

The influence of personality dimensions on victims' and offenders' willingness to participate in online
forms of victim-offender mediation

Sarah Tomlin (s2070332)

Department of Psychology of Conflict, Risk and Safety, University of Twente

Dr. Sven Zeibel

Jiska Jonas-van Dijk

07-07-2021

Abstract

Background. The aim of this study was to investigate the effects the personality dimensions Emotionality, Agreeableness and Openness to Experience have on the willingness to participate in video call VOM. Recently the relevance of online VOM has increased due to the effect so the pandemic. Video call is the closest replacement for face-to-face VOM and is therefore the main focus of this study. It was hypothesized that the higher a person is on these traits the more likely they would participate in video call VOM. In addition, this research looked at the effect of the personality dimension Honesty-Humility on the offender's willingness to participate in VOM, hypothesizing that being higher in this trait leads to a higher willingness to participate.

Method. The data was collected with a survey in which participants (n=77) should imagine themselves in a fictitious robbery scenario as in the role of the victim and of the offender in random order. Hierarchical regression analysis was carried out to analyse the data. The personality dimensions, the role (Victim or Offender) and the perceived beneficiality of a second mediator were the independent variables. The dependent variable was the willingness to participate in video call VOM in imagined victims and offenders and the willingness to participate in VOM in imagined offenders. Additionally, the TAM was used to further explain any effects.

Results. In contrast to the hypotheses, the results showed that the personality types of Emotionality, Agreeableness and Openness to Experience did not have an effect on the willingness to participate in VOM in victims and offenders. Unexpectedly, for those in the offender role, Honesty-Humility showed a negative relationship with the willingness to participate in video call VOM. Also for the imagined offenders, eXtraversion showed a positive relationship with the willingness to participate in online VOM. For offenders, no relationship between the personality types and the willingness to participate in VOM were indicated.

Conclusion. The current study added to the research on the effects of personality dimensions on the willingness to participate in video call VOM. Personality does seem to have an effect on the choice to participate in video call VOM. Further research could investigate the effects of personality on other online forms of VOM.

Personality's Effects on the Willingness to Participate in Victim-Offender Mediation in Offenders and Victims

The pandemic has changed the world drastically in the last few months. It has changed the way we communicate and has forced us to be more creative in finding ways to socialise (Wen, 2019). In these times online platforms are more important than ever to stay connected and many people are getting used to this means of communication. In light of the current changes, utilizing online communication in Victim-Offender Mediation (VOM), by means such as video calls, video recordings, and chatting, becomes an important asset to be able to conduct and continue to organise these sessions during the pandemic (Marder, 2020). VOM aims to resolve the aftermath of a crime between the victim and the offender as an alternative to just punishing the offender (Hansen & Umbreit, 2018) and gives the offender as well as the victim an important means of resolving the conflict between them and in themselves psychologically (Choi & Severson, 2009).

Research has shown that victims benefit from participating in VOM by experiencing a decrease in fear of being revictimized (Umbreit, Coates, & Roberts, 2000). Moreover, taking part in VOM reduces re-offense rates of offenders (Jonas-van Dijk, Zebel, Claessen, & Nelen, 2019). Thus it is crucial to be able to further offer the right service to the disputants when the pandemic has limited the ways this can take place. For some victims and offenders being able to see each other is an important part of acquiring a successful outcome, making indirect forms of VOM such as letters or emails, which comply with the current restrictions less suitable. Even after the pandemic, digital communication methods of VOM could still be useful for cases when the other options are not feasible or desired.

Previous research (Baumhof, 2016; Kippers, 2015) have found connections between personality types and the willingness to participate in VOM. In practice, research in the area of personality in connection to VOM can help to adapt the process of VOM to the persons personality types to be able to provide adequate support to the people who need it. More specifically, it can help to know which personality types are more likely to prefer certain types of VOM, such as digital forms of VOM. In this way the process can be adapted to people with specific personality types. Another point is that this research will help to gain insight into how to improve the mediation sessions. More specifically, it will give an understanding to who might need a second mediator to be present in the video call mediations based on their personalities.

Regarding theoretical knowledge this research contributes to existing knowledge on the factors that influence a person's willingness to take part in VOM and the type of VOM they prefer. While Baumhof (2016) looked at the effect the (perceived) personality of the offender had in the willingness of the victim to participate she did not look at how the personality of an offender will influence his or her willingness to take part in VOM. Moreover, this research did not take video call VOM into account. Considering the missing gaps of research on these topics the aim of this research is to determine the effect of personality on the preference for video calls among imagined victims and

offenders. The question this paper seeks to answer is “How do personality types affect the participation in VOM by means of video-calling for both the (imagined) offender and (imagined) victim?”

In the following paragraphs first the types of VOM communication methods will be outlined and online VOM will be explained further. Next the determinants of willingness to participate in VOM will be discussed and why personality matters in the context of VOM. Finally, the effects personality may have on the willingness to participate in online video call VOM will be hypothesized.

Synchronous vs. Asynchronous Communication

In the field of VOM there are indirect, asynchronous and direct, synchronous types of communication available. Indirect communication includes methods such as shuttle mediation, in which the mediator acts like a messenger between the two parties (Scherman, et al., 2007) and letter exchanges. These types of communication methods are asynchronous, meaning the parties do not communicate with each other in real time meaning there is a delay in response time. In contrast to this type of communication, direct communication involves face-to-face-communication and are synchronous communication types. This type of communication happens in real time and the two parties react instantly to what the other is communicating.

Regarding the attributes each communication type has, asynchronous communication was found to be beneficial in cases where both parties are not on good terms with each other.— In such cases direct, synchronous communication could lead to an escalation whereas asynchronous communication could lead to better negotiation outcomes (Swaab, Galinsky, Medvec. & Diermeier, 2011). In contrast, synchronous communication is better to build rapport between parties who are neutral or cooperative to each other (Swaab, et al., 2011).

Online VOM

Online VOM may also be indirect such as e-mail writing and video recordings or direct such as chatting, voice calls and video calls. There may also be differences in some being synchronous such as chatting or calling or asynchronous such as letter writing or shuttle mediation. Recent research examined the potential advantages and disadvantages of online VOM (Bonesteffer, Zebel, & Giebels, 2021). In this study the mediators, victims, and offenders interviewed did not personally have experience participating in online VOM, although they did have experience with offline forms of VOM. Rather they were asked about how they would imagine an online session would be and what the benefits and drawbacks of these session could be. One of the advantages mentioned was that online VOM would be more accessible for when the victim and offender are far apart from each other and this would be more flexible than a face-to-face meeting. Another aspect that was touched on was that online VOM could give the victim a feeling of control and distance from the offender, which

could make the visual meeting more bearable for the victim than when meeting face-to-face (Bonensteffen, et al., 2021)

Concerning the disadvantages one of the most important drawbacks issued by the participants was that there would be safety concerns for both the victim and offender. It could be hard to ensure that no one else is listening in on the conversation and it is not sure whether the meeting is being recorded. Apart from that, connection issues and distance could inhibit the natural conversation flow and as a result make it harder for the two parties to connect psychologically with each other (Bonensteffen, et al., 2021) This notion is backed up by a study which showed that delay in responses from 1200ms onwards can negatively impact how one perceives the other person (Schoenenberg, Raake, & Koeppel, 2014). Moreover, concerns were raised about whether the mediator would be able to provide the same support from a distance. Despite the disadvantages, video calls seem psychologically the closest alternative to traditional face-to-face VOM for when traditional VOM is unfeasible or undesirable for different reasons and when indirect forms of VOM cannot give the participants the satisfaction they would wish for from mediation.

