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In empirical review of related literature provides a strong foundation and generates insights in the mind of research. Reviewed theories and conducted studies are essential for a researcher to set the objectives, research questions and formulate the hypotheses as well as design the entire research. Hence in the present study also exhaustive effort is made to review the studies of related variables involved in the present investigation.


2.1 Studies on Forgiveness

Suchday, Friedberg and Almeida (2006) measured forgiveness, rumination, stress, and physical health in Indian college students to compare their responses to that of a US sample. Participants were 188 college students, 92 males and 96 females from Mumbai, India. Results indicated that lower levels of forgiveness predicted increased rumination and stress, but not physical symptoms. Similar to data in the US, rumination mediated the relationship between forgiveness and stress. There were no
significant differences in forgiveness, rumination, or stress between the Indian and US samples. Results suggested the universality of these variables across cultures.

Mullet, Girard and Bakhshi (2004) surveyed the extent to which (1) laypeople agree with conceptualizations of forgiveness encountered in literature, notably that forgiveness supposes the replacement of negative emotions toward the offender by positive emotions, (2) forgiveness is a process that can only take place between an offended and an offender who is known to the offended and (3) forgiveness is not a process that devalues the forgiven but a process that encourages him/her to behave better in the future. A total of 343 students participated in the study. Four conceptualization factors were identified: Change of Heart, More-Than-Dyadic Process, Encourages Repentance, and Immoral Behavior. 23% of participants agreed with the idea that forgiving supposes regaining affection or sympathy toward the offender and 33% of with the idea that forgiveness could be encouraged repentance from the forgiven. 46% of participants agreed with the ideas that the forgiver could be somebody in close relationship with the offended and that the forgiven could be an unknown offender or an abstract institution. Only 4% of participants agreed with the idea that forgiveness is immoral.

Mullet, Nann, Kadiangandu, Neto and Pinto (2010) suggested the model for representing intergroup forgiveness had been extended through the examination of data from a large sample of 1036 of Asian (Cambodians and East Timorese) and African (Angolans, Guineans and Mozambicans) adults who had been personally affected by long-term wars and conflicts in their area. Exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses showed that a nine-factor model could adequately fit the whole set of data. Overall, a large majority of the participants agreed with the view that forgiveness as an intergroup process was conceivable. For a majority of the participants: The aim of the intergroup forgiveness process is reconciliation with the former offender; it should be democratic, in other words, forgiveness should not be decided solely by politicians, traditional or religious authorities, forgiveness should be announced to the whole community using broad international languages and (it should be an all-encompassing process, that is, it should encompass all the members of the requesting group, all the members of the forgiving group and all the offences.
Neto, Pinto and Mullet (2007) surveyed on intergroup forgiveness conducted among people from East Timor and Angola, most of who had been personally touched by the various conflicts affecting their countries. Only one of the two aspects of intergroup forgiveness was assessed: granting forgiveness. A sample of 354 East Timorese adults was presented with a questionnaire addressing the meaningfulness of intergroup forgiveness and possible conceptions about granting intergroup forgiveness. Using confirmatory factor analysis, this model was subsequently tested on a sample of 250 Angolan adults. In both samples, a large majority of participants agreed with the idea that a group of people can forgive another group of people. A majority of participants agreed with the idea that (a) the aim of this process is reconciliation and that intergroup forgiveness is not strictly conditional on adequate reparation or compensation, and (b) this process must be democratic; in other words, granting forgiveness should be decided by a majority.

Younger, Piferi, Jobe and Lawler (2004) studied perspective to the forgiveness discussion by investigating lay definitions of forgiveness, as well as reasons for forgiveness and non-forgiveness. In Study 1, undergraduate students completed a questionnaire packet in which they provided three narratives of interpersonal offense: a time when they had been hurt and then forgave the offender, a time when they had been hurt and did not forgive, and a time when they had hurt someone else and were forgiven. Respondents were also asked questions about their conceptualization of forgiveness and the factors that influence their decisions to forgive or not forgive. In Study 2, community adults participated in interviews during which they described a time when they had been betrayed or hurt. Following their story, participants answered questions about their definitions of and motivations for forgiveness. A number of important themes in forgiveness definition and motivation are identified, and important similarities and differences between the under-graduate and community samples are discussed. In particular, it is noted that primary motivations for forgiveness appear to be largely self-focused, rather than altruistic.

