

National Research University Higher School of Economics

as a manuscript

Adamyana Anna

Justice sensitivity as a phenomenon of personality

PhD Dissertation Summary

for the purpose of obtaining academic degree

Doctor of Philosophy in Psychology

Academic supervisor:

Sofya Nartova-Bochaver

Professor, Doctor of Science

Moscow 2020

The relevance of the research

Justice as one of the key values of human culture, used to denote the concept of due order of things, corresponding to the ideas about the essence of a person and his inalienable rights [Ilyichev et al., 1983], is critically important for the successful functioning of society; norms of justice represent the necessary basis for the existence of any social institutions. In this regard, the attention of individuals to issues of justice, their willingness to act in accordance with the standards, as well as vigilantly monitor possible violations and strive to restore justice are favorable for society. At the same time, a number of questions arise regarding the place of sensitivity to violation of justice in the structure of personality and about its role in the life of an individual. Is sensitivity to justice violation a stable characteristic? Do individuals differ in their level of sensitivity? What role does the sensitivity to injustice play in the general structure of personality? Is it adaptive and favorable for the mental well-being of an individual? How does this type of response relate to other reactions to injustice, in particular to forgiveness? Finding answers to these research questions set the direction and subject of this study.

Research problem

The concept of Justice sensitivity was proposed and developed by the German psychologist Manfred Schmitt [Schmitt et al., 1995] in order to study individual differences in reactions to injustice, which persist in various circumstances and are not explained by situational factors. Studies conducted in Germany have confirmed that Justice sensitivity is a stable independent personality trait that cannot be reduced to other characteristics [Baumert, Schmitt, 2016; Schmitt et al., 2005; Schmitt et al., 2010]. In accordance with the roles that the individual can play in a situation of violation of justice, researchers distinguish victim sensitivity, observer sensitivity, beneficiary sensitivity, perpetrator sensitivity. Studies conducted in Germany [Baumert, Schmitt, 2016] showed that Justice sensitivity (primarily from victim's perspective) is negatively associated with indicators of mental well-being.

In this paper, the theoretical and methodological basis for understanding the place of Justice sensitivity in the personality structure is the Five-Factor Theory of Personality,

in which the following components of the personality space are defined: basic tendencies, facets - lower level traits, characteristic adaptations - a wide range of motivational, social-cognitive, and developmental adaptations, contextualized in time, place, and/or social role [McAdams, Pals, 2006]. In the interpretation of P. Costa and R. McCrae self-concept is regarded as a domain within characteristic adaptations (as an element, integrating all representations of the person about himself, it occupies a special place and has an impact on the behavior and reactions of the individual in all situations) [McCrae & Costa, 1999; McAdams, Pals, 2006; Shchebetenko, 2017].

In our study, Justice sensitivity is regarded as a lower level personality trait, that defines behavior, cognitive and emotional reactions to those situations where, in the opinion of the individual, justice is violated. The research aims to answer the question if Justice sensitivity exists in Russian culture as a separate phenomenon, we also study the relationship with basic tendencies, elements of self-concept. At the moment of the study there was a study of the relationship of Justice sensitivity from victim's perspective with the characteristics of emotional state and ideological beliefs conducted in Russian culture [Nartova-Bochaver, Astanina, 2014], however, a holistic study of the phenomenon of Justice sensitivity and verification of its status as a separate personality trait had not been conducted. In addition, this study addresses the issue of the adaptability of Justice sensitivity in terms of the mental well-being of an individual. Despite the existence of a large range of studies of Justice sensitivity, only a few of them addressed the issue of its relationship with mental well-being. A. Baumert, M. Schmitt [Baumert, Schmitt, 2016] cite the results of studies according to which various aspects of Justice sensitivity (and first of all victim sensitivity) are associated with depressive tendencies, psychological stress, and a decrease in life satisfaction. And finally, the work explores the relationship of Justice sensitivity with forgiveness. Dispositional forgiveness (as a stable personality characteristic, expressed in the tendency to forgive), as well as Justice sensitivity, can be regarded as a lower level personality trait. In this regard, questions arise about how these two traits are related and coexist, whether is lower level associated with, or whether they can complement each other. At the moment, the only study of Justice sensitivity in

relation to forgiveness has been carried out, it covered only the relationship of victim sensitivity with forgiveness, leaving other aspects of Justice sensitivity outside the scope of consideration; in addition, dispositional forgiveness and situational forgiveness were diagnosed using short forms of self-report, which does not allow us to distinguish patterns of relationship of Justice sensitivity with various components of forgiveness [Gerlach et al., 2012].

The object of the research is Justice sensitivity.

The subject of the research is the ontological status of Justice sensitivity, namely, its place in the personality structure, correlation with other lower level personality traits, that manifest in situations of injustice (on the example of forgiveness) and its role as a predictor of mental well-being.

The purpose of the research is to determine the place of Justice sensitivity in the intrapersonal space (in particular, in relation to another personality trait - dispositional forgiveness), to study its adaptive potential in relation to the mental well-being of the individual.

Research objectives

1. Theoretical objectives

- To analyze the theoretical and empirical studies of Justice sensitivity and its relationship to indicators of mental well-being
- To analyze the theoretical and methodological literature in order to determine the theoretical place of Justice sensitivity in the structure of the personality, to identify priority aspects of the study of Justice sensitivity in relation to key elements within the personality space.

2. Methodological objectives

- Validate the Justice Sensitivity Inventory

- Conduct psychometric preparation of tools for the study of dispositional and situational forgiveness

3. Empirical objectives

- Verify the status of Justice sensitivity as an independent personality trait in the Russian sample

- Empirically investigate place of Justice sensitivity in the personality space: relationship to basic tendencies and elements of self-concept

- Investigate the relationship of Justice sensitivity with mental well-being

- Investigate the relationship of Justice sensitivity with dispositional and situational forgiveness

General hypothesis: Justice sensitivity is an independent personality trait of the lower level, which is non-adaptive from the point of view of the mental well-being of an individual.

Private hypotheses:

1. Justice sensitivity is an independent personality trait associated with other traits, but not reducible to them.

2. Justice sensitivity is negatively correlated with the parameters of the self-concept: self-esteem and resilience

3. Justice sensitivity is negatively related to mental well-being

4. The negative relationship between Justice sensitivity and mental well-being is at least partially explained by the presence of basic tendencies and aspects of self-concept associated with Justice sensitivity and affecting mental well-being

5. Justice sensitivity is negatively related to forgiveness; Justice sensitivity and forgiveness are personality traits, manifestations of which are alternative reactions to situations of perceived injustice.

Theoretical and methodological foundations of the study are Theory of Justice sensitivity (M. Schmitt), Five-Factor Theory of Personality (P. Costa, R. McCrae, D. McAdams), an activity-based approach in which personality traits are regarded as behavioral characteristics of a person (A.N. Leontiev, S.L. Rubinstein), the concept of psychological well-being (E. Deci, R. Ryan, C. Riff, B. Singer), theoretical concepts and empirical studies of forgiveness (M. Rye, E. Worthington, M. Allemand, M. Steiner, Thoresen, M. Exline), the concept of dispositional forgiveness of L. Thompson, K. Snyder, the concept of common representations of justice (O.A. Gulevich, E.O. Golynchik), theoretical ideas of conscience (M.I. Volovikova, V.D. Shadrikov, E.P. Ilyin), ideas about justice and care as the basis of morality (L. Kohlberg, C. Gilligan, S.V. Molchanov)

Methods

In the study of the structure and psychometric characteristics of the Justice Sensitivity Inventory, in addition to the Justice Sensitivity Inventory, the following methods were used:

the Big Five Factor Markers Questionnaire in adaptation of Knyazev [Knyazev, Mitrofanova, Bocharov, 2010]

the Belief in a Just World scale [Dalbert, 1999]

the Basic World Assumptions Scale in adaptation of M.A. Padun and A.V. Kotelnikova [Janoff-Bulman., 1989]

the Moral Motives Model (MMM) scale [Janoff-Bulman., Carnes, 2013]

the Personal aggressiveness and conflict Inventory developed by E.P. Ilyin and P.A. Kovaleva [Ilyin, 2000; Methodology “Personal aggressiveness and conflict”, 2002]

the Questionnaire of emotional empathy by A. Mehrabian and N. Epstein [Mehrabian, Epstein, 1972]

In addition, to study the predictive validity of the questionnaire, a separate part of research was conducted using vignettes created by the author of the study.