The benefits of video calling over forms of asynchronous digital communication lies in several aspects. Drawing from research conducted on face-to-face mediation the benefits of this type of VOM might be applicable to video call VOM, since this also involves synchronous communication. Strang, Sherman, Mayo-Wilson, Woods, & Ariel (2013) concluded one positive effect was that face-to-face mediation led to offenders reoffending less than those subject to the standard criminal justice system. Moreover the benefits for victims were that they were more satisfied with the process, had a higher chance of receiving an apology and rated these apologies as more sincere. Furthermore, victims benefit psychologically, by being less vengeful and suffer less from post-traumatic stress symptoms.

Besides these factors, video calling in VOM is already being implemented during the pandemic and has thus become an important factor in offering VOM. However, despite the importance of this type of communication method, little research has been conducted on the use of this specific type in VOM sessions. This focus was mainly on the offline methods of these sessions such as face-to-face, shuttle, and letters. This is presumably since it was not as common as it has become now due to the pandemic and the resulting restrictions. The question arises whether the results of offline forms of communication can also be attributed to VOM in an online setting. More particularly this research will focus on video call VOM.

Willingness to participate in VOM

Research on the willingness to participate in VOM has been limited, although it is important, especially in light of online VOM because knowing who is likely to participate in digital forms of VOM the process of VOM can be adapted to their needs. Moreover, by understanding how offenders and victims decide whether to participate in VOM or not the psychological needs of the victims and

offenders can be better addressed. Especially for mediators this information is valuable since it gives them an information base to work with and can improve mediation session by addressing the needs and wants of the participants.

Research has focused on different areas of VOM looking at external and also internal factors of the victims and offenders relating to the willingness to participate in VOM. Zebel, Schreurs and Ufkes (2017) found that the perceived crime seriousness, an internal factor, and time elapsed since the offence, an external factor, had an effect. The more harmful the victim had perceived the crime to be, the more willing they became to participate in VOM as time elapsed since the offense; however the reverse was true for when the victims perceived the crime less serious. In these cases the more time elapsed the less likely they were to participate.

Concerning internal factors, research shows that a need to get answers about the offence from the offender, feelings of safety, and, as an external factor, support from their surroundings influence the victim's willingness to participate (Paul & Schenck-Hamlin, 2017). Similarly Bolivar (2013) found that victims looking for an explanation as to why the offender committed the offence were more willing to participate in direct mediation. Apart from this she also showed that people who decided to take part had a more positive view of the offenders and saw them as a person who could also be good. These findings also relate to Paul's and Schenck-Hamlin's (2018) research outcomes, in which they related the Theory of Planned Behaviour (TPB) to the openness to participate in VOM for victims. The TPB postulates that people make decisions based on perceived ability to perform an action, the perceived likelihood of an outcome and perceived subjective norm (Ajzen, 1991). This was found in their study indicating that victims are more likely to participate when the expected outcome of the mediation was positive and if the likelihood of this occurring was high. The positive outcome of the mediation was found to be related to victims wanting the offender to take responsibility and learn from the experience, thereby showing that the victim takes part not only for themselves but more for the offender and what he or she can gain. The results also reflect the finding that victims are more likely to participate when they see the offender as having good inside of them as Bolivar (2013) indicates.

Taken together these results seem to also already hint that the personality of the victim significantly affects the participation in VOM. This is because these findings indicate that victims with a more positive outlook on life and who are more open-minded seem more willing to participate, which can be related to personality traits such as eXtraversion or Openness to experience of the HEXACO model. This will be explained in more depth later on. A link between personality and the willingness to participate in VOM is exactly what Baumhof (2016) found in her research in which people who are high on eXtraversion, Openness to Experience and Agreeableness are more likely to participate in VOM. The relevant personality dimensions found in this study seem also indicate a certain type of victim is more willing to participate.

Further research also took the offender into account. The needs-based model by Shnabel and Nadler (2008) postulates that offenders have the need to regain a sense of morality showing the importance of moral standards which could also hint towards a certain personality type of offenders that are more likely to participate. Moreover, Jonas-van Dijk, et al. (2019), examined whether the positive effects of VOM on lower reoffence rates may be due to self-selection bias meaning that the offenders who are willing to participate in VOM may already be inclined to reoffend less. As a result of their findings Jonas-van Dijk, et al. (2019) concluded that the decreased reoffence rates shown were most likely partly due to the mediation process and partly due to factors related to the offender, who was willing to participate in VOM. This could hint that those offenders who take part in VOM are generally more likely to improve, thereby further providing evidence that a certain type of offender is willing to participate. The behaviour of the offender could underlie certain personality traits. Researchers suggest that our personalities are determined by both genetic and environmental factors (Krueger, et al., 2008). It affects us in many ways in our life, for instance it has an effect on how we process emotions in our daily lives (Komulainen, et al., 2014).

As can be seen, researchers have explored several factors on the willingness to participate in VOM both internal and external aspects. There seem to be parts of internal factors that could be related to the general personality traits of the victims and offenders and as aforementioned research on personality dimensions have shown to have significant effects on the willingness to participate in offline forms of VOM (Baumhof, 2016; Kippers, 2015). However research looking at what effect the personality dimensions have on the VOM process is scarce.

Personality and VOM

While the research of Bonensteffen et al. (2021) researched the benefits and drawbacks of online VOM as well as what measures should be taken to make sure online VOM can work there is not any research yet on how personality relates to the willingness to opt for online types of VOM. This has however been shown to be a significant factor in the willingness to participate in VOM (Baumhof, 2016; Kippers, 2015). As aforementioned this knowledge could further help to tailor online VOM to the participants so that they can experience mediation best adapted to their needs. Moreover, it can help mediators better understand their clients, so that they can act accordingly.

In Baumhof's (2016) research she investigated the personality traits of the HEXACO Model which consists of six personality dimensions (Ashton & Lee, 2007) namely, **H**onesty-Humility (H), **E**motionality (E), **eX**traversion (X), **A**greeableness (A), **C**onscientiousness (C) and **O**penness to Experience (O). The results showed that people who imagined being a victim and who were high in extraversion, agreeableness, and openness to experience are significantly more willing to participate in VOM. Furthermore, she found that emotionality does not have any influence in the decision-making process. She proposed that it could be that this personality trait focuses more on self-related

facets. Taking this into account Emotionality could still have other significant effects in the VOM process such as how the VOM process is experienced.

