

Taking the other perspective

*The influence of a fear and self-efficacy on victims' participation in
victim-offender-mediation*

Matthias Großkopf

S0193402

Masterthesis

Faculty of Behavioral Sciences

Psychology of Conflict, Risk and Safety

University of Twente

Dr. S. Zebel

Dr. E.G. Ufkes

14 August 2015

Abstract

This study aims to explore factors that influence a victim's decision to participate in victim-offender-mediation, in particular the level of fear and self-efficacy. Stemming from previous research it was expected that a higher level of self-efficacy is associated with greater willingness to participate in VOM. In addition, lower to mild levels of fear were expected to be associated with higher levels of willingness to participate in VOM than high levels of fear. Finally, it was expected that the influence of fear on the willingness to participate in VOM is moderated by the level of the victim's self-efficacy. An experiment was conducted using a 2x3 design (Self-efficacy: low vs. high x Fear: low vs. medium vs. high) using German participants with an average age of 27. The outcomes showed that no assumption could be confirmed. Practical implications include a research approach with actual crime victims for better and more valid results.

Directory

Abstract	2
Introduction	4
<i>Victim-offender-mediation</i>	5
<i>Slachtoffer in Beeld and the positive effects of VOM</i>	6
<i>Fear and VOM</i>	9
<i>Self-efficacy and VOM</i>	12
<i>Hypotheses</i>	13
Method	14
<i>Participants</i>	14
<i>Design</i>	15
<i>Pilot studies</i>	15
<i>Independent variables</i>	17
<i>Dependent variables</i>	21
<i>Procedure</i>	21
Results	22
<i>Randomization checks</i>	22
<i>Manipulation checks</i>	24
<i>Testing the hypotheses</i>	25
<i>Correlation analysis</i>	26
Discussion	26
<i>Findings</i>	28
<i>Limitations</i>	31
<i>Implications</i>	32
References	34
Appendix	37
<i>Appendix A: Overview sample</i>	37
<i>Appendix B: Stimulus Material</i>	38
<i>Appendix C: Survey</i>	45

The influence of a victim's fear and self-efficacy on the participation in Victim-offender-mediation

Restorative justice is an approach within the justice system aiming to incorporate the perspective of every party involved in a criminal offence (Sagel-Grande, 2013). This means that offender and victim as well as potential others (for example the victims and/or the offenders social surrounding) are involved in the process. John Braithwaite (2004) describes restorative justice as

...a process where all stakeholders affected by an injustice have an opportunity to discuss how they have been affected by the injustice and to decide what should be done to repair the harm. [...] It follows that conversations with those who have been hurt and with those who have inflicted the harm must be central to the process. (p. 28)

Restorative justice can have a number of different objectives. In the United Kingdom, Ireland, Australia and New Zealand for example, the aim to use restorative justice is to reduce the offenders' chance of recidivism, give victims a chance to ask questions and receive information, give the victims the chance to receive reparation and to increase the general satisfaction with the justice process for victims and offenders (Shapland et al., 2006). In the Netherlands, restorative justice focuses especially on the victim and less on the offender (Van Burik et al., 2010; Sagel-Grande, 2013). This means that restorative justice in the Netherlands is seen as more of an approach to improve the victims' situation within the juridical process, in place of being an alternative approach to the juridical process in general.

Studies show that the restorative justice approach can lead to positive outcomes for both the victim and offender. Emotions such as fear, anger or even hate have direct influence on psychological functionality of victims (Pemberton, Winkel, & Groenhuijsen, 2006). The restorative justice approach can, for example, reduce fear or anger towards the offender and

improve the victim's psychological well being (Steketee, ter Woerds, Moll & Boutellier, 2006; Strang et al., 2006). Shnabel and Nadler (2008) showed that restorative justice could also positively influence the emotional well being of offenders, although it must be noted that they did not work with actual offenders. Research further indicates that restorative justice can reduce the chance of offenders' recidivism (Bonta, Wallace-Capretta, Rooney & McAnoy (2002); Shapland et al., 2008; Umbreit, Coates & Vos, 2004).

Research on the effects of restorative justice is more prevalent than research on the factors influencing the participation in it, especially for victims. This is particularly the case in the Netherlands, which have a general victim-centered approach in restorative justice. The evaluation report of van Burik et al. (2010) about victim-offender-mediation in the Netherlands could not name reasons for the comparatively small number of victims to initiate the restorative justice process. Recently, Gröbe (2013) and Jansen (2013) researched in this field, but a lot of questions remain unanswered. This study aims to investigate the two factors *fear* and *self-efficacy* that appear to influence victims in their decision to participate in restorative justice processes. The focus here lies on the willingness to participate in victim-offender-mediation, a widely used instrument in restorative justice, especially in the Netherlands (Sagel-Grande, 2013).

Victim-offender-mediation

The term victim-offender-mediation (or VOM) describes a concept where victim and offender of a crime have a meeting which is accompanied and guided by a trained professional mediator (Bright, 1997). It provides the chance for both parties to give each other a view of their own perspective. One of the desired outcomes of VOM (and restorative justice in general) is to restore the status or situation of the victim which was damaged through the

offence, through the means of empathy and understanding for the other side. This does not only include monetary reparation, but also psychological reconciliation (Brookes, 2000; as cited in Lawson & Katz, 2004). In the Netherlands, giving the victim a better chance to process the offence is central (Hissel et al., 2006). Victims can get answers to prudent questions regarding the crime and/or the offender. Offenders can explain themselves, offer their apologies and approach the victim to make up for it (Umbreit, 2008).

There are three requirements for VOM (van Burik et al., 2010). First, participation is voluntary for both sides. Victim and offender can approach the other side through an agency or third person for the talk and both can decline the same way without giving reasons. This also means that both parties can back down from the mediation at any point. Second, the content of the meetings is strictly confidential and only shared between the three parties involved. No one is allowed to share the content with others without the permission of every party (that includes the mediator). This is to provide a safe atmosphere for the participants, in which they are free to talk about anything that concerns them regarding the offence. Third, a trained professional mediates the meeting at all times and provides supervision. This is to provide a safe and moderate atmosphere and to ensure that an honest exchange can take place.

VOM can be direct or indirect (Shapland et al., 2006). The direct form constitutes a direct meeting between the three parties victim, offender and mediator. If the social environment of the parties is part of the meeting (like family or friends), this is called a conference. Indirect VOM can be conducted in form of letter contact or through shuttle mediation, where victim and offender meet separately with the mediator in person. The mediator exchanges statements of each party with the other one. Letter contact means that the parties exchange letters instead of a personal meeting.

***Slachtoffer in Beeld* and VOM**

VOM in the Netherlands is managed and conducted through the organization *Slachtoffer in Beeld*. The numbers of requests for mediation are constantly rising since this organization was assigned. In 2012, VOM was requested 1508 times at *Slachtoffer in Beeld*. A year later in 2013, already 1759 requests reached the organization (Slachtoffer in Beeld, 2013; 2014). Although more and more parties register themselves for VOM, not all requests lead to mediated contact. Only 36 percent of the requested cases resulted in a contact (Slachtoffer in Beeld, 2014). To improve the numbers of actual mediation after an approach, research into the underlying reasons is warranted.

Offenders are also more likely to take the initiative for VOM in the Netherlands. In 2012, 84 percent of all the approaches for VOM at *Slachtoffer in Beeld* were requested by the offender's side and only 15 percent come from the victims side (Slachtoffer in Beeld, 2013). A year later in 2013, the majority of initiatives still came from the offenders' side, although it seems that the proportions are adjusting (75% offenders vs. 23% victims initiative; Slachtoffer in Beeld, 2014). The reason for the disparity is not entirely clear. It appears not to be a general dislike for VOM, as the likeliness to agree to a contact after one of both parties took the initiative is much closer for both groups. Offenders engaged in mediation in 60 percent of the cases when it was requested through the victim's side and victims in 47 percent vice versa (Slachtoffer in Beeld, 2014). The disparity in initial requests for VOM from the victims' side is therefore another important point for research.

A problem within the research on VOM which must be addressed is the self-selection bias of the participants. A number of factors like the positive outcomes of VOM in terms of psychological well being for victims or chance of recidivism for offenders could be influenced through this bias. For example, victims partaking in VOM report high numbers of satisfaction afterwards. Umbreit, Coates and Vos conducted a meta-study in 2004 and found

high numbers of satisfaction for participants of VOM in western countries. Latimer, Dowden and Muise (2005) found similar outcomes in their study and showed that victims who took part in VOM as an addition to the criminal court proceedings had a higher level of satisfaction with the outcome than those who did not. But research among actual participants of VOM (victims and offenders) makes per definition use of people that voluntarily took part in it and excludes those who did not wish to participate. This means, that for example a high level of satisfaction afterwards cannot without doubt be attributed to the process of VOM: Being motivated to participate in the first place could also mean a motivation to end the process with a positive outcome or to cooperate with the process. On the other hand, if someone would not be motivated to engage in VOM, but forced to do so, the level of satisfaction afterwards could be vastly different. Additionally, other factors like a victim's personality could influence the willingness to participate in and afterwards satisfaction with the process: being more open towards others in general for example could eventually lead to an increased willingness to participate in VOM.

Therefore, it is especially necessary to look into the factors which influence a potential participant's decision to undergo VOM. In the work, the focus lies on the victim. The disparity between offenders and victims in terms of taking initiative for VOM indicates a need for research. Factors which influence the victims' decision to (not) participate in VOM, from the point of restorative justice in general and *Slachtoffer in beeld* (as an organization involved) in particular, stand in the focus.

Fear and VOM

Fear is often a result of being victim in a criminal offence. The victim can suffer from serious emotional damage up to the point of post traumatic stress disease (PTSD), is often directly

related to the offender. A significant impairment of the psychological functioning is very probable (Lens, Pemberton & Groenhuijsen, 2010; Pemberton, Winkel, & Groenhuijsen, 2006). Connected to this is the extended body of research that is concerned with the positive effects of VOM and its objective to restore the emotional well being of the victim. As already named above, VOM can contribute to the reduction of feelings of fear or anger towards the offender and the restoration of victim's the emotional well being (Burik et al., 2010; Hissel et al., 2006; Shnabel & Nadler, 2008; Steketee et al., 2006; Strang et al., 2006).

