Development of the Factors Related to Forgiveness Inventory (FRFI): Assessing Social-Cognitive Facilitators and Inhibitors of Interpersonal Forgiveness

Linda Blatt and Eleanor H. Wertheim

School of Psychological Science, La Trobe University, Melbourne, Australia 3086

Corresponding Author email: e.wertheim@latrobe.edu.au

For citation purposes, prior to citing, please check if this paper has appeared in print or online.   Prior to publication, cite as

Blatt, L., & Wertheim, E. H. (in press). Development of the Factors Related to Forgiveness Inventory (FRFI): Assessing social-cognitive facilitators and inhibitors of interpersonal forgiveness   *European Journal of Psychological Assessment.*

Summary

This research aimed to develop a brief, multi-factorial *Factors Related to Forgiveness Inventory* (FRFI), assessing social-cognitive factors that facilitate or inhibit forgiveness. In total, 512 participants completed a questionnaire, reporting trait forgivingness, and describing a specific transgression, characteristics of the offence or offender, beliefs about forgiving the offender, overall forgiveness and revenge, avoidance, and benevolence motivations toward the offender. Exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses suggested seven factors including positive post-transgression offender responses, perceived likelihood of the offender repeating offences, valuing the relationship with the offender, social influences to not forgive, believing forgiveness would be condoning or excusing the offence, intent of the offender, and spiritual beliefs about forgiveness. Construct, criterion, and incremental validity were assessed and supported validity of scores of the seven FRFI subscales for 415 adults. All subscales explained unique variance in overall forgiveness. Furthermore, FRFI subscales accounted for between 21% and 59% of variance in forgiveness-related constructs, after trait forgivingness was accounted for. One-week test-retest reliability suggested scores were temporally stable. The FRFI has potential for use in future research into factors facilitating and inhibiting forgiveness and in therapeutic contexts.

Recent decades have seen an emergence of literature related to the psychology of forgiveness (Riek & Mania, 2012; Worthington & Wade, 1999).   Forgiveness has been found to be associated with greater psychological well-being and physical health (Fehr, Gelfand, & Nag, 2010; Tse & Yip, 2009) as well as desirable relationship effects (Worthington & Scherer, 2004).   For these reasons, developing models and measures of the factors that facilitate forgiveness are important goals for researchers and practitioners interested in relationship processes and well-being.

The aim of our research was to develop a brief multi-dimensional measure of factors related to forgiveness that could be used in research, clinical and practical settings, to assess social-cognitive factors facilitating or inhibiting forgiveness after a specific offence. To date measures of forgiveness-related constructs have been developed, assessing forgiveness following a specific offence (situational forgiveness, e.g., McCullough, & Hoyt, 2002; Rye et al., 2001); trait forgivingness (e.g., Thompson et al., 2005), and forgiveness conceptualizations (Mullet, Girard, & Bakhshi, 2004). Additionally, social-cognitive constructs reflecting injured parties' perceptions of specific transgressions have been assessed, such as offender apology, perceived intent, relationship closeness, and relationship value (e.g., Koutsos, Wertheim & Kornblum, 2008; Fehr et al., 2010, Riek & Mania, 2012); however, multi-dimensional measures of a range of social-cognitive factors are still needed.

A brief multi-dimensional measure of social-cognitive factors predicting forgiveness would have many advantages. First, a measure assessing clearly differentiated factors will offer researchers a single device to concisely predict forgiveness. In practice contexts, administering a single measure of context-specific social and cognitive factors that facilitate or hinder forgiveness can be a starting point for interventions in counseling contexts. Therefore we aimed to develop a measure of social-cognitive factors associated with forgiving specific transgressions.

Defining and Predicting Forgiveness

Forgiveness is often defined as a transformation, following an offence or transgression, in which negative thoughts, feelings and behaviour toward an offender are replaced by positive thoughts, feelings and behaviour (Enright and the Human Development Study Group, 1991). Forgiveness has also been described as a motivational shift, in which avoidant and vengeful motivations are replaced with benevolent motivations (McCullough, Worthington, & Rachal, 1997). These changes occur even though the offended party continues to view the offender's harmful actions as unjust (Enright, et al, 1991; McCullough et al., 1997; 1998).

The extent to which someone forgives is likely to depend on both dispositional and situational factors. Certain people are thought to have a *disposition to forgive*, a general tendency to forgive transgressions which is stable across time, situations and relationships (Berry, Worthington, Parrott, O'Connor, & Wade, 2001; Riek & Mania, 2012). While trait forgivingness and personality predict forgiveness, research suggests that situational factors surrounding the offence and offender often predict more strongly (Fehr et al., 2010).

Several models of social-cognitive, contextual factors have been proposed. These models include factors such as the relationship between offender and forgiver, offender and transgression characteristics, environmental influences, and injured parties' perceptions of events, which all theoretically influence forgiveness (Kaminer, Stein, Mbanga & Zungu-Dirwayi, 2000; Koutsos et al., 2008; Worthington & Wade, 1999).

