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Experiment 1

Please note that we present the experimental materials in the order to which they were presented to the participant in the experiment. The listed measures were included within a larger survey. Also included within the survey were items assessing attitudes and emotions felt towards the outgroup, outgroup hostility, regulatory style for forgiving the transgressor, perceptions that the outgroup downplayed the transgression, perceptions of transgression severity, perceptions of micro-transgressions, and perceived remorse in the apology. These variables were beyond the scope of the present research.

Group Identification

Please read the following statements and indicate to what extent you agree or disagree with each of them by selecting your answer using the scale below:
1: Strongly Disagree 2: Disagree 3: Somewhat Disagree 4: Neither Agree or Disagree 5: Somewhat Agree 6: Agree 7: Strongly Agree

1. I identify with Carleton University.
2. I see myself as a member of Carleton University.
3. I do not feel strong ties to other members of Carleton University.
4. I am not pleased to be a student at Carleton.
Manipulation Stimuli

**Autonomy Supportive Apology**

Want to know how to insult an entire university? Ask the University of Ottawa. On Saturday, the Official University of Ottawa Facebook page and Twitter account posted a link to an article in the Ottawa Citizen discussing Carleton University’s newly re-introduced football team, speculating whether this new team will stoke the rivalry between the two universities. The post/tweet (approved by the University of Ottawa Administration) which accompanied the link read, “The new Carleton team will be mediocre, much like Carleton's academic reputation." The post quickly received over a thousand 'likes' and approving comments on Facebook from University of Ottawa students, staff, faculty and alumni. The tweet was retweeted by the University of Ottawa Student Federation and over 500 followers.

Carleton University President Dr. Roseanne Runte called the post/tweet "unfortunate and disrespectful". Echoing Dr. Runte, the Carleton University Students Association (CUSA) said in a prepared statement: "A sports rivalry is one thing, but throwing our school's academic reputation under the bus is another."

Dr. Rock attended Carleton Board of Governor's meeting on June 1st, 2013. At the meeting CUSA Vice President for Student Issues Hayley Dobson criticized the lack of professionalism displayed by the University of Ottawa Administration for allowing such behaviour. Dr. Rock announced public plans of amends which will be discussed at CUSA's next board meeting. All are welcome to attend.

University of Ottawa President Allan Rock has since taken full responsibility for the post/tweet. On May 26, 2013, he issued the following statement:

“On behalf of the University of Ottawa, I would like to offer a public apology to Carleton University students and President Runte. Our lack of support and poor sportsmanship has resulted in an atmosphere of hostility and distrust among fans, athletes, and members of our communities alike. As a fellow respected Canadian institution, we want to take this moment and express our dedication to insuring that this appalling behaviour exhibited by our university is conveyed to future generations of students so that it is not repeated again. We are committed to playing our part to insure that cooperation can be restored. The University of Ottawa hopes that all members of the Carleton University community may forgive us for this transgression. However, I and all other members of the University of Ottawa community understand that it may be difficult for all members of the Carleton University to accept this apology. We don't expect that an apology will smooth all the waters. We understand the hurt this has caused, and we respect Carleton University’s right to be offended with the University of Ottawa.”

**Autonomy Unsupportive Apology**

Want to know how to insult an entire university? Ask the University of Ottawa. On Saturday, the Official University of Ottawa Facebook page and Twitter account posted a link to an article in the Ottawa Citizen discussing Carleton University’s newly re-introduced football team, speculating whether this new team will stoke the rivalry between the two universities. The post/tweet (approved by the University of Ottawa Administration) which accompanied the link read, “The new Carleton team will be mediocre, much like Carleton's academic reputation." The post quickly received over a
thousand 'likes' and approving comments on Facebook from University of Ottawa students, staff, faculty and alumni. The tweet was retweeted by the University of Ottawa Student Federation and over 500 followers.

Carleton University President Dr. Roseanne Runte called the post/tweet "unfortunate and disrespectful". Echoing Dr. Runte, the Carleton University Students Association (CUSA) said in a prepared statement: "A sports rivalry is one thing, but throwing our school's academic reputation under the bus is another."

Dr. Rock attended Carleton Board of Governor's meeting on June 1st, 2013. At the meeting CUSA Vice President for Student Issues Hayley Dobson criticized the lack of professionalism displayed by the University of Ottawa Administration for allowing such behaviour. Dr. Rock announced public plans of amends which will be discussed at CUSA's next board meeting. All are welcome to attend.