Tam, Hewstone, Kenworthy, Cairns, Marinetti, Geddes and Parkinson (2008) studied crucial psychological processes to moving beyond a history of violent sectarian conflict in Northern Ireland. The study investigated the predictors of intergroup forgiveness, in terms of intergroup emotions, infra-humanization, empathy,
and intergroup contact. Intergroup trust and measures of implicit intergroup bias were also explored in this area of real intergroup conflict. The results are discussed in terms of their implications for post-conflict reconciliation in Northern Ireland and other conflict areas.

Greenaway, Louis, Michael and Wohl (2012) identified why and under what conditions perpetrator groups expect forgiveness from victims when focused on common humanity. In Experiment 1: 41 participants thinking about victims as fellow humans increased expectations of forgiveness among perpetrator group members. Experiment 2: 74 participants revealed the important role of subjective temporal distance in qualifying the effect of appealing to common humanity. Forgiveness expectations increased when a transgression was perceived as temporally distant rather than close. Experiment 3: 70 participants revealed that expecting forgiveness was associated negatively with remorse for wrongdoing and revealed reduced empathy for victims as a mediator of the effect. Taken together, the findings reveal that factors shown to encourage forgiveness among victims can also create corresponding expectations among perpetrators.

Suwartono, Prawastia and Mullet (2007) explored the factorial structure of forgivingness in an Indonesian sample, compared Indonesian and French students’ forgivingness scores, and assessed the relationship between forgivingness and emotional regulation among Indonesian participants. The same three-factor structure (lasting resentment, sensitivity to circumstances and willingness to forgive) that was evidenced in European samples was evidenced in the Indonesian sample. Sensitivity to circumstances and willingness to forgive scores were higher, and lasting resentment scores lower, among Indonesian students than among French students. Lasting resentment was negatively associated with reappraisal, and sensitivity to circumstances was positively associated with both reappraisal and suppression.

Neto and Mullet (2004) examined the relationship between forgivingness (enduring resentment, sensitivity to circumstances, and overall propensity to forgive) and a number of personality dimensions relevant to forgivingness. The main relationships between forgivingness and personality concerned the interpersonal dimensions of personality: shyness, embarrassment, independence from others, and interdependence with others. However, the intra-personal, strictly self-referential
concomitants of these dimensions (self-esteem and loneliness) were not much linked to forgivingness. Furthermore, each personality factor had a distinct link with forgivingness: independence made the resentment still more enduring, shyness and social embarrassment exacerbated the sensitivity to circumstances, and interdependence increased the willingness to forgive. These findings throw light on the double aspect of forgiveness as intra- and inter-individual and on the relative independence of these aspects.

Park (2012) evaluated the psychometric utility of Decisional Forgiveness Scale and Emotional Forgiveness Scale for the North Korean refugee population and explored the relationship among social adaptation, religious commitment, unforgiveness, forgiveness style and mental health variables (trauma symptoms and depression) among North Korean refugees. Confirmatory Factor Analyses were conducted to investigate the North Korean version of DFS and EFS with collected data from 269 North Korean refugees. The forgiveness instruments, when modified with appropriate item deletions, could be considered as useful for North Korean refugees.

Miller, Worthington, Jr. and McDaniel (2008) conducted a meta-analysis with 53 articles reporting 70 studies that addressed gender and forgiveness. Females were more forgiving than males. Potential methodological moderators were examined: (a) type of sample, (b) target of forgiveness, (c) trait, state, or familial/marital forgiveness, (d) actual versus hypothetical transgressions, (e) measurement modalities (i.e., questionnaire, experiment, or survey), (f) type of forgiveness measure, (g) published or not published, (h) validated measures versus non-validated measures, and (i) culture. No methodological variables moderated the relationship between gender and forgiveness. However, there were larger gender differences on vengeance than any other forgiveness-related measure. Other potential moderators were suggested as possibly influencing the gender difference including functional differences processing forgiveness, differences in dispositional qualities, and situational cues.

Wang (2008) studied the associations between measures of adult attachment and forgiveness in college students in Taiwan. 203 women and 82 men participants completed measures of adult attachment dimensions (Adult Attachment Scale), State
Forgiveness (Forgiveness Scale), and Trait Forgiveness (Forgiveness Likelihood Scale). Pearson correlations and regression results indicated ratings on three dimensions of Adult attachment, Dependence, Anxiety, and Closeness, were significantly related to State Forgiveness, and all but scores on Dependence were significantly related to scores on Trait Forgiveness.