The measure developed in our study assessed social-cognitive factors potentially influencing a willingness to forgive after a specific offence. Thus the focus was primarily on injured parties' perceptions of the situation, and associated cognitions, rather than on injured party trait characteristics. Our research was founded on a study of four social-cognitive factors developed by Koutsos and colleagues (2008). Starting from qualitative interviews

exploring lay persons' perceptions of what facilitated and inhibited forgiving actual offences

(Wertheim, Love, Peck & Littlefield, 2006), items were developed and factor analyzed

(Koutsos et al., 2008). Four factors emerged: perceptions of positive offender post-offence

responses, expecting repeated offences, valuing the relationship with the offender, and

believing the offender's actions were not intentionally malicious. These factors correlated

with forgiveness of an offence, predicting beyond trait forgivingness. The current study

aimed to ascertain whether these four constructs would emerge as independent factors in new

samples, to improve upon these existing factors, and to extend the number of factors, resulting

in an expanded *Factors Related to Forgiveness Inventory* (FRFI). The existing and newly

proposed factors can be grouped into six categories.

Perceptions of the Offender and Offence. An injured party's perceptions about an

offender and offence are likely to predict forgiveness. *Attributions about the cause of the*

offence, such as inferring offenders acted in intentionally hurtful ways, can inhibit forgiveness

(Riek & Mania, 2012). A victim's *expectations of future re-offending* by the offender

(Koutsos et al., 2008) and that forgiveness might risk further exploitation (Burnette,

McCullough, Tongeren, & Davis, 2011) have also predicted lower forgiveness. Similarly,

general distrust of an offender has been proposed to inhibit forgiveness (Wieselquist, 2009).

Positive Post-Offence Offender Responses.   While most studies focus on apologies

following offences (Riek & Mania, 2012), a range of post-offence transgressor responses can

occur, including expressing remorse, rehabilitative efforts, and compensation (Ristovski &

Wertheim, 2005). Koutsos et al.'s study (2008) found that these responses clustered into a

single factor associated with greater forgiveness.

Relationship-Based Variables. When injured parties continue to *value the*

relationship with the offender, they appear less willing to risk losing it by remaining

unforgiving (Burnette et al., 2011, Koutsos et al., 2008). Similarly, closeness, commitment,

and investment in the relationship have been shown to predict forgiveness (Fehr et al., 2010).

The four factors from Koutsos and colleagues' (2008) study fell into the above categories. We examined three further potential influences on forgiveness, described next.

Social Influences. Perceptions of social influences feature in social psychological theories such as the Theory of Planned Behaviour (Fishbein & Ajzen, 1980), in which social norms are core predictors. Similarly, social influences have been proposed as predictive of forgiveness (Exline, Worthington, Hill and McCullough, 2003). Injured parties may withhold forgiving to conform to perceived external demands or norms. Therefore we assessed injured party perceptions of *social influences*, reflecting significant others' communications about whether the offender should be forgiven.

Spiritual Beliefs about Forgiving. Many theorists propose that religiosity and spirituality facilitate forgiving (Younger, Piferi & Lawler, 2004; Edwards et al., 2002). However in meta-analyses, while religiosity moderately predicts self-reported trait forgiveness; it is less predictive of forgiving specific offences (Riek & Mania, 2012). A more proximal and predictive factor appears to be beliefs that forgiving is spiritually important, since these beliefs are likely to become salient when thinking about transgressions (Davis, Hook, Tongeren, & Worthington's, 2012). Therefore, we assessed *spiritual beliefs about forgiving*, a concept similar to Davis et al.'s (2012) sanctification of forgiveness.

Beliefs about the Meaning of Forgiveness. Forgiveness theorists often distinguish between concepts of forgiving versus condoning, minimising or excusing an offence (Kaminer et al., 2000), and forgiveness interventions typically assist participants to make these conceptual distinctions (Wade, Worthington & Meyer, 2005). Theoretically, forgiving implies that the hurtful action was wrong, otherwise there is nothing to 'forgive'. However, offering forgiveness, particularly to an unrepentant offender, could be perceived as minimizing the offence's importance. Construing forgiveness in this way is likely to inhibit

engaging in a forgiveness process. Indeed, Butler, Dahler, and Fife (2002) found that framing forgiveness as implying condoning resulted in participants rating forgiveness therapy as less acceptable. We therefore assessed *believing forgiving would excuse or condone the offence*.

Aims and Overview

In summary, we sought to develop a multi-factorial *Factors Related to Forgiveness Inventory* which included social-cognitive facilitators and inhibitors of forgiveness. We aimed to examine whether four factors found by Koutsos et al. (2008) would be replicated, to improve upon those factors through adding further items, and to extend the number of factors into a more complete assessment tool. The goal was to develop a brief measure, with good psychometric properties including internal reliability, test-retest reliability, and construct, criterion and incremental validity of scores.