The influence of VOM on fear is researched and explained well. What is less well explained is the influence of fear on VOM, precisely spoken on the willingness to participate in VOM. Research into the field has come up with a number of different descriptions for the relationship between fear and the willingness to participate. However, no plausible explanation to incorporate all findings has been given yet. The problem is that the outcomes of different studies are conflicting and partly also contrary. This study aims to solve this problem and to explain the different findings with an encompassing solution.

Fear can negatively influence a victim's willingness to participate in VOM. A very important point for victims is that the offender is taking responsibility for the act and to get answers and insight about the circumstances of their crime, especially reasons and motives of the offender (Coats, Burns & Umbreit, 2004; Umbreit, Coats & Vos, 2004). Not getting answers to their questions and the risk possibly having to relive the situation again through the contact with their offender can lead to fear (Steketee et al., 2006). The victim's family can also fear that this situation will happen and thus discourage a participation in VOM (Coats, Burns & Umbreit, 2004; Steketee et al., 2006). In addition, victims suffer from an increased vulnerability in addition to fear, which alone can be enough not to participate (Pemberton, Winkel & Groenhuijsen, 2006). It is likely that a vulnerable victim relies on the advice of his

or her trusted social surrounding, therefore giving chance to further fuel their fear and decline VOM.

There have been various attempts to link the experienced fear of a victim to the severity of the crime (Umbreit, Coats & Vos, 2004). Following these propositions, Janssen (2013) expected victims of a crime with higher severity (e.g. home invasion) preferring punishment of their offender while victims of a crime with lower severity (e.g. a simple theft) preferring mediation. The outcomes were actually quite contrary. Being victim of a high severity crime made it more likely to prefer mediation over punishment. Vice versa, being victim of a low severity crime made it not more likely to prefer mediation. Participants in the high severity crime condition showed significant higher levels of fear in comparison to participants in the low severity crime condition. These findings are partly supported by the study of Coats, Burns and Umbreit (2004), where a majority of the victims stated that their crime was not serious enough to justify mediation. A possible explanation would be that the severity of a crime influences the level of fear and that fear can also be positively influence the willingness to participate in VOM.

The positive influence of fear is supported by a report over VOM conducted by Hissel et al. (2006). It showed that a part of the victims that feared their offender, choose not to avoid but to engage in a confrontation. Despite their fear, VOM was seen as a potentially viable instrument to overcome their fear in a controlled and moderated environment. The report showed also that in general an increased level of fear led to an increased level of participation (Hissel et al., 2006). Gröbe (2013) supports these findings. The study compared a number of attributes (including emotions towards the offender) of participants with their willingness to engage in VOM. The level of *anticipated fear* towards the offender was a significant positive predictor of the victim's willingness to partake in mediation; the higher the level of fear, the higher the willingness to participate.

It should be noted that Gröbes study was conducted with participants who were indeed not real victims, but asked to put themselves in a victim situation. This is important, because a (real) victim can suffer from an increased feeling of vulnerability in addition to the increased feeling of fear, which can be sufficient for a decline of participation as mentioned above (Pemberton, Winkel & Groenhuijsen, 2006). Although Gröbes (2013) study did not measure the participants' vulnerability, it measured self-efficacy. Self-efficacy is negatively related to vulnerability (Bandura & Locke, 2003), making it another possibly influencing factor for the participation in VOM.

Self-efficacy and VOM

Self-efficacy describes a person's trust and believe in the own ability to reach a goal or complete a task (Omrod, 2006). Moreover, it can influence a number of things, like a person's motivation and persistence against stress or difficulties, emotional well-being or sensitivity to stress (Bandura & Locke, 2003). Until now, only little research has been done regarding the relationship between self-efficacy and VOM. Gröbe (2013) approached the subject referring to the *Theory of Planned Behavior*, a model which is used to describe and predict human behavior (Ajzen, 1991). Crime severity and the point of time of the VOM happening were added to the original model. Gröbes study (2013) had two important outcomes. First, being victim of an offence with a high crime severity decreases the perceived self-efficacy (in reference to VOM) in victims, the same self-efficacy that directly increases the willingness to participate in VOM. Second, an increase in self-efficacy also reduces the perceived amount of fear in a victim (Gröbe, 2013). These findings give reason to assume that self-efficacy influences relationship of fear and a victim's willingness to participate in VOM.

A similar interaction concerning self-efficacy can be found in the field of risk studies, which is concerned with the perception and processing of risks and the reaction to it. A person's intention to engage in risk preventing behavior is influenced by self-efficacy and also the height of the risk. Kievik and Gutteling (2011) stated that people who see themselves as able to cope with a risk (e.g. those with a high self-efficacy) are more inclined to start with measures to protect themselves from the risk (as long as the measures are seen as effective). They also found that higher levels of risk increases a person's willingness to engage in information seeking behavior and the willingness to take risk preventing measures (Kievik & Gutteling, 2011). As it appears, a distinct level of risk is needed to create a necessity for a reaction to the risk. If there is necessity, self-efficacy is also needed so that a person feels able to cope with the risk and engages in the preventive measures.

These findings are comparable to the findings on the relationship between fear and the willingness to participate in VOM. As described above, a raised level of risk probably creates a necessity to engage in self-protective behavior, similar to the distinct level of fear that is needed for a general willingness to participate in VOM (Coats, Burns & Umbreit, 2004; Hissel et al., 2006). But there is also evidence that a too high level of fear decreases the victim's willingness to participate in VOM and prevents a mediation (Burns & Umbreit, 2004; Steketee et al., 2006; Umbreit, Coats & Vos, 2004). Self-efficacy is also needed for an engagement in self-protective behavior in risk situations. Following Gröbes (2013) study, the same could be true for the engagement in VOM: with increased self-efficacy increases the willingness to participate in VOM. In summary, fear (experienced by being victim of a crime) creates a necessity to engage in behavior to cope with it. If a person or a victim then sees themselves as being able to cope with it (through having a distinct amount of self-efficacy), the possibility that one engages in the behavior (self-protective or VOM) rises.

Self-efficacy negatively influences fear (Gröbe, 2013) and vulnerability (Bandura & Locke, 2003) which showed to negatively influence the participation of VOM. Combined with the conflicting results regarding the relationship between fear and the willingness to participate in VOM (Coats, Burns & Umbreit, 2004; Gröbe, 2013; Hissel, 2006) stated earlier in this work, this offers a new approach for explanation. An increase in fear likely leads to an increase in willingness to participation in VOM. But it also appears that a level of fear which is too high effectively decreases willingness for participation.

A possible explanation could be a curve-linear relationship between fear and the willingness to participate in VOM, dependent on the level of self-efficacy. In this proposed scheme, there must be a distinct level of fear for VOM to be seen as a necessary coping mechanism. At lower levels of fear, the necessity is likely not given and therefore the willingness to participate is low. At higher levels, fear has also a negative influence on the level of willingness to participate. Self efficacy can make a distinction: with high self-efficacy, the willingness to participate rises at all levels of fear. The highest willingness to participate could then be found in a combination of a mid level of fear and a high level of self-efficacy.

Hypotheses

This study attempts to further explain the influencing factors on the willingness to participate in VOM. Fear and self-efficacy appear to be relevant. Fear and self-efficacy are proposed to directly influence the willingness for participation. It is also proposed that a curve-linear relationship between fear and the willingness to participate in VOM exists. A main-effect is expected for self-efficacy and the willingness to participate in VOM.

H1) *Higher levels of self-efficacy are associated with higher levels of willingness to participate in VOM*

A main-effect is expected for fear, with a curve linear relationship between fear and the willingness to participate in VOM.

H2) *Low to mid levels of fear are associated with higher levels of willingness to participate than high levels of fear.*

An interaction effect is expected between fear, self-efficacy and the willingness to participate in VOM. The strength of relationship between fear and the willingness to participate in VOM changes depending on the level of self-efficacy.

H3) *The effect of fear on the willingness to participate in VOM is moderated by self efficacy. Willingness to participate in VOM is highest for a combination of a mid level of fear and a high level of self-efficacy.*

Method

Participants

The participants in the study were not real crime victims, but voluntaries who were asked to put themselves in a comparable situation throughout an experiment. The participants were recruited online via German social networks, with the experiment being done in German. In total 258 people started with the experiment. 67 participants were excluded from the study for missing crucial data because they stopped their participation within the manipulation phase and before any variable could be measured. Three participants were further excluded for being aware of the manipulations during the experiments. This leaves 188 participants whose data was analyzed (response rate = 73%). Of the 188 participants, 52% were male, 48% were

female. The average age was 27 ($SD = 7.62$). 72.3% were familiar with VOM and 99.5% had not partaken in VOM before. One participant has been offender before (0.5%), 6.9% of the participants were acquainted with an offender. 14% had been a victim themselves, and 35% were acquainted with a victim in a comparable crime. 51.4% of the participants were still students and 34.1% already had a college degree. Most of the participants held a bachelor's degree (54.8%), followed by a master's degree (19.4%), the diploma degree (17.7%) and a doctoral degree (3.2%). See appendix A for a precise breakdown of the distribution of participants over the experiment conditions.

Design

An experiment was chosen with six different conditions, using a 2 (Self-efficacy: low vs. high) x 3 (Fear: low vs. medium vs. high) design. Manipulated was the participant's fear and self-efficacy. To research the possibility of a curve linear relationship, a *medium* fear condition was placed in between the low and high fear condition. The dependent variable, willingness to participate in VOM, was assessed with two dimensions: willingness to engage in contact with the offender and actual willingness to participate in VOM. All dependent and independent variables using a questionnaire made use of a 5 point Likert-scale, consisting of the answers *strongly disagree* (1), *disagree* (2), *neither agree or disagree* (3), *agree* (4) and *strongly agree* (5).