Mathias (2008) examined age differences in forgivingness, defined as an enduring tendency to forgive others. Building on the theory of socio-emotional selectivity, the study aimed at clarifying the role of future time perspective and social proximity on age differences in forgivingness. 132 Older and 225 younger participants were instructed to judge their willingness to forgive as a function of social proximity and future time perspective. Controlling for self-reported future time perspective, results indicate that older adults were more willing to forgive than younger adults. Social proximity did not play a role in older adults, whereas younger adults reported greater forgivingness with respect to a friend as compared to an acquaintance. In addition, results demonstrate that the perception of future time plays an essential role in forgivingness. An age by future time perspective interaction effect was found, suggesting that the effect of limited future time perspective was smaller in older adults than in younger adults.

Suwartono and Mullet (2006) explored the factorial structure of forgivingness in an Indonesian sample, compared Indonesian and French students’ forgivingness scores, and assessed the relationship between forgivingness and emotional regulation among Indonesian participants. The same three-factor structure (lasting resentment, sensitivity to circumstances and willingness to forgive) that was evidenced in European samples was evidenced in the Indonesian sample. Sensitivity to circumstances and willingness to forgive scores were higher, and lasting resentment scores lower, among Indonesian students than among French students. Lasting resentment was negatively associated with reappraisal, and sensitivity to circumstances was positively associated with both reappraisal and suppression.

Green, Burnette and Davis (2008) tested the hypothesis that close friends of victims (third parties) are less forgiving than the victims themselves (first parties). In this experiment individuals imagined a scenario in which either their romantic partner or the romantic partner of a close friend committed the identical relationship offense.
Third parties were less forgiving than first parties, a phenomenon we termed the third-party forgiveness effect. This effect was mediated by attributions about the perpetrator's intentions and responsibility for the offense.

Cehajic, Brown and Castano (2008) examined the effects of contact and common-in-group identification on intergroup forgiveness and out-group behavioral tendencies. A sample of Bosnian Muslims (N = 180) were asked to report their readiness to forgive the misdeeds committed by Bosnian Serbs during the 1992–95 war in Bosnia and Herzegovina. A path analysis of the presumed antecedents and consequences of forgiveness revealed that frequent and good quality contact with members from the perpetrator group predicted forgiveness (positively) and desire for social distance (negatively). Moreover, the positive relationship between contact and forgiveness was mediated by empathy and trust towards the out-group and by perceived out-group heterogeneity. Common-in-group identification was also found to be positively associated with forgiveness and negatively with social distance towards the out-group. Finally, inter group forgiveness also predicted social distance from the out-group.

Exline and Zell (2009) studied how empathic processing and self-affirmation would influence responses to transgression? After undergraduates (84 men, 83 women) recalled situations when they were hurt or offended, they were randomly assigned to either recall a similar offense of their own, consider the offender's perspective, recall a self-affirming situation, or recall a typical week (control). The similar offense and perspective-taking conditions prompted higher empathy but also more negative emotions (guilt, sadness, anger) than the other two conditions. As predicted, the similar offense and perspective-taking conditions yielded lower vengefulness and expressed hostility than the control and self-affirmation conditions but only for men.

Toussaint and Webb (2005) examined gender differences in levels of empathy and forgiveness and the extent to which the association of empathy and forgiveness differed by gender. Participants were 127 community residents who completed self-report measures of empathy and forgiveness. The present results showed that women were more empathic than men, but no gender difference for forgiveness was apparent. The association between empathy and forgiveness did differ by gender. Empathy was associated with forgiveness in men but not in women.
Farrow, Zheng, Wilkinson, Spence, Deakin, Tarrier, Griffiths and Woodruff (2001) used functional MRI to detect brain regions engaged by judging others' emotional states and the forgivability of their crimes. Ten volunteers read and made judgments based on social scenarios and a high level baseline task (social reasoning). Both empathic and forgivability judgments activated left superior frontal gyrus, or bitofrontalgyrus and precuneus. Empathic judgments also activated left anterior middle temporal and left inferior frontal gyri, while forgivability judgments activated posterior cingulate gyrus. Empathic and forgivability judgments activate specific regions of the human brain, which we propose contribute to social cohesion.

Macaskill, Maltby and Liza (2002) explored the relationship between forgiveness and empathy in 324 British undergraduate students (aged 18-51 yrs). Participants completed measures of forgiveness of self, forgiveness of others and one of emotional empathy. It was found that women scored higher overall than did men on empathy, but there were no gender differences on overall forgiveness scores. Despite the difference in empathy scores, the findings suggest that, among both men and women, individuals with higher levels of empathy find it easier to work toward forgiveness of others, but not necessarily toward forgiveness of themselves.