Study 1: Developing the Factors Related to Forgiveness Inventory

Materials and Methods

Participants. Through a social network method, 200 participants (75% female; 25% male) were recruited (named Group 1); of whom 72.7% resided in Australia. Age ranged from 18 to 68; Table 1 shows further demographics.

Materials. A self-report questionnaire included demographics and how religious and spiritual participants rated self, from 1 (*not at all)* to 5 (*extremely*). Participants described a specific time when someone treated them unfairly or hurt them.

Factors Related to Forgiveness Inventory Items. The 43 items developed by Koutsos et al. (2008) were included in the item pool for developing the FRFI. In addition, 51 new items were written, some expanding the item pool on existing factors: assessing offender's intent (5 items), offender's likelihood of reoffending (3), valuing the relationship or person (13). Items to create new constructs included believing forgiving would condone or excuse

the offence (11 items); third party social influence (9), spiritual beliefs about forgiving (5), and trust of the offender (5). Items (e.g., "The offender apologized") were rated from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*). Other measures assessed are described in Study 3.

Procedure. University ethics approval was obtained. Participants were invited, by email, Facebook, or word of mouth, to complete a survey on responses to hurtful inter-personal events. A snowball approach involved participants inviting others to take part. Participants completed an online survey, and could enter a prize draw for a shopping or movie voucher. Participants could volunteer to repeat the survey one week later.

Results

The original 94 items were initially reduced by removing those with very skewed distributions, and items that appeared multi-collinear and phrased similarly were dropped. Principle Axis Factoring, with Direct Oblimin rotation was run with 74 remaining items. Twelve factors with eigenvalues above 1.0 resulted; scree plot inspection indicated eight factors be retained. Items were dropped that did not load one of those factors or cross-loaded above 0.35 on two factors. The EFA was rerun several times to refine factors.

Through this process seven factors emerged with eigenvalues greater than 1.0, confirmed by scree plot inspection and Monte Carlo parallel analysis (95th percentile; Horn, 1965); which were conceptually coherent without cross-loadings. The final factors, in descending eigenvalue order, were named: *Positive Offender Post-Offence Responses* (6 items), *Belief that to Forgive is to Condone or Excuse the Offence* (condoning-related beliefs, 5 items), *Valuing the Relationship* (relationship value, 4 items), *Forgiveness-related Spiritual Beliefs* (spiritual beliefs, 3 items), *Social Influence to Not Forgive* (social influence, 3 items), *Perception that Offender is Unlikely to Reoffend* (unlikely to reoffend, 4 items), and *Perceived Offender Non-malicious Intent* (non-malicious intent, 4 items)

Study 2: Confirmatory Factor Analyses

Materials and Methods

Participants. Participants were obtained through three new sources: 215 participants recruited through a university volunteer registry (Group 2); 46 participants through another forgiveness-focused study supervised by the second author (Group 3); and 51 participants through well-being workshops for people with cancer and their support persons (Group 4). Of the combined sample (N=312), 77.2% were female, 22.8% male, age ranging from 18 to 72, with 95.2% residing in Australia. Table 1 shows demographic data.

Materials. Study 2 participants completed the same demographic, religiosity and spirituality measures as in Study 1. A transgression example was reported and the 29 final items established in Study 1 administered. Other measures are described in Study 3.

Procedure. Group 2 participants, obtained via the La Trobe University Participant Registry, completed an online survey. Group 3 participants, recruited through social network methods, completed a similar online survey for another study, with the 29 items added at the end. For Group 4, workshop facilitators administered hardcopy questionnaires at four residential well-being programs for people with cancer and support persons.

Results

A confirmatory factor analysis (CFA), using Amos V.19 maximum likelihood estimation of covariances was conducted. This resulted in normed χ^2 (CMIN/DF) = 1.85, RMSEA = 0.05, 90% C.I [.046, .058], SRMR = 0.05, and CFI = .945, suggesting adequate to good fit (Schweizer, 2010). All expected paths were significant and standardized weights exceeded .61 (p<.001). However, standardized residuals exceeding 2.85 and modification indices exceeding 11 and reflecting cross-loading paths, suggested the model would fit better with three items (not critical to constructs represented) removed. Error terms were not allowed to inter-correlate.

After removing these items, indices indicated a good fit: CMIN/DF= 1.39, RMSEA=

.04; SRMR = 0.04; TLI = .97; CFI= .98. Path weights were all significant, $p < 0.001$, with standardized weights from .60 to .97. Most latent constructs were significantly inter-correlated, $r = .16$ to $r = .53$.

The seven-factor structure and item loadings for the 26-item, optimal version are shown in Table 2. Items from each factor were averaged to form subscales of a *Factors Related to Forgiveness Inventory* (FRFI). Full sample Cronbach's alphas ranged from .76 to .91. Alphas for 37 participants born and residing outside of Australia were .71 to .94.