The study of the relationship of Justice sensitivity with common representations of justice, as well as with choice of moral positions in the justice-care continuum, was conducted to further confirm the assumption that the Justice sensitivity is not reducible as a personality trait to other personality phenomena and to investigate correlations of various Justice sensitivity perspectives with ideas about justice and commitment to one or another moral standard, in this study the questionnaire “Justice - Care” by V.S. Molchanov [Molchanov, 2005] was used, as well as an analysis of associations to the word “justice” from the point of view of assigning them to the categories distinguished in studies of common representations of justice [Gulevich, 2012]

The Center for Epidemiologic Studies Depression Scale (CES-D) [Andryushchenko et al., 2003], the Connor-Davidson Resilience Scale (CD-RISC) [Campbell - Sills, Stein, 2007], the Self-Esteem scale [Rosenberg, 1979], the Warwick-Edinburgh Mental Well-being Scale (WEMWBS) [Tennant et al, 2007; Nartova-Bochaver et al., 2013] were used to study the relationship of Justice sensitivity with mental well-being and elements of the self-concept. At the stage of analysis, this part of the study also used the data from the Big Five Factor Markers Questionnaire from the first stage of the study.

At the stage devoted to the study of the relationship of Justice sensitivity with forgiveness and preliminary psychometric preparation of Russian-language versions of dispositional and situational forgiveness research tools, the Heartland Forgiveness Scale [Thompson et al., 2005], the Forgiveness Scale (hereinafter the Situational Forgiveness Scale) [Rye, 2001], and the Forgiveness Likelihood Scale [Rye , 2001] were used.

The methods of statistical data processing included descriptive statistics, correlation analysis, Cronbach α for analysis of internal consistency of the questionnaire, exploratory factor analysis, confirmatory factor analysis, hierarchical regression analysis, Mann-Whitney U test, Kruskal-Wallis H test, chi-square. As the software used statistical packages IBM SPSS 22.0 and EQS 6.4.

Sample and empirical research base

The study involved university students receiving first or second higher education. The questionnaires were completed on paper or via the electronic platform (www.ika.si).

A total sample of 1005 subjects aged 17 to 45 years participated in the first stage of the study, devoted to the research of the structure and psychometric characteristics of the Justice Sensitivity Inventory, and in the second stage of the study – research of the relationship of Justice sensitivity with mental well-being. An additional group of 98 participants aged 17 to 20 years old took part in a separate sub-stage of the research — study of the predictive validity of the Justice Sensitivity Inventory (the same sample participated in the study of the correlation of Justice sensitivity with common representations of justice and in agreement with moral and ethical positions from the field of morality of justice and morality of care, as well as with empathy). In the study of the relationships of Justice sensitivity with forgiveness and preliminary psychometric preparation of Russian-language versions of the tools for measuring dispositional and situational forgiveness the sample consisted of 590 respondents aged 17-29 years (the same sample participated in the study of the aspect of convergent validity - the relationship of Justice sensitivity with indicators of personal aggressiveness and conflict). The total sample of the study, thus, amounted to 1693 people.

Scientific novelty

To date, no comprehensive studies of the phenomenon of Justice sensitivity in Russia have been conducted. The cultural conditionality of common representations of justice [Gulevich, 2012] raises the question of possible cultural conditionality of Justice sensitivity, as well as the very existence of the phenomenon of Justice sensitivity in Russian culture.

Our study has methodological and empirical novelty.

1. Justice sensitivity was studied within the framework of the Five-Factor Model as a lower level personality trait that manifests in situations of justice violation (in comparison with forgiveness) and as an adaptation resource (in the context of mental well-being).

2. It has been empirically shown that Justice sensitivity is negatively associated with mental well-being, positive aspects of self-concept and forgiveness.

3. The relationship of Justice sensitivity with mental well-being was investigated. It was shown that the relationship with depressive symptoms is not due to the unique content of Justice sensitivity, but is formed at the intersection of Justice sensitivity, neuroticism (the basic tendency behind Justice sensitivity) and the characteristics of the self-concept (a group of properties that relate to the level of characteristic adaptations, but manifest not in separate situations, but in life as a whole). Correlation with the level of mental well-being (its positive pole) is observed only for the female sample and is also determined by the interaction of Justice sensitivity and the characteristics of the self-concept, and not by the unique content of Justice sensitivity directly.

4. For the first time in Russia, models of forgiveness have been tested [Thompson et al, 2005; Rye, 2001] and tools for measuring this phenomenon are validated, which is an important additional result of the work.

Theoretical significance of the study

1. For the first time in Russia, the theory of Justice sensitivity of M. Schmitt has been adapted and applied. The main research tool the Justice sensitivity Inventory was validated.

2. Justice sensitivity is regarded as a personality trait of the lower level (characteristic adaptation), which has four aspects (perspectives): victim sensitivity, observer sensitivity, beneficiary sensitivity and perpetrator sensitivity. Viewing Justice sensitivity through the prism of the Five-Factor personality model provided a valuable perspective for studying the mechanism of the impact of Justice sensitivity on mental well-being and the prevention of depressive symptoms.

3. Also, for the first time, the relationships of all Justice sensitivity perspectives with forgiveness were investigated; Justice sensitivity and forgiveness were regarded as personality traits manifestations of which are alternative reactions to situations of perceived injustice, but the results showed non-mutually exclusive relationships.

Practical implication of the study

The results obtained will allow specialists from the field of psychological counseling to better understand the role of Justice sensitivity as a potential source of psychological distress, as well as the mechanisms that stand behind it, focusing attention on the relationship of Justice sensitivity with self-concepts. The non-mutually exclusive relationship between Justice sensitivity and another lower level personality trait - dispositional forgiveness - opens up opportunities, in particular, for studying the possible neutralizing effect of forgiveness on the indicators of mental well-being in relation to the negative effects of Justice sensitivity. Other possible areas of practical work include, for example, the development of training to resist attempts of manipulating Justice sensitivity for socio-political purposes.

Basic ideas of the dissertation to be defended:

1. Justice sensitivity is an independent personality trait that contains stable individual differences in the willingness to perceive cases of injustice and in the power of cognitive, emotional and behavioral responses to injustice. This is a trait of the lower level, that is associated with Big Five traits but is not reducible to them.

2. In the structure of Justice sensitivity, four interrelated but irreducible to each other aspects are identified - Justice sensitivity from victim's, observer's, beneficiary's and perpetrator's perspectives. In the Russian sample, this structure, which was identified earlier in foreign studies, was confirmed.

3. Justice sensitivity acts as an anti-predictor of mental well-being in the broad sense, including a positive correlation with depressive symptoms and a negative correlation with the positive pole of mental well-being (in its eudemonistic and hedonistic components). However, there is a gender-specific relationship between different perspectives of Justice sensitivity and aspects of well-being. While victim sensitivity, observer sensitivity and beneficiary sensitivity positively correlate with depressive symptoms in both male and female groups, perpetrator sensitivity is associated with it only in the male group. All

perspectives of Justice sensitivity are associated with positive aspect of mental well-being only in the female group; in the male group there are no such correlations.

