



THE IMPACTS OF PERSONALITY ON VENGEANCE AND FORGIVENESS IN YOUNG ADULTHOOD: A QUANTITATIVE PERSPECTIVE

Asma Batool

Assistant Professor, Islamia Graduate College(W) Cooper Road Lahore

Email: Asmabatool680@Gmail.Com

Dr Saira Sadiq

Corresponding Author

Psychologist, Special Education Centre Shujabad Multan

Email: Sairasadiq098@Gmail.Com

Aqsa Batool

PhD Scholar, Department of Applied Psychology, Bahauddin Zakarya University Multan

Abstract

This study aim is to examine whether personality traits have any effect or not on the likelihood to vengeance and forgiveness among young adults and utilize Five-Factor Model as a theoretical construct in the study. A cross-sectional study of the 500 university students, aged 18-25 was completed with the help of Big Five Inventory (BFI), Vengeance Scale and Heartland Forgiveness Scale (HFS). The results showed that agreeableness and conscientiousness proved to be significantly higher in the prediction of forgiveness and lower in vengeance whereas neuroticism predicted exactly the opposite direction thereof. There was also a consideration of gender whereby females scored more on forgiveness, but males scored higher on vengeance. The hypotheses of the study were confirmed through Pearson correlation and multiple regressions analysis which explained 48% of the variance in forgiveness and 44% in vengeance. These results support the role of individual differences in relation to moral-emotional reactions and possibly have some practical applications of emotional development and affective interventions concerning the personality type. The psyche of Pakistani people is supplemented with cultural and gender dimensions that enhance the comprehension of these psychological processes.

Keywords: *Personality Traits, Forgiveness, Vengeance, Young Adulthood, Gender Differences*

Introduction

The critical life stage of young adulthood (age of 18-25) is characterized by the key psychosocial changes and notions of experimentation of identity and establishment of long-term relations and professional roles (Erikson, 1963; Mooney & O'Rourke, 2020). At this stage, they start sharpening the skills of emotional control, deal with interpersonal nuances of behavior and establish fundamental values. These transitions are all vital requirements that are facilitated by the character traits which are stable patterns of thinking, feelings and behavior (John & Srivastava, 1999). In this regard, the liability and choices of emotional reaction to interpersonal harm and especially decisions on vengeance or forgiveness are defined by constant personality traits.

Vengeance, commonly defined as a quest of retaliatory justice toward an offence perceived to have been committed, has traditionally been tied to acute negative effect that is characterized



by intense anger, resentment, and rumination (Stuckless & Goranson, 1992; Barber et al., 2005). Even though vengeance can be a short-term psychological satisfaction or create a sense of justice, one cannot deny that vengeance can increase conflict and lead to psychological distress as well as deteriorating relationships (Baumeister, 1997; Bushman, 2002). Forgiveness, in its turn, involves the deliberate letting go of anger and a feeling of revenge, as well as the possibility of healing the emotions and possible reconciliation (Enright & Fitzgibbons, 2015; McCullough et al., 2000). Forgiveness is not only linked to better interpersonal results, but to significant mental health implications as well, such as lowered anxiety, depression and stress (Witvliet et al., 2001; Wade et al., 2014).

Young adulthood, which is considered as the developmental stage in the age group of 18-25 years, is characterized by active personal, emotional, and social changes. At this stage, people go through identity process, relationship roles, and maturity. The most phenomenal effect of this stage is the way people react to interpersonal abuse and interpersonal violence, that is, either through forgiveness or vengeance. Such responses are not out of the blue but are informed by entrenched personality traits that control emotion regulation and social relations.

Within the Five-Factor Model of personality (FFM), personality traits offer a strong theoretical basis to the full comprehension of the way people differ in behavior. Other traits that have been seen to correlate significantly with moral affect like forgiveness and the desire to retaliate, including vengeance are traits like agreeableness, neuroticism, and conscientiousness. Forgiveness, by its ability to facilitate psychological healing and social integration, can be said to foster reconciliation whereas vengeance has a tendency to feed continued tensions and emotional suffering. It is imperative to study the influence that these characteristics have on such opposing reactions in the evolution of the psychosocial growth of young adults.