Factorial Consistency Across Age Groups. The groups from Studies 1 and 2 were combined and divided into two age subgroups: ≤ 25 years, $n = 235$, $M_{age} = 22.28$, $SD = 2.18$, and 26+ years, $n = 276$, $M_{age} = 38.09$, $SD = 13.28$. Confirmatory factor analyses were repeated with the final 26 items on each age group. Satisfactory fits were found: younger age group normed $\chi^2 = 1.16$, RMSEA = 0.03, 90% C.I [.008, .04], SRMR = 0.046, and CFI = .985; older group normed $\chi^2 = 1.38$, RMSEA = 0.043, 90% C.I [.032, .053], SRMR = 0.053, and CFI = .968. All standardized path weights exceeded .52 ($p<.001$).

Study 3: Validity and Test-retest Reliability

Study 3 aimed to establish construct validity, test-retest reliability, and incremental validity of FRFI scores.

Materials and Methods

Participants. Groups 1 and 2, described previously, comprised 415 participants, 78.6% female, 21.4% male; 86.2% resided in Australia. Table 1 displays demographics.

Materials. Measures were described in previous studies, plus the following were relevant to this study.

Dispositional measures. The *Heartland Forgiveness Scale – Others Subscale* (HFS-O; Thompson et al., 2005) measured disposition to forgive. This 6-item subscale is rated from 1

(*almost always false of me*) to 7 (*almost always true of me*). Our sample Cronbach's α= .82. Fischer and Fick's (1993) *Marlowe Crowne Social Desirability Scale revised form X1* was used. The *short version Spiritual Transcendence Scale* (Piedmont, 1999) assessed one's ability to stand outside one's immediate sense of time and place and to view life from a larger, objective perspective (Piedmont, 1999, p. 988). Our sample Cronbach's α =.79.

  Situational Variables Related to a Specific Transgression. After describing a specific transgression, degree of hurt was rated from 1 to 10 (*extremely hurtful*) and FRFI items completed.

  Situational Forgiveness. The 15-item *Forgiveness Scale* (Rye, Loiacono, Folck, Olszewski, Heim, & Madia, 2001) assessed *overall forgiveness* of the offender, using a 5-point Likert scale. Our sample Cronbach's α = .86. The *Transgression Related Interpersonal Motivations Inventory* (TRIM-18-R; McCullough & Hoyt, 2002) measures three motivations towards an offender: *revenge*, *avoidance*, and *benevolence*, rated on a 5-point scale. To address multicollinearity ($r = -.82$), a combined avoidance-nonbenevolence index was created. Cronbach's α for revenge = .87, avoidance-nonbenevolence = .94.

  Construct Validity Measures. Groups 1 and 2 completed further measures to assess construct validity. *The Dyadic Trust Scale* assessed interpersonal trust (Larzelere & Huston, 1980) of the offender. Our sample Cronbach's α = .94. *The Investment Model Scale* assessed commitment, satisfaction, quality of alternatives and investment size (Rusbult, Martz, & Agnew, 1998). Our sample Cronbach's α = .92. *The Relationship Attribution Measure responsibility-blame* subscale assessed attributions for another's behaviour, related to intent, motivation and blame (Fincham & Bradbury, 1992). The word *partner* was changed to *person*. Our sample Cronbach's α = .75. *Pre-transgression Closeness and Commitment* was measured by two items rated from 1 *(not at all close/committed)* to 7 *(extremely close/committed)* (Tsang, McCullough & Fincham, 2006) which were averaged to form an

index of pre-transgression closeness-commitment, $r = .76$.

Procedure. Twenty-eight participants repeated the survey at least one week later,

assessing test-retest reliability.

Results

Inverse transformation was applied to TRIM revenge to address skewness. Regarding

the described transgression, 83% reported feeling at least very hurt, $M = 4.35$; $SD = 0.83$.

Offender types included friend (32.5%), ex-partner (23.6%), spouse/partner (13.5%), family

member (12.5%), boss (4.8%), co-worker (3.6%), or other (9.4%). Table 3 displays

transgression types.

Construct Validity. Table 4 shows construct validity data, means and standard

deviations of FRFI scales. Overall forgiveness correlated between .26 to -.57 with FRFI

subscales. Revenge and avoidance-nonbenevolence correlated moderately with all factors

except spiritual beliefs for which correlations were significant but low.   Measures most

closely related theoretically to each FRFI subscale were most highly correlated with expected

FRFI scales at levels of .45 to .75, supporting construct validity.

Supporting discriminant validity, no FRFI subscale correlated significantly ($p < .05$)

with social desirability (rs $< .10$), or education ($r \leq .11$), and only spiritual beliefs correlated

with age ($r=.19$, $p<.001$; other rs $< .08$). FRFI subscales were not significantly associated

with gender ($t < 1.3$, $p > .20$).

