

ARTICLE

EXAMINING THE RELATIONS BETWEEN REVENGE, FORGIVENESS AND GUILT LEVELS OF HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS

Gizem Öneri Uzun*

Near East University, Ataturk Faculty of Education, Nicosia, North Cyprus, Via Mersin 10, TURKEY

ABSTRACT

Mankind passes through different phases within the lifeline between birth and death. When we look at the physical structure, there are different characteristics of each phase according to the age of the individual. When the life cycle starting with the birth, is examined, humans pass through five different phases, namely childhood, youth, first adulthood, middle age and old age. This research worked on adolescents which has known as the most stormiest period of lifecycle. Taking into consideration that the aim of the study are to evaluate the desire of adolescents for revenge, their feelings of forgiveness and the levels of guilty which are one of the most intense emotions in puberty, the results of research and the aim of the study tried to associate with each other. The purpose of the study is to examine the relationships between high school students' feelings of revenge, forgiveness, and guilt and to know what the concept of revenge, the concept of forgiveness and the concept of guilt are in line with the outcomes. To reveal what these concepts mean for the students, what situations they want to take revenge, what situations they want to forgive and feel guilty. The subject to be investigated is a matter that has not been studied before in the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus. At the same time, this study has an important place because the concepts of revenge and forgiveness are not worked together before in the same study and the study group is different.

INTRODUCTION

KEY WORDS

Life Periods, Youth, Vengeance,

Adolescence is the accumulation of sweet dreams, passions, tight friendships, and many moments in which first love is experienced and difficult to forget. The period of youth, known as the period in which forward-looking attempts have been made and efforts to build up their identity have been experienced, is a turbulent period.

Young people are individuals who have not recognized the bad behavior, are early trusting, able to connect early, have high goals and dreams, and therefore have not learned the limiting effect of circumstances. The fact that young feel mixed feelings of revenge, forgiveness, and guilt is, therefore, foreseeing to do research and interpretation. In line with these explanations; we can defend and explain that the concepts of revenge, forgiveness, and guilt can be more emphasized.

First of all, it is necessary to look at what the word "revenge" is. The word "revenge", in its most clear and general definition, is a concept that is attempted to be described as 'a desire or act to respond with bad thoughts or behaviors in order to punish bad behavior, movement or promise'. However, a few of the definitions of "forgiveness" can be exemplified as follows; " Forgiveness is to forgive the act or wrong that is done ", " To forgive and forget is the revenge of good people " and " Only the courageous knows what the forgiveness is, and there is no forgiveness in the nature of the cowards ".

Crime, with the sociological phenomenon that humanity has faced since its existence, has been subject to many branches of science. Today it has become an important social problem. Just as a society without crime cannot be considered, crime cannot be fully excluded from society. In the sense of guilt, the individual feels sinful, blaming themselves for thinking they are doing something wrong, cannot forgive themselves, cannot leave their experience in their past and cannot continue to live.

Adolescence, one of the developmental periods, is depicted as a 'storm period'; it is an important phase between childhood, adulthood and old age. Individuals go through different developmental periods on the dimension of life that develops from childhood to old age. During these periods, they show different psychological, physiological and socio-cultural characteristics with each other.

Adolescents' desire for revenge is perceived differently than children and adults. According to Deniz [1] the relationship of the adolescent with his parents is an effective factor on school success. An adolescent who develops in a tolerant, supportive and understanding family model is expected to have a positive impact on school success. In the opposite family model, the adolescent appears to be in the form of personalities that are constantly exposed to criticism, do not care about their emotions, are not shared with family decisions, and are thought to be worthless. Therefore, they are not expected to be successful in school; the levels of desire for revenge can be high [1].

The word "revenge", in the most general sense and in the open-ended notion, is a concept that has been tried to be described as "a desire or an act to respond with bad thoughts or behaviors in order to punish bad behavior, movement or promise".

Revenge is defined in up-to-date dictionary as "-the general name of the actions to take out the pain of an evil done by doing evil, the worst feeling of the universe, the general name of the actions that are thought to be done to harm the person whom we think making a mistake-".

Received: 14 June 2018
Accepted: 12 Aug 2018
Published: 10 Sept 2018

*Corresponding Author

Email:

gizem.oneri.uzun@neu.edu.tr

Unlike forgiveness, or even in contrast, the emotion developed in the individual may be a sense of revenge. In contrast, McCullough, Fincham and Tsang [2] suggested that when individuals choose to forgive, their well-being increases, when they choose to feel revenge, their well-being decreases. According to Stuckless and Goranson, avengers are exposed to a number of illogical behaviors, which can result in devastating consequences. Some individuals even exaggerate this situation, reducing their trust, integrity and social cohesion because of the high level of revenge sentiment [3].

On the concept of revenge, researchers have made many definitions. For example, according to Bacon [4], revenge is that an individual engages in brutal sentiments by exhibiting aggressive behavior, according to Elster [5], revenge is useless and expressed in anger; According to Kim and Smith [6], the person facing the revenge is causing both the emotional and behavioral harm to the person facing him and making him feel bad.

Some researchers have dealt with the concept of revenge from the moral point of view. They have described revenge, holding the sense of justice present in individuals in the foreground, as behaviors aimed at putting an end to injustice in the face of injustice [7].

According to Axelrold [8], the desire to seek revenge is neither condemned nor overly tolerated by the social environment; therefore, revenge is regarded as an intense response to the injustice of the person who has suffered the injustice.