Konstam, Holmes and Levine (2003) expanded understanding of forgiveness by (a) distinguishing forgiveness from unforgiveness and their respective correlates (empathy and selfism) and (b) examining coping style and its impact on the process of forgiveness and unforgiveness. Participants were 92 students in a large northeastern urban public university. Correlates of forgiveness and unforgiveness were distinctly different. With respect to forgiveness, 42% of the variance was explained by the variables under study. Emotion-focused coping was associated with forgiving.

Burnette, Davis, Green, Worthington and Bradfield (2009) investigated the associations between attachment, empathy, rumination, forgiveness, and depressive symptoms via the framework of attachment theory. Participants (N = 221; 141 F and 80 M) completed a battery of questionnaires. It was hypothesized that (a) anxious and avoidant attachment would be negatively linked to dispositional forgiveness; (b) the anxious attachment–forgiveness link would be mediated through excessive rumination; (c) the avoidance attachment–forgiveness link would be mediated through lack of empathy; and (d) the insecure attachment–depression relation would, in turn,
be partially mediated by the forgiveness process. SEM modeling confirmed these propositions, revealing the potential deleterious outcomes associated with insecure attachment and unforgiving responses to offenses.

David and Choi (2006) examined major theoretical assumptions about forgiveness by victims of human rights abuses in the context of transitional justice in the Czech Republic. The authors hypothesize that forgiveness is facilitated by restoring equality between victims and perpetrators, namely: individual, social and political empowerment of victims; decreasing the superior position of perpetrators, especially through their punishment; and a repentant gesture of perpetrators towards victims, especially by apologizing. The results of path analysis confirm that religious belief, individual, social, and political empowerment, punishment, and apology directly promote forgiveness.

Karremans, Lange and Holland (2005) examined whether forgiveness may spill over beyond the relationship with the offender, promoting generalized pro-social orientation. Consistent with hypotheses, study revealed that forgiveness compared to unforgiveness is generally associated with higher levels of a generalized pro-social orientation, as indicated by higher levels of frame of mind (as indicated by a greater use of first-person plural pronouns, e.g., we, us, in a language task) and greater feelings of relatedness toward others in general. Moreover, forgiveness (vs. unforgiveness) was associated with greater probability of donating to charity and greater willingness to engage in volunteering. Finally, the authors found forgiveness restores generalized prosocial orientation to baseline levels within the relationship.

Leach, Baker and Hill (2011) examined the association between Black racial identity attitudes and the forgiveness of Whites. An intergroup forgiveness instrument developed to assess forgiveness between Protestants and Catholics in Northern Ireland was adapted to assess racial forgiveness. Results were generally consistent with our predictions. The Internalization Multiculturalist Inclusive identity scale predicted both Future and Never Forgiving. The Immersion-Emersion Anti-White and Internalization Afrocentric scale predicted Never Forgiving but not Future Forgiving. Dispositional forgiveness and personality features were found to be associated with intergroup forgiveness.
Karremans and Smith (2010) examined the association between power, defined in terms of experienced control over outcomes and resources in a relationship, and interpersonal forgiveness. Based on recent findings in the literature suggesting that power is associated with goal directedness, it was hypothesized that high levels of experienced power should facilitate forgiveness, in particular in relationships of strong commitment. The results of three studies, using both correlational and experimental designs, supported this prediction: Power was positively associated with forgiveness, but this effect was stronger in relationships of strong (rather than weak) commitment. This pattern of results was observed for both the inclination to forgive hypothetical offenses and actual forgiveness regarding a past offense.

Thompson, Snyder and Hoffman (2005) studied forgiveness. The Heartland Forgiveness Scale (HFS), a self-report measure of dispositional was developed and demonstrated good psychometric properties. Forgiveness correlated positively with cognitive flexibility, positive affect, and distraction; it correlated negatively with rumination, vengeance, and hostility. Forgiveness predicted four components of psychological well-being (anger, anxiety, depression, and satisfaction with life); forgiveness of situations accounted for unique variance in these components of psychological well-being.

VanOyen, Ludwig and Laan (2001) examined the immediate emotional and physiological effects that occurred when participant (35 females, 36 males) rehearsed hurtful memories and nurse grudges (i.e., were unforgiving) compared with when they cultivate empathic perspective taking and imagined granting forgiveness (we're forgiving) toward real-life offenders. Forgiving thoughts prompted greater perceived control and comparatively lower physiological stress responses. The results dovetail with the psychophysiology literature and suggest possible mechanism through which chronic unforgiving responses may erode heal whereas forgiving responses may enhance it.