Test-Retest Reliability. One week test-retest reliability ($n = 28$) on the seven FRFI

subscales ranged from $r = .74$ to $.93$.

Criterion-related Validity.   As shown in Table 5, a multiple regression predicting

overall forgiveness indicated that FRFI subscales predicted 52% of the variance, $p < 0.001$,

and all subscales contributed unique variance to the prediction. The prediction of avoidance-

nonbenevolence was also significant, $p < 0.001$; FRFI subscales together predicted 70% of the

variance; all subscales were unique contributors except spiritual beliefs. Prediction of revenge was significant, $p < 0.001$; FRFI subscales predicted 30% of the variance. All subscales contributed except for spiritual beliefs and positive offender responses.

Incremental Validity. To assess incremental validity, hierarchical regressions were conducted with disposition to forgive entered at step one, and FRFI subscales at step two. At step one, disposition to forgive predicted 29% of the variance of overall forgiveness, $F\Delta(1,413) = 170.12$, $p<.001$; 12% of avoidance-nonbenevolence, $F\Delta(1,413) = 57.74$, $p<.0005$; and 14% of revenge, $F\Delta(1,413) = 68.60$, $p<.001$. At step two, FRFI subscales contributed another 32% of forgiveness, $F\Delta(7,406) = 47.78$, $p<.001$; 59% of avoidance-nonbenevolence, $F\Delta(7,406) = 119.28$, $p<.001$; and 21% of revenge, $F\Delta(7,406) = 19.23$, $p<.001$.

Criterion-related Validity across Age Groups. To examine whether relationships between FRFI subscales and criterion variables were moderated by age, the sample was divided into two subgroups based on median split, ≤ 25 years, $n = 208$, and 26+ years, $n = 206$. For each subgroup, each FRFI subscale was correlated with overall forgiveness, avoidance-nonbenevolence, and revenge$_{inverse}$. Using Fisher r to z transformations, no significant differences ($p<.05$ two-tailed) were found between correlations for the younger versus older age groups. Analyses were repeated using three subgroups, ≤ 25, $n=208$; 26- 33, $n = 133$; and 34+ years, $n=73$; no significant differences between groups resulted.

Discussion

The Factors Related to Forgiveness Inventory developed here replicated, in a larger and more varied sample, four factors found by Koutsos et al. (2008), including Positive Offender Post-offence Responses, Non-malicious Intent, Relationship Value, and Unlikelihood of Re-offending, and introduced three new factors: Condoning-related Beliefs, Social Influence to Not Forgive, and Forgiveness-related Spiritual Beliefs. Supporting convergent validity, FRFI

subscales correlated with relevant measures of similar constructs, such as dyadic trust, relationship investment, blame attributions and forgiveness-related constructs. The FRFI subscale scores demonstrated criterion and incremental validity, statistically predicting forgiveness following a specific offence over and above trait forgivingness. Findings are consistent with situational variables being stronger predictors of forgiveness than trait forgivingness and support a multifactorial social-cognitive approach to predicting forgiveness.

Participants, of various ages and backgrounds, described a wide range of hurtful, actual offences, which helps generalize findings across types of offences and offenders. Furthermore, factor structure and levels of correlations between FRFI subscales and forgiveness-related variables were consistent across age groups.

A strength of the measure developed was a clarification of multiple independent factors, each contributing uniquely to forgiveness. While factors were allowed to inter-correlate, they represented separate constructs, which can assist in further theory building and practice. The measure has potential as a research tool contributing to clarifying the influence of contextual variables on forgiveness.

Understanding which types of social-cognitive variables are predictive of forgiveness can be useful for therapists. The FRFI has potential to pinpoint particular factors preventing a client from forgiving, enabling them to be addressed in therapy. Future research is needed to examine usefulness of the FRFI in therapeutic assessment contexts.

A limitation of this study is the cross-sectional design; future studies should include longitudinal designs to confirm predictive validity of scores. Test-retest reliability needs replication in larger samples. Demographics in the samples favored women, and more educated individuals; however, significant relationships were generally not found between subscales and gender or education, suggesting generalizability of findings. Our sample's level of religiosity was low, so future research should examine the spiritual beliefs subscale in

more religious samples.   Finally, volunteer response bias is possible, as people willing to answer emotionally laden questions may more readily contemplate forgiveness.

In future, to further demonstrate construct validity, a multi-method approach should be employed, including observational methods, interviews, daily monitoring, and significant other reports. Further research could expand upon factors included in the FRFI, considering characteristics such as offence-targeted rumination and empathy (Fehr et al., 2010; Riek & Mania, 2012). Empathy has been proposed as important in the forgiveness process (Wertheim, 2012), and it may facilitate some FRFI factors, such as perceptions of benign intent and relationship value. Furthermore, the inter-relationships among factors uncovered need examination; cognitive factors, such attributions of non-malicious intent and expecting repeated offending, may partially mediate relationships between social-environmental variables, such as social influences or positive offender responses, and forgiveness.