As you can see, there are researchers who argue that the concept of revenge is both positive and negative. According to Tripp and colleagues [9], the concept of revenge or the desire to take revenge must be judged morally so that it can be judged as a positive (good/constructive) and a negative mood (bad/destructive).

Therefore, according to McCullough revenge is morally worthy when the aggressive person becomes aware of his mistake and chooses to remedy them, once an individual who has suffered an injustice, i.e. the avenger has received his revenge. Revenge is evaluated as negative in terms of morality, in the event that an avenger harms a third person who is not interested in the matter while taking revenge. In addition to the positive or negative evaluation of revenge in the moral dimension, it is stated that thinking of taking revenge have the characteristic of causing psychological health to deteriorate [10].

The process of revenge can be explained together with the deterioration of psychological health in individuals. In the process of revenge, individuals have many complex feelings. According to Barber, Maltby and Macaskill, the individual who decides to take revenge on the other side is musing about the opposite until to the revenge decision, and is beginning to make plans in detail [11].

The detailed thoughts on revenge or the person are increasing individual's anxieties and angering them with an intense struggle. Bushman suggested that it is an indispensable attitude for the avenger to focus on the person to be revenged and to concentrate only on that subject [12].

The individual who has survived the thinking and planning phases to get revenge wants to get his revenge right away. Therefore, after a long thought and planning phase, the avenger cannot adjust the dose of the reaction and can exhibit destructive behaviors that are highly damaging to the opposite person [13]. The avenger who has come to the last stage and has taken his revenge, is get rid of from the anger and stress, and emerges as an individual who has become the last of his worries. According to Goldberg the avenger has thus also abandoned his negative feelings and has also fulfilled a defense duty against feelings of hopelessness and powerlessness [14].

There are notions similar to the concept of revenge in the literature. When examining the field related to revenge, there are concepts such as hostility, punishment, retaliation. Although these concepts are analogous to each other, their meanings are different. According to Kaufman [15], revenge is a personal behavior and a decision taken after the suffering of the individual.

Stuckless and Goranson suggested that the revenge can be explained as a reaction to an aggressive individual to change his deep thoughts of aggression and frustration. The concept of revenge is very similar to the concept of retaliation. As a matter of fact, the purpose of the retaliation is deterrence. Retaliation involves giving a quick response to the individual who harms. In revenge, there is a process to include deep thoughts about what happens to the injured individual after the incident [3].

Another concept, the concept of hostility, is confused with the concept of revenge. According to Barefoot, the concept of hostility includes both cognitive, affective, and behavioral tendencies, and it is based on other insecurities. The desire to harm in hostility appears cognitively, or it is expected that the damage done to the individual will be seen by others, and the most basic feature that distinguishes revenge from hostility is explained in this way [16].

Vengeance depicts direct aggressive behavior toward the individual who constitutes the perception of injustice. In the concept of hostility, negative thinking and aggression are based on insecurity and generally towards other individuals [17].

According to Cota, Woody and Bell, among the reasons that lead individuals to take revenge are; loss of self-identity, the desire to rebalance inequality, the destruction of equality, the attainment of lost power, and the unwillingness to be exposed again to unfair behavior [18].

If we are going to address them one by one, the most important reason for revenge is the damage to self-identity. According to Nasr and Morrin, self-identity comes from the individual's own personality within the social environment and culture of the individual. Negative movements in the social environment can harm individuals' self-identities, so when an individual is faced with an injustice, he sees it as a movement made to his self-identity. The damage of self-identity is psychologically disturbing to the individual. As a result, individuals can go into a psychological quest for revenge both to regain their suffering and to correct their self-identity in a positive way [19].

One of the other reasons for the desire to revenge can be explained as thinking that the equilibrium is broken immediately after an injustice. Individuals, constantly in search of equality, think that if their equality deteriorates, they will suffer harm both psychologically, physically and emotionally if they are exposed to injustice. They, therefore, consider that they may also experience financial losses [20].

Individuals who have suffered injustice in these situations are able to feel themselves at a low level against the people who are injurious to themselves. The individual tries to rearrange the equilibrium by trying to carry it up from the level it sees low. He may also seek revenge to ensure equity equilibrium. We can also understand them from daily idioms. For example, Expressions such as "an eye for an eye" are often confronted in the form of words spoken by individuals seeking revenge.

Şahin said when we look at the origin of the concept of "forgiveness" (affetmek in Turkish), it is seen that the root is Arabic and "afeve" in its root [21]. The word "forgiveness" (af in Turkish) means disease, trouble, and misfortune. In this context, according to Kasapoğlu, it has been stated that before the forgiveness takes place, the individual will move away from some psychological disorders and tensions after forgiveness [22].

Forgiveness means in the sense of 'to forgive', 'to meet with tolerance', 'to give fair quarter' and 'to allow one's work to be taken out of responsibility' in the Contemporary Turkish Dictionary. When we look at the concept of forgiveness in its most general sense, it can be mentioned that it is necessary to give up feelings such as fury, anger, and revenge [23]. According to Alpay, the act of forgiveness is independent of the individual who hurt [24].

Sigmund Freud, who is regarded as the father of psychoanalysis, has been implicit in the concept of forgiveness in his work on forgiveness, although he has not been able to explain the issue of forgiveness. That is why it is thought that the concept of forgiveness can be difficult to explain in psychoanalysis [25].