Pilot Studies

Two different pilot studies were conducted to check if the stimulus for fear and self-efficacy manipulation was working and also to test the questionnaires for the manipulation check. 28 test persons were part of the first pilot study, with an average age of 27 years ($SD = 5.53$). 15

of the participants were male, 13 were female. The participants were recruited via social networks and randomly placed in one of the six conditions. The first pilot study did not show a significant influence of the experimental conditions on *perceived fear* or *perceived self-efficacy*, making it unlikely that the stimulus was effective. Both stimuli for fear and self-efficacy manipulation within the experiment were then reworked. Factor analysis indicated that the manipulation check questionnaire for self-efficacy consisted of two different dimensions. The questionnaire was expanded on items in regards to the dimensions *self-efficacy: self in conflict* and *self-efficacy: others in conflict*. Existing were items for example “*I think I can handle my emotions that could play a role in a conflict*” or “*I can stand up for positions in a conflict situation*”. The existing items that were attributed to the *self in conflict* dimension were mirrored with items that could be attributed to the *others in conflict* dimension, for example “*I think I can handle the emotions of my counterpart in a conflict situation*” or “*I can sympathize with the positions of my counterpart in conflict situation*”. No significant differences in the outcomes were found between participants with a psychological background in comparison to other participants.

The second pilot test had 19 participants with an average age of 27 ($SD = 2.68$), 10 were male and 9 female. The participants were randomly distributed over the conditions. The manipulation of self-efficacy showed significant differences on the manipulation check of *self-efficacy: self in conflict* ($F(1, 18) = 6.81, p < 0.05$). Participants in the *high* self-efficacy condition significantly had a higher level of experienced *self-efficacy: self in conflict* ($M = 4.10$) than the participants in the *low* self-efficacy condition ($M = 3.22$). For the manipulation of *self-efficacy: others in conflict*, a promising effect was found ($F(1, 18) = 3.58, p = 0.076$) but no significance difference between the participants in the *high* self-efficacy ($M = 3.93$) and the *low* self-efficacy condition ($M = 3.36$). Both scales had high reliability, *self-efficacy: self in conflict* Cronbach's $\alpha = .91$ and *self-efficacy: others in conflict* Cronbach's $\alpha = .84$. No

significant effects were found for the condition *fear* on perceived fear. The stimulus of the manipulation of fear was adjusted to a more severe crime and more severe outcomes in the *high fear* condition and a less severe crime in the *low fear* condition.

Independent variables

Self-efficacy

Self-efficacy was manipulated through a personality characteristics questionnaire consisting of a shortened version of the Hexaco Personality Inventory (Ashton & Lee, 2009). 30 statements regarding six major personality traits (*Honesty-humility, emotionality, extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, openness to experience*) had to be answered. The statements for the *high self-efficacy* experimental condition were positively worded in order to evoke a higher degree of agreement, while the statements for the *low self-efficacy* experimental condition were negatively worded in order to evoke a higher degree of rejection. An example statement for the *high self-efficacy* condition would be “*On most days, I am happy and optimistic*” and for the *low self-efficacy* condition “*On most days, I am neither happy nor optimistic*”. See Appendix B.1 for a complete listing of the questions.

The participants self efficacy was further manipulated via an Emotional Recognition Task. In both self-efficacy conditions, the test persons were successively shown 5 different pictures that depicted basic emotions (happiness, anger, amusement, surprise, and pride, see appendix B.2). Each picture was accompanied with four possible emotions and the participants were asked to choose which one was depicted on the picture. For the *high self-efficacy* experiment condition, the appropriate emotion was among the four possible answers. For the *low self-efficacy* experimental condition it was not, meaning that the participants in that condition were not able to give the right answer. The intent in the low self-efficacy

condition was to evoke mistrust within the participants for their abilities of emotional recognition, therefore lowering the level of experienced self-efficacy and making the manipulation more believable.

Because the personality characteristics questionnaire was only for face value, no actual score was measured or calculated. Instead on completion, the participants were presented with a score dependent on their self-efficacy condition. Participants in the high self-efficacy condition got a message that attested them with a high score and the information that scores like this were associated with good social skills in reference to conflict solving and recognizing emotions. Participants in the low self-efficacy condition got a message which told them the opposite, that they achieved a low score and that these score were associated with low problem solving skills and difficulties in the recognition of emotions (see appendix B.3 for the complete messages). This was done to ensure that the manipulation of self-efficacy was tailored to the participants' relationship to VOM and their willingness to partake in it.

Fear

Anticipated fear of a victim can be traced in the severity of the crime he or she was exposed to. Gröbe (2013) made use of different scenarios graded on severity, which proved to gradually invoke fear into the participant; higher severity resulted in higher levels of fear. The three conditions *low fear*, *medium fear* and *high fear* were manipulated through constructed crime stories in three different levels of severity. The participants were exposed to one story each and asked to put themselves in the situation of the victim in the story for the course of the experiment.

The three stories used to induce fear in the participants are graduated in severity of the offence and negative consequences for the victim (see appendix B.4 for the complete

scenarios). All three describe a robbery of the victim. In the story for the condition *low fear*, the victim is robbed of a sports bag after a gym visit. The victim places the bag on the ground to open a car; the robber takes the bag and runs away. The victim has faces no negative consequences (beside the stolen bag) through the offence. In the condition *medium fear*, the offender additionally threatens the victim with violence should he not be able to grasp the bag. Besides that, the circumstances are the same with the condition *low fear*. In the third condition, *high fear*, the offender carries a knife and threatens with serious violence and death in case the victims resists that the offender grabs the bag. Additionally, the victim sustains negative consequences for the time being as a result of the offence. This includes a fear of going out after dark alone, feeling uncomfortable and unsafe in general and avoiding the area where the offence took place.

In all three stories, the victim decides to call the police right away to report the offence. The story goes on that the offender is found; being a distant acquaintance from the fitness studio where the offence took place (This is presented in all fear conditions alike). Afterwards, VOM is shortly introduced with a number of key points and the participants (as victims) are offered the chance to participate in it. All three fear conditions were presented the same introduction.

Social demographical facts

All participants were asked to give their social demographical facts at the end of the experiment. This included age, sex, country of origin, level of education and description of their occupation. The participants were also asked if they were familiar with VOM. An example question is “*Have you heard about victim-offender-mediation*”. It was also asked if they were once victim or offender in a comparable situation, for example “*Have you ever been victim in a comparable situation like the story you read*” or “*Have you ever been*

offender in a comparable situation like the story you read". This was done to control if a familiarity with the concept of VOM is of influence on the outcomes.

Manipulation checks fear, anger and self-efficacy

Manipulation checks were conducted for both variables self-efficacy and fear. A complete list of the survey can be found in appendix C. Participants were asked to choose the answer that confirmed most with their feeling. The five items are oriented at Gröbe's scale from 2013, although some adjustments were made when the items were translated to German. Factor analysis showed two sub constructs for fear, namely *perceived fear* (6 items, $\alpha = .85$) and *perceived frustration* (1 item). An example question for *perceived fear* would be "*If I would think of the offender one month later, I would feel anxious*". Perceived frustration was measured through "*If I would think of the offender one month later, I would feel frustrated*".

Although the variable *anger* was not directly part of the study in terms of manipulation, anger towards the offender was a significant influence on the willingness to participate in the study of Gröbe (2013). To control for a possible influence of anger, three items were added to the questionnaire to measure the victims *perceived anger* ($\alpha = .85$). A typical question would be "*If I would think of the offender one month later, I would feel angry*".

The manipulation of self-efficacy was conducted via a questionnaire, derived from Gröbe's scale from 2013 with some adjustments made as a result of the pilot studies. Based on the on the pilot studies and factor analysis, self-efficacy consists in this case of two dimensions *self efficacy: self in conflict* (7 items, $\alpha = .81$) and *self efficacy: others in conflict* (3 items, $\alpha = .65$). Internal consistency is sufficient in both cases.

Dependent variables

The items are oriented at the study of Gröbe (2013) which showed a high internal consistency for both dimensions, with 3 items each. Even though factor analysis only identified one factor for the whole construct (explaining 54,94% of the variance), it was decided to keep both dimensions separate for a more accurate interpretation of the outcomes. The first dimension takes reference to the victim's willingness to engage in contact with the offender, called *willingness for contact* (three items, $\alpha = .68$). An example would be: "*As a victim in this situation, I want answers from the offender*". The second dimension refers to the actual participation in VOM, called *willingness for participation* (three items, $\alpha = .83$). The statement "*I would like to participate in VOM with the offender*" would be a typical example. In both cases, the internal consistency was satisfying.

Procedure

The experiment was conducted online via Qualtrics, participants were recruited via social networks. The experiment began with an introduction and short outline of the goal of the study and asked the participants to give their consent. The participants were further informed that they could stop the experiment at any point. The face value of the experiment pretended that the study aims to research the relationship between personality characteristics and conflict solving skills. This masked the real aim of manipulating the participants fear and self-efficacy. The participants were randomly distributed over the six conditions (low fear/low self-efficacy; low fear/high self-efficacy; medium fear/low self-efficacy; medium fear/high self-efficacy; high fear/low self-efficacy; high fear/high self-efficacy).

After the introduction, the participants were then asked to complete the personality characteristics questionnaire. No actual scores were measured or calculated (the questionnaire

was for face value only). Subsequent, the participants were asked to fill in the emotional recognition task. On completion of the both tasks, participants were presented with the manipulation message depending on their experimental condition. The first manipulation check for self-efficacy was conducted afterwards.