Finally, studies are needed examining generalizability of the FRFI across cultures. Most participants in our study were born and residing in Australia, although a range of countries of origin were included and some participants resided in other countries.

Conclusions

Overall, a multi-factorial measure based on a social-cognitive model of contextual factors that predict forgiveness was developed. Seven separate factors each appear to contribute to an understanding of the facilitators and inhibitors of interpersonal forgiveness. To our knowledge, this is the first large multi-factorial measure of factors predictive of forgiveness to appear in the literature. The new measure has potential for inclusion in future research and theory development, and application in clinical practice.

References

Armour, M. P. & Umbreit, M. S. (2005). The paradox of forgiveness in restorative justice. In

    E. L. Worthington, Jr. (Ed.), *Handbook of Forgiveness* (pp. 491 - 503). New York:

    Routledge.

Berry, J.W., Worthington, E.L., Parrott, L., O'Connor, L.E., & Wade, N.G. (2001).

    Dispositional forgiveness: Development and construct validity of the Transgression

    Narrative Test of Forgivingness. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 27*, 1277-

    1290.

Burnette, J. L., McCullough, M. E., Van Tongeren, D. R., & Davis, D. E. (2012). Forgiveness

    results from integrating information about relationship value and exploitation risk.

    Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 38, 345-356.

Butler, M.H., Dahler, S.K., & Fife, S.T. (2002). "Languaging" factors affecting clients'

    acceptance of forgiveness intervention in marital therapy. J*ournal of Marital and*

    Family Therapy, 28, 285-298.

Davis, D.E., Hook, J.N., Van Tongeren, D.R., Gartner, A.L., & Worthington Jr., E.L. (2012).

    Can religion promote virtue? *International Journal for the Psychology of Religion, 22*,

    252.

Edwards, L.M., Lapp-Rincker, R.H., Magyar-Moe, J.L., Rehfeldt, J.D., Ryder, J., Brown, J.

    C., & Lopez, S.J. (2002). A positive relationship between religious faith and

    forgiveness: Faith in the absence of data? *Pastoral Psychology, 50*, 147-152.

Enright, R.D., & the Human Development Study Group. (1991). The moral development of

    forgiveness. In W. Kurtines & J. Gewirtz (Eds), *Handbook of moral behaviour and*

    development (pp. 123-152). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Exline, J.J., Worthington Jr., E.L., Hill, P., & McCullough, M.E. (2003). Forgiveness and

    justice: A research agenda for social and personality psychology. *Personality and Social*

Psychology Review, 7, 337-348.

Fehr, R., Gelfand, M.J., & Nag, M. (2010). The road to forgiveness: A meta-analytic

synthesis of its situational and dispositional correlates. *Psychological Bulletin, 136*,

894-914.

Fincham, F.D., & Bradbury, T.N. (1992). Assessing attributions in marriage: The

Relationship Attribution Measure. *Journal of personality and social psychology, 62*,

457-468.

Fischer, D.G., & Fick, C. (1993). Measuring social desirability: Short forms of the Marlowe-

Crowne Social Desirability Scale. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 53*,

417-424.

Fishbein, M., & Ajzen, I. (1980). *Understanding attitudes and predicting social behavior.*

Englewood cliffs, N. J: Prentice-Hall.

Horn, J.L. 1965. A rationale and test for the number of factors in factor analysis.

Psychometrica, 30, 179-185.

Kaminer, D., Stein, D.J., Mbanga, I., & Zungu-Dirwayi, N. (2000). Forgiveness: Toward an

integration of theoretical models. *Psychiatry, 63*, 344-357.

Koutsos, P., Wertheim, E.H., & Kornblum, J. (2008). Paths to interpersonal forgiveness: The

roles of personality, disposition to forgive and contextual factors in predicting

forgiveness following a specific offence. *Personality and Individual Differences, 44*

337-348.

Larzelere, R.E., & Huston, T.L. (1980). The Dyadic Trust Scale: Toward understanding

interpersonal trust in close relationships. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 42*, 595-

604.

McCullough, M.E., & Hoyt, W.T. (2002). What we know (and need to know) about assessing

forgiveness constructs. In M.E. McCullough, K. Pargament & C.E. Thoresen (Eds.),

Forgiveness Theory, Research and Practice. NY: Guilford Press.

McCullough, M.E., Rachal, K.C., Sandage, S., Worthington, E.L., Brown, S., & Hight, T.L.

(1998). Interpersonal forgiving in close relationships: Two. Theoretical elaboration and

measurement. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 75*, 1586-1603.

McCullough, M.E., Worthington, E.L., & Rachal, K.C. (1997). Interpersonal forgiving in

close relationships. *Journal of personality and social psychology, 73*, 321-336.