The concept of crime is defined as behavior that destroys the feelings that every individual in society has [26]. Crime is defined as the totality of behaviors that are in bad behavior towards the public, which break the moral laws in society and disrupt the rule of law system. However, every crime defined in criminal law is deemed to be an actual penalty [27].

Crime is defined by Turkish Language Association as "unlawful acts that are seen as unjust in a society, prohibited by written or unregistered laws, or depicted in a statutory law and sanctioned" [28].

According to Uzun, crime and committing a crime is a phenomenon that must be tackled in every direction. In order to be able to look in the right direction, it is necessary to have a general opinion about the crime [29].

Criminality is a response to an error and in addition the emotional state that a person experiences when he or she hurts another person [30].

According to Tak, there are different kinds of feelings of guilt depending on the situations that are experienced [31]. If we give an example, the guilt of something done can represent the first order. There is a sense of guilt that is felt because of hurting someone else physically or psychologically or breaking their moral code.

The sense of guilt begins to blame himself as "I should have helped more" while directing the feeling of liveliness to help behavior. The sense of guilt is the guilt feeling that is felt because the emotional form known as the last variant is made better than the other is. Rather, the loss of an individual's family, friends, or neighbors is the feeling that he or she is feeling healthy and alive if he or she becomes ill. This variant of guilt is described as a negative feeling that harms the mental health of the individual [31].

Examining the youth delinquency in the world; It is seen that the youth delinquency in Russia is 3/4 more than the adult delinquency, and the age of committing crime varies between 14 and 17 years of age. It has been argued that the majority of the population in Africa is struggling with poverty and the youth delinquency associated with it are increasing and that the young people in Latin America are involved in crimes due to the economic problems.

It seems that the Japanese youth are inclined to have a tendency to violence, and accordingly, the youth delinquency increases. Lastly, when looking at industrialized countries, the constantly increasing consumption seems to have led to new adolescent crimes, such as theft, bullying, or the forcible seizure of property [32].

Juvenile delinquency can be described as an attitude and behavioral disorder that many situations identify and emerge as a result of all negative factors, including mental, spiritual, familial and social [33].

Though seemingly small crimes are temporarily welcomed to the teenager, a group of criminals can show a permanent crime tendency starting in childhood [34]. These children exhibit unhealthy individual development, with more severe and violent crimes committed in adulthood. Young people who tend to crime are opposed to all kinds of authority and show undesirable behavior [35].

One common thought among all people living in the world is that children and young people should be the determinants of the future of society. In all societies, meeting the basic needs of children and adolescents, earning the trust of themselves and their environment, and most importantly, the education factor is of utmost importance.

Criminal liability accepted to mention juvenile and youth delinquency varies according to age; 15 for the UNESCO, 12 for the UN, 14 for the UK-Germany-Italy, 13 for France and 16-17 for the United States. According to the Turkish Criminal Code numbered 5237, the age of criminal responsibility is 12 years in Turkey.

When the Turkish Penal Code is examined in the Turkish Law System, children and adolescents aged between 12 and 15 are in a state of partial criminal liability [36].

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The model of the study

This research is a descriptive research aimed at developing a valid and reliable instrument for measuring the attitudes of high school students to take revenge and to determine their attitudes towards revenge, forgiveness, and guilt. The survey model was used in the study.

The population and sampling of the research

The universe of the research is composed of high school students in official general high schools and vocational high schools attached to the Department of Secondary Education of Ministry of National Education of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus (TRNC).

The stratified random sampling method was used to select the sample to represent the working population in the study, as it would be difficult to reach all of the population in terms of time, cost and control. The students who are educated in the vocational high schools affiliated to Vocational Technical Education Department and general high schools affiliated to the Department of Secondary Education of the TRNC are stratified according to the districts and the number of the samples proportional to the layer weights is calculated. Then students in the strata were selected by simple random sampling method. When the number of samples is determined, the population sampling formula is used.

Findings and comments

Table 1: Comparison of scores of revenge, Heartland Forgiveness, and Guilt-Shame Scale according to gender of students

Scales	Gender	n	\bar{x}	s	t	p
Revenge	Female	319	16,71	5,60	-5,910	0,000*
	Male	270	19,38	5,32		
Vengeance	Female	319	15,25	4,55	-3,788	0,000*
	Male	270	16,66	4,42		
Emotion-State	Female	319	9,00	2,93	-1,199	0,231
	Male	270	9,28	2,66		
Forgiveness	Female	319	11,15	3,66	-2,330	0,020*
	Male	270	11,84	3,48		

Self-Perception	Female	319	9,82	2,71	1,038	0,300
	Male	270	9,59	2,64		
Revenge Scale Total	Female	319	61,92	12,58	-4,897	0,000*
	Male	270	66,74	11,06		
Self-Forgiveness	Female	319	25,84	6,69	1,361	0,174
	Male	270	25,07	6,88		
Forgiveness of Others	Female	319	22,71	5,66	-1,767	0,078
	Male	270	23,51	5,34		
Forgiveness of the Situation	Female	319	25,29	6,00	2,876	0,004*
	Male	270	23,87	5,98		
Forgiveness Scale Total	Female	319	73,83	14,08	1,232	0,218
	Male	270	72,45	12,91		
Guilt	Female	319	46,16	9,00	8,950	0,000*
	Male	270	39,66	8,52		
Shame	Female	319	42,31	8,35	7,147	0,000*
	Male	270	37,53	7,78		
Guilt-Shame Scale Total	Female	319	88,47	15,44	9,063	0,000*
	Male	270	77,19	14,59		

*p<0,05

[Table 1] shows the results of the independent sample t-test conducted to compare scores of revenge scale, Heartland Forgiveness Scale, and Guilt-Shame Scale according to the gender of the students included in the survey.

