

Supplementary Materials

Characteristics of Forgiven and Unforgiven Offences

Mean confidence ratings regarding decisions to ‘forgive’ or ‘not forgive’ the transgressor, the hurtfulness of the offence, and sympathy towards the victim and the transgressor were each compared using a 2 (time: before TNT task vs after TNT task) x 2 (forgiveness: forgiven vs. unforgiven) x 3 (instruction: baseline vs. think vs. no-think) mixed design ANOVA. For confidence, analysis revealed that there was no effects of instruction, $F(2, 117) = 0.36, p > 0.05$; time, $F(2, 117) = 0.69, p > 0.05$, forgiveness, $F(1, 118) = 0.24, p > 0.05$, nor an instruction by time by forgiveness interaction; $F(2, 117) = 0.54, p > 0.05$. We only report significant effects here (see Table 2 for means). These analyses revealed that unforgiven scenarios were perceived more hurtful than forgiven scenarios ($M = 6.47, SD = 0.42$ vs. $M = 4.33, SD = 0.80$, respectively; $F(1, 118) = 317.32, p < 0.01, d = 3.35$). Participants were also more sympathetic to forgive the transgressor for forgiven than unforgiven scenarios ($M = 4.08, SD = 0.77$ vs. $M = 6.22, SD = 0.64$, respectively; $F(1, 118) = 392.02, p < 0.01, d = 3.02$). In contrast, participants were more sympathetic towards the victim in unforgiven than forgiven scenarios ($M = 1.43, SD = 0.60$ vs. $M = 2.58, SD = 0.71$, respectively; $F(1, 118) = 94.52, p < 0.01, d = 1.75$).

Effect of forgetting on forgiveness

We initially compared participants’ ratings for forgiven and unforgiven scenarios on the forgiveness questionnaires in the first session (pre-TNT) with those in the second session (post-TNT) in order to determine whether there was any effect of no-think instructions on subsequent forgiveness. Mean ratings for how confident participants were about their decision to forgive or not forgive the transgressor, the seriousness and the hurtfulness of the offence, the motivation to forgive the transgressor, and sympathy towards the victim and the

transgressor were each compared using a 2 (time of rating: session 1 vs. session 2) x 2 (forgiveness: forgiven vs. unforgiven) x 3 (instruction: baseline vs. think vs. no-think) mixed design ANOVA. These analyses revealed that there was neither an effect of time, nor a time by forgiveness by instruction interaction for any of these dimensions; all tests, $p > 0.05$. See Table 2. Furthermore, in order to determine whether participants were more forgiving of offences following the instruction to suppress, a 2 (time of rating: session 1 vs. session 2) x 2 (forgiveness: forgive vs. not forgive) chi square analysis was also conducted. This analysis revealed that there was no significant difference in participants' tendency to forgive following suppression instructions, $\chi = 6.0, p > 0.05$.

Table 2. Mean ratings for scenarios at Time 1 (pre-TNT) and Time 2 (post-TNT)

	Time 1 (SD)	Time 2 (SD)
Confidence in the decision to forgive	5.55 (0.79)	5.43 (0.81)
Seriousness of the offence	5.30 (1.43)	5.09 (1.03)
Hurtfulness of the offence	5.40 (1.25)	5.26 (1.26)
Motivation to forgive the offender	4.38 (1.65)	4.11 (1.58)
Sympathy towards the victim	2.00 (0.88)	1.95 (0.78)
Sympathy towards the offender	5.15 (1.28)	5.01 (1.28)