Mullet, E., Girard, M., & Bakhshi, P. (2004). Conceptualizations of forgiveness. *European*

Psychologist, 9, 78-86.

Piedmont, R.L. (1999). Does spirituality represent the sixth factor of personality? Spiritual

transcendence and the five-factor model. *Journal of Personality, 67*, 985-1013.

Riek, B.M., & Mania, E.W. (2012).   The antecedents and consequences of interpersonal

forgiveness: A meta-analytic review. *Personal Relationships*, *19,* 304–325.

Ristovski, A., & Wertheim, E.H. (2005). Investigation of compensation source, trait empathy,

satisfaction with outcome and forgiveness in the criminal context. *Australian*

Psychologist, 40, 63-69.

Rusbult, C.E., Martz, J., & Agnew, C.R. (1998). The Investment Model Scale: Measuring

commitment level, satisfaction level, quality of alternatives, and investment size.

Personal Relationships, 5, 357-391.

Rye, M.S., Loiacono, D., Folck, C., Olszewski, B., Heim, T., & Madia, B.P. (2001).

Evaluation of the psychometric properties of two forgiveness scales. *Current*

Psychology: Developmental, Learning, Personal, Social, 20, 260-277.

Schweizer, K. (2010). Some guidelines concerning the modeling of traits and abilities in test

construction. *European Journal of Psychological Assessment, 26*, 1-2.

Thompson, L.Y., Snyder, C., Hoffman, L., Michael, S.T., Rasmussen, H.N., Billings, L.S., . .

. Roberts, D.J. (2005). Dispositional forgiveness of self, others, and situations. *Journal*

of Personality, 73, 313-359.

Tsang, J., McCullough, M.E., & Fincham, F.D. (2006). The longitudinal association between

forgiveness and relationship closeness and commitment. *Journal of Social and Clinical*

Psychology, 25, 448-473.

Tse, W.S., & Yip, T. (2009). Relationship among dispositional forgiveness of others,

interpersonal adjustment and psychological well-being: Implication for interpersonal

theory of depression. *Personality and Individual Differences, 46*, 365-368.

Wade, N. G., Worthington, E. L., Jr., & Meyer, J. E. (2005). But do they work? A meta-

analysis of group interventions to promote forgiveness. In E. L. Worthington, Jr. (Ed.),

Handbook of Forgiveness (pp. 423-439). New York: Routledge.

Wertheim, E. H. (2012). Empathy in the process of forgiveness. In Christie, D. J. (Ed).,

Encyclopedia of peace psychology (pp. 408-413). Maldon, MA: Blackwell.

Wertheim, E.H., Love, A., Peck, C., & Littlefield, L. (2006). *Skills for resolving conflict:*

Creating effective solutions through co-operative problem solving (2nd edition).

Melbourne, Victoria: Eruditions.

Wieselquist, J. (2009). Interpersonal forgiveness, trust, and the investment model of

commitment. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 26*, 531-548.

Worthington, E.L., & Scherer, M. (2004). Forgiveness is an emotion-focused coping strategy

that can reduce health risks and promote health resilience: Theory, review, and

hypotheses. *Psychology & Health, 19*, 385-405.

Worthington, J.R., & Wade, N.G. (1999). The psychology of unforgiveness and forgiveness

and implications for clinical practice. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 18*,

385-418.

Younger, J.W., Piferi, R.L., Jobe, R.L., & Lawler, K.A. (2004). Dimensions of forgiveness:

The views of laypersons. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 21*, 837-855.

Table 1.

Demographic Characteristics of the Samples

	Study 1 (*n*=200)	Study 2 (*n*=312)	Study 3[a] (*n*=415)
Country of birth			
Australia	65.5%	73.4	70.4%
UK	5.5%	6.1	5.3
Europe	5.5%	5.4	4.8
USA	4.0%	1.9	3.4
Other country	19.5%	13.2	14.1
Education level			
Masters or doctoral degree	16.5%	15.7	15.4
Bachelors or equivalent	62.0%	38.5	48.4
Technical diploma or some bachelors	8.5%	10.9%	10.4
Completed Year 12 or less	13.0%	34.9	25.8
Religion			
No religion	32.5%	45.2	38.3
Catholic	13.5%	13.8	14.0
Protestant	7.0%	13.5	10.1
Jewish	33.5%	9.2	21.9
Other	13.5%	18.4	15.7
Age mean (*SD*)	26.96 (6.82)	32.76 (13.99)	27.82 (9.19)
Religiosity[b] mean (*SD*)	1.86 (0.87)	1.89 (1.02)	1.86 (0.94)
Spirituality[b] mean (*SD*)	2.73 (1.09).	2.95 (1.21)	2.78 (1.13)

[a] Study 3 sample comprised Study 1 Group 1 and Study 2 Group 2

[b] Rated from 1 (*not at all*) to 5 (*extremely*)

Table 2.