When [Table 1] was examined, it was found that there was a statistically significant difference between the scores of the revenge scale in total and its subscales; revenge, vengeance and forgiveness subscales based on their genders ($p < 0,05$). Male students' scores on revenge scale in total and its subscales; revenge, vengeance and forgiveness subscales were significantly higher than female students were. It was determined that there was not a statistically significant difference between the scores of emotion-state and self-perception subscales of revenge scale according to the gender of the students ($p > 0,05$).

It was found that there was no statistically significant difference between the scores of the Heartland forgiveness scale according to the gender of the students included in the survey and the scores they received from the self-forgiveness and forgiveness subscales ($p > 0,05$). It was found that the difference between the scores of students' forgiveness subscale on the Heartland forgiveness scale according to their gender was statistically significant ($p < 0,05$). Female students' scores on the status of forgiveness subscale were higher than male students.

It was determined that there was a statistically significant difference between the scores of the guilty-shame scale according to the gender of the students and the scores of the guilt and shame subscales included ($p < 0,05$). Male students were found to have lower scores on the total scale of guilt and shame and its sub-scales than female students.

Table 2: Comparison of scores of Revenge Scale, Heartland Forgiveness Scale, and Guilt-Shame Scale according to students' disciplinary punishment status at school

Scales	disciplinary punishment	n	\bar{x}	s	t	p
Revenge	Received	64	19,77	4,71	2,775	0,006*
	Not Received	525	17,71	5,70		
Vengeance	Received	64	17,97	4,52	3,916	0,000*
	Not Received	525	15,64	4,49		
Emotion-State	Received	64	9,47	2,97	1,020	0,308

	Not Received	525	9,09	2,79		
Forgiveness	Received	64	12,31	3,62	2,008	0,045*
	Not Received	525	11,36	3,58		
Perception of Self	Received	64	10,11	2,82	1,265	0,206
	Not Received	525	9,66	2,66		
Revenge Scale Total	Received	64	69,63	10,82	3,883	0,000*
	Not Received	525	63,46	12,13		
Self-Forgiveness	Received	64	24,88	6,60	-0,764	0,445
	Not Received	525	25,56	6,81		
Forgiveness of Others	Received	64	24,20	5,96	1,734	0,083
	Not Received	525	22,94	5,46		
Forgiveness of the Situation	Received	64	24,36	6,47	-0,392	0,695
	Not Received	525	24,67	5,98		
Forgiveness Scale Total	Received	64	73,44	14,14	0,148	0,882
	Not Received	525	73,17	13,51		
Guilt	Received	64	40,69	7,96	-2,265	0,024*
	Not Received	525	43,48	9,47		
Shame	Received	64	38,95	8,07	-1,174	0,241
	Not Received	525	40,26	8,47		
Guilt-Shame Scale Total	Received	64	79,64	14,00	-1,935	0,053
	Not Received	525	83,75	16,25		

*p<0,05

[Table 2] shows the results of the independent sample t-test conducted to compare scores of the Revenge Scale, Heartland Forgiveness Scale, and Guilt-Shame Scale according to the level of disciplinary punishment of the students included in the study.

When [Table 2] was examined, it was found that there was a statistically significant difference between the scores of the revenge, vengeance, and forgiveness subscales according to the students receiving the disciplinary punishment in the school ($p < 0,05$). Students who received disciplinary punishment in school were significantly higher than those who did not receive disciplinary punishment, in terms of revenge, vengeance, and forgiveness subscales. It was determined that there was no statistically significant difference between the scores of the self-perception and emotion-state subscales of the revenge scale according to the students' disciplinary punishments ($p > 0,05$).

It was found that there was no statistically significant difference between the scores of the Heartland Forgiveness Scale and its subscales; self-forgiveness, forgiveness of others and forgiveness of situation subscales, depending on the status of students receiving any disciplinary punishment at school ($p > 0,05$). The scale scores of students who receive disciplinary punishment in the school and do not receive it are similar.

It was found that there was no statistically significant difference between the scores of the guilt-shame scale and its subscales based on whether the students received or not received disciplinary punishment at school ($p > 0,05$). It was determined that the difference between the scores of the guilt subscale according to the status of students receiving disciplinary punishment at school was statistically significant ($p < 0,05$). It was determined that students who received any disciplinary punishment in school had lower scores on the guilt sub-dimension than the other students.