University of Ottawa President Allan Rock has since taken full responsibility for the post/tweet. On May 26, 2013, he issued the following statement:

"On behalf of the University of Ottawa, I would like to offer a public apology to Carleton University students and President Runte. Our lack of support and poor sportsmanship has resulted in an atmosphere of hostility and distrust among fans, athletes, and members of our communities alike. As a fellow respected Canadian institution, we want to take this moment and express our dedication to insuring that this appalling behaviour exhibited by our university is never conveyed to future generations of students. We are committed to playing our part to insure that cooperation can be restored. The University of Ottawa hopes that all members of the Carleton University community may forgive us for this transgression. We expect that this apology can smooth the waters. It is time that both our groups turn the page on this unfortunate event."

Basic Apology

Want to know how to insult an entire university? Ask the University of Ottawa. On Saturday, the Official University of Ottawa Facebook page and Twitter account posted a link to an article in the Ottawa Citizen discussing Carleton University’s newly reintroduced football team, speculating whether this new team will stoke the rivalry between the two universities. The post/tweet (approved by the University of Ottawa Administration) which accompanied the link read, “The new Carleton team will be mediocre, much like Carleton's academic reputation." The post quickly received over a thousand 'likes' and approving comments on Facebook from University of Ottawa students, staff, faculty and alumni. The tweet was retweeted by the University of Ottawa Student Federation and over 500 followers.

Carleton University President Dr. Roseanne Runte called the post/tweet "unfortunate and disrespectful". Echoing Dr. Runte, the Carleton University Students Association (CUSA) said in a prepared statement: "A sports rivalry is one thing, but throwing our school's academic reputation under the bus is another."

Dr. Rock attended Carleton Board of Governor's meeting on June 1st, 2013. At the meeting CUSA Vice President for Student Issues Hayley Dobson criticized the lack of professionalism displayed by the University of Ottawa Administration for allowing such behaviour. Dr. Rock announced public plans of amends which will be discussed at CUSA's next board meeting. All are welcome to attend.
University of Ottawa President Allan Rock has since taken full responsibility for the post/tweet. On May 26, 2013, he issued the following statement:

“On behalf of the University of Ottawa, I would like to offer a public apology to Carleton University students and President Runte. Our lack of support and poor sportsmanship has resulted in an atmosphere of hostility and distrust among fans, athletes, and members of our communities alike. As a fellow respected Canadian institution, we want to take this moment and express our dedication to insuring that this appalling behaviour exhibited by our university is never conveyed to future generations of students. We are committed to playing our part to insure that cooperation can be restored.”

Forgiveness

Please use the numbers given below to indicate how much you agree or disagree with each statement:

1: Strongly Disagree 2: Disagree 3: Somewhat Disagree 4: Neither Agree or Disagree 5: Somewhat Agree 6: Agree 7: Strongly Agree

1. The University of Ottawa should be forgiven.
2. It is time to move past the anger directed toward the University of Ottawa.
3. I don’t think the University of Ottawa should pay for what they did.
4. I can’t let go of the negative feelings I have toward the University of Ottawa.
5. The University of Ottawa should get what is coming to them
6. The University of Ottawa should be “taught a lesson”
7. I wouldn’t want to be close to someone at the University of Ottawa.

Perceptions of the Apology (Included the manipulation check and measure of perceived empathic support)

This questionnaire contains items that are related to how your group is treated by another group, the University of Ottawa. Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the statements below.

1: Strongly Disagree 2: Disagree 3: Somewhat Disagree 4: Neither Agree or Disagree 5: Somewhat Agree 6: Agree 7: Strongly Agree

Manipulation Check

1. In their apology, the University of Ottawa acknowledged that it is Carleton University's choice to accept or refuse their apology.
Perceived Empathic Support

1. In their apology, the University of Ottawa showed that they understand how Carleton University felt as a result of the transgression.
2. Carleton University can trust what was said in the University of Ottawa apology.
3. In their apology, the University of Ottawa showed that they took the time to listen to the concerns of Carleton University.
4. In their apology, the University of Ottawa showed that they took the time to ask questions and understand Carleton University’s reactions to the transgression.
5. In their apology, the University of Ottawa showed that they care about Carleton University.
6. In their apology, the University of Ottawa showed that they were able to take the perspective of Carleton University.
7. In their apology, the University of Ottawa showed that they were sensitive to the feelings of Carleton University.