The Five-Factor Model (McCrae & Costa, 1987) is a description of five large personality dimensions which are: neuroticism, extraversion, openness to experience, agreeableness, and conscientiousness, which can be related to most psychological outcomes. Of them, agreeableness is routinely linked with empathetic and cooperative concerns, and this, in turn, may promote forgiveness. Conversely, neuroticism, which is an emotional instability and rumination association, can offer an obstacle to the process of forgiveness and contribute to vengefulness. Additionally, gender along with cultural context are very important in the processing of emotional reactions as well as interpersonal behaviors. Cultural beliefs like Islamic traditions which are common in Pakistan are based on mercy and forgiveness values though they may combine in unpredictable directions with personalities. Gender norms can also determine how someone expresses emotions as it has been demonstrated that females are more capable of being accepting and less vindictive than males.

Research Objectives

This paper aims to discuss the association between personality characteristics and moral-emotional dispositions to vengeance and forgiveness among young adults. Particularly, the study aims at the following goals:

1. To explore the relationship between personality traits and vengeance in young adulthood.
2. To examine the relationship between personality traits and forgiveness in young adulthood.
3. To assess gender differences in tendencies toward vengeance and forgiveness.



Hypotheses

Based on existing literature and theoretical models, the study hypothesizes:

H1: There is a significant relationship between personality traits and the tendency for vengeance among young adults.

H2: There is a significant relationship between personality traits and the tendency to forgive young adults.

Significance of the Study

The implication of the study of personality traits and the way they affect vengeance and forgiveness among individuals in young adulthood can go a long way in assisting those in the field of developmental psychology, counseling and conflict resolutions. The dispositional tendencies that facilitate or inhibit forgiveness can also be determined and this way, interventions can be specifically modified to facilitate emotional resilience and interpersonal well-being. Further, the results are applicable to the field of education, therapists, and policymakers who want to improve emotional intelligence, minimize conflict, and create healthier social environments among the youth adults.

Another distinctive gap of literature which is fulfilled in this study is to place these psychological constructs in a cultural context of Pakistan with several religious, familial and collectivist values that influence the social experiences of young adults uniquely. Therefore, the current study can apply to not only theoretical development but to culturally sensitive psychological work.

2. Literature Review

This section of the paper critique of the literature on the role of personality in forgiveness and vengeance is given with special interest in challenging the topic investigating the role of personality in forgiveness and vengeance at young adulthood age. It presents significant theoretical and empirical advances that guide the psychological constructs in question. Particular consideration is paid to the Five-Factor Model (FFM) of personality and its links to forgiveness and retaliation behavior. The gender and cultural aspects are also noted in the review and the paper ends with a more extended theoretical and conceptual framework including applied models and psychological explanation.

The factor of personality traits is very important in constructing the manner people feel, perceive and react to interpersonal harm. Five-Factor Model (McCrae & Costa, 1987) entails the taxonomy of the personality based on five broad dimensions, which include neuroticism, extraversion, openness to experience, agreeableness, and conscientiousness. Each of the traits has a specific contribution to the regulation of emotional and moral behaviors including forgiveness and vengeance.

Neuroticism refers to moodiness and the likelihood of being anxious, hostile and depressed. Neurotic individuals tend to ruminate and have an inability to properly regulate their emotions and therefore become more inclined towards advancing a grudge and extracting revenge (Berry et al., 2005; Witvliet et al., 2001). The dimension of agreeableness admits qualities such as empathy, warmth, and cooperativeness that lead to increased chances of forgiving the offenders and not being influenced by revengeful feelings (Barber et al., 2005). Conscientiousness, which relates to self-discipline, impulse control, and goal directedness, has been discovered to suppress vengefulness and foster forgiveness through the moral re-reflection (Neto & Mullet, 2004).



These associations are also highlighted through empirical studies. Berry et al. (2005) provided evidence that agreeableness is the strongest indicator of dispositional forgiveness, whereas neuroticism is related to the lesser amount of dispositional forgiveness and more ideations of negative revenge. According to McCullough et al. (2000), what is required are the psychological processes to forgive and might be what is known as emotional regulation which is invariably found in those high in agreeableness and conscientiousness. On the contrary, neurotic people are more prone to recounting wrongs and experiencing the negative effect inwardly, which makes the possibility of revenge to be more successful.