Matsuyuki (2011) investigated the process of forgiveness and the relationship among state forgiveness, self-compassion, and psychological well-being experienced by Buddhists in the United States. A convenience sample of 112 adults completed an online survey. Multiple regression analysis was performed to examine the impact of gender, age, and the years spent in Buddhist practice on state forgiveness and self-
compassion. State forgiveness positively predicted psychological well-being. The years spent in Buddhist practice positively predicted self-compassion. Age did not predict any of the three primary variables. Gender did not predict state forgiveness.

Burnette, Taylor, Worthington and Forsyth (2007) predicted that secure attachment reduces angry rumination and promotes forgiveness. To examine this prediction, in Study 1 (n = 213), participants completed the Experience in Close Relationships Scale and the Trait Forgiveness Scale. Individuals who were classified as securely attached displayed greater dispositional forgivingness than did insecurely attach. In Study 2 (n = 218) we included the Dissipation-Rumination Scale. Results from Study 2 replicated the association between attachment security and greater dispositional forgivingness and confirmed the mediating role of angry rumination in the attachment forgivingness relation.

Merolla (2008) coded retrospective accounts of transgression and forgiveness situations in ongoing friendships and dating relationships based on Kelley’s three forms of forgiveness granting (direct, indirect, and conditional). Across the sample, indirect forgiveness was reported most frequently, followed by direct and conditional forgiveness. Forgiveness-granting tendencies varied by relationship type, as friends reported more instances of indirect forgiveness than did dating partners, and dating partners reported more instances of conditional forgiveness than did friends. For both relationship types, transgressions of increasing severity and blameworthiness tended to be forgiven indirectly or conditionally. An additional focus of this study was on ongoing negative affect (ONA) that persists after forgiveness has been communicated to a transgressor. ONA was salient for about 22% of participants, was positively related to transgression severity and was negatively related to relational satisfaction. Conditional forgivers reported higher levels of ONA than did direct or indirect forgivers.

Girard and Mullet (1997) studied the evolution of the propensity to forgive an offense in a sample of 236 people from various age groups. The effect of a number of circumstances connected with the offense was considered: intent to harm, severity of consequences, cancellation of consequences, social proximity to the offender, apologies from the offender, and the attitude of others. The method was an application of information integration theory. A global increase in the propensity
to forgive from adolescence to old age was observed. Several interactions between age and circumstances were found: (a) The effect of the cancellation factor was higher in young adolescents and in the very old than in the middle-aged, (b) the attitude of others and the restoration of harmony factors were important only in adolescents. Finally, the structure of the Forgiveness schema was shown to be an additive one, regardless of the age of the participants.

McCullough and Worthington (1994) hypothesized to yield cognitive, emotional, and interpersonal benefits to individuals who forgive others of significant interpersonal offenses, though little evidence supports these claims. Religious counsellors and clients value forgiveness and its implementation in counselling, and forgiveness is frequently encouraged in religious counselling. Forgiveness receives little attention from many non-religious professionals and remains to be investigated critically. In light of the potential benefits associated with forgiving, researchers and practitioners are encouraged to consider forgiveness as a therapeutic technique and to investigate its effects scientifically.

Hui and Ho (2004) examined the implementation of forgiveness as a guidance programme with Hong Kong Chinese adolescents in the classroom setting. The forgiveness programme was based on Enright’s process model of forgiveness. The effectiveness of the programme was evaluated, using both quantitative and qualitative methods. Findings showed that it is viable to promote forgiveness as a classroom guidance programme. Though no significant improvement in participants’ self-esteem and hope was found, participants showed a better understanding of forgiveness, had a more positive attitude towards their offenders, and were more willing to apply forgiveness as a strategy. They also evaluated the forgiveness programme positively, specifically the use of an experiential approach.

Cioni (2006) described as a process that includes (1) re-constructing cognitions about the offender and self and (2) re-imaging the offender and re-experiencing self and violator. Object relations theory can help to show that the violated individual’s conflict is within as the person struggles inwardly with hostile images (object-representations) during the process of forgiveness. Within the context of forgiveness as a therapeutic process, cognitive restructuring and object transformation can promote the client’s psychological health and well-being. It is
proposed that forgiveness is a spiritual as well as a psychological process, which includes grace-filled choices and behaviour.