Experiment 2

Please note that we present the experimental materials in the order to which they were presented to the participant in the experiment. The listed measures were included within a larger survey. Also included within the survey were items assessing attitudes and emotions towards the outgroup, outgroup hostility, items assessing self-overlap with one’s Canadian identity, regulatory style for forgiving the transgressor, feelings that the outgroup downplayed the transgression, perceptions of transgression severity, perceived remorse in the apology, ulterior motives for granting the apology, and psychological wellbeing. These variables were beyond the scope of the present research.

Experimental Manipulation

(Experimental manipulations are provided on the next pages, in the following order: Basic Apology, Autonomy Unsupportive Apology, Autonomy Supportive Apology.)
On April 18th, 2002, an American F-16 fighter jet dropped a 225-kilogram bomb on Tarnak Farm, a region near Khandahar. The laser-guided explosive was directed at a Canadian unit, the Princess Patricia's Light Infantry, who were engaged in a planned night-time training exercise. Four Canadian soldiers were killed, and eight more Canadian soldiers suffered severe injuries.

At the time, the U.S. Government claimed the incident to be a friendly-fire accident. The Canadian government concluded after a lengthy inquiry that the incident was likely preventable, as the U.S. Major who dropped the bomb failed to properly verify that his target was in fact hostile. Furthermore, it was later learned that the same Major disobeyed his air controller’s instructions to standby while information on the target was verified.

Originally, the Major was charged with 4 counts of manslaughter and 8 counts of assault by the US army. If convicted on all 12 charges, the Major could have been sentenced to a maximum of 64 years in prison. However, the charges were soon reduced to the minor charge of dereliction of duty. On June 19th, 2003, a high-ranking commander in the U.S. Air Force decided that the incident warranted only non-judicial charges. By the time the case was settled, the Major failed to be court-marshaled or tried in American judicial courts, leaving many Canadians, including the families of those killed, to feel that justice was not properly carried out in this case.

Ten years after the incident, a ceremony was held at the Edmonton Garrison on June 29th, 2013 with the present United States Minister of Defence, Chuck Hagel in attendance. At the meeting, the Canadian Foreign Affairs Minister, John Baird, criticized the United States Armed Forces and the American Government for their failure to enforce stricter protocols that could have prevented the tragedy, and for their failure offer justice to the Canadian people by upholding the more serious charges originally placed on the U.S. Major.
Following the meeting, United States Minister of Defence, Chuck Hagel, went on to announce that the US Government intends to make amends with the Canadian people for the incident, and indicated that the issue would be further discussed at meetings with Minister Baird and the Canadian Government.

Since then, Chuck Hagel and the United States Department of Defence have taken full responsibility on behalf of the United States Air Force and the American Government for the events preceding and following the friendly fire incident which took place on April 18, 2002. On June 29th, 2013, he issued the following statement:

"On behalf of all Americans, I sincerely offer a public apology to the victims of the tragic incident that took place at Tarnak Farms, on April 18, 2002. I want to extend this apology to the families and friends of those victims and all Canadians. We failed to put into place stricter protocols that could have prevented this incident. After meetings with Canadian Government, I understand that we have also failed to offer a sense of justice to the victims’ families and the Canadian people. We wish to fully acknowledge that this has caused much harm and an unspeakable loss to Canada. As Americans, we want to take this moment to express our dedication to ensuring that this type of behaviour on the part of our country is conveyed to future generations so that this is never again repeated. Furthermore, we will offer compensation to the families and relatives of the Canadian soldiers who were affected by this tragedy. We are committed to ensuring that they are fairly compensated.”
On April 18th, 2002, an American F-16 fighter jet dropped a 225-kilogram bomb on Tarnak Farm, a region near Kandahar. The laser-guided explosive was directed at a Canadian unit, the Princess Patricia's Light Infantry, who were engaged in a planned night-time training exercise. Four Canadian soldiers were killed, and eight more Canadian soldiers suffered severe injuries.

At the time, the U.S. Government claimed the incident to be a friendly-fire accident. The Canadian government concluded after a lengthy inquiry that the incident was likely preventable, as the U.S. Major who dropped the bomb failed to properly verify that his target was in fact hostile. Furthermore, it was later learned that the same Major disobeyed his air controller’s instructions to standby while information on the target was verified.