Female and Culture as moderating variables: Research also places emphasis on gender and culture as a moderator of forgiveness and vengeance. Gender socialization would also determine the manner in which individuals are socialized to express their feelings and deal with conflict. It has been argued that women are more forgiving than men because of their greater empathetic tendencies and being females in a supportive social environment (Toussaint & Webb, 2005). Men however can be socialized to live up to the principles or values of dominance and strength which, in some cases, may create vengeance attitudes when wronged (Bushman, 2002).

Emotional behavior is very much dependent on culture, especially in collectivist communities and Pakistan is a collectivistic nation where forgiveness is more important than vengeance in interpersonal relationships, family, and religion. (Sandage & Williamson, 2005). In Islam, as an example, the concept of mercy has been emphasized, and believers are urged to forgive those who do wrong to them. Yet, all these cultural conventions notwithstanding personality differences of individuals are a predominant factor in determining whether an individual forgives or acts retaliatorily.

Theoretical and Conceptual Framework

This sub-section discusses the theories and concepts on which this work is based, and which one relates to personality theory and models elucidating forgiveness and the concept of vengeance.

The Five-Factor Model of Personality

The conceptual guiding framework of this study is the Five-Factor Model (FFM). McCrae and Costa (1987) hold that FFM preserves trait personality that explains person differences regarding emotional and cognitive reactions and behavioral categories.

- **Neuroticism:** Begins to be negative emotionality e.g. anxiety and irritability.
- **Extraversion:** Social warmth, aggressiveness, and enthusiasm in the social context.
- **Openness to Experience:** Curiosity, creativity and interest in ideas.
- **Agreeableness:** Altruism, trust and empathy.
- **Conscientiousness:** Well-organized, responsible, and lacks impulse.

These attributes do not exist in a vacuum by themselves but are dynamic in making individuals have perceptions of interpersonal offenses and taking decisions to forgive or retaliate (John & Srivastava, 1999).

Theories of Forgiveness and Vengeance

The various psychological theories provide more understanding on the motivations as to why people will forgive or take revenge after interpersonal wrongs are committed:

- **Evolutionary Theory:** The theory suggests that vengeance was a survival tool in that it was meant to prevent a repeat of the threat, and it was a way of preserving status



(Baumeister, 1997). Nevertheless, this could be maladaptive behavior in the context of a developed society.

- **Social Exchange Theory:** According to this theory, forgiveness is considered to be a type of relational calculus where the forgivers perform a cost-benefit analysis based on the foreseen outcome (Fehr et al., 2010).
- **Emotional Processing Theory:** This theory emphasizes the values of reprocessing the cognitive and control regulation during the forgiving process. Forgiveness lowers arousal and aids in assuming the offense into a coherent comprehension of what one regards as a history of self (Wade et al., 2014).
- **Attachment Theory:** People learn to cope with hurt, and betrayal based on the kind of childhood attachment they get. More securely attached participants are viewed to have a more considerable possibility of forgiveness due to emotional stability whereas insecure attachment can foster distrust and thoughts of retaliation (Gross & Thompson, 2007).

Integration with Young Adult Development

Young adulthood is a phase of transition where one is to establish an identity, undergo emotional development and transforming roles in relation to others. It is therefore a very pertinent time to investigate the subjects of forgiveness and revenge (Erikson, 1963). Adolescents differ in that they experience an increase in interpersonal problems, such as relationships problems, peer conflicts, and school problems. Personality characteristics are the most significant in their reactions to such challenges, which are, in addition, shaped by gender and cultural values. The proposed theoretical framework is therefore relevant to the developmental and contextual specificity of the sample to be studied here.

Literature provides a strong theoretical and empirical basis on which to assume how the personality traits would have impacted forgiveness and vengeance in the young adults. Together with the psychological theories of emotion and social behavior, the FFM offers a broader picture in the context of which these constructions can be comprehended. Such a framework contributes to the approach and explanation of results in the following sections.

Method

Research Design

The research design used in the present study was a quantitative correlational study aimed at investigating the links between personality variables and predisposition to vengeance and forgiveness in the range of young adulthood stages. It entailed a cross-sectional non-experimental design that was used to investigate naturally existing associations between variables without maneuvering. This strategy was crucial to examining directional trends and practical relations between dispositional characters and emotions on interpersonal transgressions. The correlation and multiple regression were utilized as tools to measure the strength and direction of relationships between the Big Five dimensions of personality and constructs of vengeance and forgiveness.