Emotionality includes a person's Fearfulness, Anxiety, Dependence and Sentimentality (Ashton & Lee, 2007). People high in this trait require more emotional support when faced with a situation of crisis, are more anxious in response to stress and are scared of physical dangers. These traits could mean that the online VOM process could seem more daunting to people high in Emotionality. Since people high in emotionality are said to be afraid of physical dangers, the online option of face-to-face VOM would most likely be preferred by victims high in Emotionality due to the physical distance to the offender. Respondents in Bonensteffen, et al.'s (2021) research reported that online communication could give the victims a sense of environmental safety. However their results also showed that most of the participants (83%) would actually prefer face-to-face over online form of VOM. But just over half (56%) also stated that face-to-face mediation could be too confronting and stressful making on online meeting easier to handle for the people involved. Thus it is stipulated that people high in Emotionality could prefer online VOM over face-to-face since they are more prone to being anxious when stressed. This hypothesis is assumed to be true for both the offender and the victim, based on statements made in Bonensteffen, et al.'s research. Offenders stated it would be easier for them to face the victim in cases of feeling intimidated or ashamed. These findings lead to the following hypothesis:

***H1** In (Imagined) victims and offenders the higher the degree of Emotionality the stronger the preference for video calling over face-to-face VOM.*

In addition, it should be considered that although the physical dangers are diminished as well as the stress levels, there are still some other risks regarding online VOM as aforementioned. People high in Emotionality who are prone to worry might be deterred by these downsides of online VOM such as safety concerns and less emotional support from the mediator. However, support can lower uncertainty and give a sense of personal control (Albrecht & Adelman 1987). In this sense a second mediator so that both the offender and the victim can have someone by their side could lessen the worry of the participants, as was proposed by Bonensteffen, et al. (2021). This way some safety concerns can be alleviated and emotional support can be given adequately. Regarding this point it is important to note that the mediators on either side are not there to take sides but their purpose is to solely provide support and safety. Therefore the second hypothesis proposed is the following:

***H2** Two mediators (one at each side) in a video call session would increase the likeliness that people higher in Emotionality will opt for video calling in (imagined) victims and offenders.*

In Baumhof's (2016) research Openness to Experience was also significant in determining whether victims would take part in VOM. This trait looks at a person's Aesthetic Appreciation, Inquisitiveness, Creativity, and Unconventionality. People high in this trait admire their surroundings and are open to unique and unusual ideas (Lee, & Ashton, 2009). Considering people who are high in Openness are not averse from new and different things, they are likely to try different and new ways of VOM. Moreover, they are presumably less likely to be deterred by the downsides of video calling since unique and different ideas usually come with risks of the unknown.

***H3** (Imagined) victims and offenders high in Openness to Experience are more likely to take part in video calling.*

Baumhof's (2016) research also indicated a significant role of Agreeableness in the willingness to participate in VOM. This trait includes Forgiveness, Gentleness, Flexibility, and Patience. Looking specifically at the facet Flexibility, it may indicate a greater willingness to opt for online VOM in general, and therefore also video calling, making them more open to accommodate to other situations. Therefore the fourth hypothesis is the following:

***H4** (Imagined) victims and offenders scoring high in Agreeableness are more likely to take part in video calling.*

The decision to not form a hypothesis for the personality dimension *e*Xtraversion was made on the basis that in previous research it was found that this personality type did not show significantly influence the type of VOM a person would prefer (Kippers, 2015).

Lastly, looking at the personality trait Honesty-Humility Baumhof's (2016) research did not find that this trait had any effect on participation for victims. However it may be a different case for the offender. The Honesty-humility scale assesses a person's Sincerity, Fairness, Greed Avoidance and Modesty. People high in this trait will adhere more to rules and are more honest, whereas people low on the scale would not be deterred to taking advantage of others and use manipulation tactics to get what they want. In contrast people high in Honesty-Humility do not take advantage of other people for their personal gain, nor do they wish for a lavish lifestyle. Considering these usual traits of people high in Honesty-Humility, it seems contradictory and against their nature to cause harm to someone to satisfy their own needs. As a result, offenders could feel a conflict of identity within themselves. Furthermore, the finding that offenders that participate in VOM are less likely to reoffend (Jonas-van Dijk, et al., 2019) might also indicate that these people could be higher on the Honesty-Humility scale.

Shnabel and Nadler (2008) found that the needs of victim and offenders differ when reconciling. On the one hand victims take part in VOM to regain a sense of power and status. On

the other hand offenders feel the need to regain social acceptance and their sense of morality (Shnabel & Nadler, 2008). Connecting this need of the offender when taking part in VOM there may be a connection to being high in Honesty-Humility and through this conflict in their identity, or more specifically with their moral image, offenders might wish for an opportunity to show remorse in order to replenish their moral image and thus would be more likely to participate in VOM.

In line with this argument the fifth hypothesis is the following:

***H5** (Imagined) offenders, who score higher on the honesty-humility personality dimension are more willing to participate in VOM.*

This current study made use of the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) to determine how the participants would rate online VOM. TAM is a method used to find out how users perceive a technology (Lai, 2017; Mortenson & Vidgen, 2016). It includes the factors *perceived ease of use*, *perceived applicability*, and *perceived usefulness*. *Perceived ease of use* relates to how easy the participants think that online VOM can be used. *Perceived applicability* focuses on the extent to which online VOM can be utilized for a mediation session. Lastly, *Perceived usefulness* indicates how useful online VOM is as a form of a mediation session. This model can provide valuable information to allow a more detailed interpretation of the results by understanding the relationship between personality dimensions and willingness more precisely. This way it can be understood why or why not a relationship was found between the variables.

Method

Design and Participation

The independent variables (IVs) in this study were the personality dimensions, Emotionality, eXtraversion, Agreeableness, Openness to Experience and Honesty-Humility as well as the Participants' Role (victim vs. offender) – the last IV was varied within subjects. The dependent variables (DV) were the willingness of the offenders and victims to participate in video call VOM, the wish for second mediator in video call VOM and the general willingness of the offender to participate in VOM (in any form).

Participants were recruited through various means. One method was using the Sona system of the uni. Each student is to collect a certain number of points within their studies by taking part in other students' research. Apart from this, participants were reached by sharing the survey applying the snowball principle with email and social media. Another platform that was used was Survey Circle and Survey Swap. In total 91 participants started the survey. Participants who did not complete the survey fully or answered the same to all the questions were excluded (n= 14). In the end 77 participants were included in the analysis. Of those 63.6% were female (n=49) and 35.1% male

(n=27). One participant preferred not to share this information. The minimum age participants had to be, was 18 years old. All participants were above the age of 18, therefore no participants had to be excluded on the basis of this criteria. There was one participant who gave the age of 4 but this person did not complete the survey. The mean age of participants was 27.23 years with the maximum age being 59 years. Most participants were from Germany making up 70.1% (n=54) of the respondents. Most participants that took part in the survey were students at 75.3% (n=58). The two highest levels of education completed were secondary school at 53.2% (n=41) and Bachelor a 35.1% (n=27).

Most participants, 75.3% (n=58) had not been a victim of crime before and 23.4% (n=18) had been a victim before. One person preferred to not share this information. About half of the participants 48.1% (n=37) knew someone close to them who had been a victim of crime and 50.6% (n=39) did not know someone who had been a victim. One participant did not share this information. The majority of participants, 96.1% (n=74) reported that they had not committed a crime before. Only 3.9% (n=3) had committed a crime before. Slightly more, 19.5% (n=15), knew someone who had committed a crime before and 80.5% (n=62) did not.