Originally, the Major was charged with 4 counts of manslaughter and 8 counts of assault by the US army. If convicted on all 12 charges, the Major could have been sentenced to a maximum of 64 years in prison. However, the charges were soon reduced to the minor charge of dereliction of duty. On June 19th, 2003, a high-ranking commander in the U.S. Air Force decided that the incident warranted only non-judicial charges. By the time the case was settled, the Major failed to be court-martialed or tried in American judicial courts, leaving many Canadians, including the families of those killed, to feel that justice was not properly carried out in this case.

Ten years after the incident, a ceremony was held at the Edmonton Garrison on June 29th, 2013 with the present United States Minister of Defence, Chuck Hagel in attendance. At the meeting, the Canadian Foreign Affairs Minister, John Baird, criticized the United States Armed Forces and the American Government for their failure to enforce stricter protocols that could have prevented the tragedy, and for their failure offer justice to the Canadian people by upholding the more serious charges originally placed on the U.S. Major.
Following the meeting, United States Minister of Defence, Chuck Hagel, went on to announce that the US Government intends to make amends with the Canadian people for the incident, and indicated that the issue would be further discussed at meetings with Minister Baird and the Canadian Government.

Since then, Chuck Hagel and the United States Department of Defence have taken full responsibility on behalf of the United States Air Force and the American Government for the events preceding and following the friendly fire incident which took place on April 18, 2002. On June 29th, 2013, he issued the following statement:

"On behalf of all Americans, I sincerely offer a public apology to the victims of the tragic incident that took place at Tarnak Farms, on April 18, 2002. I want to extend this apology to the families and friends of those victims and all Canadians. We failed to put into place stricter protocols that could have prevented this incident. After meetings with Canadian Government, I understand that we have also failed to offer a sense of justice to the victims’ families and the Canadian people. We wish to fully acknowledge that this has caused much harm and an unspeakable loss to Canada. As Americans, we want to take this moment to express our dedication to ensuring that this type of behaviour on the part of our country is conveyed to future generations so that this is never again repeated. Furthermore, we will offer compensation to the families and relatives of the Canadian soldiers who were affected by this tragedy. We are committed to ensuring that they are fairly compensated.

The American Government is confident that all Canadians will forgive myself and the United States of America for these actions. We expect that this apology will smooth all of the waters. We believe that it is time to acknowledge this negative episode in our history so that we can both turn the page and continue face the future together."

*Article submitted June 30th, 2013*
U.S. Minister of Defence, Hagel Offers Apology to Canadians

On April 18th, 2002, an American F-16 fighter jet dropped a 225-kilogram bomb on Tarnak Farm, a region near Khandahar. The laser-guided explosive was directed at a Canadian unit, the Princess Patricia's Light Infantry, who were engaged in a planned night-time training exercise. Four Canadian soldiers were killed, and eight more Canadian soldiers suffered severe injuries.

At the time, the U.S. Government claimed the incident to be a friendly-fire accident. The Canadian government concluded after a lengthy inquiry that the incident was likely preventable, as the U.S. Major who dropped the bomb failed to properly verify that his target was in fact hostile. Furthermore, it was later learned that the same Major disobeyed his air controller’s instructions to standby while information on the target was verified.

Originally, the Major was charged with 4 counts of manslaughter and 8 counts of assault by the US army. If convicted on all 12 charges, the Major could have been sentenced to a maximum of 64 years in prison. However, the charges were soon reduced to the minor charge of dereliction of duty. On June 19th, 2003, a high-ranking commander in the U.S. Air Force decided that the incident warranted only non-judicial charges. By the time the case was settled, the Major failed to be court-marshaled or tried in American judicial courts, leaving many Canadians, including the families of those killed, to feel that justice was not properly carried out in this case.

Ten years after the incident, a ceremony was held at the Edmonton Garrison on June 29th, 2013 with the present United States Minister of Defence, Chuck Hagel in attendance. At the meeting, the Canadian Foreign Affairs Minister, John Baird, criticized the United States Armed Forces and the American Government for their failure to enforce stricter protocols that could have prevented the tragedy, and for their failure to properly offer justice to the Canadian people by upholding the more serious charges originally placed on the U.S. Major.
The American Government hopes that all Canadians may forgive myself and the United States of America for these past actions. However at the end of the day, I and all other Americans understand that it will be the choice of Canadians to accept this apology and we don't expect that this will smooth all of the waters. We understand the hurt that this has caused, and we respect the right of Canadians to be angry and upset during this process.”

Article submitted June 30th, 2013

Following the meeting, United States Minister of Defence, Chuck Hagel, went on to announce that the US Government intends to make amends with the Canadian people for the incident, and indicated that the issue would be further discussed at meetings with Minister Baird and the Canadian Government.