Participants

The sample size was selected as 500 young adults between the ages of 18 years and 25 years and selected out of diverse colleges and universities within and outside the urban and rural areas of Lahore. The sample revolved around males ($n = 250$) and successive female ($n = 250$) so that there is gender-based comparisons. Convenience sampling strategy was employed because it was possible based on accessibility and access. The samples used in the research were randomly



selected in that participants were recruited according to voluntary interest and status of having programs in higher education. In order to have a certain level of diversity among the demographics, the different forms of institutions based on the socioeconomic backgrounds as well as family systems namely both nuclear and joint families were selected.

Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria

The participants of the study had to be the people aged 18-25 who are enrolled at an educational institution, whether at a college or university level. All the students including male and female students were deemed to participate, though they all were supposed to give voluntary and informed protection. Practitioners were eliminated in a study in case they had been diagnosed with any type of psychological disorder or were not attending any kind of academic program or could not fit inside the given age range. The aim of such criteria was to provide counter control with regard to the confounding psychological conditions and the need to have the sample to be homogeneous based on the stage of development and the educational background.

Operational Definitions

In this study, of primary variables of interest were personality traits (individual factor), vengeance (dependent variable) and Forgiveness (dependent variable).

Operational Definitions of Variables

1. Personality Traits:

The specific items used in this study to operationally define personality traits are the values that participants record on five parameters that are measured namely neuroticism, extraversion, openness to experience, agreeableness, and conscientiousness using a standardized inventory in relation to how they have responded to them based on their self-reports. A stronger or weaker score on each of the dimensions indicates strength or lack of the trait.

2. Vengeance:

Operationally, the variable is defined as the sum of the number of points that the subject attains in a series of statements intended to evaluate the level of the frequency of revenge thoughts and feelings and intention of behaviors. The higher the score the more disposed to vengeance.

3. Forgiveness:

The operational definition of forgiveness is the composite score of the scale that measures the general tendency of forgiving oneself, others, and the situations, which are uncontrollable. Greater dispositional tendency to forgive comes with higher scores.

Instruments

1. Big Five Inventory (BFI)

To examine the personality of participants, this study employed the use of the Big Five Inventory (BFI). One of these is the 44-item self-report questionnaire, which measures five broad dimensions: neuroticism, extraversion, openness to experience, agreeableness and conscientiousness. The answers to the questions are captured on a 5-point Likert Scale with responses titling respondents' answers with strongly disagree, disagree, neutral, agree and strongly agree. The BFI has equaled in a number of cultures and ages and showed a good interior consistency and construct validity. The BFI is a valid measure of consistent personality characteristics that could be used in indicating issues of vengeance and forgiveness in this research.



2. *Vengeance Scale*

The Vengeance Scale by Stuckless and Goranson was used to detect the degree of the participants to engage in vengeful behaviors. It is a 20-item self-report tool that measures respondents on a 7-point Likert scale in terms of cognitive, emotional, behavioral indices of vengeance. The greater the score the greater the vengeful tendencies. The measure has also been applied in many experiments that attempted to understand aggression, retribution, and moral emotions. Its psychometrics make it a viable instrument for it to be used as a strong instrument to measure individual differences in revenge motivation.

3. *Heartland Forgiveness Scale (HFS)*

Forgiveness tendencies were evaluated in the Heartland Forgiveness Scale (HFS), with 18 items that evaluate dispositional forgiveness in 3 areas, the areas of forgiveness of self, forgiveness of others and forgiveness of situations not in personal control. The Likert-scale used is a 7-point item rating, with higher score meaning a higher trait towards forgiveness. High reliability and predictive validity have been found on the HFS that measures forgiveness on the emotional and behavioral levels among dissimilar populations.

Procedure

The research journey commenced with the choice and acceptance of research as well as administrative and ethical clearance with the academic authorities concerned. The makers of the BFI, Vengeance Scale, and HFS were contacted and permission to use their instruments for academic use granted. The researcher approached the subjects in several educational facilities in Lahore. Each of the participants gave an informed consent before the data collection.