In the second part of the study, participants were asked to read a short story and to put themselves into the role of the victim. They were then exposed to one of three stories (in dependence of their experimental group), ranked in severity of manipulated fear. The experiment continued in telling the participants that the offender was arrested and that they could participate in VOM. VOM as a concept was shortly explained to the participants. To check the manipulation of fear, the participants were presented with a questionnaire. A second check for the manipulation of self-efficacy was also conducted at this point, as well as a questionnaire to determine the participants' interest in contact with the hypothetical offender and their willingness to engage in VOM.

The third and last part consisted of a questionnaire to examine the participants' familiarity with VOM and if they or someone out of their social surrounding had ever been victim or offender in a comparable crime (comparable to the crime in their story). Afterwards, the social demographical information was collected, followed by the debriefing. The debriefing explained the true background and purpose of the study and thanked for participation. The experiment was then completed.

Results

Randomization Check

Randomization checks were conducted via Chi-Square tests for the experimental conditions *fear* and *self-efficacy*, the sociographic background, familiarity and former participation in

VOM and also if the participant or someone in their social surrounding had ever been victim or offender in a comparable crime. An unexpected significant difference was found in familiarity with VOM depending on the self-efficacy manipulation, $X^2(1) = 5.72, p < 0.05$. Participants in the *high* self-efficacy condition were less likely to be familiar with VOM (21% yes, 79% no) than participants in the low self-efficacy condition (36% yes, 64% no). As a result, familiarity with VOM was used as a covariate in the analyses below. See Appendix A for a complete list of the results of the analyses.

Manipulation checks fear and self-efficacy

To check if the manipulation of fear and self-efficacy of the participants was successful and to further check for interaction effects between fear and self-efficacy, a two-way independent ANOVA was conducted for the dependent variables perceived fear, perceived self efficacy: self in conflict and self efficacy: others in conflict. A two-way independent ANOVA was also conducted to check for unexpected manipulation of perceived anger and perceived frustration through fear and self-efficacy.

A significant main effect was found for the manipulation of fear (low vs. mid vs. high) on manipulation check *perceived fear*, $F(2, 185) = 6.31, p < 0.01$. Scores on perceived fear are significantly lower for participants in the *low fear* condition ($M = 3.02, SE = 0.81, p = 0.001$) and the *mid fear* condition ($M = 3.20, SE = 0.74, p < 0.05$) in comparison to the *high fear* condition ($M = 3.49, SE = 0.77$). Scores on perceived fear are not significantly lower in the *low fear* condition in comparison to the *mid fear* condition ($p = 0.21$). No significant effect for the manipulation of self-efficacy on *perceived fear* was found ($F(1, 186) = 0.89, p = .35$) and there was also no interaction effect between fear and self-efficacy on *perceived fear* ($F(2, 185) = 0.40, p = .67$). Thus, the manipulation of fear proved successful.

Unexpectedly, no significant main effects were found for the manipulation of self efficacy (low vs. high) on the manipulation check *self efficacy: self in conflict*, $F(1, 186) = 0.01, p = .93$. No significant main effects were found for the manipulation of self efficacy (low vs. high) on the manipulation check *self efficacy: others in conflict*, $F(1, 186) = 0.01, p = .91$. There were further no effects found for *fear on self efficacy: self in conflict* ($F(2, 185) = 1.13, p = .330$) or *self efficacy: others in conflict* ($F(2, 185) = 0.27, p = .77$). No interaction effects between fear and self-efficacy were found on *self efficacy: self in conflict* ($F(2, 185) = 0.14, p = .87$) or *self efficacy: others in conflict* ($F(2, 185) = 0.28, p = .76$). Thus, the manipulation of self-efficacy was not successful.

No main effects were found for the manipulation of fear on *perceived frustration* ($F(2, 185) = 1.94, p = .15$). There were also no main effects found for the manipulation of self-efficacy on *perceived frustration* ($F(1, 186) = 0.03, p = .87$). There were further no main effects found for the manipulation of fear on *perceived anger* ($F(2, 185) = 1.67, p = .19$) or the manipulation of self-efficacy on *perceived anger* ($F(1, 186) = 0.26, p = .61$). Finally, no interaction effects emerged between the manipulation of fear and self-efficacy on *perceived anger* ($F(2, 185) = 0.57, p = .57$) or *perceived frustration* ($F(2, 185) = 0.05, p = .95$). Thus, no unintended manipulations of anger or frustration have occurred.

Testing the hypotheses

To explore the differences between the experimental groups on the willingness to engage in contact with the offender and to participate in VOM, a two-way independent analysis of variance was conducted. Familiarity with VOM was added as covariate.

No significant effect was found for the manipulation of *self-efficacy* on the willingness for contact ($F(1, 178) = 1.49, p = .22$). In addition, no significant effect was found for *self-*

efficacy on the willingness to participate in VOM ($F(1, 178) = 1.95, p = .17$). Hypothesis 1 is therefore rejected.

No significant effect was found for the manipulation of *fear* on the willingness for contact ($F(2, 178) = 1.47, p = .23$). No significant effect was found for *fear* on the willingness to participate in VOM ($F(2, 178) = 1.25, p = .29$) either. Thus, hypothesis 2 is not confirmed.

A marginal significant effect was found for the interaction between the manipulation of *fear* and *self-efficacy* on the willingness to participate in VOM ($F(2, 178) = 2.70, p = .07$). A one-way independent analysis of variance was then conducted for differences between the experimental groups (1: low self-efficacy/low fear; 2: low self-efficacy/mid fear; 3: low self-efficacy/high fear; 4: high self-efficacy/low fear; 5: high self-efficacy/mid fear; 6: high self-efficacy/high fear) and the willingness to participate in VOM, but no significant difference between the groups was found ($F(5, 187) = 1.11, p = .36$). The means for each group show unexpected outcomes for the willingness to participate. The highest mean was found in group 2 ($M = 3.46, SE = 0.99$), followed by group 4 ($M = 3.41, SE = 0.88$), group 6 ($M = 3.35, SE = 0.99$), group 1 ($M = 3.15, SE = 0.91$). Group 5, which was expected to have the highest willingness to participate, had the second to lowest mean score ($M = 3.14, SE = 0.83$). However, the combination of high levels of fear and low levels of self-efficacy (as found in group 3) yielded the lowest level of willingness to participate as expected ($M = 3.02, SE = 0.89$). No interaction effect between the manipulation of *fear* and *self-efficacy* was found for the willingness for contact ($F(2, 178) = .50, p = .61$). Based on the findings, hypothesis 3 can only be partly confirmed.

The covariate *familiarity with VOM* had no significant effect on *willingness to contact* ($F(1, 178) = .13, p = .72$) and *willingness to participate* ($F(1, 178) = .09, p = .77$).

Correlation analysis

Because the manipulation of self-efficacy was not successful, a correlation analysis was conducted between (individual differences in) the self-reported perceived self-efficacy *self* & *others* in conflict and the willingness to contact and to participate in VOM. This was done as an alternative test for hypothesis 1.

No significant correlation was found between perceived self-efficacy: *self* in conflict and the willingness to contact ($r(186) = .09, p = .12$) or the willingness to participate in VOM ($r(186) = .09, p = .12$). And no significant correlation was found between perceived self-efficacy: *others* in conflict and the willingness to contact ($r(186) = .03, p = .37$) or the willingness to participate in VOM ($r(186) = .08, p = .13$). The outcomes leave hypothesis 1 unconfirmed.

Discussion

Research has shown that victim offender mediation can have several positive impacts on both victim and offender. Apart from the general potential to improve coping with the offence, VOM can reduce feelings of anger or fear in victims (Steketee, ter Woerds, Moll & Boutellier, 2006; Strang et al., 2006). Offenders can profit from VOM as well, for example through the reduction of their recidivism rate (Umbreit, Coates & Vos, 2004) or through improvement of their own emotional well being (Shnabler & Nadler, 2008).

Slachtoffer in Beeld is the organization concerned with implementation and execution of VOM in the Netherlands. Their reports of 2014 showed some points of improvement. A big disparity exists between victims and offenders in who approaches for VOM: only 23% of the approaches in 2013 came from the victim (Slachtoffer in Beeld, 2014). Additionally, only 36% of all approaches resulted in actual mediation between victim and offender (Slachtoffer

in Beeld 2014). These numbers raise questions, but only little research has been concerned with possible causes. Van Burik et al. (2010) could not give an explanation for the existing disparity in the approaches for VOM. Recently, some research began to explore the field (Gröbe, 2013; Jansen, 2013) but a big part is still unclear. This study aims to explain the influence of two factors and their interaction on a victim's decision making process for the engagement in VOM. An experiment was executed that influenced *fear* and *self-efficacy* of the participants and measured their impact on the willingness to participate in VOM.

The first hypothesis was concerned with the possible influence of self-efficacy on VOM. The decision making process to participate in VOM was expected to be similar to the decision making process for risk preventing behavior. A higher level of risk increases the intention to engage in risk preventing behavior and this intention is influenced by self-efficacy (Kievik and Gutteling found 2011). It was thus expected that an increased level of self-efficacy was related to a likewise increased level of willingness for participation in VOM. No effect for self-efficacy on the willingness to participate in VOM could be found, which can be attributed to the deficient manipulation of self-efficacy within the participants.

A second assumption was based on the preceding research on the relationships between fear and participation in VOM (Coats, Burns & Umbreit, 2004; Pemberton, Winkel & Groenhuijsen, 2006; Steketee et al., 2006) it was expected that lower to mid levels of fear were related to a higher willingness for a participation in VOM in comparison to higher levels of fear. This assumption could not be confirmed.

Preceding research implicates that fear can influence the willingness to participate positively and negatively (Coats, Burns & Umbreit, 2004; Gröbe, 2013; Umbreit, Coats & Vos, 2004). Based on comparable theories out of the field of risk management, a curve-linear relationship for the influence of fear on the willingness to participate in VOM seems likely, moderated through self-efficacy. Fear creates a necessity for coping in the victim that must be

approached, making a distinct level of fear necessary for a potential willingness to participate in VOM. On high levels, fear also negatively influences the willingness. Self-efficacy influences fear negatively and willingness to participate positively. The highest willingness to participate in VOM was thus expected for a combination of mid-levels of fear and high levels of self-efficacy. The assumption that the effect of fear on the willingness to participate is moderated by self-efficacy could not be confirmed through the experiment, but indications for a relationship between the two factors and an influence on the willingness to participate in VOM was found.