Independent variables

Personality Dimensions

The first independent variables were the mean scores of the factors Emotionality, eXtraversion, Agreeableness, Openness to Experience and Honesty-Humility. The HEXACO-PI-R 60-item self-report questionnaire was used to evaluate the personality dimensions (10 questions per factor). The questions were to be answered on a 5-point-Likert scale (1=strongly disagree – 5=strongly agree). Example items of the questionnaire for the personality dimensions were “*I wouldn't use flattery to get a raise or promotion at work, even if I thought it would succeed*” (Honesty-Humility $\alpha=.63$) “*I would feel afraid if I had to travel in bad weather conditions*” (Emotionality $\alpha=.80$) “*I feel reasonably satisfied with myself overall*” (eXtraversion $\alpha=.83$), “*I rarely hold a grudge, even against people who have badly wronged me*” (Agreeableness $\alpha=.71$), “*I plan ahead and organize things, to avoid scrambling at the last minute.*” (Conscientiousness $\alpha=.72$) and “*I'm interested in learning about the history and politics of other countries*” (Openness to Experience $\alpha=.80$).

Participants` Role

The participants of this survey were to imagine themselves both in the role as the victim and the offender through the given scenarios. The participants were randomly assigned to either first the victim or first the offender role.¹

¹ Order effects were checked and none were found.

Victim Role. First the participants imagined themselves in the role as the victim. The scenario was a robbery (see Appendix A). The participants were to imagine themselves walking down a street late at night when another person violently pushes them against a wall and steals their belongings. They were then informed about the possibility to have mediated contact with the offender through various forms. The situation must be serious enough since previous research has found that crimes that are not perceived as serious enough result in a less likelihood of participating in VOM Zebel, Schreurs and Ufkes (2017). The participants were asked on a 5-point-likert-scale (1= 'strongly disagree' to 5 = 'strongly agree') how realistic they perceived the scenario to be (*"The described scenario seems realistic."*). Analysis showed that participants perceived the scenario fairly realistic (M = 3.88, SD = 1.088). Most participants were able to imagine themselves in the role of the victim (*"I was able to imagine myself in the role of the victim."*) (M=4.18, SD= .914).

Offender Role. For the offender role the participants had to imagine themselves in the role of an offender who robs from a person. The scenario was the same as for the victim role (see Appendix B). The crime was not too serious and could be justified in a way that the participants are likely able to understand the action of the offender. This way they should be able to put themselves in the perspective of the offender more easily. The participants were asked to indicate on a 5-point-Likert scale (1=strongly disagree – 5=strongly agree) how realistic the perceived the scenario was to them (*"The described scenario seems realistic."*). Analysis showed that participation rated the scenario as realistic (M = 3.49, SD=1.11). Next there were inquired whether they could put themselves in the perspective of the offender (*"I was able to imagine myself in the role of the offender"*). The participants were not convincingly able to put themselves in the role of the offender (M=3.34, SD=1.31).

Dependent variables

Willingness of offender and victims to participate in video calling

For this DV, 3 items were presented to the respondents after each role which indicate their willingness to participate in video call VOM (H1, H2, H4). Each of these items was analysed separately. The first item was regarding whether they would like to have mediated contact with the offender or victim *"To what extent would you as the victim (offender) like to have mediated contact with the offender (victim)?"* to which they could answer on a 5 point-Likert scale (1=Strongly disagree – 5=strongly agree). Next they were to indicate how much they would prefer three specific types of VOM, video call, face to face and other types of VOM on a 5-point-Likert scale (1= Strongly disagree – 5=Strongly agree).

Lastly they were to indicate on a 5-point-likert scale (1= Strongly disagree – 5=Strongly agree) if they would be open to video call VOM if the other party refuses face-to-face mediation (*"Presuming face-to-face mediation was not possible because the offender does not want to meet in*

person, to what extent would you as a victim agree to video call VOM?”). This item was included to be able to gain a deeper insight into their decisions and was analyzed separately.

Willingness of the Offender to participate in VOM

This DV was important for hypothesis 5. It was assessed with the item “*To what extent would you like to have mediated contact with the victim?*” to which they should answer on a 5-point-Likert scale (1=strongly disagree – 5=strongly agree). This question was also posed in the victim role as an aid for comparison.

Second mediator

The participants were informed that in video call VOM, they have the option to have a second mediator taking part in the VOM process, so that both parties will have a mediator in person with them. Further they were told that the mediators do not take sides but offer further support. To find out whether a second mediator would be seen as more beneficial for people high in Emotionality (H3) the participants were to answer how much they agree with the following statement: “*A second mediator would be beneficial for me during a video call mediation session.*” on a 5-point-likert scale (1=strongly disagree – 5= strongly agree). This question was asked after the role of the victim and again after the role of the offender.

Additional Variable

Technological acceptance model (TAM)

The TAM was used to further understand the potential relations between the effects of personality and the willingness to participate in video call VOM. The items were based on the responses of the research participants of Bonensteffen et al’s (2021) study on their attitude towards digital VOM. The respondents were to respond to a total of 9 items for the mode of VOM via video call and the mode of VOM via face-to-face (Appendix C). This way a comparison could be made between the two modes to further explain any effects. These were measured for each the offender and the victim role. The participants were to indicate how they think video call and face-to-face mediation would score on the items on a 5-point-Likert scale (1=Terrible – 5 = Excellent).

To measure perceived safety 2 of the 10 items were used to measure this construct, which were “*feeling of control*” and “*safety*”. This construct was to assess how safe the victims rated the mode of VOM. To measure perceived usefulness 4 items were used. These were “*emotional expression*”, “*confrontation*”, “*interpreting the other persons gestures*” and “*symbolic form of reparation or closure*”. This construct measured how useful the participants would assume the mode would be for VOM. The other 3 items were “*control of the mediator*” to assess how well the participants perceived the mediator had would have control over the VOM session. Next,

“*confidentiality of data*” measured how confidential the participants assumed the modes of VOM handled their data. Lastly, the item “*ease of use*” measured how easy the participants perceived the modes of VOM are to use.

There were two additional items directed to video call which could give more detailed information explaining the participants decisions. These items were “*The logistical efficiency of video call VOM is important to me*” and “*Unstable internet connection would inhibit the personal connection with the victim/offender*”. To these items the participants responded on a 5-point-Likert scale (1=strongly disagree – 5=strongly agree).

In the following the factor analysis of the constructs perceived safety and perceived usefulness for video call and face-to-face in the view of the victim and offender are displayed.

Perceived safety

For the perceived safety of victims of video call the factor analysis showed one factor with an Eigenvalue of 1.389 and an explained variance of 69.4%. Cronbach’s alpha was moderate at .56 and Lambda 2 at .56.

For victims for face-to-face, factor analysis showed an Eigenvalue of 1.456 and an explained variance of 72.789%. Reliability was moderate at Lambda2 .626 and Cronbach’s alpha showing .626.

Of offenders for video call there was one factor with an Eigenvalue of 1.486 and explained 74.306% of the variance. Reliability was moderate with Lambda2 at .653 and Cronbach’s alpha at .653.

For offender for face-to-face there was one factor with an Eigenvalue of 1,579 and an explained variance of 78.958%. Reliability was good as Lambda2 was .733 and Cronbach’s alpha was Alpha.733.

Perceived Usefulness

For victims for video call the factor analysis showed a factor with an Eigenvalue of 2.482 and an explained variance of 62.06%. Reliability was good as Lambda 2 was .799. and Cronbach’s alpha was .796.

For victims on face-to-face factor analysis showed and Eigenvalue of 2.855 and an explained variance of 71.367%. Reliability was good with Lambda2 at .877 and Cronbach’s alpha at .866.