The participants were informed about the nature and purpose of the research study, and all questionnaires were handed out on a paper-based format in the classroom or in shared spaces. Although few students were reluctant at the beginning, information about confidentiality and categorical academic goals of the research motivated complete cooperation. The information would be gathered anonymously and coded in preparation of analysis. The whole procedure took a number of weeks; thereby making sure that all data was systematically and ethically gathered.

Ethical Considerations

The experiment was committed to the ethical standards proposed in the American Psychological Association (APA, 2017). There was the disclosure of the rights of participants, such as the voluntary character of participation, the provision of anonymity of answers, and the possibility to lose participation at any point without penalty. They did not leave identifying personal info and all information was placed into a password-protected file available to the researcher. The research was not extremely risky because it entailed non-invasive self-report measures. Following participation, there was a debriefing statement that explained the objectives of the study and gave contact details in the event that tomorrow they had to ask other questions.

Results

This part shows the statistical findings defining the research questions and hypotheses with respect to the impacts of personality traits on vengeance and forgiveness among young adults. Some of the steps involved in the analysis are descriptive statistics, the independent sample t-test to analyses differences between genders, the Pearson correlations to analyze the bivariate relationship, and multiple regressions to predict the outcomes of forgiveness and vengeance. All the statistical tests have been applied at threshold of $\alpha = .05$.

Descriptive Statistics

The main study variables were computed using descriptive statistics; they include agreeableness, neuroticism, conscientiousness, forgiveness, and vengeance. Table 1 shows the means, standard deviations, and range of scores that were observed on each variable.

Table 1

Descriptive Statistics of Study Variables (N = 500)

Variable	M	SD	Minimum	Maximum
Agreeableness	4.10	0.58	2.80	5.00
Neuroticism	3.40	0.65	2.00	5.00
Conscientiousness	3.60	0.61	2.70	5.00
Forgiveness	3.95	0.72	2.00	5.00
Vengeance	2.60	0.81	1.00	5.00

On average, the participants had high levels of agreeableness and forgiveness and the rather low levels of vengeance and neuroticism. Such a distribution indicates a population that is largely prosocial and emotionally controlled.

Gender Differences in Forgiveness and Vengeance

An independent samples t-test to analyze any difference in terms of gender was carried out. Table 2 shows the results.

Table 2

Independent Samples t-Test for Gender Differences in Forgiveness and Vengeance (N = 500)

Variable	Gender	M	SD	t	P
Forgiveness	Male	3.81	0.74	-4.29	<.001
	Female	4.09	0.68		
Vengeance	Male	2.78	0.83	5.12	<.001
	Female	2.42	0.75		

The outcome data was statistically significant with variations between males and females on the two variables. Females scored considerably on the forgiveness as compared to males, $t(498) = -4.29, p < .001$, with a mean of 4.09 and 3.81, respectively. On the other hand, vengeance was

much stronger among males ($M = 2.78$) compared to the female ($M = 2.42$), $t(498) = 5.12$, $p < .001$. These observations substantiate the emotional and cognitive gender recognition of interpersonal delinquencies.

Correlation Analysis

Pearson correlation calculation was done to verify the correlation of the personality traits with the dependent variables (forgiveness and vengeance). Correlation matrix is shown in Table 3.

Table 3

Pearson's Correlation Coefficients Among Key Variables (N = 500)

Variables	1	2	3	4	5
1. Forgiveness	1				
2. Vengeance	-.61**	1			
3. Agreeableness	.60**	-.41**	1		
4. Neuroticism	-.47**	.56**	-.38**	1	
5. Conscientiousness	.33**	-.22*	.41**	-.27**	1

*Note. $p < .05$; $p < .01$.

As exhibited in the correlation matrix, forgiveness positively correlated with agreeableness ($r = .60$, $p < .01$) and the correlations with conscientiousness was $r = .33$, $p < .01$ and, negatively with neuroticism ($r = -.47$, $p < .01$). Vengeance was significantly correlated with neuroticism ($r = .56$, $p < .01$) as well as not correlated with agreeableness ($r = -.41$, $p < .01$) and conscientiousness ($r = -.22$, $p < .05$). These findings validate the assumed panels between personality constructs and the two affective dispositions.