FRFI Factors with Standardized Path Coefficients for Each Item

Factor	Path	Item
Positive offender post-offence	.83	The person tried to undo damage caused
responses	.86	Showed signs of remorse
	.94	Expressed feelings of guilt
	. 83	Apologized
Condoning-related beliefs	.73	If forgave means condoning what they did
	.82	If forgave makes seems like what they did was okay
	.89	If forgave I'd be letting the person get away with it
	.75	If forgave, wouldn't appreciate seriousness of actions
	.87	If forgave it would be excusing actions
Relationship value	.68	I valued the relationship
	.79	relationship would satisfy important needs
	.90	Time and effort put into relationship makes me value it
Spiritual beliefs	.68	My religious or spiritual beliefs encouraged to forgive
	.90	God or a higher spiritual power would want me to forgive
	.93	My religious beliefs were one should forgive
Social influence	.97	People tell me person does not deserve forgiveness
	.72	People telling let go of the relationship
	.79	Other people said I should not forgive
Unlikely to re-offend	.78	Believed the person would never do it again
	-.74	Likely would act in a similar way again
	-.84	Believed would repeat hurtful action.
	.67	A one-time act and would not be repeated
Non-malicious intent	.80	Person had not done the act on purpose to hurt
	.60	Person had good intentions
	.65	Intent most likely benign
	.60	What they did was not personal

Table 3.

Types of Transgressions Reported

Transgression	%
Friendship ended or friend distanced unfairly	16.7
Failed to support or reciprocate support	15.0
Devalued, disrespected	15.0
Unfairly blamed/accused	14.2
Betrayed trust/broke promises	13.4
Lied/withheld important information	12.6
Partner break up or distancing	10.2
Criticised or verbally abusive	9.3
Sexual infidelity	8.9
Spread lies/rumours	7.7
Self-centred/inconsiderate	6.1
Felt used	5.7
Workplace bullying	4.9
Public criticism/embarrassment	4.1
Deliberately hurtful/vengeful	3.3
Mistreated loved one	2.0
Sexual/physical assault	0.8

Note: Percentages based on respondents (87.4%) giving descriptions. Total

percentages exceed 100% because participants described multiple hurtful elements.

Table 4.

Construct validity (Pearson correlations), Means, Standard Deviations and Cronbach's Alphas of FRFI Subscales Scores

	Positive Offender Response	Condoning-related beliefs	Relationship Value	Spiritual beliefs	Social Influence to Not Forgive	Unlikely to Reoffend	Non-malicious Intent
Dyadic Trust Scale	.57	-.35	**.67**	-.06	-.40	**.70**	.48
Pre-Transgression Close/Commit	.25	-.05	**.45**	-.04	.03	.21	.12
Investment Model Scale	.41	-.14	**.75**	.01	-.29	.48	.33
Piedmont Spirituality Scale	-.07	-.13	.05	**.49**	-.12	.00	.12
Responsibility-Blame (RAM)	-.38	.34	-.51	.17	.38	**-.61**	**-.63**
Overall Forgiveness	.42	-.57	.42	.26	-.37	.49	.45
Revenge[a]	.28	-.35	.43	.13	-.30	.39	.38
Avoidance-Nonbenevolence	-.51	.43	-.75	-.18	.38	-.57	-.50
Average Item Mean (SD)	2.50 (1.25)	2.70 (1.20)	3.47 (1.22)	2.67 (1.18)	3.01 (1.09)	2.32 (0.98)	2.74 (0.98)
Cronbach's alpha	.90	.91	.83	.90	.86	.84	.76

[a] Due to inverse transformation, high revenge scores indicate low revenge motivations; *Note.* Highest expected correlations are in bold.

Table 5.

Multiple Regression Analyses of FRFI Subscales Predicting Forgiveness-Related Measures (N=415)

Predictor	TRIM Avoidance-nonbenevolence		TRIM Revenge[a]		Overall Forgiveness	
	β	sr	β	sr	β	sr
Positive offender responses	-.11**	-.09	-.02	-.02	.12**	.10
Condoning-related beliefs	.19***	.17	-.19***	.17	-.37***	-.33
Relationship value	-.53***	-.43	.24***	-.20	.13**	.10
Spiritual beliefs	-.05	-.05	.02	-.02	.12**	.12
Social influence to not forgive	.09**	.08	-.09*	.08	-.12**	-.11
Unlikely to reoffend	-.14***	-.11	.15**	-.11	.15**	.11
Non-malicious intent	-.08*	-.06	.14**	-.11	.13**	.11
F (7, 407), *Adj R^2*	F = 132.65*** *Adj R^2*= .69		F = 25.18*** *Adj R^2* = .29		F = 63.15*** R^2 = .51	

[a] High revenge scores indicate low revenge motivations.   *$p < 0.05$, ** $p<0.01$, ***$p<0.001$