For offenders on video call there was an Eigenvalue of 2.385 and an explained variance of 59.622%. Reliability was good as Lambda2 was .779 and Cronbach’s alpha was .771.

For offenders on face to face the factor analysis showed one factor with an Eigenvalue of 2.949 and an explained variance of 73.729. Lambda2 was .885 and Cronbach’s alpha was .880 indicating good reliability.

Procedure

Before the data collection took place, the survey was approved by the ethics committee of the BMS faculty at the University of Twente. All data from this study was collected by means of an online survey of Qualtrics using seven blocks of questions. The questionnaire used here was distributed via the snowball system to collect sufficient data. The participants were given a brief explanation of the purpose of the survey before being asked to give informed consent. In the questionnaire, first the variable personality was measured. Then they were asked about their views on the advantages and disadvantages of online video call VOM. Next participants were then to read the scenario of either the victim or the offender first before measuring the variable of their willingness to participate in VOM. Then they were asked about whether a second mediator would be beneficial for them. Afterwards they were to imagine themselves in the other role. In the end, the participants were asked questions regarding their demographics, and about their experience with crime. The data was examined using statistical analysis via SPSS to determine to what extent the variables described above influence the victim-offender mediation process.

Results

Table 1 displays the correlation matrix between several variables which are the willingness to participate in various forms of VOM, preference of a second mediator, the TAM questions and the personality dimensions. Important for the hypotheses are the correlations between the personality dimensions Emotionality, Agreeableness, and Openness to Experience and the willingness to participate in video call VOM. Additionally for the offender role the willingness to participate in VOM and the personality dimension Honesty Humility was important. The TAM questions can aid as further explanation.

Regarding the victim role, the main variables personality dimensions did not correlate with the willingness to participate in VOM or other types of VOM. Only Honesty-Humility ($r=-.268$) and eXtraversion ($r=.300$) were negatively correlated with other types of VOM.

In the offender role none of the sought-after personality dimensions correlated with the wiliness to participate in video call VOM. However, Emotionality was correlated moderately correlated with the willingness to participate in other types of VOM ($r=.465$). Furthermore, Honesty Humility showed a negative correlation with the willingness to participate in video call VOM ($r=-.298$). Agreeableness ($r=.240$) and Openness to Experience ($r=.240$) were positively correlated with the willingness to participate in VOM. EXtraversion was positively correlated with face-to-face VOM ($t=.278$) but negatively with other types of VOM ($r=-.243$). Lastly, Agreeableness was positively correlated with face-to-face VOM ($r=.241$)

Table 1

Correlation matrix between the willingness to participate in VOM and VOM types, the perceived beneficiality of a second mediator, TAM, and the personality dimensions.

	Victim		Offender																		
	M(SD)	M(SD)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19
1.Willingness VOM	3.23(1.21)	3.23(1.30)	1	.346 **	.741 **	-.158	.671 **	.217	.343 **	.105	.206	.247*	.293 **	.276*	.178	-.194	-	.223	.240*	.051	.240*
2.Video call	2.90(1.23)	3.14(1.27)	.387 **	1	.436 **	.166	.516 **	.117	.374 **	.304 **	-	.298**	.195	.113	.289	-	-	.218	.060	-.051	-.165
3.Face to face	3.31(1.37)	3.14(1.43)	.684 **	.183	1	.649**	.249 *	.407 **	.051	.088	.092	.262*	.290 *	.290*	.217	-.136	-	.278*	.227*	.070	.203
4.Other VOM types	2.65(1.06)	3.22(1.22)	.167	.324 **	-	1	.046	.058	.091	.146	-	.029	.046	.024	.062	-.035	.465 **	-.243*	-.005	.088	-.064
5. agree to video call if offender/victim wants	3.36(1.33)	3.75(1.22)	.511 **	.636 **	.400 **	.129	1	.313 **	.387 **	.263 *	.085	.193	.313 **	.235*	.228	-.140	.021	.336*	.226*	-.006	.241*
6.Second mediator	3.74(1.11)	3.63(1.15)	.340 **	.164	.350 **	.168	.442 **	1	.259 *	.294 **	.119	.126	.106	.155	.202	.041	-	.140	.155	.074	.185
7.Safety	3.2(.84)	3.99(.83)	.294 **	.084	.429 **	-.119	.269 *	.000	1	.362 **	.088	.184	.286 *	.380*	.152	-.083	-	.375*	.092	0.144	.065
8.Usefulness	2.99(.68)	3.69(.74)	.019	.397 **	-	.145	.395 **	.132	.362 **	1	.209	.360**	.276 *	.052	.128	-.201	.065	.057	.030	-.200	-.134
9.Control of mediator	3.19(.79)	3.22(.79)	.075	.102	.004	.129	.094	.088	.088	.209	1	.402**	.095	.097	.126	-.138	-	.255*	.020	.034	.034
10.Ease of use	3.84(.80)	3.69(.85)	.175	.225 *	.045	-.050	.341 **	.223	.184	.360 **	.402 **	1	.206	.296* *	.195	-.092	.033	.216	.065	.206	.043
11.Confidentiality of data	2.96(.92)	2.95(1.04)	.302 **	.228 *	.239 *	-.041	.301 **	.145	.213	.338 **	.279 *	.278*	1	.130	.188	-.143	-	.123	.195	-.003	.140
12.Unstable internet connection	4.34(.82)	4.36(.82)	.263 *	.022	.256 *	.032	.212	.345 **	.261 *	.106	.301 **	.404**	.191	1	.255 *	.012	.350 **	.165	.152	.051	.184
13.Logistical efficiency	3.66(1.09)	3.68(1.13)	.278 *	.247 *	.273 *	-.001	.393 **	.264 *	.195	.246 *	.227 *	.331**	.286 *	.436**	1	-.138	-	.055	.127	.024	.163
14.Honesty Humility	3.47(.58)	3.47(.578)	.025	-	.087	-.268*	-	.045	.290	-	-	-.036	.008	.196	-	1	.007	.073	.154	.170	.249*
15.Emotionality	3.39(.70)	3.39(.70)	-	-	-	.034	.060	.260	-	.045	-	.051	-	.068	-	.007	1	-	-.207	.166	-.137

			.049	.017	.066			*	.237		.080		.089		.043			.309*			
16.eXtraversion	3.29(.72)	3.30(.72)	.220	.100	.150	-	.192	.060	.375	.156	.164	.079	.154	.186	.137	.073	-	1	.200	-.067	.257*
						.300**			**								.309				
17.Agreeableness	3.11(.60)	3.11(.60)	.126	-	.196	-.193	.060	.045	.101	-	-	-.043	.204	.213	.176	.154	-	.200	1	-.024	.341**
				.006						.058	.013						.207				
18.Conscientiousness	3.61(.56)	3.61(.56)	.018	.080	.039	-.045	.087	.165	-	-	.011	.194	-	.335**	.194	.170	.166	-.067	-.024	1	.188
									.067	.076			.052								
19.Openness to experience	3.63(.65)	3.63(.65)	.008	-	-	-.121	.109	.080	.040	.091	.053	.154	.214	.314**	.200	.249*	-	.257*	.341**	.188	1
				.005	.072												.137				

Note. Pearson`s r was calculated to examine the association between the variables. The correlations of the victim role are in the lower diagonal and the correlations of the offender are in the upper diagonal. *p<.05 **p<.001.