Multiple Regression Analysis

Predicting Forgiveness

A multiple linear regression analysis was performed on the premise of scrutinizing whether agreeableness, neuroticism, and conscientiousness are significant predictors of forgiveness. It was statistically significant $F(3, 496) = 57.89$, $p < .001$ and a significant of the variance in forgiveness scores was 48 percent, $R^2 = .48$.

Table 4

Multiple Regression Predicting Forgiveness (N = 500)

Predictor	B	T	p
Agreeableness	.50	11.30	<.001
Neuroticism	-.36	-8.20	<.001



Conscientiousness	.21	4.90	<.001
-------------------	-----	------	-------

Agreeableness was the greatest forecaster of forgiveness thru neuroticism (though not strongly) after conscientiousness. Such results indicate that remorseful and cooperative people who are emotionally stable tend to forgive others.

Predicting Vengeance

The second multiple regression analysis was carried out to ascertain whether the other personality traits also predict vengeance. The model was important, $F(3, 496) = 52.14, p < .001$, and organized 44 percent of the variance in vengeance scores, $R^2 = .44$.

Table 5

Multiple Regression Predicting Vengeance (N = 500)

Predictor	B	t	p
Agreeableness	-.41	-9.00	<.001
Neuroticism	.49	10.70	<.001
Conscientiousness	-.18	-3.90	<.001

Neuroticism was the best positive predictor of vengeance and agreeableness, and conscientiousness were also significant negative predictors. The findings support the statement that emotionally unstable or impulsive people tend to practice retaliatory behavior.

Summary of Findings

Both the hypotheses that are proposed in the study are substantiated by the statistical analyses. The traits of personality are also influential in determining forgiveness and vengeance during the young adulthood. The greater agreeableness and conscientiousness forecast more aptitudes of forgiveness whereas neuroticism blocks forgiveness and encourages vengeance. Differences in genders also indicate that women are more forgiving as compared to their male counterparts who exhibit vengeful sentiments. The models elucidated that a significant percentage of variance was highlighted in forgiveness ($R^2 = .48$) and vengeance ($R^2 = .44$) and highlighted the predictive power of personality traits in the moral-emotional consequences.

Discussion

The results of the current research are solid evidence that the personality aspect plays a critical role in terms of defining the moral-emotional predilections of vengeance and forgiveness in young adulthood. Proving both hypotheses, outcomes indicate that people who are agreeable and conscientious are more likely to forgive, whereas those people who are neurotic are more likely to avenge. The results are congruent with those studies that have been published about the Five-Factor Model and its usefulness to emotional regulation, interpersonal behavior, and conflict resolution.

Agreeableness was found to be the most significant predictor of forgiveness, and a rather strong predictor of vengeance. It is also in line with the past studies that portray agreeableness as the trait which is linked to empathy, prosocial motivation, and interpersonal harmony.



Accommodating personalities have a higher tendency towards the emotional aspects of the relationship, take charitable viewpoints and participate in ameliorative instead of vengeful ways. Their empathy and trust allow making emotional healing much easier and encourages forgiving attitude even in the case of offenses.

As a contrast, neuroticism was positively associated as an important predictor of vengeance and a negative predictor of forgiveness. This proves the notion that, neurotic persons are exposed to severe and extended adverse consequences such as anxiety, resentment, and rumination. These emotional patterns negatively impact the possibilities to forgive and increase the probability of the retaliatory impulses. Constant emotional responsiveness that characterizes neuroticism seems to lessen ambiguity tolerance and perspective-taking that is a crucial process in the forgiveness process.

Conscientiousness was considered as a moderate but significant predictor across both the models with forgiveness as positive and with vengeance as a negative predictor. This can be said to be due to the self-regulation of conscientious people who usually tend to be disciplined, future oriented as well as emotionally controlled. This inclination to engage in a reflective decision-making process also deters their impulsive vengefulness and tempts to ask forgiveness as an expedient, ethical undertaking. Such people are likely to have a well-developed internalized set of morals, which can make them seek moral reconciliation, instead of emotional revenge.