4. The relationship of Justice sensitivity with indicators of mental well-being is explained by the presence of correlations between these indicators with other elements of the personality structure (correlated with Justice sensitivity). Thus, the correlation of Justice sensitivity with depressive symptoms is explained by the presence of correlations with neuroticism and self-esteem, and the correlation with mental well-being in the narrow sense (positive component of mental well-being in broad sense), which is present for the female sample, is explained by correlations with self-esteem and resilience.

5. According to the results of the study of the factor structure of the Heartland Forgiveness Scale, aimed at diagnosing forgiveness as a personal disposition, two components of forgiveness were distinguished in the Russian-language sample: the readiness to forgive and the absence of ruminations on the topic of injustice, in the absence of factors related to the object of forgiveness (myself, other people or situation).

6. Justice sensitivity and forgiveness are not mutually exclusive alternatives in relation to adaptation to violation of justice; their intersection area is susceptibility to rumination. It is this quality, which at the same time represents the negative pole of forgiveness and is one of the components of Justice sensitivity, determines the significant negative relationships between Justice sensitivity and forgiveness. Another component, Willingness to forgive (to change one's attitude towards a perpetrator from negative to positive), is a unique component of dispositional forgiveness, not related to Justice sensitivity. Thus, Justice sensitivity and forgiveness can coexist in one personality.

Approbation and introduction of the results

The main results were presented at the conferences: Russian Scientific Conference "Methodology, Theory, History of Personality Psychology", dedicated to the 95th birthday of L.I. Antsyferova (Moscow, 2019); V International scientific conference "Psychology of stress and coping behavior: challenges, resources, well-being" (Kostroma, 2019); VII International Scientific Conference "Actual Problems of

Theoretical and Applied Psychology" (Yerevan, 2019); International Scientific Conference of Young Scientists "Psychology - Science of the Future" (Institute of Psychology, RAS, Moscow, 2017); VI International Scientific and Practical Conference "Actual Problems of Theoretical and Applied Psychology" (Yerevan, 2017), XXIV International Scientific Conference of Students, Graduate Students and Young Scientists "Lomonosov" (Moscow, 2017), XXII International Symposium "Psychological Problems of the Meaning of Life and Acme" (Moscow, 2017), as well as in 3 scientific articles in Journals recommended by the Higher Attestation Commission.

Thesis structure

The work consists of introduction, two chapters, conclusion, list of references (162 in total, 120 of them in foreign languages) and seven appendices. The text of the dissertation includes 15 tables (with appendices - 16 tables). The text of the thesis is presented on 167 pages.

MAIN CONTENT OF THE DISSERTATION

The Introduction justifies the relevance of the work, defines the goal, objectives, object and hypotheses of the study, scientific novelty, theoretical and practical significance of the work; basic ideas to be defended are presented.

The first chapter, "Justice sensitivity in the Context of Interdisciplinary Ideas of Justice", consisting of four paragraphs, provides an overview of the concepts of "justice" in philosophy, discusses aspects of the concept of "justice" that are within the scope of psychology, in particular, the concepts of existence and the content of the justice motive and the Justice sensitivity as its specific embodiment, which is a lower level personality trait that characterizes individual readiness to perceive cases of injustice, the intensity of emotional reactions and thoughts on the topic of injustice and willingness to restore justice. The chapter covers in detail research on Justice sensitivity, considers the Five-Factor Theory of Personality, in terms of which we define the place of Justice sensitivity within the personality space as a lower level personality trait, discusses

forgiveness as lower level personality trait manifestations of which may be regarded as an alternative to Justice sensitivity.

Paragraph 1.1, “**Justice as an Interdisciplinary Concept**” discusses the concept of justice in the framework of philosophy in the era of antiquity and in modern history. The views on justice both from the point of view of political philosophy and from the point of view of ethics are considered. In particular, the views of J. Rawls [Muntyan, 2009] are discussed, his concept of an individual, possessing moral abilities to have concepts of justice and good, basically postulates the existence of a universal moral motive for justice. In the framework of ethics, justice is seen as the embodiment of the rational aspects of moral systems of utilitarianism and perfectionism and contrasted with care, embodying the moral system of altruism [Apresyan, 1995; Molchanov, 2005].

In psychology, the topic of justice as one of the determinants of social human behavior is of interest primarily for social psychology. However, the concept of justice is always represented in a certain way in the worldview of an individual, and situations related to issues of justice have varying degrees of personal significance, provoke a response of a different type and intensity not only depending on the characteristics of the situation itself, but also depending on the stable individual forms of cognitive, affective and behavioral responses to relevant situations or the possibility of their occurrence. Therefore, in the psychological sciences, the problems of justice are also investigated by the psychology of personality. The paragraph discusses the norms and components of justice that are defined in social psychology, as well as the common representations of justice that exist in modern Russian society [Gulevich, 2012]. It also describes various ideas about the content of the justice motive [for example, Thibaut, Walker, 1975; Schwartz, 2012; Janoff-Bulman, Carnes, 2013; Lerner, 1980] and examples of the embodiment of the justice motive: concept of Belief in a Just World developed by M. Lerner [1980] as well as Justice sensitivity.

Paragraph 1.2, “**The Phenomenon of Justice sensitivity**” discusses in detail the Justice sensitivity theory and existing studies based on it.

The first subparagraph **“Components and Dimensions”** describes the four components of Justice sensitivity: perceptual, emotional, cognitive and motivational - and the four dimensions of Justice sensitivity that are distinguished according to the role that a person can play in a situation of injustice. The research tool (Justice Sensitivity Inventory) developed by the author of the theory is discussed [Schmitt, 2005]. The paragraph discusses studies conducted in Germany that confirm the status of Justice sensitivity as an independent personality trait that cannot be reduced to other traits, including the Big Five factors, as well as other constructs within the personality space related to the concept of justice [Schmitt et al, 2010; Schmitt et al, 2005]. The predictive validity of the Justice sensitivity construct is confirmed by studies of the relationship between Justice sensitivity and behavioral responses to injustice in experimental situations, as well as commitment to the principles of justice in everyday behavior [Mohiyeddini, Schmitt, 1997; Schmitt, Mohiyeddini, 1996; Baumert, Schmitt, 2016].

The system of correlates among other personality traits that are different for the perspectives of Justice sensitivity is also discussed. Victim sensitivity stands out among other dimensions: although all dimensions are positively associated with facets of the NEO-PR questionnaire (The Revised NEO Personality Inventory), such as self-awareness, openness to feelings, kindness and modesty, victim sensitivity is positively associated with hostility and negatively with consent [Nartova-Bochaver, Astanina, 2014a]. While beneficiary, perpetrator and observer sensitivity positively correlate with indicators of moral identity, with commitment to the norms of justice and concern for other people, for victim sensitivity no such correlation was found [Rothmund et al, 2012]. Behavioral experiments and field studies confirm trends found in correlative studies [Lotz et al., 2013; Fetchenhauer, Huang, 2004; Gollwitzer et al, 2009; Baumert, Schmitt, 2016]. It is concluded that while beneficiary sensitivity, perpetrator sensitivity and observer sensitivity can be considered a resource for effective social interaction and cooperation, victim sensitivity is associated with antisocial behavior, justified by the idea of self-protection from injustice, can be an obstacle to interaction, a source of possible conflict.

The subparagraph “**Justice sensitivity as a personality trait**” discusses position of Justice sensitivity in personality space. We share the point of view of the author of the concept M. Schmitt, according to which Justice sensitivity is regarded within the Five Factor Theory as a lower level personality trait – facet.

Modern ideas about personality traits are discussed, the integral structure of personality in the framework of the Five-Factor Personality Theory of P. Costa, R. McCrae, which includes personality traits of different levels and characteristic adaptations. The unique role of the self-concept as a private category within characteristic adaptations is discussed, self-concept plays a special role in preserving the stability of self-representations in different circumstances.