Table 3: Comparison of scores of Revenge scale, Heartland Forgiveness scale, and Guilt-Shame scale according to students' previous revenge status

Scales	Revenge Status	n	M	s	t	p
Revenge	Received	310	19,12	5,49	5,543	0,000*
	Not Received	279	16,61	5,50		
Vengeance	Received	310	17,27	4,27	8,199	0,000*
	Not Received	279	14,36	4,35		
Emotion-State	Received	310	9,59	2,87	4,246	0,000*
	Not Received	279	8,62	2,65		
Forgiveness	Received	310	12,41	3,22	7,008	0,000*
	Not Received	279	10,41	3,69		
Perception of Self	Received	310	9,91	2,73	1,945	0,052
	Not Received	279	9,48	2,61		
Revenge Scale Total	Received	310	68,31	11,01	9,450	0,000*
	Not Received	279	59,48	11,65		
Self-Forgiveness	Received	310	25,58	6,81	0,352	0,725
	Not Received	279	25,38	6,77		
Forgiveness of Others	Received	310	23,51	5,48	2,004	0,045*
	Not Received	279	22,59	5,54		
Forgiveness of the Situation	Received	310	24,25	6,31	-1,644	0,101
	Not Received	279	25,07	5,68		
Forgiveness Scale Total	Received	310	73,34	13,57	0,261	0,794
	Not Received	279	73,05	13,59		
Guilt	Received	310	41,60	9,27	-4,387	0,000*
	Not Received	279	44,94	9,15		
Shame	Received	310	39,15	8,28	-2,959	0,003*
	Not Received	279	41,20	8,48		
Guilt-Shame Scale Total	Received	310	80,75	15,67	-4,114	0,000*
	Not Received	279	86,13	16,05		

*p<0,05

[Table 3] shows the results of the independent sample t-tests conducted to compare the scores of Revenge Scale, Heartland Forgiveness Scale, and Guilt-Shame Scale according to the revenge status of students who were included in the study.

When [Table 3] was examined, it was found that the difference between the scores of revenge scale in total and vengeance, emotion-state and forgiveness subscales was statistically significant according to the previous revenge status of the students ($p < 0,05$). The scores of revenge scale in total and revenge, vengeance, emotional-state and forgiveness subscales for the students who stated that they had previously received revenge were found to be higher than from the students who did not take revenge before. It was determined that there was no statistically significant difference between the scores of self-perception subscale according to the previous revenge status of the students ($p > 0,05$).

There was no statistically significant difference between the total scores of the forgiveness scale and the scores of self-forgiveness and forgiveness of the situation subscales, according to the previous revenge status of the students ($p > 0,05$). However, it was found that the difference between the points that they have taken from the sub-scale of forgiveness of others is statistically significant. ($p < 0,05$). It has been seen that students who had previously taken revenge had a lower score than those who did not take revenge before in the sub-scales of forgiveness of others.

It was found that the difference between the total scores of guilt-shame scale and the scores of guilt and shame subscales were found to be statistically significant according to the students' previous revenge status ($p < 0,05$). Those students who stated that they had received revenge previously were found to have lower scores from both the total scales and subscales than the students who stated that they did not get revenge before.

Table 4: Comparison of Revenge Scale, Heartland Forgiveness Scale, and Guilt-Shame Scale scores according to the strong feelings of forgiveness of the students

Scales	Feelings of Forgiveness	n	\bar{x}	s	t	p
Revenge	Strong	428	17,47	5,56	-3,260	0,001*
	Not Strong	161	19,16	5,66		
Vengeance	Strong	428	15,30	4,45	-5,309	0,000*
	Not Strong	161	17,48	4,44		
Emotion-State	Strong	428	8,99	2,83	-1,978	0,048*
	Not Strong	161	9,50	2,73		
Forgiveness	Strong	428	11,04	3,59	-4,698	0,000*
	Not Strong	161	12,58	3,37		
Perception of Self	Strong	428	9,28	2,52	-6,641	0,000*
	Not Strong	161	10,86	2,75		
Revenge Scale Total	Strong	428	62,08	11,89	-6,945	0,000*
	Not Strong	161	69,58	11,09		
Self-Forgiveness	Strong	428	25,82	6,65	1,946	0,052
	Not Strong	161	24,60	7,06		
Forgiveness of Others	Strong	428	23,11	5,36	0,251	0,802
	Not Strong	161	22,98	5,96		
Forgiveness of the Situation	Strong	428	24,63	5,99	-0,065	0,948
	Not Strong	161	24,66	6,15		
Forgiveness Scale Total	Strong	428	73,56	13,79	1,044	0,297
	Not Strong	161	72,25	12,94		
Guilt	Strong	428	43,79	9,53	2,592	0,010*
	Not Strong	161	41,56	8,69		
Shame	Strong	428	40,43	8,29	1,464	0,144
	Not Strong	161	39,29	8,76		
Guilt-Shame Scale Total	Strong	428	84,22	16,15	2,278	0,023*
	Not Strong	161	80,85	15,62		

*p<0,05

[Table 4] shows the results of the independent sample t-test for the comparison of scores of Revenge Scale, Heartland Forgiveness Scale, and Guilt-Shame Scale according to the strength of the forgiveness feelings of the students participating in the research.

When [Table 4] is examined, it was found that the difference between the total scores of the revenge scale and the scores of all the subscales of revenge was statistically significant, based on whether the students had a strong emotional forgiveness feeling ($p < 0,05$). Those students who indicated strong emotional forgiveness feelings were scored lower than the students who indicated that they did not have strong feelings of forgiveness from the overall revenge scale and all subscales of revenge.

It was found that there was no statistically significant difference between the total scores of the forgiveness scale and the scores of self-forgiveness, forgiveness of others and forgiveness of the situation subscales, based on whether the students had strong emotional forgiveness feelings ($p > 0,05$).

It was found that the difference between the overall guilt-shame scale and the score of the guilt subscale was statistically significant, according to the students' strong emotional forgiveness feelings ($p < 0,05$).

Those students who indicated that they had strong feelings of forgiveness had a higher score on the overall revenge scale and in the guilt subscale than students who indicated that, their feelings of forgiveness were not strong.