Hierarchical Analysis

Hierarchical analysis was carried out to test all hypothesis. In block 1 are the demographic items “age”, “sex”, “country”, “occupation”, “education”, and their experience with crime “Victims of crime”, “Close person was a victim of crime”, “Committed a crime” and “Close to someone who committed a crime”. In block 2 were the personality types of the HEXACO model.

Willingness to participate in video call VOM.

The ANOVA table for the victim role showed that the model with both blocks for the construct willingness to participate in video call VOM in victims was not significant ($F(15, 73) = .763, p=.712$). The ANOVA table for the offender role showed that the model with the two blocks also was not significant ($F(15, 73) = 1.155, p=.332$).

Emotionality. To test whether the higher victims and offenders score on Emotionality the stronger their preference for video call VOM is two separate hierarchical regression analyses were conducted, one for the victim and one for the offender. There were no significant effects found for emotionality in both the victim ($b=.018, t(73) = 0.71, p=.944$) and the offender ($b= .091, t(73)=353, p=.726$). Thus it can be said that emotionality did not affect a victim’s willingness to participate in video call VOM. To test whether there is an effect for face-to-face VOM another analysis (Table 3) was conducted. Here there were also no significant effects to be observed. Thus, taking these results together hypothesis 1 was rejected.

A third block was added to test whether a second mediator would moderate the effect of the preference for video call to become more likely. The ANOVA table showed that the construct was not significant ($F(17, 73)=1.266, p=.248$ for the offender role or for the victim role ($F(17,73)=.733, p=.757$). Looking at the interaction effect “second mediator*emotionality” in both tables no significant effect can be seen and the effect of emotionality does not become significant. Thus hypothesis 2 is rejected.

Agreeableness and Openness to Experience. For both the personality type Agreeableness (Victim: $b=-.025, t(73)=-.084, p=.933$; Offender: $b=.302, t(73)=1.033, p=.306$) and Openness to Experience (Victim: $b=-.142, t(73)=-.515, p=.609$; Offenders: $b=-.391, t(73)=-1.425, p=.160$) the results showed no significant effects and thus the hypotheses that these personality types lead to a higher likelihood to participate in video call VOM are rejected.

Other personality types. Unexpectedly, there were two significant effects in the offender role regarding the willingness to participate in online VOM. One significant effect was found for Honesty-Humility ($b = -.622, t(73) = -2.131, p = .037$) indicating that offenders are less likely to favour video call the higher they are in the trait. Additionally, a significant positive effect was found for extraversion ($b = .481, t(73) = 2.135, p < .037$) indicating the higher offenders are on this trait the more likely they would regard video call as an option.

Other predictors.

In table 3 in block 1 it can be seen that there is a weak effect for victims being less likely to participate in face-to-face VOM the older they are ($b=-.052$, $t(73)=$, $p=.$).

Table 2

Hierarchical regression for the willingness of victims to participate in video call VOM.

	Block 1	Block 2	Block 3
Age	-.031	-.029	-.029
Sex	-.118	-.132	-.140
Country	.061	.072	.061
Occupation	.031	.008	-.018
Education	-.120	-.028	.022
Victim of crime	-.142	-.277	-.276
Close person was a victim of crime	.474	.539	.527
Committed a crime	.248	.180	.267
Close to someone who committed a crime	-.652	-.697	-.674
Honesty Humility		-.417	-.470
Emotionality		.018	.418
Extraversion		.191	.176
Agreeableness		-.025	-.048
Conscientiousness		.425	.446
Openness to Experience		-.142	-.140
Second mediator			.517
Second mediator*emotionality			-.113
R2	.099		
N	77		

* $p<.05$

Note. The dependent variable was the victim's willingness to participate in video call VOM.

Table 3

Hierarchical regression for the willingness of victims to participate in face-to-face VOM.

	Block 1	Block 2
Age	-.052*	-.060*
Sex	.032	-.048
Country	-.076	-.054
Occupation	-.188	-.171
Education	.112	.104

Victim of crime	.807	.797
Close person was a victim of crime	.205	.206
Committed a crime	.799	.659
Close to someone who committed a crime	-.955	-.852
Honesty Humility		.371
Emotionality		.058
Extraversion		.198
Agreeableness		.212
Conscientiousness		.390
Openness to Experience		-.388
<hr/>		
R2	.099	
N	77	
<hr/>		
*p<.05		

Note. The dependent variable was the victim`s willingness to participate in face-to-face VOM.

Table 4

Hierarchical regression for the willingness of offenders to participate in video call VOM.

	Block 1	Block 2	Block 3
Age	-.003	.014	.022
Sex	-.116	-.064	-.026
Country	-.041	-.005	.008
Occupation	.023	.024	.034
Education	-.027	.040	.085
Victim of crime	.635	.239	.317
Close person victim of crime	-.305	-.146	-.360
Offender	-1.211	-1.056	-1.041
Close to offender	.226	.389	.558
Honesty Humility		-.622*	-.586
Emotionality		.091	-1.437
Extraversion		.481*	.458*
Agreeableness		.302	.305
Conscientiousness		.063	-.067
Openness to Experience		-.391	-.347
Second mediator			-1.119
Second mediator*emotionality			.372

R2	.259
N	77

*p<.05

Note. Dependent variable Victim`s willingness to participate in video call VOM.

Table 5

Hierarchical regression for the willingness of offenders to participate in face-to-face VOM.

	Block 1	Block 2
Age	-.012	.005
Sex	-.554	-.427
Country	.024	.024
Occupation	.029	.025
Education	-.416*	-.289
Victim of crime	.156	-.126
Close person victim of crime	-.069	-.130
Offender	.797	.935
Close to offender	.166	.352
Honesty Humility		-.561
Emotionality		.065
Extraversion		.325
Agreeableness		.451
Conscientiousness		.000
Openness to Experience		.299
R2	.259	
N	77	

*p<.05

Note. Dependent variable offender`s willingness to participate in face-to-face VOM.

Willingness of Offender to participate in VOM.

Table 6 shows the regression analysis conducted for the fifth hypothesis that offenders are more likely to agree to VOM the higher they score on the Honesty-Humility scale. The ANOVA table indicated that the construct with both blocks was not significant ($F(13,73) = 1.348, p = .205$). For Honesty-Humility no significant effect was found ($b = .144, t(73), p = .057$) and thus the hypothesis was rejected. There was a different significant result regarding the education of the participants ($b = -.490,$

($t_{73} = -2.065, p = 0.042$). Indicating that a higher educational level resulted in a lower likelihood to participate in VOM.

Table 6

Hierarchical regression for the willingness of the offender to participate in VOM.

	Block 1	Block 2
Age	-.011	.004
Sex	-.603	-.532
Country	.036	.051
Occupation	.043	.054
Education	-.490*	-.377
Victim of crime	.183	-.100
Close person victim of crime	-.100	-.189
Offender	.434	.506
Close to offender	.412	.657
Honesty		.144
Humility		
Emotionality		-.415
Extraversion		-.420
Agreeableness		.154
Conscientiousness		.410
Openness to Experience		.548

*= $p < .05$

Note. The dependent variable was the offender's willingness to participate in VOM.