The possibility of regarding Justice sensitivity, which is a strategy of high sensitivity to injustice, focusing on it in thought and readiness to restore justice, as an alternative to strategy of forgiveness, which involves cognitive and emotional restructuring of the situation in order to accept and adapt to the difference between expectations and reality, is discussed.

Taking into account the fact that at the moment extensive research of Justice sensitivity was conducted primarily in Germany, the question arises as to whether the phenomenon of Justice sensitivity exists in the personality space of representatives of Russian-speaking culture and what its place is in it. In the context of the proposed answer to this question, the first hypothesis of the study is put forward.

The sub-paragraph “**Relationships of Justice sensitivity with mental well-being**” describes the results of studies conducted in Germany, according to which aspects of Justice sensitivity are generally negatively related to mental well-being [review: Baumert, Schmitt, 2016]: dimensions of Justice sensitivity positively correlate with depressive symptoms and psychological tension and negatively - with satisfaction with the recognition at work. Among all aspects of Justice sensitivity, correlations are the strongest for victim sensitivity. The results of the victim sensitivity study conducted in the Russian sample are also discussed [Nartova-Bochaver, Astanina, 2014a]. In the Russian-speaking

sample positive relationship of victim sensitivity with depressive symptoms and negative relationships with some elements of the self-concept (including self-esteem and resilience) was found, interesting data were obtained on gender differences in the correlations of victim sensitivity. In the same subparagraph, relying on the described studies and the theoretical and methodological basis of the study - the Five-Factor Theory of Personality - the second, third and fourth hypotheses of the study are put forward.

In the subparagraph "**Justice sensitivity in the space of moral categories in psychology**" position of the concept of Justice sensitivity among other categories of moral psychology (concepts of moral sensitivity of J. Rest [Rest, 1984] and conscience) is analyzed from theoretical perspectives.

When discussing the relationship between constructs of moral sensitivity and Justice sensitivity, several key differences are identified related to the types of moral situations and roles of a person in the situation that are described in the theories, and the fact that the theory of moral sensitivity discusses the processes behind moral actions in a specific situation, and not stable personality traits, like Justice sensitivity theory. Thus, the concepts are not identical in phenomenology and theoretical structure and require a separate study.

When discussing the concept of conscience, the ideas of the philosophy of stoicism and existentialism, and Christian ethics are briefly covered. In the context of psychology, the concept of conscience presented in the scientific works of V.D. Shadrikov [Shadrikov, 2006, 2017ab, 2019] is discussed in more detail. He defines conscience as “the spiritual state of the subject, which is formed on the basis of assessing his behavior from the standpoint of moral values that are accepted by the subject, while the act of not pursuing these values is perceived from the ontological position as loss of oneself” [Shadrikov, 2017b]. In discussion of the relationship between constructs of conscience and Justice sensitivity, mutual intersection of the volumes of concepts is noted while they are irreducible to each other. On the one hand, victim sensitivity is obviously not associated with moral values. However, it can be assumed that prosocial dimensions of Justice sensitivity do not exhaust the content of the concept of “conscience”. Beneficiary

sensitivity, perpetrator sensitivity and observer sensitivity can be considered as particular cases of the work of conscience.

Besides, in the subparagraph are defined several important questions for empirical research in the field of moral psychology: in particular, question about relationship of Justice sensitivity with moral basis (justice or care) and level of moral development and also question about relationship of Justice sensitivity and common representations of justice.

Paragraph 1.3, “**Forgiveness as a personality trait that is an alternative to Justice sensitivity**”, reviews the concepts of forgiveness in psychology, describes single study of the relationship of forgiveness with Justice sensitivity, as well as research tools aimed at studying various aspects of the forgiveness.

Considering the concept of forgiveness is due to the fact that forgiveness, as well as Justice sensitivity, can be regarded as a lower level personality trait, manifestations of which are an alternative reaction to situations of perceived injustice. From the point of view of personality psychology, the important question is how these two traits are related and coexist in one person, whether the choice of one of them means rejection of the other, or whether they can complement each other.

In theoretical concepts of forgiveness, it is generally accepted to distinguish situational and dispositional forgiveness. Situational forgiveness is defined as a process of change in a situation, and dispositional forgiveness is a personality trait that is a tendency to forgive [Allemand, Steiner, 2011].

In this work, at a theoretical level, Justice sensitivity is considered primarily in parallel with dispositional forgiveness, however, an empirical study of Justice sensitivity and situational forgiveness is of interest as it helps to shed light on how in a particular situation sensitivity to injustice is associated with reactions to the offender and the situation.

The theoretical basis of understanding of forgiveness in this work is the concept of L. Thompson et al. [Thompson et al., 2005], they define forgiveness as the framing of a

perceived transgression such that one's responses to the transgressor, transgression, and sequelae of the transgression are transformed from negative to neutral or positive. According to the concept of the authors, when people forgive, they acknowledge the fact that expectations from reality are violated, and then they do work on a cognitive, emotional and / or behavioral level that provides a change in the response to the situation.

This paragraph briefly describes a previous study of the relationship between victim sensitivity and forgiveness [Gerlach et al., 2012]. This study, shedding light on some aspects of the relationship between victim sensitivity and forgiveness, leaves open the question of how other dimensions of Justice sensitivity relate to forgiveness. In addition, dispositional forgiveness and situational forgiveness are diagnosed using very brief forms of self-report, which does not allow us to distinguish patterns of relations of Justice sensitivity with various components of forgiveness. In this regard, the task is to examine in more detail the relationship of Justice sensitivity with indicators of dispositional and situational forgiveness. The fifth hypothesis of the study is formulated

To study dispositional forgiveness, the Heartland Forgiveness Scale, developed by L. Thompson et al. [Thompson et al., 2005], is used. A feature of L. Thompson's theory and the corresponding methodology is that the authors distinguish between types of forgiveness by the criterion of the addressee: forgiveness for oneself, forgiveness for others, forgiveness for situations. The paragraph also provides an overview of situational forgiveness research tools that are used in the empirical part of the study: the Forgiveness Scale (hereinafter the Situational Forgiveness Scale) [Rye, 2001], and the Forgiveness Likelihood Scale [Rye, 2001]

The second chapter, “Empirical Study of place of Justice sensitivity in the Intrapersonal Space”, consisting of four paragraphs, describes validation of the Justice Sensitivity Inventory; study of the place of Justice sensitivity in the intrapersonal space, in particular, correlations with basic tendencies (Big Five) and elements of Self-concept; study of the relationship of Justice sensitivity with mental well-being, as well as study of the relationship between dimensions of Justice sensitivity and various aspects of dispositional and situational forgiveness.

Paragraph 2.1 “**Validation of the Justice Sensitivity Inventory**” describes the procedure and results of validation.

The procedure included preparation of the text of the inventory, study of its factor structure and psychometric characteristics: internal consistency, convergent and discriminant validity, predictive validity.

Evaluation of convergent and discriminant validity was conducted through analysis of the relationship of Justice sensitivity perspectives with the results of other questionnaires. The following tools were used to assess the discriminant validity: the Big Five Factor Markers Questionnaire [Knyazev et al., 2010], the Belief in a Just World Scale (SCM) [Dalbert, 1999; Nartova-Bochaver et al, 2018], the Basic World Assumptions Scale by R. Janoff-Bulman in the adaptation of M.A. Padun and A.V. Kotelnikova [Janoff-Bulman, 1989; Padun, Kotelnikova, 2008]. To study convergent validity at the first stage of the study, the Moral Motives Model (MMM) scale by R. Janoff-Bulman [Janoff-Bulman, Carnes, 2013] was used. Two separate research sub-stages included the study of the correlations between Justice sensitivity and empathy that was assessed with the Questionnaire for emotional empathy by A. Mehrabian and N. Epstein [Mehrabian, Epstein, 1972] and between Justice sensitivity and personal aggression and conflict that was measured with the Personal aggressiveness and conflict inventory by E.P. Ilyin, P.A. Kovaleva [Ilyin, 2000].