Findings

Hypothesis 1, 2 could not be confirmed and hypothesis 3 only to an extent. This can be attributed to the failure to manipulate self-efficacy. Additional explanations are discussed below.

Self-efficacy

The first hypothesis stated that higher levels of self-efficacy are associated with higher levels of willingness to participate in VOM. No significant effect of the condition self-efficacy on both the *perceived self-efficacy* variables could be found, and no significant effect of both *perceived self-efficacy* variables on the willingness to participate in VOM could be found either. This means that a participant's self-efficacy category influenced the willingness to participate, but not the measured level of self-efficacy.

It is difficult to give a thorough explanation. Manipulation of self-efficacy itself in general is possible, however to contain the effect only to conflict situations is more challenging. It was attempted to manipulate the self-efficacy through an emotional recognition task and direct message, but emotional recognition is only related to conflict

situations. The manipulation in the experiment could have influenced other constructs within the participant, for example self-efficacy regarding emotional recognition or handling, but other constructs were not tested. Further, the scale to measure the perceived self-efficacy was newly constructed and only tested through a small pilot study (that showed promising results regarding the manipulation of self-efficacy). The possibility that the scale had a low validity and did not measure self-efficacy in regards to conflict situations cannot be excluded. A bigger and more explorative scale would be necessary for a satisfying explanation of the outcomes. Items that measure the participants' self-efficacy in regards to emotional recognition would be needed to give insight and to make a distinction in the manipulation.

Fear

The second hypothesis stated that low to mid levels of fear would have a higher willingness to participate in VOM than high levels. The results did not show a significant effect for fear on the willingness to participate. This could be attributed to the fact that no real victims were used in the experiment. The participants did not suffer the real potentially severe consequences of being a victim and only placed themselves in a role. Although the manipulation checks showed that the condition fear significantly influenced perceived fear, the participants were never in danger and suffered no actual consequences of an offence as victims. This experiment can be classified as low stakes situation, wherein reality, conflicts are often a high stakes situation. Giebels, Ufkes and van Erp (2014) classify high stake situations with three points: the conflict is experienced as troublesome and urgent (for at least one party), the outcome is of high value and beyond the reach the parties, and it is uncertain how the conflict outcome develops. None of this is given in the experimental situation. Neither can be expected that the participant experiences actual urgency for an outcome, nor is this outcome of any value for the participant. There is also no uncertainty, because the

“conflict” ends with experiment. That being said, the results could be very different in a real world situation, for example when working with actual victims of crimes as participants.

In addition, it is possible that manipulation did not influence only fear, but also the perceived severity of the crime. Similar results were found by Gröbe (2013) where crime severity had no significant influence on the willingness to participate in VOM. The experimental condition fear was graded in crime severity and expected to also influence fear in the participants. The condition fear influenced *perceived fear*, but perceived crime severity could have been a stronger influenced. Crime severity could also have influenced constructs like willingness for reparation or punishment. If perceived fear was only a small subset of variables that were influenced through the manipulation, its influence on the willingness to participate in VOM could have been too weak to measure.

Interaction of fear and self-efficacy

The third hypothesis stated that influence of fear on the willingness for Participation in VOM was moderated by self-efficacy. Only a marginal significant interaction effect between the manipulation of fear and self-efficacy could be found for the willingness to participate in VOM, but not for the willingness to contact the offender. Comparison between the means of each experimental group for the willingness to participate in VOM revealed that the highest level of willingness to participate was unexpectedly not found in the combination of high levels of self-efficacy and mid levels of fear, but in the combination of low levels of self-efficacy and mid levels of fear.

The lowest level of willingness to participate was found for the combination of high levels of fear and low levels of self-efficacy. This would fit with the idea of a curve linear relationship for fear and self-efficacy and their influence on the willingness to participate, but it should be noted that the means between the groups did not differ significantly from each

other. The findings cannot confirm the initial hypothesis, but they indicate that a relationship between fear and self-efficacy and a combined influence on the willingness to participate in VOM exists.

Limitations

The study suffered from two important limitations. First, subjects in the study were not real victims of crimes, but voluntary participants that were asked to put themselves in the role of a victim. Although their age ranged from 16 to 76, participants were only 27 on average and predominantly students (especially from the psychology department). Analysis showed that background variables like familiarity with VOM did not significantly influence the willingness to participate in it, but a generally more positive attitude towards VOM cannot be ruled out for this population. Influencing the participant's emotions like fear or anger throughout the experiment can only be an approximation to a real world situation. Using real victims would promise a higher validity, but also raises ethical concerns. Victims of crime can suffer from a variety of negative consequences like PTSD (Ehlers & Clark, 2000). Having them relive the offence could be stressful, if not worsening. Protection of the victims must be in any way central in such an approach.

Second, only measuring intent to do a certain behavior (the willingness to participate in VOM) instead of measuring actual behavior is another limitation that must be mentioned. The study did not work with actual (possible) participants of VOM. Measured was the willingness to engage in contact with the (hypothetic) offender and to participate in a (hypothetic) possible VOM. A statement to intent does not automatically lead to participation in real world situation. As mentioned, based on the population that took part in the study, a generally more positive attitude towards the participation in VOM can be expected. A study

design where intent and later an actual rate of participation in VOM are measured could give further insight into impacting factors. Of course as already mentioned, experiments with real victims can only happen under more strict ethical guidelines than those already necessary.

Implications

This study attempted to look into factors that influence the participation in VOM. The study failed to confirm the first two hypotheses and only confirmed the third hypothesis to a (weak) extent. No definitive conclusions can be made that would be of impact on the handling and application of VOM for victims. With other experiment parameters and/or other participants it would be possible to confirm the hypotheses.

Research with real victims and/or potential participants of VOM would be preferred. Actual victims would be in high stake situations, which means that the implications of possible conclusions could be stronger (Giebels, Ufkes & van Erp, 2014) than in a low stake situation like in this experiment. Such an experiment design would not only have to incorporate narrow and important ethical guidelines. Victims often suffer from PTSD and other various negative consequences after the offences, which under no circumstances can be worsened by the experiment. Having a victim reliving the offences for example should therefore be avoided. Instead of manipulating certain parameters like fear, a scale that would measure emotional states like fear or anger would be preferred. The moment of implementation of a possible research scenario is also of importance. Measuring victims that already (plan to) participate in VOM could lead to a bias of a higher acceptance rate or more positive attitude towards VOM and or the offender (much like the bias of using psychology students as participants) in comparison to those who denied a participation or made no approach. Slachtoffer in Beeld could implement a survey at the same time they approach a

victim or offender for participation. Afterwards, the outcomes could be compared between those who in the end did participate in VOM and those who declined it.

Unfortunately, no practical implications can be given based on this study. No significant results were found that could practically improve victim-offender-mediation for victims. But in terms of research, implications can be made. Although working with actual victims would be more complicated in general than with participants that only pretend to be victims, it could improve the outcomes by length and further improve implementation of VOM for victims.

References

- Ajzen, I. (1991). The theory of planned behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 50 (2), 179-211.
- Ashton, M. C., & Lee, K. (2009). The HEXACO-60: A short measure of the major dimensions of personality. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 91, 340-345.
- Bandura, A., & Locke, E. A. (2003). Negative self-efficacy and goal effects revisited. *Journal of applied psychology*, 88 (1), 87.
- Bergseth, K. J. & Bouffard, J. A. (2007). The long-term impact of restorative justice programming for juvenile offenders. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 35, 433-451.
- Bonta, J., Wallace-Capretta, S., Rooney, J., & McAnoy, K. (2002). An outcome evaluation of a restorative justice alternative to incarceration. *Contemporary Justice Review*, 5, 319-338
- Braithwaite, J. (2004). "Restorative Justice and De-Professionalization". *The Good Society*, 13 (1), 28-31.
- Bright, C.. (1997). Victim Offender Mediation . In *What is restorative justice?*. Retrieved 31.12.2014, from <http://www.restorativejustice.org>.
- Coates, R. B., Umbreit, M. S. & Burns, H. (2004). Why Victims Choose to Meet with Offenders. *Offender Programms and Society*, 4, 55-79.
- Ehlers, A. & Clark, D.M. (2000). A cognitive model of posttraumatic stress disorder. *Behavior research and therapy*, 38, 319-345.
- Giebels, E., Ufkes, E. G., & van Erp, K. J. (2014). Understanding high-stakes conflicts. In N. Ashkanasy, O. B. Ayoko, & K. A. Jehn (Eds.), *The Handbook of Research in Conflict Management* (pp. 66 – 78). Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar Publishing
- Gröbe, M. (2013). *Op weg naar herstel: een experimenteel onderzoek naar de factoren die een rol spelen bij de intentie van slachtoffers tot aanmelden voor slachtoffer daderbemiddeling*.
- Heppner, P. P., & Petersen, C. H. (1982). The development and implications of a personal problem solving inventory. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 29 (1), 66.