**Ballester, Sastre** and **Mullet** (2009) assessed the relationships between conceptualizations of forgiveness and general propensity to forgive. A positive association was found between unconditional forgiveness and the beliefs that (a) forgiveness corresponds to a decrease in negative feelings and to an increase in positive feelings towards the offender and (b) forgiveness is a broad process that is not limited to the victim-offender dyad. A positive association between the view that forgiveness is immoral and propensity to lasting resentment was also found. These associations were evidenced beyond the associations already found with educational level, religious involvement, and personality variables.

**Sastre, Vinsonneau, Neto, Girard** and **Mullet** (2003) aimed at examining the link between satisfaction with life and forgivingness using a dispositional measurement for forgiveness. The participants were 810 adolescent and adults living in France, and 192 college students living in Portugal. They were presented with the Forgivingness and the Satisfaction with Life Scale. The link between satisfaction with life and all three components of forgivingness (enduring resentment, sensitivity to circumstances, and overall willingness to forgive) was weak, and most of the time non-significant. This result is consistent with previous findings showing that (a) forgiving an offense to an offender does not result in a strong increase in overall satisfaction, and (b) strictly self-referential traits (self-esteem and loneliness) are typically not linked with forgivingness. Possible reasons why forgivingness and satisfaction with life are not linked are discussed.

**Miller, Worthington** and **McDaniel** (2008) conducted a meta-analysis with 53 articles reporting 70 studies that addressed gender and forgiveness. The mean $d$ was 0.28 indicating that females are more forgiving than males. Potential methodological moderators were examined: (a) type of sample (b) target of forgiveness (c) trait, state, or familial/marital forgiveness (d) actual versus hypothetical transgressions (e) measurement modalities (questionnaire, experiment, or survey) (f) type of forgiveness measure (g) published or not published (h) validated measures versus non–validated measures and culture. No methodological variables moderated the relationship between gender and forgiveness. There were larger gender differences on vengeance than any other forgiveness related measure.
By, Day and Barber (2005) examined the relationship between forgiveness and happiness using a two-dimensional model of happiness (hedonic and eudaimonic happiness). 224 United Kingdom students were administered the Enright’s Forgiveness Inventory, The Depression–Happiness Scale and the Oxford Happiness Questionnaire – Short-form. The present findings suggest that forgiveness accounts for statistically significant variance, albeit quite low, in both hedonic and eudaimonic happiness and the relationships may vary depending on which aspect of happiness is being considered. In terms of shorter-term hedonic happiness, the present findings suggest it is important not to engage in negative cognitions about the transgression. In terms of maintaining eudaimonic happiness, engaging in positive behaviours and feelings may lead to, be the result of, or be very much part of longer-term happiness.

Flanagan, Hoek, Ranter and Reich (2012) examined the potential of forgiveness as a coping response for negative peer experiences in early adolescence. Participants were 616, 6th through 8th grade students at a middle school (46% girls) who completed self-report measures of bullying and victimization experiences, general coping strategies in response to bullying, social anxiety, self-esteem, and a measure of forgiveness to a self-identified experience of being bullied or hurt by a peer. Forgiveness was positively associated with conflict resolution, advice and support seeking strategies, and negatively associated with revenge seeking. Forgiveness was also positively associated with concurrent self-esteem and negatively associated with social anxiety.

Strelan and Sutton (2012) provided further evidence that justice and forgiveness are not necessarily competitive responses. 157 undergraduates were instructed to recall either serious or benign transgressions, just-world belief’s for the self (BJW-self) was associated with forgiveness as inhibition of negative responding but not forgiveness as positive responding. Each of these relations was significantly moderated by transgression severity: the more benign the transgression, the stronger the relationship. Just-world beliefs for others (BJW-others) was negatively associated with inhibition of negative responding and unrelated to positive responding. These relations held over and above well-established predictors of transgression-specific forgiveness (relationship closeness and post-transgression offender effort), and an individual difference variable, justice sensitivity.
Tse and Cheng (2006) examined if depression predicts forgiveness beyond the effects of transgression and relationship closeness, and whether its effect on forgiveness is strongest in specific transgression–closeness situations. 119 university students were randomly assigned into one of two experimental conditions in which they were presented with hypothetical scenarios depicting a mild as well as a serious offense by either an acquaintance or a best friend. They also filled out a depression inventory. Results confirmed a depression transgression, closeness interaction effect, in addition to a main effect of depression, on forgiveness. Depressed and non-depressed persons were similarly forgiving when they were severely offended by an acquaintance, or when they were mildly offended by a best friend. These findings were explained in terms of how the cognitive biases of depressed people operate in different relationship contexts and under different emotional intensities following the offense.