In order to check the predictive validity of the Justice Sensitivity Inventory, the probability of evaluating a situation as an unjust one was studied in participants. Vignettes were developed based on the results of a pilot study - a survey of an independent group of students in which participants gave their own examples of unfair situations. Variants of vignettes were discussed with an expert - a psychologist and a university professor who understands the realities of student life. The vignettes were composed in such a way that the central character was a victim, an observer, a beneficiary or a perpetrator. Participants evaluated the situation in terms of whether its analysis in the categories of justice and injustice is appropriate and, if appropriate, whether the situation can be regarded as just or unjust.

The sample of the study of the factor structure of the questionnaire was 1002 people (average age = 22.3; SD = 6.3; 769 women). Inventories for the study of convergent and discriminant validity were completed by 268 people (average age = 21.1; SD = 2.5; 202 women) (it was a subsample of the general sample). However, the Belief in a Just World questionnaire was also completed by all participants in the first study (1,002 people). In the study of the relationship between Justice sensitivity and empathy, the sample was 98 people (average age = 18.6, SD = 1.2; among them 81 were girls). In the study of relationship with personal aggressiveness and conflict 590 people were included in the sample (average age - 18.7 years, SD = 1.1, among them 477 girls). The study of predictive validity was carried out with the same sample as the study of the relationship of Justice sensitivity with empathy. The study involved volunteers, students of Moscow universities, participants of the programs of the first or second higher education.

The study demonstrated good psychometric characteristics of the Justice Sensitivity Inventory. The factor structure of the original questionnaire with four scales corresponding to the four perspectives was confirmed. Scales and the inventory as a whole have good internal consistency. In the study of descriptive statistics, gender differences and an age trend were revealed: significant differences between genders are noted for all scales, except for victim sensitivity, women have an average higher Justice sensitivity rate than men; with age, victim and observer sensitivity decrease, and perpetrator sensitivity grows. It has been shown that despite correlation of Justice sensitivity with basic tendencies (the Big Five traits), basic assumptions, Belief in a Just World, Justice sensitivity occupy a special place within the personal space. Convergent validity was confirmed by the presence of correlations between Justice sensitivity and moral motives, as well as between main prosocial aspects of Justice sensitivity (beneficiary sensitivity and perpetrator sensitivity) and empathy and between victim sensitivity and indicators of aggressiveness and conflict, but correlation values indicate that Justice sensitivity cannot be reduced to other variables. A study of respondents' assessments of specific life situations as just or unjust showed that all aspects of Justice sensitivity are predictors of assessing a situation as unjust when the situation is described

from the perspective of the victim. At the same time, for all types of descriptions of situations, the number of cases evaluated as unjust is correlated with victim, observer and beneficiary sensitivity, and Justice sensitivity as a whole, the results confirm predictive validity of the tool.

Paragraph 2.2 **“Justice sensitivity in the space of moral categories”** is devoted to research, which, on the one hand, is an extension of the study of the discriminant validity of Justice sensitivity - confirmation of the irreducibility of Justice sensitivity to other constructs related to justice and morality, on the other hand, makes a special substantial contribution to understanding the relationship of Justice sensitivity with ideas about justice and preferred moral positions in the “care-justice” dichotomy. The objectives of the study were to find out whether common representations of justice differ in people with different levels of Justice sensitivity, as well as what moral orientations in the care-justice dichotomy are common for people with different levels of Justice sensitivity. In order to answer the first question, a study of common representations of justice in relation to Justice sensitivity was conducted. In order to answer the second question, correlation analysis of Justice sensitivity indicators and types of moral orientation and the levels of moral development, measured by the “Justice - Care” questionnaire developed by V. S. Molchanov [Molchanov, 2005], was conducted.

The study participants were the same students who participated in the study of the predictive validity of Justice sensitivity. The study of common representations of justice included analysis of a set of three associations to the word “justice” that were given by the participants. Associations were divided into categories of common representations of justice, defined in the study of O.A. Gulevich [Gulevich, 2012]. Categories include: following moral standards, following legal norms, reward according to merit, good attitude towards people, ability to trust a person, equality of position, personal activity. Groups of respondents with high and low levels of each of Justice sensitivity perspectives were identified: the results were considered high or low if they went beyond the limits of one standard deviation on the scale. For each of the groups, the number of participants whose associations belonged to each of the categories of common representations was

counted. Then, using the Chi-square test, the significance of differences between the groups was evaluated.

The largest number of associations in all the groups belonged to the category “the ability to trust a person”. Significant differences were found between the high and low victim sensitivity groups for the categories “following moral standards” and “reward according to merit”, as well as between the high and low observer sensitivity groups for the “reward according to merit” category. The following associations belonged to the category of ““reward according to merit””: objectivity, impartiality. The category “following moral standards” included: conscience, morality, decency. An understanding of justice in terms of compliance with some external rules for the distribution of benefits or procedures is more common for people with low levels of victim and observer sensitivity. At the same time, the perception of justice on a par with the categories of morality, decency, and conscience is characteristic of a high level of victim sensitivity. It can be assumed that in this case, the image of a person, choosing the position of immorality, unscrupulousness appears very vividly, causing strong emotions in the moment and a tendency to reflect on the situation in the future. The other person not only violated a certain order of things, he stepped over moral law, while the victim of injustice finds himself in the position of an innocent sufferer.

According to the results of the correlation analysis of Justice Sensitivity Inventory and “*Justice - Care*” questionnaire, victim sensitivity is statistically significantly related to Kolberg’s conventional morality: focusing on the opinions of others, striving to be “good”, relying on social law and order - and post-conventional morality - orientation to universal ethical principles. Justice sensitivity from other perspectives is positively correlated exclusively with the orientation to care as a moral principle, namely with a reflexive empathic orientation.

It is concluded that the concept of justice for a person with a high victim sensitivity carries a moral burden, is not a formality, but he himself is more likely to follow the rules than to worry about the fate of other people. At the same time, the prosocial aspects of

Justice sensitivity are mainly related to the morality of care - a position of concern for the fate of others.

Paragraph 2.3 “**An empirical study of the relationship of Justice sensitivity with indicators of mental well-being of a person**” is devoted to the study of the relationship of Justice sensitivity perspectives with self-concept (self-esteem and resilience) and mental well-being. The study tested the hypothesis that the alleged negative correlations of Justice sensitivity with mental well-being are at least partially explained by the presence of basic tendencies (neuroticism) and elements of the self-concept correlated both with Justice sensitivity and mental well-being .

The study involved 1001 respondents (772 females, 229 males). There was a common battery that included: the Justice Sensitivity Inventory, the Center for Epidemiologic Studies Depression Scale (CES-D) [Andryushchenko et al., 2003], the Connor-Davidson Resilience Scale [Campbell - Sills, Stein, 2007], the Self-Esteem scale [Congregation, 2002; Rosenberg, 1979]. Some participants also filled out additional questionnaires: the Warwick-Edinburgh Mental Well-being Scale (WEMWBS) [Tennant et al, 2007; Nartova-Bochaver et al., 2013] (785 people, 608 girls), the Big Five Factor Markers Questionnaire (this was a subsample that participated in the study of the divergent validity of the Justice sensitivity questionnaire).

Correlation analysis found positive relationship of all Justice sensitivity perspectives with depressive symptoms. The highest rate was found for victim sensitivity; similar results were obtained in a study by M. Schmitt, M. Dörfel (Schmitt, Dörfel, 1999). Perpetrator sensitivity has the weakest correlation with depressive symptoms. The assumption is made that since the role of the offender is active, a person who seeks to be just himself can usually avoid actions that lead to remorse. The victim sensitivity, on the contrary, is associated with the most passive position of the sufferer, who cannot resist the circumstances. Only in the female sample Justice sensitivity is negatively correlated with the WEMWBS, which in this study represents the positive component of mental well-being.