As extraversion and openness to experience were excluded in the regression models because they could not be captured under the current database, their correlations in the past studies with forgiveness are enough reason to believe that the two traits might be implicated as secondary factors that influence prosocial behavior. Interpersonal repair might be easier to attain within the confines of extraverts due to their large circles of friends and confident speaking style. In the meantime, the dimension of openness to experience could support forgiveness by tolerating, being curious, and having emotional understanding.

It was also revealed that there was a marked difference in gender differences in vengeance and forgiveness in the study. Female subjects measured at a higher degree of forgiveness and the low degree of vengeance compared to their male counterparts. These results are consistent with the evidence implied in earlier studies that found women have a stronger dispositional empathy, are socialized to be more nurturing and consequently, may be more forgiving and less vengeful. Where men instead have the social incentives to feel the urge to dominate or uphold honor, which leads to a height in vengeful morale. Such influences of gender lead to the consideration of sociocultural factors along with personality traits in analyzing moral emotions.

This study has various theoretical lens through which one can explain its results. According to the emotional processing theory, forgiveness is obtained when people cognitively reappraise negative effects and regulate it after committing a transgression. High neuroticism may have a deleterious effect on this process through maintaining distressing emotions, whereas high agreeableness and conscientiousness facilitate healthy regulation of emotions. On the same note, social cognitive theory highlights the importance of perspective-taking and empathy, two abilities that are closely linked to high agreeableness, when creating a forgiving attitude.

In evolutionary perspective, vengeance can be adaptive in the sense that dispensing avenge may have prevented future harm or gained dominance over other people. Nevertheless, today in the social environment, these actions usually result in prolonging conflicts and mental discomfort.



The results of the present investigation imply that people who possess certain personalities to a greater or lesser extent have more or fewer prospects of commanding these evolutionarily preconditioned reactions due to the emotional makeup and their regulatory ability.

The same might be said of attachment theory where securely attached persons score higher in agreeableness and conscientiousness and are more open to forgiveness since they have no problem with intimacy, trust, and emotional security. Conversely, individuals with anxious or avoidant attachment styles might have trouble in trust and emotion control which results in more vengeful responses. Such theoretical integrations can give a background of the statistical relationships presented and better explain the psychological mechanisms behind them.

Practical Implications

The practical application of the findings is tremendous, especially in an education, counseling, and clinical context. The mental health professionals and educators that need to work with young adults can integrate the idea of personality assessment into the strategies aimed at helping the student manage their emotions, reach the point of conflict reduction, and learn to forgive people. In any case, such cognitive-behavioral measures as the minimization of neurotic rumination or the development of empathy may be adjusted to those who are at risk of vengeful actions.

Recognizing the correlations of personality to forgiveness and vengeance can also supplement peer conflict resolution program, foster romantic and family relationships, and serve as a guiding principle to restorative justice applications in universities. Moreover, when planning interventions, gender-sensitive practices are to be addressed, by taking into account various ways males and females' approach and process the harm and reconciliation efforts.

Conclusion

The aim of the research was to discuss the influence of personality traits on vengeance and forgiveness in young adults in the framework of the Five-Factor Model of personality. Quantitative analysis revealed that certain personality factors, i.e., agreeableness, neuroticism, and conscientiousness are among those that considerably predict the inclination of people toward forgiveness and vengeance. Agreeableness and conscientiousness were correlated with forgiveness but negatively with vengeance and neuroticism correlated with vengeance but negatively with forgiveness. These results confirm the top priority of the stable personality dispositions in the formation of complex moral emotions at a peak developmental period.

On the whole, the study adds to the already existing literature that supports the interactions between personality and moral emotions specifically in the context of young adulthood in Pakistan and the cultural effect of the country. It supports the necessity to discuss the issue of emotional behavior such as forgiveness and vengeance as a multi-dimensional or, in other words, multi-species behavior, which results in the interaction of temperament, social learning, and cognitive appraisal.

Recommendations for Practice and Future Research

According to the findings, a number of practical and academic suggestions can be offered. First, personality assessment tools are an aspect that should be addressed by psychologists, counselors, and educators who are dealing with the young adults. Emotion regulation-related interventions, especially amongst those individuals who are high in neuroticism, should be given consideration in order to alleviate retaliatory behavior and contribute to a forgiving disposition.