Discussion

The current study was carried out to contribute to the new field of online VOM as it is becoming a more important factor in current times (Marder, 2020). The study set out to look at how personality affects the willingness to participate in video call VOM for victim and offenders. For this, imagined victims and offenders completed a survey about their willingness to participate in VOM. First the hypotheses that the higher imagined victims and offenders score high in Emotionality, Agreeableness or Openness to experience more they are willing to participate in video call VOM. The result of this study lead to a rejection of the hypotheses, indicating that the personalities Emotionality, Agreeableness and Openness to experience did not predict the willingness to participate in video call VOM for neither imagined victims nor offenders. It was further hypothesized that people high in Emotionality would be more willing to participate in video call VOM if a second mediator would be present. No effect was found and thus this hypothesis was also rejected.

Lastly, the study hypothesized that the higher imagined offenders are in Honesty-Humility the more willing they are to participate in VOM. The results indicated to significant results and thus the hypothesis was rejected.

However, the results indicated other unexpected significant effects. Firstly, the higher imagined offenders scored in eXtraversion the more willing they were to participate in video call VOM. This could be due to the fact that people high in this trait feel positively about themselves. A scenario where the offender can interact with the victim via direct communication might give them a feeling that they can better resolve the conflict with the victim. However, there was no significant effect regarding imagined offender high in eXtraversion in preferring face-to-face mediation, which would further support this possible explanation. Looking at the correlation table eXtraversion, although weakly, correlated negatively with other types of VOM but slightly positive with face-to-face VOM. This could indicate that extraverts do indeed prefer being able to communicate with the victim directly.

The study also showed that the trait Honesty-Humility was negatively correlated with the willingness to participate with video call VOM in the imagined offenders. There was no significant difference in imagined victims. At the same time, the results did not show any significant results for their preference of face-to-face or other types of VOM. Moreover, Honesty-Humility did not significantly affect the willingness of the imagined offender to participate in VOM in general. A possible explanation might be that the imagined offenders high in Honest-Humility have a general aversion to online forms of VOM. This could be because perhaps they feel that this way of communication is not a good make amends with the victim. As aforementioned, offenders want to regain a sense of acceptance in society by regaining their morality (Schnabel & Nadler, 2008). Taking the disadvantages of video call communication into account, such as the possibility of unstable internet connection interfering with the communication, offenders might feel this way of communication could not give them a sense of replenishing their morality. Perhaps they see a reduced

probability for the victim to forgive them and for them to accept their apology. Maybe they feel their apology will not reach the victim in a way they wish for.

Another unexpected aspect of this study was that it did not replicate the results of Baumhof's (2015) research regarding the effects of personality on the willingness to participate in VOM for victims. In her study the higher imagined victims scored in eXtraversion, Agreeableness and Openness to Experience, the more willing they were to participate in VOM. There were no such effects indicated in this study. There might be several reasons for this. For one this study had a fairly small sample size. Another aspect to point out is that although the scenarios of this study and Baumhof's were similar, there were some differences that could have had an effect. One difference is that the scenario of Baumhof's study indicated an armed robbery, whereas in this study only mild violence was used. This might have affected the perceived severity of the crime. Zebel et al. (2017) study indicated that a higher perceived severity of a crime is associated with a higher intention to participate in VOM. Another factor related to this is the time elapsed in the scenario until the suggested meeting with the offender. A shorter period might have yielded different results since Baumhof's scenario included only a one-week time period while the current study's scenarios had a period of 1 month. When the crime is perceived as less severe a longer time elapsed can result in a less willingness to participate in VOM (Zebel, et al., 2017).

Limitations

There are several limitations in this study. For one the small sample size of this study was relatively small. Additionally, most of the participants were students and female, indicating a lack of diversity in these areas. Furthermore, no attention checks were included in the survey. Thus was not certain whether all participants answered truthfully. This could have had an effect on the outcome. Another limitation is that the scenarios only seemed moderately realistic to the participants. While the participants were able self reportedly able to imagine themselves in the role of the victim they were not able to imagine themselves in the role of the offender. This might have inhibited the participants ability to give more realistic answers.

Lastly, most of the participants had not actually been a victim of crime before, and even less had committed an offense. Therefore, the answers they have given might not reflect how they would act in a real-life situation.

Strengths

A strength of this research was the novelty. In the area of VOM research online forms of VOM have not been looked into much yet. This study made a first step at finding a relationship between personality dimensions and the amount of preference for video call VOM. Furthermore, while most research on the effects of personality on willingness to participate in VOM focused

primarily on the victims, this study also considered the offender role. A further strength of this study was the variety of participants as can be seen in the wide age range up to 59 years old.

Further research

This study only focused on video call VOM. Further research could explore the effect of personality on other types of online forms of VOM. There may be some differences between various online form of VOM relating to personally as there have been found in traditional forms of VOM.

Additionally, while there was no support for the hypotheses of this study, another study could use scenarios with a higher crime severity. This could yield different results giving deeper insight into personality in relation to video call VOM. If there are some differences found with the change of the scenarios this could also give more insight to when video call VOM is favoured depending on the offense.

There still remains some unclarity why the Honesty-Humility dimension had a negative impact on the imagined offender's willingness to participate in video call VOM, since face-to face and other forms of VOM did not yield significant results. Further research could look into other forms of online VOM to see whether there is a general aversion to online forms of VOM in people high on the Honesty-Humility scale.

Furthermore, regarding eXtraversion, it could be further researched why this trait has an effect on the type of VOM for offenders and whether this can also be said for other forms of VOM. These findings indicate that eXtraversion, while perhaps not important for victims, is important for offenders when deciding on the type of VOM they prefer.

Lastly, touching on the limitation of this study the willingness to participate in video call or other forms of online VOM could be explored with actual victims and offenders to gain more realistic data on the matter.

Conclusion

To answer the research question "How do personality types affect the participation in VOM by means of video-calling for both the (imagined) offender and (imagined) victim?" it can be said that for imagined offenders Honesty-Humility affects the willingness to participate in video call VOM negatively, whereas eXtraversion affects the willingness positively. The current study did not find any association between the personality dimensions Emotionality, Agreeableness and Openness to Experience and the willingness to participate in video call VOM in imagined victims or offenders. Moreover, Honesty-Humility had no association with the willingness to participate in VOM in imagined offenders.