The study of the relationship of Justice sensitivity with the positive aspects of the self-concept showed that all dimensions of Justice sensitivity are negatively correlated with self-esteem, observer sensitivity and beneficiary sensitivity have the highest correlation. The suggestion is made that being a witness of injustice (especially if one can't influence the situation) is associated with experience of weakness. The position of the victim of injustice can damage self-esteem through experiencing one's own vulnerability, if strength is a condition of self-respect for a particular person. At the same time, the relationship is not one-sided causal: for a person with problematic self-esteem, monitoring situations where his self-attitude may be at risk becomes especially important. For a female sample, the correlation between self-esteem and Justice sensitivity is stronger than for a male sample.

Negative correlations were also found between resilience and victim, beneficiary and perpetrator sensitivity, but only for the female sample (the absence of significant relationships for the male sample can also be associated with differences in the volume and power of the samples.). Reciprocal relationships are also assumed here: high level of Justice sensitivity is associated with a subjectively large number of injustice situations, which can be a threat to the idea of self as of a strong person. On the other hand, the idea of oneself as being unable to cope can make a person more alert to injustice.

The study of the mechanisms of the relationship between Justice sensitivity and depressive symptoms was performed using hierarchical regression analysis. At the first step of the regression analysis variables of neuroticism and self-esteem were introduced into the model, at the next step, the indicators of Justice sensitivity were added (resilience in the presence of variables of neuroticism and self-esteem at the preliminary step of the analysis did not appear to be a significant predictor of depressive symptoms even for female sample and was excluded). When controlling for parameters of neuroticism and self-esteem, the contribution of beneficiary and perpetrator sensitivity to depressive symptoms is not statistically significant, for the positions of the victim and the observer, the contribution is significant at the level of the statistical trend, and at this significance level the additional volume of the explained variance (ΔR^2) is low (no more than 1%).

Despite the fact that people who are sensitive to justice are slightly more prone to manifest depressive symptoms, this is due to the fact that Justice sensitivity is more often formed in people with higher neuroticism, and also in combination with a characteristic adaptation that is universal for all life situations - self-respect: and at the intersection of two interrelated characteristics (higher Justice sensitivity and lower self-esteem), a greater susceptibility to depressive symptoms is manifested.

The study of the mechanisms of the relationship between Justice sensitivity and mental well-being was performed using hierarchical regression analysis, where at the first step indicators of self-esteem and resilience were introduced into the model, and at the second stage Justice sensitivity was added (neuroticism does not make a statistically significant contribution to depressive symptoms in the presence of variables of self-esteem and resilience). The analysis was carried out for a female subsample, since in a male sample correlations between Justice sensitivity perspectives and mental well-being were very low and insignificant. It was shown that when controlling the parameters of self-esteem and resilience, the contribution of all Justice sensitivity perspectives to mental well-being is not statistically significant. It turns out that although for women, Justice sensitivity is associated with a positive aspect of mental well-being, part of the variance explained by Justice sensitivity is shared with self-esteem and resilience.

Paragraph 2.4 describes the study of the relationship between Justice sensitivity perspectives and aspects of dispositional and situational forgiveness and the preliminary psychometric preparation of questionnaires: the Heartland Forgiveness Scale, the Situational Forgiveness Scale and the Forgiveness Likelihood Scale.

The psychometric preparation of the questionnaires included the stages of translation, research of the factor structure, verification of internal consistency, as well as the study of convergent validity of questionnaires.

The sample consisted of 590 students of Moscow universities aged 17-29 years ($M = 18.7$, $SD = 1.1$; 477 females and 113 males). In addition to questionnaires of dispositional and situational forgiveness participants completed the Personal

aggressiveness and conflict inventory [Ilyin, 2000; The methodology “Personal aggressiveness and conflict”, 2002] and the Ways of Coping Questionnaire (WCQ) adapted by T.L. Kryukova and E.V. Kuftyak [Kryukova, Kuftyak, 2007].

In Russian-speaking sample a unique factor structure of the Heartland Forgiveness Scale was obtained, it is different from the original one: two factors and two corresponding scales were identified: Readiness to forgive and Absence of rumination on the topic of injustice, which are associated with only one of the two dimensions of the factor structure in the original study by Thompson et al. (2005) – valence (the dimension associated with the addressee of forgiveness was not reflected in the structure of the Russian-language version). It has been suggested that the cultural feature of the Russian-speaking sample is the universality of the processes of forgiveness in relation to any sources of perceived injustice. In the factor structure of the Russian-language version of the Situational Forgiveness Scale were defined four factors: Stability of negative reactions, Significance of psychological damage, Goodwill towards the offender, Completeness of negative experiences. The difference from the original structure is that the items related to a single scale of negative reactions were distributed on three separate scales corresponding to the characteristics of the experiences: stability, depth, completeness of the most acute phase. The structure of the Forgiveness Probability Scale is one-factor, similar to the original.

Analysis of the correlations between Justice sensitivity and forgiveness scales revealed a special pattern of correlates for each of the Justice sensitivity perspectives. The only aspect of forgiveness that is almost equally negatively related to all positions of Justice sensitivity is the absence of rumination. As a component of the cognitive style and part of the regulation of forgetting mechanisms (Fawcett et al., 2015), rumination is probably not associated with the content of attitudes towards another person, or injustice situations, and is related probably only to the degree of significance of a particular topic, but not with the content of the ideas. Significant correlations with all dimensions of Justice sensitivity were found for the subscale Stability of negative reactions of the Situational forgiveness scale, this demonstrates that, both at the dispositional and

situational levels, Justice sensitivity is associated with a tendency to become stuck in negative thoughts and experiences. The most prosocial pattern of correlates was identified for perpetrator sensitivity. Only perpetrator sensitivity positively correlates with dispositional Readiness to forgive and Goodwill towards the offender. In addition, there is a significant negative relationship with the scale Significance of psychological damage: a person with high perpetrator sensitivity is not inclined to hate the offender and perceive the significance of a particular situation of injustice as high. Thus, the sensitivity to situations of one's own violation of justice is associated with a general supportive and sympathetic attitude towards another person who violate justice. Perhaps this is due to the relative ease with which a person who is sensitive to his own violations can identify with another who, willingly or unwillingly turned out to be the violator, to project his own feelings on him and experience sympathy. At the same time, perpetrator sensitivity is associated with the general readiness to forgive and not return to the fact of violation in the memoirs, at least intentionally. If, due to the peculiarities of the cognitive process, a person with high perpetrator sensitivity is prone to rumination, then at some point he seeks to put an end to it and to leave the event in the past. Pattern of correlations of beneficiary sensitivity is largely similar to that of perpetrator sensitivity with the difference that there is no relationship with the Readiness to forgive and the rate of connection with Goodwill to the offender is slightly lower and there is no negative correlation with the scale Significance of psychological damage. Like perpetrator sensitivity, beneficiary sensitivity is associated with a positive attitude towards the violator of justice, which apparently also can be explained by the ease with which a person with high beneficiary sensitivity can put himself in the place of the beneficiary in a situation of injustice. In contrast, victim sensitivity is negatively associated with Goodwill towards the offender and positively with the Significance of psychological damage in a particular situation of injustice. The correlation with the Goodwill towards the offender and the Significance of psychological damage are present only in the female subsample (in the male subsample, correlation values are much lower, therefore, the difference cannot be attributed only to the difference in sample size). Only victim sensitivity negatively correlates with the Completeness of negative experiences - a person with high

victim sensitivity is inclined to experience negative emotions from the past situation as brightly as at the moment when it happened. Interestingly, the relationship also has a gender specificity: it is significant only for the female sample. At the same time, only victim sensitivity is significantly negatively correlated with the likelihood of forgiveness. Victim sensitivity is associated not only with rumination, but also with vigilance and persistently negative attitude towards the offender. Observer sensitivity has the highest correlation with ruminations about injustice, has no positive or negative correlations with Goodwill towards the offender in female sample, although the male part of the sample is characterized by a positive relationship between observer sensitivity and a good attitude towards the perpetrator. In addition, observer sensitivity is positively associated with the Stability of negative reactions, but only in female sample.