Table 5: Comparison of the scores of Revenge Scale, Heartland Forgiveness Scale, and Guilt-Shame Scale based on whether the students had previously felt guilty

Scales	Previous feel of Guilty	n	\bar{x}	s	t	p
Revenge	Yes	306	17,56	5,57	-1,661	0,097
	No	283	18,33	5,68		
Vengeance	Yes	306	16,00	4,58	0,593	0,553
	No	283	15,78	4,51		
Emotion-State	Yes	306	9,23	2,83	0,851	0,395
	No	283	9,03	2,79		
Forgiveness	Yes	306	11,69	3,60	1,613	0,107
	No	283	11,22	3,57		
Perception of Self	Yes	306	9,49	2,62	-2,105	0,036*
	No	283	9,95	2,72		
Revenge Scale Total	Yes	306	63,97	12,12	-0,336	0,737
	No	283	64,30	12,17		
Self-Forgiveness	Yes	306	26,44	6,45	3,572	0,000*
	No	283	24,46	6,99		
Forgiveness of Others	Yes	306	23,26	5,22	0,853	0,394
	No	283	22,87	5,84		
Forgiveness of the Situation	Yes	306	25,16	5,81	2,205	0,028*
	No	283	24,07	6,21		
Forgiveness Scale Total	Yes	306	74,86	12,90	3,115	0,002*
	No	283	71,40	14,06		
Guilt	Yes	306	44,21	9,29	2,783	0,006*
	No	283	42,07	9,32		
Shame	Yes	306	40,73	8,21	1,824	0,069
	No	283	39,46	8,64		
Guilt-Shame Scale Total	Yes	306	84,93	15,70	2,580	0,010*
	No	283	81,53	16,29		

*p<0,05

[Table 5] shows the results of independent sample t-test on the comparison of the scores of Revenge Scale, Heartland Forgiveness Scale, and Guilt-Shame Scale according to students' previous experience of guilt.

It was found that the difference between the scores of the overall revenge scale, revenge, vengeance, emotion-state and forgiveness subscales was not statistically significant according to the fact that the students who had taken the survey had any previous guilt ($p < 0,05$). It was determined that the difference between the scores of the self-perception subscale was statistically significant according to the fact that the students had previously been guilty ($p < 0,05$). The scores of the self-perception sub-scale of students who had previously experienced guilt were found to be lower.

It was determined that the difference between the general forgiveness scale and the points that they have taken from the self-forgiveness and status forgiveness subscales included in the scale were statistically significant, in the case of students who had previously been guilty ($p < 0,05$). It was determined that the students who had any previous incidents of guilt had higher scores on the overall scale of forgiveness and the self-forgiveness and the forgiveness of the situation subscales than the scores of students who were not guilty. It has been found that the difference on the scores of the students about the points they have taken from the forgiveness of others subscale based on their previous experience of guilt is not statistically significant ($p > 0,05$).

The difference between the general guilt-shame scale and the guilt subscale scores was found to be statistically significant according to their previous experience of guilt ($p < 0,05$). Students with any previous

experience of guilt are scored higher on the overall scale and guilt subscale than on students without any experience of guilt.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

In this section, the results of the research are evaluated and the interpretation of the relations of high school students with revenge, forgiveness and guilt levels are compared with the literature results. Suggestions have been made in the light of the results.

Looking at the revenge scale in general, it appears that men are more likely to seek revenge than women are. Among the reasons; the patriarchy of our society, the growth of women under the pressure of society, the differences in the ways of gender development, the difficulty of women expressing themselves and the public view that men are angrier than women. The survey conducted by Satici and his colleagues revealed that the revenge of college students was the result of the anger memories and the post-anger thoughts [37].

When we look at the Heartland Forgiveness scale in general, the levels of forgiveness of self and forgiveness of women and men are similar; the level of forgiveness of the situation is different. This can be interpreted as the different perception of men and women. In this context, according to Cheavens and colleagues, the connection of affirmation to interpersonal relations seems to be handled considerably; it is argued that forgiveness is related to hope, empathy and self-acceptance [38]. It is different from everybody's way of perception, interpretation, cognition as it is in every subject. In the same way, in the case of forgiveness, everyone has different ways of forgiving events.

In general, the scale of the guilt-shame scale shows that women are more guilty and shameful than men. Likewise, in the work of Lutwak and Ferrari, it turns out that men's sense of shame is related to self-critical cognition and guilt is related to perfectionism; it has been found that the feeling of shame in women is loaded with both self-critical cognition and perfectionism. It was emphasized that women in the survey had a significant sense of guilt and shame compared to men [39]. It can be thought that the consequences of this outcome are that women may feel guilty because they live in their own ways of expressing themselves and cannot fully express it.

When students were assessed for their level of revenge, forgiveness, and guilt by taking disciplinary action, it was concluded that students receiving disciplinary punishment across the revenge scale were more likely to seek revenge, more vengeance, and more vindictive. Nevertheless, students who did not receive disciplinary punishment had a higher guilt feeling; while those who received disciplinary punishment were found to have a lower level of guilt. Students who receive disciplinary penalty have increased anger and more revenge as they receive punishment among the reasons for their desire for revenge. High school students are able to concentrate their feelings of revenge more intensely in their own selves when they receive every disciplinary punishment, giving them cyclical reactions, becoming angry and aggressive in the same way. In the study by Webb and colleagues, it has been determined that all dimensions of aggression, including verbal and physical aggression, hostility and anger are negatively related to forgiveness but positively related to revenge [40].