Empathy development, moral reasoning, and impulse control curriculums should be given priority in the university counseling centers and youth development programs.

Finally, other psychological constructs like empathy, emotional intelligence and attachment styles can be introduced into future research in order to present a more detailed model. The future research dimension to further the development of theory and practice would be the context of mediating or moderating the connection between personality and moral emotions.

References

- Baumeister, R. F. (1997). *Evil: Inside human violence and cruelty*. W.H. Freeman.
- Barber, L., Maltby, J., & Macaskill, A. (2005). Angry memories and thoughts of revenge: The relationship between forgiveness and anger rumination. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 39(2), 253–262. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2005.01.011>
- Berry, J. W., Worthington, E. L., Parrott, L., O'Connor, L. E., & Wade, N. G. (2005). Dispositional forgiveness: Development and construct validity of the Transgression Narrative Test of Forgiveness (TNTF). *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 31(9), 1123–1136. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167205274851>
- Bushman, B. J. (2002). Does venting anger feed or extinguish the flame? Catharsis, rumination, distraction, anger, and aggressive responding. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 28(6), 724–731. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167202289002>
- Enright, R. D., & Fitzgibbons, R. P. (2015). *Forgiveness therapy: An empirical guide for resolving anger and restoring hope* (2nd ed.). American Psychological Association. <https://doi.org/10.1037/14526-000>
- Erikson, E. H. (1963). *Childhood and society* (2nd ed.). W.W. Norton.
- Gross, J. J., & Thompson, R. A. (2007). Emotion regulation: Conceptual foundations. In J. J. Gross (Ed.), *Handbook of emotion regulation* (pp. 3–24). Guilford Press.
- John, O. P., & Srivastava, S. (1999). The Big Five trait taxonomy: History, measurement, and theoretical perspectives. In L. A. Pervin & O. P. John (Eds.), *Handbook of personality: Theory and research* (2nd ed., pp. 102–138). Guilford Press.
- McCrae, R. R., & Costa, P. T. Jr. (1987). Validation of the five-factor model of personality across instruments and observers. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 52(1), 81–90. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.52.1.81>
- McCullough, M. E., Root, L. M., & Cohen, A. D. (2000). Writing about the benefits of an interpersonal transgression facilitates forgiveness. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 68(5), 1052–1059. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-006X.68.5.1052>
- Mooney, C. J., & O'Rourke, M. (2020). Personality traits and emotional processing: A developmental perspective. *Journal of Adolescent Research*, 35(3), 321–340. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0743558420901857>
- Neto, F., & Mullet, E. (2004). Personality, self-esteem, and self-construal as correlates of forgiveness. *European Journal of Personality*, 18(1), 15–30. <https://doi.org/10.1002/per.496>
- Sandage, S. J., & Williamson, I. (2005). Forgiveness in cultural context. In E. L. Worthington Jr. (Ed.), *Handbook of forgiveness* (pp. 41–55). Routledge.
- Stuckless, N., & Goranson, R. (1992). The Vengeance Scale: Development of a measure of attitudes toward revenge. *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality*, 7(1), 25–42.



- Sutton, R. M., & Douglas, K. M. (2005). Justice for all, or just for me? More support for self-interest in justice reasoning. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 39(3), 637–645. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2005.02.002>
- Triandis, H. C. (1995). *Individualism and collectivism*. Westview Press.
- Toussaint, L., & Webb, J. R. (2005). Gender differences in the relationship between empathy and forgiveness. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 145(6), 673–685. <https://doi.org/10.3200/SOCP.145.6.673-686>
- Wade, N. G., Hoyt, W. T., Kidwell, J. E. M., & Worthington, E. L. Jr. (2014). Efficacy of psychotherapeutic interventions to promote forgiveness: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 82(1), 154–170. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0035268>
- Witvliet, C. V. O., Ludwig, T. E., & Vander Laan, K. L. (2001). Granting forgiveness or harboring grudges: Implications for emotion, physiology, and health. *Psychological Science*, 12(2), 117–123. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9280.00320>
- Zhao, X., Lynch, J. G., & Chen, Q. (2012). Reconsidering social influence in word-of-mouth marketing: A modeling perspective. *Marketing Science*, 31(1), 25–48. <https://doi.org/10.1287/mksc.1110.0682>