Tabak and McCullough (2011) examined the relationships of (a) victims’ agreeableness and neuroticism, and (b) victims’ perceptions of their transgressors’ agreeableness and neuroticism with plasma cortisol responses in women and (in a larger sample of men and women) forgiveness over time. Victims who perceived their transgressors as highly agreeable had (a) lower cortisol responses following a simulated speech to the transgressor, and (b) higher self-reported forgiveness, even after controlling for initial levels of forgiveness. Participants’ own agreeableness and neuroticism had negligible associations with cortisol response and forgiveness over time.

2.2 Studies on Individualism and collectivism

Hook, Worthington and Utsey (2008) proposed a theoretical model that clarifies the relationship between collectivism and forgiveness. The importance of maintaining social harmony in collectivistic cultures is central to this relationship. The model had two propositions. First, collectivistic forgiveness occurs within the broad context of social harmony, reconciliation, and relational repair. Second, collectivistic forgiveness was understood as primarily a decision to forgive but was motivated largely to promote and maintain group harmony rather than inner peace (as is more often the case in individualistically motivated forgiveness). Finally, the authors
suggested a research agenda to study collectivistic forgiveness and provide guidelines for addressing forgiveness with collectivistic clients.

**Kadiangandu, Mullet and Vinsonneau (2001)** examined the factorial structure of the responses of Congolese participants to a willingness-to-forgive already used on European samples. The same two factors, revenge and circumstances, were found. Then they examined the overall level of willingness to forgive expressed by Congolese as compared to that found in European samples. The hypothesis that the Congolese are less willing to seek revenge than the Europeans was supported by the data. Finally studied possible Congo-Europe differences in the way education, religious practice, and other characteristics are related to revenge and circumstances. On overall propensity to forgive, Congolese men and women did not differ as much as did European men and women, and Congolese people attending and non-attending church did not differ as much as did European people attending and non-attending church. Forgiveness may be more characteristic of collectivistic cultures than of individualistic cultures.

**Kadiangandu, Gauche, Vinsonneau and Mullet (2007)** investigated the cross-cultural differences in conceptualizations of forgiveness, using a modified version of the Conceptualizations of Forgiveness Scale. In the Congolese (collectivistic) culture, forgiveness was expected to be mainly conceived as an “interpersonal” construct, and in the French (individualistic) culture as an “intrapersonal” process. The findings supported these views. The Congolese more than the French conceived forgiveness as aimed at reconciling with the offender and extensible to people outside the offended—offender dyad.

**Merolla, Zhang and Sun (2012)** examined forgiveness communication in United States and Chinese relationships. Four key forgiveness antecedents social harmony, empathy, apology, and blame were examined as predictors of forgiveness communication. Social harmony, counter to predictions, positively predicted direct, rather than indirect, forgiveness in Chinese relationships. Empathy, expected to be a robust predictor of forgiveness communication across cultures, was not a good predictor in either. Instead, the best predictors of forgiveness communication were offender apology and, to a lesser extent, blame. In both cultures, apology positively predicted direct and conditional forgiveness and negatively predicted non-expression,
while blame positively predicted conditional forgiveness. These results suggest direct forgiveness is an important component of relational repair in individualistic and collectivistic contexts. Conditional forgiveness, though unrelated to relational damage, positively predicted ongoing negative effect in Chinese and United States relationships.

Karremans, Regalia, Paleari, Fincham, Cui, Takada, Ohbuchi, Terzino, Cross and Uskul (2011) examined the association between relationship closeness and forgiveness across six countries, including both traditionally individualistic—Italy, the Netherlands, the United States—and collectivistic cultures—Japan, China (and one country, Turkey, with both individualistic and collectivistic features). Results demonstrated the offender and level of forgiveness, both for trait-forgiveness and offense-specific forgiveness. However, this association was weaker in the collectivistic countries, which may suggest that strong norms in these countries to maintain social harmony may partly weaken the role of closeness in forgiveness.