- Hissel, S. C. E. M., Jansen, M., Soethout, J. E., & Tromp, E. (2006). *Procesevaluatie slachtoffer dadergesprekken*
- Janssen, A. L. (2013). *Hoe beïnvloeden ernst van het misdrijf en relatie met de dader de bereidheid van slachtoffers tot slachtoffer-daderbemiddeling*
- Kievik, M. and Gutteling, J.M. (2011) *Yes, we can: motivate Dutch citizens to engage in self protective behavior with regard to flood risks. Natural hazards, 59 (3), 1475-1490.*
- Latimer, J., Dowden, C., & Muise, D. (2005). The effectiveness of restorative practices: A meta analysis. *The Prison Journal, 85 (2), 127-44.*
- Lawson, C.L. & Katz, J. (2004). Restorative justice: an alternative approach to juvenile crime. *Journal of Socio-Economics, 33, 175-188.*
- Lens, K., Pemberton, A., & Groenhuijsen, M. (2010). *Het spreekrecht in Nederland: een bijdrage aan emotioneel herstel van slachtoffers?* Tilburg/Den Haag: INTERVICT/WODC
- Ormrod, J. E. (2006). *Educational psychology: Developing learners (5th ed.)*. Upper Saddle River, N.J.: Pearson/Merrill Prentice Hall
- Pemberton, A., Winkel, F.W., & Groenhuijsen, M.S. (2006). Op weg naar slachtoffergerichte theorievorming in het herstelrecht. *Tijdschrift voor Herstelrecht, 6 (1), 48-64.*
- Umbreit, M. S. (2008). *Victim offender mediation and dialogue*. Retrieved from http://www.cehd.umn.edu/ssw/rjp/resources/rj_dialogue_resources/VOM_&_Conferencing
- Umbreit, M. S., Coates, R. B., & Vos, B. (2004). VOM: three decades of practice and research. *Conflict Resolution Quarterly, 22 (1-2), 279-303*. doi: 10.1002/crq.102
- Sagel-Grande, I. (2013). *Restorative Justice in the Netherlands*. Retrieved from http://3e-rj-model.web.auth.gr/files/national_reports/Netherlands.pdf
- Shapland et al. (2006). *Restorative Justice in practice: The second report from the evaluation of three schemes*. Sheffield: Sheffield Center for Criminological Research, University of Sheffield.

Shnabel, N. & Nadler, A. (2008). A Needs-Based Model of Reconciliation: Satisfying the Differential Emotional Needs of Victim and Perpetrator as a Key to Promoting Reconciliation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *94*, 116-132.

Slachtoffer in Beeld. (2014). *Jaarverslag 2013*. Utrecht: Slachtoffer in Beeld

Strang, H., Sherman, L., Angel, C. M., Woods, D. J., Bennett, S., Newbury-Birch, D., & Inkpen, N. (2006). Victim evaluations of face-to-face restorative justice conferences: A quasi experimental analysis. *Journal of Social Issues*, *62*, 281-306

Steketee, M., Woerds, S. ter, Moll, M., & Boutellier, H. (2006). Herstelbemiddeling voor jeugdigen in Nederland: een evaluatieonderzoek naar zes pilotprojecten. Utrecht: *Verwey Jonker Instituut*

van Burik, A., Heim, M., Hoogeveen, C., de Jong, B. J., Slump, G. J., & Vogelvang, B. (2010). Evaluatie slachtoffer-dadergesprekken: Een onderzoek naar de landelijke implementatie van slachtoffer dadergesprekken. Woerden: *Adviesbureau Van Montfoort*.

Vancouver, J.B., More, K.M. & Yoder, J.R., (2008). Self-Efficacy and Resource Allocation: Support for a Nonmonotonic, Discontinuous Model. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *93* (1), 35-47. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.93.1.35

Appendix A: Overview sample

Table 1: Overview sample & outcomes randomization checks

	Total	Self-efficacy Low			Self-efficacy High			Self-efficacy		Fear	
		Fear Low	Fear Mid	Fear High	Fear Low	Fear Mid	Fear High	χ^2	p	χ^2	p
		1	2	3	4	5	6				
Participants	188	28 (15%)	28 (15%)	30 (16%)	34 (18%)	29 (15%)	39 (21%)				
Age (mean)	27	26	27	27	26	26	27				
Familiartiy VOM											
- Yes	52 (27.7%)	9 (32.1%)	14 (50.0%)	8 (26.7%)	7 (20.6%)	6 (20.7%)	8 (20.5%)	5.72	0.018*	2.37	0.306
- No	136 (72.3%)	19 (67.9%)	14 (50.0%)	22 (73.3%)	27 (79.4%)	23 (79.3%)	31 (79.5%)				
Participation VOM											
- Yes	1 (0.5%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (2.6%)	.85	.357	1.73	0.420
- No	187(99.5)	28 (100%)	28 (100%)	30 (100%)	34 (100%)	29 (100%)	38 (97.4%)				
Being Offender											
- Yes	1 (0.5%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (3.6%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1.19	.275	2.31	.315
- No	187 (99.5%)	28 (100%)	27 (96.4%)	30 (100%)	34 (100%)	29 (100%)	39 (100%)				
Being Victim											
- Yes	26 (14%)	2 (7.1%)	6 (21.4%)	4 (13.3%)	4 (11.8%)	5 (17.2%)	5 (12.8%)	.002	.964	2.36	.307
- No	162 (86%)	26 (92.9%)	22 (78.6%)	26 (86.7%)	30 (88.2%)	24 (82.8%)	34 (87.2%)				
Knowing Offender											
- Yes	13 (6.9%)	5 (17.9%)	2 (7.1%)	1 (3.3%)	2 (5.9%)	2 (6.9%)	1 (2.6%)	1.40	.236	3.57	.167
- No	175 (93.1%)	23 (82.1%)	26 (92.9%)	29 (96.7%)	32 (94.1%)	27 (93.1%)	38 (97.4%)				
Knowing Victim											
- Yes	67 (35%)	11 (39.3%)	12 (42.9%)	10 (33.3%)	9 (26.5%)	8 (27.6%)	17 (43.6%)	.52	.472	.68	.711
- No	121 (65%)	17 (60.7%)	16 (57.1%)	20 (66.7%)	25 (73.5%)	21 (72.4%)	22 (56.4%)				
Sex											
- M	97 (52.4%)	16 (61.5%)	12 (42.9%)	17 (56.7%)	14 (42.4%)	18 (62.1%)	20 (51.3%)	.100	.951	.08	.777
- W	88 (47.6%)	10 (38.5%)	16 (57.1%)	13 (43.3%)	19 (57.6%)	11 (37.9%)	19 (48.7%)				
School											
- Kein Schulabschluss	2 (1.1%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (3.3%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (2.6%)				
- Hauptschulabschluss	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)				
- Realschulabschluss	16 (8.6%)	4 (15.4%)	1 (3.6%)	4 (13.3%)	3 (9.1%)	2 (6.9%)	2 (5.1%)	1.76	.781	14.51	.069
- Fachabitur	16 (8.6%)	4 (15.4%)	3 (10.7%)	1 (3.3%)	2 (6.1%)	5 (17.2%)	1 (2.6%)				
- Abitur	88 (47.7%)	10 (38.5%)	16 (57.1%)	10 (33.3%)	20 (60.6%)	14 (48.3%)	18 (46.2%)				
- Hochschulabschluss	63 (34.1%)	8 (30.8%)	8 (28.6%)	14 (46.7%)	8 (24.4%)	8 (27.6%)	17 (43.6%)				
Degree											
- Diplom	11 (17.7%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (12.5%)	4 (28.6%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (12.5%)	5 (31.3%)				
- Bachelor	34 (54.8%)	6 (75.9%)	5 (62.5%)	5 (35.7%)	4 (50.0%)	5 (62.5%)	9 (56.3%)	3.81	.432	9.63	.292
- Master	12 (19.4%)	1 (12.5%)	2 (25.0%)	5 (35.7%)	3 (37.5%)	1 (12.5%)	0 (0.0%)				
- Doktorgrad	2 (3.2%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (12.5%)	1 (12.5%)	0 (0.0%)				
- Sonstiges	3 (4.8%)	1 (12.5%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (12.5%)				
Occupation											
- Ausbildung	8 (4.3%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (3.6%)	3 (10%)	1 (3.0%)	2 (6.9%)	1 (2.6%)				
- Angestellter/e	50 (27.0%)	7 (26.9%)	10 (35.7%)	9 (30.0%)	8 (24.2%)	6 (20.7%)	10 (25.6%)	2.52	.641	4.63	.797
- Selbständigkeit	7 (3.8%)	1 (3.8%)	1 (3.6%)	2 (6.7%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (3.4%)	2 (5.1%)				
- Studium	95 (51.4%)	13 (50.0%)	13 (46.4%)	12 (40.0%)	21 (63.6%)	17 (58.6%)	19 (48.7%)				
- Sonstiges	25 (13.5%)	5 (19.2%)	3 (10.7%)	4 (13.3%)	3 (9.1%)	3 (10.3%)	7 (17.9%)				