Since then, Chuck Hagel and the United States Department of Defence have taken full responsibility on behalf of the United States Air Force and the American Government for the events preceding and following the friendly fire incident which took place on April 18, 2002. On June 29th, 2013, he issued the following statement:

"On behalf of all Americans, I sincerely offer a public apology to the victims of the tragic incident that took place at Tarnak Farms, on April 18, 2002. I want to extend this apology to the families and friends of those victims and all Canadians. We failed to put into place stricter protocols that could have prevented this incident. After meetings with Canadian Government, I understand that we have also failed to offer a sense of justice to the victims’ families and the Canadian people. We wish to fully acknowledge that this has caused much harm and an unspeakable loss to Canada. As Americans, we want to take this moment to express our dedication to ensuring that this type of behaviour on the part of our country is conveyed to future generations so that this is never again repeated. Furthermore, we will offer compensation to the families and relatives of the Canadian soldiers who were affected by this tragedy. We are committed to ensuring that they are fairly compensated.
**Group Identification**

Instructions: People identify to differing degrees with different social groups. Following are statements about Canadians with which you may disagree or agree. There are no right or wrong answers. Please use the 7-point scale to indicate the extent of your agreement with each of these statements.

1: Strongly Disagree 2: Moderately Disagree 3: Somewhat Disagree 4: Neutral 5: Moderately Agree 6: Somewhat Agree 7: Strongly Agree ; No Response

1. I often regret that I am Canadian.
2. I have a lot in common with other Canadians.
3. I don’t feel a sense of being "connected" with other Canadians.
4. I feel strong ties to other Canadians.
5. In general, being Canadian is an important part of my self-image.
6. I don’t feel good about being Canadian.
7. I find it difficult to form a bond with other Canadians.
8. The fact that I am Canadian rarely enters my mind.
9. In general, I’m glad to be Canadian.
10. Overall, being a Canadian person has very little to do with how I feel about myself.
11. I often think about the fact that I am a Canadian person.
12. Generally, I feel good when I think about myself as a Canadian person.

**Forgiveness**

Below are statements related to how you personally feel about the American Government with respect to the incident described in the article. There are no right or wrong answers. Please use the 7-point scale to indicate the extent of your agreement with each of these statements.

1: Strongly Disagree 2: Moderately Disagree 3: Somewhat Disagree 4: Neutral 5: Moderately Agree 6: Somewhat Agree 7: Strongly Agree ; No Response

1. The American Government should be forgiven.
2. It is time to move past the anger directed toward the American Government.
3. I don’t think the American Government should pay for what they did.
4. I can’t let go of the negative feelings I have toward the American Government.
5. The American Government should get what is coming to them.
6. The American Government should be “taught a lesson”
7. I wouldn’t want to be close to someone in the American Government.
Impressions of the Apology

Below are statements that are related to how you feel about the apology offered to Canada by the American Government. There are no right or wrong answers. Please use the 7-point scale to indicate the extent of your agreement with each of these statements.

1: Strongly Disagree 2: Moderately Disagree 3: Somewhat Disagree 4: Neutral 5: Moderately Agree 6: Somewhat Agree 7: Strongly Agree ; No Response

Manipulation Check (Choice)

1. In their apology, the American Government acknowledged that it is the choice of Canadians to accept or refuse their apology.

Empathic Support

1. In their apology, the American Government shows that they understand how Canadians felt because of the transgression.
2. Canadians can have trust in what was said in the apology from the American Government.
3. In their apology, the American Government shows that they took the time to listen to the concerns of Canadians.
4. In their apology, the American Government shows that they asked Canadians questions about their view of the transgression.
5. In their apology the American Government shows that they care about Canadians.
6. In their apology, the American Government shows that they were able to take the perspective of Canadians.
7. In their apology the American Government shows that they were sensitive to the feelings of Canadians.

Empowerment

Below are statements that are related to how you feel about the apology offered to Canada by the American Government. There are no right or wrong answers. Please use the 7-point scale to indicate the extent of your agreement with each of these statements.

1: Strongly Disagree 2: Moderately Disagree 3: Somewhat Disagree 4: Neutral 5: Moderately Agree 6: Somewhat Agree 7: Strongly Agree ; No Response

1. The apology made Canadians feel relatively strong as a group.
2. Canadians had a lot of influence on what was said in the apology.
3. Canadians had a lot of control on what was said in the apology.