When the situation of avenging is examined, it has been seen that the students who have avenged from someone before having a high level of revenge desire, desire for revenge and emotional situations than the students who have not avenged before. While the levels of forgiveness of those who have never received revenge from others have been higher; looking at the scale in general, it is concluded that the avengers are more desirous of revenge. The reason for this is thought to be continuity and habit. The feeling of reprisal in the students can be regarded as an intensified and increasing desire as to get revenge. Those who have not received revenge before cannot react because they do not feel such feelings because they have never experienced the desire for revenge.

On the other hand, revenge from others has been seen because of the fact that they have forgiven others rather than forgiven of self and the situation. Forgiveness of others can be thought of as easier than forgiveness of oneself. According to Green et al., Who conducted a similar study, there is a positive relationship between forgiveness and physical health [41]. In addition, it was seen that those who had previously avenged felt less guilt and shame than those who did not. Therefore, those who do not take revenge may feel guiltier in some cases. In this context, it can be concluded that avengers can continue to take revenge without feeling guilty.

Given the strong emotional forgiveness feelings of the students, these five sub-dimensions were at a high level because of their lack of emotional forgiveness feelings in the revenge scale, revenge, and emotion-state, forgiveness, and self-perception subscales. Therefore, for those who are not strong in seeking revenge, their forgiveness has been found to be stronger. Since there is no desire for revenge, it will be easier for them to forgive themselves, others and the situation they are in. The strong emotions of forgiveness have also led to increased sentiments of guilt.

The increase in the sense of guilt does not mean that the wishes of revenge will not disappear; On the contrary, it means that both the desire for revenge and the feeling of guilt are at a high level. In a similar

study, most of the women who were subjected to violence expressed their forgiving attitude and at the same time, they felt guilty although they were subject to violence [42].

According to the fact that there is any event in which students are guilty before; the level of the self-perception subscale was found to be higher than the other subscales of the students who did not have any guilt before. People with a sense of guilt are at a higher level to forgive themselves and their situation than those who are not guilty. Therefore, those with high feelings of guilt can be called those who have difficulty forgiving themselves. When the students who felt or not-felt guilty before were generally examined, the students who experienced guilt before has more guilt feeling according to the guilt-shame scale.

However, students who are guilty of any topic may end up not repeating the same thing in the same way. On the guilty issue, it can be concluded that if the individual continues to feel the sense of guilt, the individual desire for revenge may be more intense but on the other hand, the forgiveness level may be less.

When the level of revenge, forgiveness, and guilt of high school students is examined, the results of the research overlap with those in the literature. Preventive seminars to high school students may reduce the need for revenge and violence; instead, they can be trained as individuals who are loveful, compassionate and tolerant. Therefore, students who will be trained in high school will experience less guilt because they will not have much motivation to take revenge in the years to come. Every individual has little desire to get revenge, and the students will be able to reduce their desire for revenge by education and training, which will increase the feelings of forgiveness; they are also thought to be able to reduce the issues they feel guilty the most.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

There is no conflict of interest.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

None

FINANCIAL DISCLOSURE

None

REFERENCE

- [1] Deniz ME. [2006] Ergenlerde Bağlanma Stilleri ile Çocukluk İstismarları ve Suçluluk - Utanç Arasındaki İlişki Eurasian Journal of Educational Research, c. 22:89 - 99.
- [2] McCullough ME, Fincham FD, Tsang JA. [2003] Forgiveness, forbearance, and time: the temporal unfolding of transgression-related interpersonal motivations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 84(3):540-557.
- [3] 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.
- [4] Bacon F. [1999] Denemeler (A. Göktürk Çev.). İstanbul: YKY Yayınları. Volume: 7 / Issue: 1. pp.187-222.
- [5] Elster J. [2008] Ekşi Üzümler, Rasyonalitenin Altüst Edilmesi Üzerine Çalışmalar. (Çev. B. Cezar). İstanbul: Metis Yayınları. Issue 28, pp.501-506.
- [6] Kim S, Smith RH. [1993] Revenge and conflict escalation. *Negotiation Journal*. 9(1):37-43.
- [7] Çoklar I. [2014] Kişilik özellikleri ile bağışlama eğilimi arasındaki ilişkinin intikam güdüsü ve adalete duyarlılık temelinde incelenmesi. Yayınlanmamış doktora tezi. Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi.
- [8] Axelrod R. [1984] *The Evolution of Cooperation*. New York: Basic Books. Volume 40, Issue 1. pp. 167-186.
- [9] Tripp TM, Bies RJ, Aquino K. [2002] Poetic justice or petty jealousy? The aesthetics of revenge. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*. 89(1):966-984.
- [10] McCullough ME. [2001] Forgiveness: Who Does It and How Do They Do It? *Current Directions in Psychological Science*. 10:194-197.
- [11] 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.
- [12] Bushman BJ. [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.
- [13] Baumeister RF. [1997] *Evil: Inside human cruelty and violence*. New York: WH Freeman. Vol.5 No.17.
- [14] Goldberg JG. [2004] Fantasies of revenge and the stabilization of the ego: Acts of revenge and the ascension of thanatos. *Modern Psychoanalysis*. 29(1):3-21.
- [15] Kaufman WR. [2012] *Honor and Revenge: A Theory of Punishment*. Massachusetts: Springer.
- [16] Barefoot JC. [2006] Hostility. R. Schultz (Ed.) *Encyclopedia of Aging* (s.545-546). New York: Springer.
- [17] Ysseldyk R, Matheson K, Anisman H. [2007] Rumination: Bridging a gap between forgivingness, vengefulness, and psychological health. *Personality and Individual Differences*. 42(8):1573-1584.
- [18] Cota-McKinley AL, Woody WD, Bell PA. [2001] Vengeance: Effects of gender, age, and religious background. *Aggressive Behavior*. 27(5):343-350.
- [19] Nasr-Bechwati N, Morrin M. [2007] Understanding voter vengeance. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*. 17(4):277-291.
- [20] Gollwitzer M, Denzler M. [2009] What makes revenge sweet: Seeing the offender suffer or delivering a message? *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*. 45(4):840-844.
- [21] Şahin H. [2014] Kur'an'da af kelimesi ve affetmenin anlam alanı. Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi, Atatürk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Erzurum. Volume 22, pp. 17-32.
- [22] Kasapoğlu A. [2007] Kur'an'da affetme olgusu (insanların birbirlerini affetmeleri). *Diyanet İlimi Dergi*, 4.
- [23] Asıcı E. [2013] Öğretmen adaylarının affetme özelliklerinin öz-duyarlılık ve benlik saygısı açısından incelenmesi. Yüksek lisans tezi. Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, İzmir. Number: 27, pp.489-505.
- [24] Alpay A. [2009] Yakın ilişkilerde bağışlama: Bağışlamanın bağlanma, benlik saygısı, empati ve kıskançlık değişkenleri yönünden incelenmesi. Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi, Ankara Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Ankara. Volume 1. pp.13-36.
- [25] Kaya F. [2015] Üniversite Öğrencilerinin Affetme ve Mükemmeliyetçilik Düzeyleri Arasındaki İlişki: Duygusal Zekanın Aracı Rolü. Yüksek Lisans Tezi. Erzurum.
- [26] Bulut M. [2010] Şiddet ve Çocuk. Asil Yayın Dağıtım Ltd Şti. Ankara.