References

- Albrecht, T., L., & Adelman, M., B. (1987). *Communicating social support*. Sage Publications, Inc.
- Ajzen, I. (1991). The theory of planned behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 50(2), 179–211.
- Ashton, M., C. & Lee, K. (2007). Empirical, theoretical, and practical advantages of the HEXACO model of personality structure. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 11(2), 150-166.
- Baumhof, R. (2016). *Tussen Hoop en Vrees. De rol van persoonlijkheid in slachtoffer-daderbemiddelin*.
- Bonensteffen, F., Zebel, S., & Giebels, E. (2021). *Is computer-based communication a valuable addition to victim-offender mediation? A qualitative exploration among victims, offenders and mediator*. 1 submitted_manuscript_digital_victim_offender_mediation.pdf
- Choi, J. J., & Severson, M. (2009). 'What! What kind of apology is this?': The nature of apology in victim offender mediation. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 31(7), 813–820. <https://doi-org.ezproxy2.utwente.nl/10.1016/j.chidyouth.2009.03.003>
- Jonal-van Dijk, J., Zebel, S., Claessen, J., & Nelen, H. (2019). Victim-offender mediation and reduced reoffending: gauging the self-selection bias. *Crime & delinquency*, 66(66-7), 949-972. <https://doi-org.ezproxy2.utwente.nl/10.1177/0011128719854348>
- Komulainen, E., Meskanen, K., Lipsanan, J., Lahti, J., M., Jylhä, P., Melartin, T., Wichers, M., Isometsa, E., ... (2014). The effect of personality in daily like emotional processes. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0110907
- Lai, P., C. (2017). The literature review of technology adoption models and theories for the novelty technology. *Journal of Information Systems and Technology Management*, 14(1), 21-38. 10.4301/S1807-17752017000100002
- Marder, J. (2020). *Justice and healing during the pandemic*. European Forum for Restorative Justice.. <https://www.euforumrj.org/en/justice-and-healing-during-pandemic>
- Mortenson, M., J., & Vidgen, R. (2016). A computational literature review of the technology acceptance model. *International Journal of Management*, 36(6), 1248-1259. Doi:10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2016.07.007
- Sherman, L., W., Strang, H., Barnes, G., Bennett, S., Angel, C., Newbury-Birch, D., . . . Gill, C. (2007). *Restorative justice: The evidence*. London, England: The Smith Institute.
- Schoenenberg, K., Raake, A., Koeppe, J. (2014). Why are you so slow? – Misattribution of transmission delay to attributes of the conversation partner at the far-end. *International Journal of Human-Computer Studies*, 72(5), 477-487. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhcs.2014.02.004>
- Shnabel, N., & Nadler, A. (2008). 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(1), 116-132. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.94.1

- Strang, H., Sherman, L. W., Mayo-Wilson, E., Woods, D., & Ariel, B. (2013). Restorative Justice Conferencing (RJC) Using Face-to-Face Meetings of Offenders and Victims: Effects on Offender Recidivism and Victim Satisfaction. A Systematic Review. *Campbell Systematic Reviews*, 9(1), 1-59. <https://doi-org.ezproxy2.utwente.nl/10.4073/csr.2013.12>
- Swaab, R., I., Galinsky, A., D., Medvec, V., & Diermeier, D., A. (2011). The Communication Orientation Model: Explaining the Diverse Effects of Sight, Sound, and Synchronicity on Negotiation and Group Decision-Making Outcomes. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 16(1), 25-53. <https://doi-org.ezproxy2.utwente.nl/10.1177/1088868311417186>
- Umbreit, M. S., Coates, R. B., & Roberts, A. W. (2000). The impact of victim-offender mediation: a cross-national perspective. *Mediation Quarterly*, 17(3), 215-229. <https://doi-org.ezproxy2.utwente.nl/10.1002/crq.3900170303>
- Wen, T. (2020, April 9). How coronavirus has transformed the way we communicate. *BBC Worklife*. <https://www.bbc.com/worklife/article/20200408-coronavirus-how-lockdown-helps-those-who-fear-the-phone>

Appendix A

Please read the following scenario and try to imagine yourself in the situation.

It is a Saturday night, and you are on your way to meet a friend. As you are walking in a street another person is coming towards you. As the person is about to pass you he pushes you against the wall, and you hit the back of your head against the wall. The offender tells you to hand over your bag. You hand over your bag and the offender runs away. You are in shock and after a while you notice your head hurts and that you are bleeding. You decide to report the robbery to the police. You are able to give a precise description of the offender.

About a month later you are told that the offender has been caught with the help of your description. You are informed about the opportunity to participate in a mediated session with the offender. During this session you have the chance to ask each other questions and to talk about compensation. There will be a mediator present who is neutral and will mediate the conversation between you and the offender and your safety will be ensured.

You are informed that you can choose between face-to-face, video call VOM or other types such as letter writing, emails etc.

In face-to-face VOM you would meet the offender in person in a safe place with a mediator present. In video call you can talk with the offender via an online medium from anywhere you like. There will also be a mediator present in the session. Alternatively you can opt for other forms available, such as exchanging letters, emails, shuttle mediation, where the mediator passes on between the victim and the offender.

Appendix B

Please read this scenario and imagine you are in the described situation.

You are walking down a quiet street at night. You are worrying because you are struggling financially. You have debt, have lost your job and are struggling to find a new one. You also have two children who you need to provide for by yourself. You come across a person who looks very wealthy. As you pass the person you push them against the wall and tell the person to give you their bag and all of their belongings on them. After getting the bag you quickly run away. Shortly after in a safe area you estimate the value of the stolen goods at around 2000 Euros.

A few weeks later you have been arrested for theft and you are informed about the opportunity to participate in a mediated session with the victim. During this session you have the chance to ask each other questions and to talk about compensation. There will be a mediator present who is neutral and will mediate the conversation between you and the victim and your safety will be ensured.

You are informed that you can choose between face-to-face, video call VOM or other types such as letter writing, emails etc.

In face-to-face VOM you would meet the victim in person in a safe place with a mediator present. In video call you can talk with the victim via an online medium from anywhere you like. There will also be a mediator present during the session. Alternatively you can opt for other forms available, such as exchanging letters, emails or shuttle mediation, where the mediator passes on messages between the victim and the offender.

Appendix C

	Terrible	Poor	Average	Good	Excellent
safety	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
feeling of control	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
confrontation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
emotional expression	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
interpreting the other persons gestures and behaviour	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
control of the mediator	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
ease of use	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
confidentiality of data	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
symbolic form of reparation of closure	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Appendix D

Introduction

Dear participant,

this study will focus on victim-offender mediation (VOM), which is a form of restorative justice that offers an alternative solution to the traditional justice system where the offender receives a punishment decided by the court. VOM gives the victim and the offender the opportunity to communicate. VOM has been shown to reduce psychological harm to the victim caused by the offense as well as to reduce re-offence rates of the offenders. There are different forms of VOM that are indirect (letters, shuttle mediation) or direct (e.g. face-to-face meetings). With the pandemic the use of digital forms of VOM has risen in importance.

The aim of this research is to find out how different personality dimensions of individuals may (or may not) predict whether they are willing to participate in VOM. To collect information, we have invited you as a participant to this questionnaire. The questionnaire will take about 15-20 minutes.

If you are sensitive to topics related to crime you are advised to not proceed with this questionnaire.

Appendix E

Informed consent

By proceeding with this questionnaire, you are aware that participation in this research is completely voluntary and that you may withdraw this consent at any time without giving any reason. By no means will your real name or identifying information be included in the report of this research. Nobody, except the researcher and the research supervisor, will have access to this anonymized data in its entirety. Your personal data will not be disclosed to third parties. If you have any questions, now or in the future, you may contact Sarah Tomlin (s.l.tomlin@student.utwente.nl).

If you have any complaints about this research, please direct them to the secretary of the Ethics Committee of the Faculty of Behavioural, Management and Social Sciences at the University of Twente, Drs. L. Kamphuis-Blikman P.O. Box 217, 7500 AE Enschede (NL), telephone: +31 (0)53 489 3399; email: l.j.m.blikman@utwente.nl).

If you click on proceed, you indicate that you have read and understood the informed consent and have been informed in a manner that is clear to you. By proceeding, you agree with participating in this study.