The paragraph also provides a brief analysis of the gender characteristics of the correlations.

At the end of the paragraph, it is concluded that despite the presence of significant correlations between dimensions of Justice sensitivity and forgiveness parameters, the absolute values of these correlations are not too high, therefore, Justice sensitivity and forgiveness are not mutually exclusive alternatives. A certain intersection of the phenomenology of Justice sensitivity and unforgiveness exists in the field of ruminations about injustice and offender. But at the same time, forgiveness is associated with the development of a new position in relation to the offender, a deliberate change in one's attitude in a positive direction, positive emotions towards the offender – and at the disposition level, this component is unique to forgiveness, but at a situational level, when it comes to specific memories from the past positively associated with prosocial measurements of emergencies (beneficiary, perpetrator, observer sensitivity). An individual can simultaneously be sensitive to injustice, be inclined to focus on injustice in his thoughts, but at the same time be able and inclined to decide to forgive offenders, thus dimensions of Justice sensitivity are associated with aspects of forgiveness that are negatively intercorrelated.

General findings of the study

1. Existence of Justice sensitivity as an independent personality trait irreducible to other personality constructs in Russian culture was empirically confirmed. While there exists a common Justice sensitivity nucleus, four aspects related to four perspectives of victim, observer, beneficiary and perpetrator are empirically distinguished within general phenomenon.

2. Relationships of Justice sensitivity with basic tendencies: emotional stability (a positive pole of neuroticism), agreeableness, consciousness, and also with the parameters of the self-concept: self-esteem and resilience, are empirically confirmed.

3. There are demographic differences in the level of Justice sensitivity: in female sample, all dimensions of Justice sensitivity except for victim sensitivity are significantly higher than in male; there is also an age-related change of Justice sensitivity: perpetrator sensitivity grows with age, victim sensitivity and observer sensitivity decrease.

4. Negative correlations of Justice sensitivity with mental well-being were found. Depressive symptoms are positively associated with all Justice sensitivity perspectives, while for the position of perpetrator the correlation is the weakest. The victim's position, as the most passive and vulnerable, is most positively associated with depression and negatively with well-being.

5. There are gender differences in the pattern of correlations between Justice sensitivity and mental well-being. Only in the female sample, Justice sensitivity is negatively associated with the positive component of mental well-being, which indicates a more widespread impact of Justice sensitivity on the mental life of women.

6. The positive relationship of Justice sensitivity with depressive symptoms is explained by correlations with neuroticism (one of the basic tendencies of the personality) and self-esteem (an element of the self-concept).

7. The negative relationship between Justice sensitivity and well-being (present in the female sample) is also not the result of the unique content of Justice sensitivity and is fully explained by correlations with elements of the self-concept: self-esteem and resilience.

8. Justice sensitivity and forgiveness as lower level personality traits that manifest in the situations of violations of justice are not mutually exclusive alternatives.

9. In the course of the study, a new methodological toolkit was prepared. Adapted Russian-language methodology for the study of Justice sensitivity. The Russian versions of tools of studying forgiveness were tested on a student sample: Heartland's scale of forgiveness, situational forgiveness scale and the scale of probability of forgiveness. The Russian-language versions of the Heartland Forgiveness Scale and the Situational Forgiveness Scale have satisfactory psychometric characteristics, have a slightly different structure compared to the original, but generally have acceptable psychometric characteristics.

The Conclusion summarizes the main results of the study, describes further prospects for the study of this topic.

The main content of the work is reflected in the following publications:

1. Adamyan A. A., Nartova-Bochaver S. K., Schmitt M. Questionnaire “Justice sensitivity”: validation in the Russian-language sample // Psychological journal. - 2018. - T. 39. - No. 4. - S. 105-116.

2. Adamyan A. A. Justice sensitivity and its consequences for the individual // Psychology. Journal of the Higher School of Economics. - 2019. -- T. 16. - No. 3. -- S. 479-493.

3. Nartova-Bochaver S.K., Adamyan A.A. Forgiveness and home environment as aspects of interpersonal interaction.// Social Psychology and Society, 2020. Vol. 11, no. 1, pp. 193–210. doi:10.17759/sps.2020110112. (In Russ., abstr. in Engl.)

REFERENCES

1. Adamyan A. A., Nartova-Bochaver S. K., Shmitt M. Oprosnik "Chuvstvitel'nost' k spravedlivosti": validizaciya na russkoyazychnoj vyborke //Psixologicheskij zhurnal. – 2018. – T. 39. – №. 4. – S. 105-116.
2. Allemand M., Steiner M. Situation-specific forgiveness and dispositional forgiveness: A lifespan development perspective //Justice and conflicts. – Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2011. – S. 361-375.
3. Andryushhenko A. V., Drobizhev M. Yu., Dobrovol'skij A. V. Sravnitel'naya ocenka shkal CES-D, BDI i HADS (d) v diagnostike depressij v obshhemedicinskoj praktike //Zhurnal nevrologii i psixiatrii. – 2003. – T. 5. – S. 11-18.
4. Apresyan R. G. Ideya morali i bazovye normativno-e'ticheskie programmy. – Federal'noe gosudarstvennoe byudzhethnoe uchrezhdenie nauki Institut filosofii Rossijskoj akademii nauk, — 1995. – S.353
5. Baumert A., Schmitt M. Justice Sensitivity // Handbook of social justice theory and research / Eds. C. Sabbagh & M. Schmitt . New York, NY: Springer. – 2016. – P.161–180
6. Campbell-Sills L., Stein M. Psychometric analysis and refinement of the Connor-Davidson Resilience Scale (CD-RISC): Validation of a 10)item measure of resilience //Journ. of Traumatic Stress. – 2007. – № 6. – P. 1019-1028
7. Connor K. M., Davidson J. R. T. Development of a new resilience scale: The Connor-Davidson resilience scale (CD-RISC) //Depression and anxiety. – 2003. – T. 18. – №. 2. – S. 76-82.
8. Dalbert C. The world is more just for me than generally: About the personal belief in a just world scale's validity // Social Justice Research. – 1999. – V. 12. – №. 2. – P. 79-98
9. Fetchenhauer D., Huang X. Justice sensitivity and distributive decisions in experimental games //Personality and Individual Differences. – 2004. – V. 36. – №. 5. – P. 1015-1029.

10. Gerlach T. M. et al. Justice sensitivity and forgiveness in close interpersonal relationships: The mediating role of mistrustful, legitimizing, and pro-relationship cognitions // *Journal of personality*. – 2012. – V. 80. – №. 5. – P. 1373-1413.
11. Gollwitzer M. et al. Why and when justice sensitivity leads to pro-and antisocial behavior // *Journal of Research in Personality*. – 2009. – V. 43. – №. 6. – P. 999-1005.
12. Gulevich O. A. Strukturno-funkcional'naya model' regulyacii obydenykh predstavlenij o spravedlivosti: dis. – Institut psixologii RAN. — 2012.
13. Il'ichyov L.F., Fedoseev P.N., Kovalyov S.M., Panov V.G.. *Filosofskij e'nciklopedicheskij slovar'*. — M.: Sovetskaya e'nciklopediya. 1983.
14. Il'in E.P. *Motivaciya i motivy* - SPb: Izdatel'stvo "Piter". – 2000. – S. 401-405.
15. Janoff-Bulman R. Assumptive worlds and the stress of traumatic events: Applications of the schema construct // *Social cognition*. – 1989. – V. 7. – №. 2. – P. 113-136.
16. Janoff-Bulman R., Carnes N. C. Surveying the moral landscape: Moral motives and group-based moralities // *Personality and Social Psychology Review*. – 2013. – V. 17. – №. 3. – P. 219-236.
17. Knyazev G.G., Mitrofanova L.G., Bocharov V.A. Validizaciya russkoyazychnoj versii oprosnika L. Goldberga «Markery faktorov „Bol'shoj Pyaterki"» // *Psixologicheskij zhurnal*. – 2010. – V. 31. – №. 5. – P. 100-110.
18. Kryukova T. L., Kuftyak E. V. Oprosnik sposobov sovladaniya (adaptaciya metodiki WCQ) // *Zhurnal prakticheskogo psixologa*. – 2007. – №. 3. – S. 93-112.
19. Lerner M.J. *The belief in a just world: A fundamental delusion*. New York, NY: Plenum Press. – 1980.
20. Lotz S. et al. The (in) stability of social preferences: Using justice sensitivity to predict when altruism collapses // *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*. – 2013. – V. 93. – P. 141-148.