- [27] Oral EA, Binici SA, Büyükçelik D, Yazar HÖ. [1997] Kriz olgularında aile içinde yaşanan şiddet. *Kriz Dergisi*. 5(2):115-121.
- [28] Türk Dil Kurumu. [1988] Büyük Türkçe Sözlük, Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basım Evi. pp. 100-101.
- [29] Uzun A, Aliağaoğlu A. [2009] Tokat şehrinde mala karşı suçlar. *Uluslararası Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi*. 2(8):430-444.
- [30] Şenel GB. [2013] Alkol Sorunu Yaşayan ve Yaşamayan Bireylerin Suçluluk Utanç Duyguları, Stresle Başa Çıkma Tazları ve İç Dış Kontrol Odağı Açısından Karşılaştırılması. Yüksek Lisans Tezi. İstanbul.
- [31] Tak H. [2014] Yardım Davranışının Travma Sonrası Gelişim Üzerindeki Etkisi ve Yardım Yöneliminin Yordayıcısı Olarak Suçluluk Duygusu. Yüksek Lisans Tezi. İstanbul.
- [32] World Youth Report [2003] Juvenile Delinquency Chapter7, <http://www.un.org/esa/socdev/unyin/documents/worldyouthreport.pdf> Erişim Tarihi: 28.11.2017.
- [33] Williams & Evans SA, Myers JS. [2004] Adolescent violence. *ABNF J*. 15(2):31-4.
- [34] Moffitt TE. [1993] Adolescent-limited and life-course-persistent antisocial behavior: a developmental taxonomy. *Psychological Review*. 100:674-701.
- [35] Köknel Ö. [2001] Kimliğini Arayan Gençliğimiz, İstanbul: Altın Kitaplar Yayınevi. Issue 7, pp 603-619.
- [36] Yılmaz FG. [2015] Ergen Suçları, Ergen Suçlulara Yönelik Okul İçindeki Düzenlemeler ve Türk Ceza Kanunu Karşılaştırması. *Ankara Barosu Dergisi*. S.335-354.
- [37] Satici SA, Can G, Akın A. [2012] The Vengeance Scale: The validity and reliability of the Turkish version. *International Counseling and Education Conference*. Special Issue 1, pp. 36-43.
- [38] Cheavens JS, Cukrowicz KC, Hansen R, Mitchell SM. [2016] Incorporating resilience factors into the interpersonal theory of suicide: The role of hope and self-forgiveness in an older adult Sample. *Journal of clinical psychology*. 72(1):58-69.
- [39] Lutwak N, ve Ferrari JR. [1996] Moral Affect and Cognitive Processes: Differentiating Shame from Guilt Among Men and Women, *Personality and Individual Differences*. 21/6: 891 - 896.
- [40] Webb JR, Dula CS, Brewer K. [2012] Forgiveness and aggression among college students. *Journal of Spirituality in Mental Health*. 14(1):38-58.
- [41] Green M, DeCourville N, Sadava S. [2012] Positive affect, negative affect, stress, and social support as mediators of the forgiveness-health relationship. *The Journal of Social Psychology*. 152(3):288-307.
- [42] Güler N, Tel HT, ve Özkan F. [2005] Kadının Aile İçinde Yaşanan Şiddete Bakışı, *Cumhuriyet Üniversitesi Tıp Fakültesi Dergisi*. 2/27:51 - 56.