Note. *** = $p < .001$, ** = $p < .01$, * = $p < .05$

Appendix B: Stimulus Material

Appendix B.1: Questions Hexaco

Self-Efficacy Hexaco: High					
	Starke Ablehnung	Ablehnung	Neutral	Zustimmung	Starke Zustimmung
Der Besuch einer Kunstausstellung würde mich interessieren.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Ich plane im Voraus und organisiere, damit in letzter Minute kein Zeitdruck aufkommt.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Im Allgemeinen bin ich mit mir ziemlich zufrieden.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Ich hätte keine Angst, wenn ich bei schlechten Wetterbedingungen verreisen müsste.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Ich bin daran interessiert, etwas über die Geschichte und Politik anderer Länder zu lernen.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Ich denke nicht, dass ich zu kritisch gegenüber anderen bin.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Ich kann manchmal nichts dagegen machen, dass ich mir über kleine Dinge Sorgen mache.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Auch wenn ich wüsste, dass ich niemals erwischt werde, wäre ich nicht bereit eine Million zu stehlen.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Ich würde es genießen, ein Kunstwerk zu schaffen, etwa einen Roman, ein Lied oder ein Gemälde.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Wenn ich wegen einer schmerzvollen Erfahrung leide, brauche ich jemanden, der mich tröstet.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Viel Geld zu haben ist nicht besonders wichtig für mich..	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Andere halten mich nicht für jähzornig.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
An den meisten Tagen bin ich fröhlich und optimistisch.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Ich denke, dass ich mehr Respekt verdiene als ein durchschnittlicher Mensch.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Wenn ich die Gelegenheit dazu hätte, würde ich gerne ein Konzert mit klassischer Musik besuchen.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Meine Einstellung gegenüber Personen, die mich schlecht behandelt haben, ist "vergeben und vergessen".	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Ich neige dazu, nachsichtig zu sein, wenn ich andere beurteile.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Ich mache mir viel weniger Sorgen als die meisten Leute.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Ich würde niemals Bestechungsgeld annehmen, auch wenn es sehr viel wäre.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Man hat mir schon oft gesagt, dass ich eine gute Vorstellungskraft habe.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Ich versuche immer fehlerfrei zu arbeiten, auch wenn es Zeit kostet.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Das Erste was ich an einem neuen Ort tue, ist Freundschaften zu schließen.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Ich mache selten Fehler, weil ich nicht nachdenke, bevor ich handle.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Die meisten Leute werden schneller ärgerlich als ich.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Ich fühle starke Emotionen, wenn jemand, der mir nahe steht, für eine längere Zeit weggeht.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Ich halte mich für einen künstlerischen oder kreativen Menschen.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Selbst wenn Leute viele Fehler machen, sage ich nur selten etwas Negatives.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Ich habe selten den Eindruck das ich wertlos bin.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Ich ziehe es vor, an einem Plan festzuhalten anstatt einfach das zu tun, was mir gerade in den Sinn kommt.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Ich würde niemals in die Versuchung geraten, Falschgeld zu benutzen, wenn ich sicher sein könnte, damit durchzukommen.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Self-Efficacy Hexaco: Low					
	Starke Ablehnung	Ablehnung	Neutral	Zustimmung	Starke Zustimmung
Der Besuch einer Kunstausstellung würde mich ziemlich langweilen.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Ich plane selten im Voraus, auch wenn dann in letzter Minute Zeitdruck aufkommt.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Im Allgemeinen bin ich eher unzufrieden mit mir.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Ich hätte Angst, wenn ich bei schlechten Wetterbedingungen verreisen müsste.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Ich bin nicht daran interessiert, etwas über die Geschichte und Politik anderer Länder zu lernen.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Andere sagen mir manchmal, dass ich zu kritisch gegenüber anderen bin.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Ich kann manchmal nichts dagegen tun das ich mir über kleine Dinge Sorgen mache.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Wenn ich wüsste, dass ich niemals erwischt werde, wäre ich bereit eine Million Euro zu stehlen.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Ich habe kein Interesse daran, ein Kunstwerk zu schaffen, etwa einen Roman, ein Lied oder ein Gemälde.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Wenn ich wegen einer schmerzvollen Erfahrung leide, brauche ich niemanden, der mich tröstet.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Viel Geld zu haben ist nicht besonders wichtig für mich.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Andere halten mich für jähzornig.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
An den meisten Tagen bin ich nicht fröhlich und optimistisch.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Ich denke, dass ich mehr Respekt verdiene als ein durchschnittlicher Mensch.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Wenn ich die Gelegenheit dazu hätte, würde ich ungern ein Konzert mit klassischer Musik besuchen.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Personen, die mich schlecht behandelt haben, vergesse ich nicht so schnell.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Ich neige nicht dazu, besonders nachsichtig zu sein, wenn ich andere beurteile.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Ich mache mir viel mehr Sorgen als die meisten Leute.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Ich würde vielleicht Bestechungsgeld annehmen, wenn es sehr viel wäre.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mir hat noch nie jemand gesagt, dass ich eine gute Vorstellungskraft habe	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Ich versuche immer, fehlerfrei zu arbeiten, auch wenn es zu viel Zeit kostet	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
An einem neuen Ort fällt es mir schwer schnell Freundschaften zu schließen	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Ich mache viele Fehler, weil ich nicht nachdenke, bevor ich handele.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Ich werde schneller ärgerlich als die meisten Leute.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Ich fühle keine starken Emotionen, wenn jemand, der mir nahe steht, für eine längere Zeit weggeht.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Ich halte mich nicht für einen künstlerischen oder kreativen Menschen.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Wenn Leute viele Fehler machen, sage ich nur schon mal etwas Negatives.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Manchmal habe ich den Eindruck, dass ich wertlos bin.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Ich ziehe es vor, einfach das zu tun, was mir gerade in den Sinn kommt, anstatt an einem Plan festzuhalten.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Ich würde in die Versuchung geraten, Falschgeld zu benutzen, wenn ich sicher sein könnte, damit durchzukommen.	□	□	□	□	□
--	---	---	---	---	---

Appendix B.2: Pictures Emotional Recognition

Emotional Recognition: Happiness



Emotional Recognition: Anger



Emotional Recognition: Amusement



Emotional Recognition: Surprise



Emotional Recognition: Pride**Appendix B.3: Messages Self-efficacy Manipulation****Self-Efficacy Message: Low**

Ihr Score liegt zwischen:

10 und 20

Sie haben einen niedrigen Score erreicht. Das bedeutet, dass Ihre gemessenen Persönlichkeitseigenschaften nur in geringerem Maße mit den Eigenschaften übereinstimmen, die als nötig erachtet werden um Konflikte im sozialen Umfeld effektiv zu lösen. Ebenso scheinen Sie nicht gut darin zu sein die Emotionen von Anderen auf Anhieb richtig zu deuten. Es fällt Ihnen als Person daher wahrscheinlich eher schwer auf Andere zu zu gehen und Sie direkt zu verstehen.

Self-efficacy Message: High

Ihr Score liegt zwischen:

80 und 90

Sie haben einen hohen Score erreicht. Das bedeutet, dass Ihre gemessenen Persönlichkeitseigenschaften in hohem Maße mit den Eigenschaften übereinstimmen, die als nötig erachtet werden um Konflikte im sozialen Umfeld effektiv zu lösen. Ebenso scheinen Sie gut darin zu sein die Emotionen von Anderen auf Anhieb richtig zu deuten. Es fällt Ihnen als Person daher wahrscheinlich eher einfach auf Andere zu zu gehen und Sie direkt zu verstehen.

Appendix B.4: Scenarios Fear Manipulation

Scenario Fear: Low

Es ist Montagabend und du bist vom Fitnessstudio aus auf dem Weg nach Hause. Du gehst zu deinem Auto, stellst deine Sporttasche auf dem Boden ab und willst den Autoschlüssel aus deiner Jacke holen.

Plötzlich erscheint eine dunkel gekleidete Person zwischen zwei Autos und greift schnell nach deiner Sporttasche. Erschrocken und überrascht bleibst du wie angewurzelt stehen. Der Räuber greift deine Tasche und rennt weg.

Du entscheidest dich gleich danach die Polizei zu rufen um den Diebstahl anzuzeigen.

Für die restliche Nacht fällt es dir schwer einzuschlafen. Davon abgesehen bist du in Ordnung.

Ein paar Tage später erreicht dich dann ein Anruf der Polizei: Der Räuber wurde offenbar gefunden. Zu deiner Überraschung ist es jemand den du kennst, es ist ein flüchtiger Bekannter aus dem Fitnessstudio.

Scenario Fear: Mid

Es ist Montagabend und du bist vom Fitnessstudio aus auf dem Weg nach Hause. *Als du zu deinem Auto läufst, kommt plötzlich eine dunkel gekleidete Person zwischen zwei Autos hervor und greift nach deiner Sporttasche. Erschrocken und entsetzt hältst du deine Tasche fest. Der Räuber hebt seine Faust und versucht dir ins Gesicht zu schlagen. Er ruft: „Gib mir deine Tasche oder ich schlag dich zusammen!“ Eingeschüchtert durch den Angriff lässt du los. Der Räuber greift deine Tasche und rennt weg.*

Du entscheidest dich gleich danach die Polizei zu rufen um den Überfall anzuzeigen.

Für die restliche Nacht fällt es dir schwer einzuschlafen. Davon abgesehen bist du in Ordnung.

Ein paar Tage später erreicht dich dann ein Anruf der Polizei: Der Räuber wurde offenbar gefunden. Zu deiner Überraschung ist es jemand den du kennst, es ist ein flüchtiger Bekannter aus dem Fitnessstudio.

Scenario Fear: High

Es ist Montagabend und du bist vom Fitnessstudio aus auf dem Weg nach Hause. *Als du zu deinem Auto läufst, kommt plötzlich eine dunkel gekleidete Person zwischen zwei Autos hervor und greift nach deiner Sporttasche. Erschrocken und entsetzt hältst du deine Tasche fest.*

Der Räuber zieht ein Messer und will dich damit erstechen. „Gib mir deine Tasche oder ich bring dich um!“ Eingeschüchtert und verängstigt durch den Angriff lässt du los. Der Räuber greift deine Tasche, ruft noch „Besser für dich!“, und rennt weg.

Du entscheidest dich gleich danach die Polizei zu rufen um den Überfall anzuzeigen.

Für die restliche Nacht fällt es dir schwer einzuschlafen, *was auch für die kommenden Tage anhält. Zudem traust du dich nach Einbruch der Dunkelheit kaum noch alleine aus dem Haus. Auch mit Anderen zusammen fühlst du dich dabei ängstlich, unsicher und drehst dich ständig nach deiner Umgebung um.*

Die Gegend, in der das Fitnessstudio liegt meidest du fortan völlig. Du glaubst nicht, dass du den Ort wo der Überfall geschehen ist, noch einmal betreten kannst.

Ein paar Tage später erreicht dich dann ein Anruf der Polizei: Der Räuber wurde offenbar gefunden. Zu deiner Überraschung ist es jemand den du kennst, es ist ein flüchtiger Bekannter aus dem Fitnessstudio.

Appendix C: Survey

C.1: Informed Consent

Herzlich Willkommen!