21. McAdams D. P., Pals J. L. A new Big Five: fundamental principles for an integrative science of personality //American psychologist. – 2006. – V. 61. – №. 3. – P. 204.
22. McCrae R. R., Costa Jr P. T. A five-factor theory of personality //Handbook of personality: Theory and research. – 1999. – V. 2. – №. 1999. – P. 139-153.
23. McCrae, R. R., Costa, P. T., Jr. The five-factor theory of personality // Handbook of personality: Theory and research. – 2008 - P. 159–181
24. Mehrabian A., Epstein N. A measure of emotional empathy 1 //Journal of personality. – 1972. – V. 40. – №. 4. – P. 525-543.
25. Metodika «Lichnostnaya agressivnost' i konfliktnost'» / Diagnostika e'mocional'no-nravstvennogo razvitiya. Red. i sost. I.B.Dermanova. - SPb., – 2002. – S.142-146.
26. Mohiyeddini C., Schmitt M. J. Sensitivity to befallen injustice and reactions to unfair treatment in a laboratory situation //Social Justice Research. – 1997. – V. 10. – №. 3. – P. 333-353.
27. Molchanov S. V. Razvitie moral'no-cennostnoj orientacii lichnosti kak funkciya social'noj situacii razvitiya v podrostkovom i yunosheskom vozraste // Dissertaciya na soiskanie stepeni kandidata psixologicheskix nauk. – 2005.
28. Muntyan G. M. Social'naya spravedlivost' (filosofskie osnovaniya i formy ponimaniya) : dis. – Volgogradskij gosudarstvennyj universitet. – 2009.
29. Nartova-Bochaver S. K., Astanina N. B. «Unizhennost' i oskorblennost'» kak cherta lichnosti: fenomenologicheskij analiz pozicii zhertvy // Social'naya psixologiya i obshhestvo. – 2014b. – № 2. – S. 13-26.
30. Nartova-Bochaver S. K., Donat M., Rüprich C. Subjective Well-Being From a Just-World Perspective: A Multi-Dimensional Approach in a Student Sample //Frontiers in psychology. – 2019. – V. 10. – P. 1739.
31. Nartova-Bochaver S. K., Podlipnyak M. B., Xoxlova A. Yu. Vera v spravedlivyj mir i psixologicheskoe blagopoluchie u gluxix i slyshashhix podrostkov i vzroslyx //Klinicheskaya i special'naya psixologiya. – 2013. – №. 3. – S. 1-14.

32. Nartova-Bochaver S., Donat M., Astanina N., & Rüprich C. Russian adaptations of General and Personal Belief in a Just World Scales: Validation and psychometric properties //Social Justice Research. – 2018. – V. 31. – №. 1. – P. 61-84.
33. Nartova-Bochaver S.K., Astanina N.B. Psixologicheskie problemy spravedlivosti v zarubezhnoj personologii: teorii i e'mpiricheskie issledovaniya // Psixologicheskij zhurnal. – 2014a. – № 1.
34. Padun M. A., Kotel'nikova A. V. Modifikaciya metodiki issledovaniya bazisnyx ubezhdenij lichnosti R. Yanoff-Bul'man //Psixologicheskij zhurnal. – 2008. – T. 29. – №. 4. – S. 98-106.
35. Prixozhan A. M. Diagnostika lichnostnogo razvitiya detej podrostkovogo vozrasta //M.: ANO «PE'B. – 2007. – T. 56.
36. Rest J.R. The major components of morality // Morality, moral behavior, and moral development. New York; Wiley. – 1984. – P. 24-38.
37. Rosenberg M. Conceiving the self: Basic Books. NY. – 1979.
38. Rothmund T., Männel K., Altschner R. Is justice sensitivity a moral disposition //14th Biennial Conference of the International Society for Justice Research, Tel Aviv, Israel. – 2012.
39. Ryan R. M., Deci E. L. On happiness and human potentials: A review of research on hedonic and eudaimonic well-being //Annual review of psychology. – 2001. – V. 52. – №. 1. – P. 141-166.
40. Rye M. S. et al. Evaluation of the psychometric properties of two forgiveness scales //Current Psychology. – 2001. – V. 20. – №. 3. – P. 260-277.
41. Rye M. S. et al. Evaluation of the psychometric properties of two forgiveness scales //Current Psychology. – 2001. – V. 20. – №. 3. – P. 260-277.
42. Schmitt M. J., Mohiyeddini C. Sensitivity to befallen injustice and reactions to a real-life disadvantage //Social Justice Research. – 1996. – V. 9. – №. 3. – P. 223-238.
43. Schmitt M. J., Neumann R., Montada L. Dispositional sensitivity to befallen injustice //Social Justice Research. – 1995. – V. 8. – №. 4. – P. 385-407.

44. Schmitt M., Baumert A., Gollwitzer M., Maes J. The justice sensitivity inventory: Factorial validity, location in the personality facet space, demographic pattern, and normative data // *Social Justice Research*. – 2010. – V.23. – P.211–238.
45. Schmitt M., Gollwitzer M., Maes J., Arbach D. Justice sensitivity: Assessment and location in the personality space // *European Journal of Psychological Assessment*. – 2005. – V. 21. – P. 202–211.
46. Schwartz S. H. An overview of the Schwartz theory of basic values // *Online readings in Psychology and Culture*. – 2012. – V. 2. – №. 1. – P. 11.
47. Shadrikov V. D. Vospitanie sovesti // *Vysshee obrazovanie segodnya*. – 2017a. – №. 6. – S. 35-44.
48. Shadrikov V.D. Pokayanie kak faktor formirovaniya sovesti // *Psixologiya. Zhurnal Vysshej shkoly e'konomiki*. – 2006. – T. 3. – № 4. – S. 3–13.
49. Shadrikov V.D. *Sovest' i ee vospitanie M.: Universitetskaya kniga*. – 2017b. – 112 s.
50. Shadrikov V.D. *Sposobnosti i odarennost' cheloveka: Monografiya*. – M.: Izd-vo «Institut psixologii RAN», 2019. – 274 s. (Dostizheniya v psixologii)
51. Shhebetenko S. A. *Cherty lichnosti v refleksii i zhiznennyx proyavleniyax cheloveka. Dis.... dokt. psixol. nauk* //M.: VShE'. – 2017.
52. Tennant R. et al. The Warwick-Edinburgh mental well-being scale (WEMWBS): development and UK validation // *Health and Quality of life Outcomes*. – 2007. – V. 5. – №. 1. – P. 63.
53. Thibaut J., Walker L. *Procedural justice: a psychological analysis*. Hillsdale, NL: Erlbaum. – 1975.
54. Thompson L. Y. et al. Dispositional forgiveness of self, others, and situations // *Journal of personality*. – 2005. – V. 73. – №. 2. – P. 313-360.