Im Rahmen meiner Masterthesis an der Universität Enschede untersucht diese Studie den Zusammenhang zwischen **Persönlichkeitseigenschaften** und **Konfliktlösungsfähigkeiten**. Sinn und Zweck ist es herauszufinden in welcher Art und Weise verschiedene Persönlichkeitseigenschaften die Fähigkeit im eigenen sozialen Umfeld Konflikte zu lösen beeinflussen können. Insbesondere geht es hierbei um das **Erkennen und Verstehen von Emotionen**.

Mit der Abgabe dieses Fragebogens willigen Sie ein, das die Daten zu **Wissenschaftlichen Zwecken** ausgewertet werden können.

Die Teilnahme an dieser Studie ist absolut **freiwillig** und kann **zu jedem Zeitpunkt** abgebrochen werden.

Die Aufnahme und Verwaltung der Daten erfolgt selbstverständlich **anonym** und kann **nicht** mit Ihnen als Person in Verbindung gebracht werden.

Bitte beantworten sie alle Fragen **wahrheitsgemäß**. Wenn Sie sich nicht sicher sind, wählen Sie die Antwort die Ihnen als Erstes in den Sinn kommt.

Bei Fragen oder Anmerkungen wenden Sie sich bitte an Matthias Grosskopf (m.grosskopf@student.utwente.nl).

Vielen Dank für Ihre Teilnahme!

Hiermit bestätige Ich das Ich den obigen Text gelesen und verstanden habe.

C.2 Manipulation Check

Im Anschluss an den Überfall informiert man Sie über die Möglichkeit zur Teilnahme an einer Täter-Opfer-Mediation. Täter-Opfer-Mediation bietet beiden Beteiligten Parteien die Möglichkeit für einen Austausch.

Opfer und Täter können gemeinsam Fragen rund um die Tat, Motive dafür und Folgen davon erörtern und klären. Täter-Opfer-Mediation kann beiden Seiten (sowohl Opfer als auch Täter) helfen die Tat besser zu verarbeiten.

In jedem Fall unterliegt die Täter-Opfer-Mediation einigen Grundregeln:

- Eine Vermittlung findet immer unter Beaufsichtigung eines professionellen und neutralen Mediators statt.
- Die Teilnahme ist für beide Seiten freiwillig und kommt nur zustande wenn Beide damit einverstanden sind.
- Der Inhalt der Gespräche ist streng vertraulich.
- Die Initiative kann sowohl vom Opfer als auch vom Täter ausgehen.
- Anstatt eines Gesprächs ist auch ein indirekter Austausch möglich, z.B. durch Briefkontakt.

In Deutschland findet Täter-Opfer-Mediation parallel oder unabhängig vom Strafprozess des Täters statt und hat auch nicht den Anspruch diesen zu ersetzen.

Wenn ich einen Monat nach der Tat an den Täter zurückdenken würde, dann würde ich mich fühlen					
	Starke Ablehnung	Ablehnung	Weder Zustimmung noch Ablehnung	Zustimmung	Starke Zustimmung
nervös	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ruhelos	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
panisch	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
unsicher	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
angespannt	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
frustriert	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ängstlich	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Starke Ablehnung	Ablehnung	Weder Zustimmung noch Ablehnung	Zustimmung	Starke Zustimmung
Ich denke, dass ich in einer Konfliktsituation für meine Standpunkte eintreten kann.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Ich denke das ich gut mit meinen Emotionen umgehen kann die innerhalb eines Konflikts eine Rolle spielen können.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Ich habe Vertrauen in meine Möglichkeiten um neue und komplizierte Probleme lösen, die innerhalb eines Konflikts auftreten.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Ich denke, dass Ich gut in der Lage bin, um zu entscheiden was genau passieren muss, um einen Konflikt zu lösen.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Ich habe Vertrauen, dass mein Gegenüber innerhalb eines Konflikts die Fähigkeit hat um eine Absprache zu machen.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Starke Ablehnung	Ablehnung	Weder Zustimmung noch Ablehnung	Zustimmung	Starke Zustimmung
Wenn innerhalb eine Konfliktes neue und komplizierte Probleme auftreten, habe ich das Vertrauen das ich diese gemeinsam mit meinem Gegenüber lösen kann.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Ich habe Vertrauen in meine Fähigkeit mit meinem Gegenüber innerhalb eines Konflikts eine Absprache zu machen.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Ich denke, dass ich gut mit den Emotionen Anderer, welche innerhalb eines Konflikts eine Rolle spielen können, umgehen kann.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Ich denke, dass ich für die Standpunkte Anderer in einer Konfliktsituation Verständnis aufbringen kann.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Ich denke, dass ich in der Lage bin	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

zusammen mit meinem Gegenüber zu entscheiden, was innerhalb eines Konflikts zu tun ist um eine Lösung zu finden.					
--	--	--	--	--	--

Als Opfer in dieser Situation...					
	Starke Ablehnung	Ablehnung	Weder Zustimmung noch Ablehnung	Zustimmung	Starke Zustimmung
hätte ich gerne vom Täter Antworten auf meine Fragen	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
habe ich das Bedürfnis dem Täter von den Folgen seiner Tat für mich zu erzählen	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
will ich mehr wissen über die Motive und den Hintergrund des Täters für die Tat	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Als Opfer in dieser Situation...					
	Starke Ablehnung	Ablehnung	Weder Zustimmung noch Ablehnung	Zustimmung	Starke Zustimmung
hätte ich gerne mehr Informationen über Täter-Opfer-Mediation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
würde ich mich durch einen Mitarbeiter der Organisation die mich kontaktiert hat anmelden lassen für eine Täter-Opfer-Mediation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
würde ich mich selbst anmelden für eine Täter-Opfer-Mediation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Wenn ich einen Monat nach der Tat an den Täter zurückdenken würde, dann würde ich mich fühlen					
	Starke Ablehnung	Ablehnung	Weder Zustimmung noch Ablehnung	Zustimmung	Starke Zustimmung
verärgert	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
wütend	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
sauer	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

C.3 Familiarity & Sociographics

Zum Schluss noch ein paar Fragen über Ihre Familiarität mit Täter-Opfer-Mediation.

Haben Sie vor ihrer Teilnahme an dieser Studie schon einmal von Täter-Opfer-Mediation gehört?	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Ja
<input type="checkbox"/>	Nein

Haben Sie vor ihrer Teilnahme an dieser Studie schon einmal an Täter-Opfer-Mediation teilgenommen?

- Ja**
 Nein

Waren Sie schon einmal Opfer in einem Verbrechen wie in der Geschichte die Sie gelesen haben?

- Ja**
 Nein

Waren Sie schon einmal Täter in einem Verbrechen wie in der Geschichte die Sie gelesen haben?

- Ja**
 Nein

War jemand aus Ihrem sozialen Umfeld bereits einmal Opfer in einem Verbrechen wie in der Geschichte die Sie gelesen haben?

- Ja**
 Nein

War jemand aus Ihrem sozialen Umfeld bereits einmal Täter in einem Verbrechen wie in der Geschichte die Sie gelesen haben?

- Ja**
 Nein

Es werden nun noch Ihre demografischen Daten benötigt.

Wie alt sind sie? (In Jahren)

Was ist ihr Geschlecht?

- Männlich
 Weiblich
 Anderes

Was ist Ihr höchster Bildungsgrad?

- Kein Schulabschluss
 Hauptschulabschluss
 Realschulabschluss
 Fachabitur
 Abitur
 Hochschulabschluss

Bitte wählen Sie Ihren höchsten Studienabschluss

- Diplom
- Bachelor
- Master
- Doktorgrad
- Sonstiges

In welchem Fach haben Sie Ihren Abschluss gemacht?

Was machen Sie zur Zeit?

- Ausbildung
- Angestellt in einem Unternehmen
- Selbständigkeit
- Studium
- Sonstiges

Bitte geben Sie an welcher Ausbildung Sie folgen

Bitte geben Sie Ihre Berufsbezeichnung an

Bitte geben Sie den Namen oder die Bezeichnung Ihres Studiengangs an

C.4 Debriefing

Vielen Dank für ihre Teilnahme an dieser Studie.

Zwar wurde zu Beginn erklärt, dass diese Studie darauf abzielt, Ihre Persönlichkeitseigenschaften mit Konfliktlösungsfähigkeiten zu vergleichen, jedoch ist das nicht die Wahrheit. Um die Ergebnisse dieser Studie nicht zu beeinflussen, wurden Sie bewusst über den genauen Hintergrund im Dunkeln gehalten.

Das Ziel dieser Studie ist es, herauszufinden welche Faktoren für Opfer von Verbrechen eine Rolle spielen bei ihrer Anmeldung zur Täter-Opfer-Mediation. Täter-Opfer-Mediation bietet besonders für Opfer sehr viele Vorteile für die Verarbeitung von Verbrechen. Leider sind jedoch die Anmeldezahlen im Vergleich zu Tätern sehr abweichend und deutlich geringer.

Ziel ist es daher die Faktoren zu finden die diesen Unterschied erklären können. Erst wenn diese Faktoren bekannt sind können gezielte Maßnahmen ergriffen werden um Täter-Opfer-Mediation für die Opferseite zu verbessern.

Im Speziellen wurden in dieser Studie die Faktoren Selbstwirksamkeit im Bezug auf Konfliktlösung

und Angst manipuliert. Beide haben nach dem aktuellen Stand der Forschung sehr wahrscheinlich großen Einfluss auf die Bereitschaft eines Opfers haben sich zur Mediation anzumelden. Die genauen Auswirkungen wie auch das Zusammenspiel der beiden Faktoren stehen innerhalb der Studie im Fokus.

Durch Ihre Mitarbeit in der Studie haben Sie geholfen, die Wissenschaftliche Arbeit in Bereich der Täter-Opfer-Mediation voranzutreiben.

Vielen Dank!
Matthias Grosskopf

Haben Sie noch Fragen bezüglich dieser Studie? Ist Ihnen möglicherweise etwas aufgefallen das Sie anmerken möchten?

Wenn Sie Interesse an den Ergebnissen der Studie haben, tragen Sie bitte hier Ihre Emailadresse ein.