Hook, Worthington, Utsey, Davis, Gartner, Jennings, Tongeren and Dueck (2012) examined whether victims believed that forgiveness requires interpersonal interaction between the victim and offender. Having an interpersonal conceptualization of forgiveness was positively related to a collectivistic worldview. An interpersonal conceptualization of forgiveness was positively related to forgiveness measures that stressed interpersonal interactions with the offender. An interpersonal conceptualization of forgiveness was positively related to a general measure of forgiveness only for those participants who were in a continuing relationship with the offender. This was an important step in understanding the contexts in which one's conceptualization of forgiveness may influence its practice.

Fu, Watkins and Hui (2004) investigated the nature of forgiveness, its measurement, and personality correlates in the People's Republic of China (PRC). Study 1 involved in-depth interviews with 27 PRC cultural scholars about the concept of forgiveness and factors influencing the tendency to forgive in Chinese philosophy and everyday life. The respondents supported the relevance of this concept for Chinese societies and were able to give examples both from classical Chinese texts and their own lives. However, they also considered that preserving group harmony was the main reason to forgive and discounted the personality or religious influences
commonly reported in the Western literature. Study 2 reported the adaptation of a Western forgiveness questionnaire for use with PRC respondents. Study 3 involved administering this questionnaire together with measures of self-esteem, anxiety, impression management, culturally appropriate constructs of face, relationship orientation and harmony to 336 college students and 432 teachers from the PRC. In the PRC, willingness to forgive is influenced largely by social solidarity needs rather than the individualistic personality variables or religiosity reported in Western research. It was assumed that this is due to the collectivist nature of PRC society and the results may well generalize to other collectivist cultures.

2.3 Studies on Religion and Forgiveness

Moeschberger, Dixon, Niens and Cairns (2005) examined empirically the interpersonal determinants of intergroup forgiveness within Northern Ireland. 297 University students were given questionnaires that measured religiosity, empathy, contact with the "other community", hope, disposition to forgive, and forgiveness of the "other community". Structural Equation Modeling was used to determine a theoretical model that best fit the data. Results provided empirical support for the use of interpersonal factors in examining societal forgiveness in Northern Ireland.

Azar, Mullet and Vinsonneau (1999) studied the propensity to forgive a severe offense in a sample of 48 people from three religious communities in Lebanon: Catholics, Maronites, and Orthodox. The effects of a number of circumstances: intent to harm, cancellation of consequences, religious and social proximity to the offender and apologies from the offender, on the propensity to forgive, and the variation of these effects as a function of age, gender, and educational level, were considered. The method was an application of Norman Anderson's functional theory of cognition. 24 stories were constructed by varying systematically the levels of each of the four factors quoted above. Participants were asked to rate in each case their propensity to forgive on a forgiveness scale. The more important results concern: (a) the overall level of propensity to forgive, which was higher than expected, (b) the impact of the religious proximity factor, which was very slight, and (c) the effect of the apologies factor, which was extremely important.

Ahmed, Azar and Mullet (2007) examined the willingness to forgive in a sample of 517 Kuwaiti citizens, aged 12 to 55 years. Participants were instructed first
to read a certain number of stories (in which a harmful act was committed against a child) and then to express their willingness to forgive in each case. The stories included four factors: intent to harm, religious proximity, presence/absence of apologies, and cancellation of consequences. A high level of willingness to forgive was observed among the Kuwaitis studies, irrespective of participants' age and gender. The impact of the religious proximity factor was limited to a very small fraction of the sample.

Scobie, Scobie and Kakavoulis (2002) examined cultural and gender differences in the construct of forgiveness and willingness to forgive. The Scobie Forgiveness Scale was administered to 564 undergraduate students in Britain, Greece, and Cyprus. Demographic factors included age, religion, church attendance, and religiosity. The results indicated a number of significant differences in response to some of the focus phrases. The underlying structure and components were similar in both the forgiver and forgiven mode, but the variable load and composition showed a number of differences, suggesting that the effect of culture is profound. A MANOVA of the 3 national groups, for the forgiveness components and mode (forgiver or forgiven) revealed no significant gender differences for the different groups. In general, most differences were between the British and Cypriot samples, and relatively few between the British and Greek and the Greek and Cypriot groups.

Fabiola and Mullet (2002) examined a sample of 240 participants (aged 18-65 yrs) from 6 different communities, Shiite, Sunni, Druze, Catholic, Orthodox, and Maronite, by asking to express their degree of agreement with 38 statements related to forgiveness in general or in specific circumstances. Overall, participants expressed significant disagreement with statements expressing the desire to seek revenge (the Forgiveness versus Revenge factor), and disagreement with statements indicating that the attitude of "close others" was important (the Social and Personal Circumstances factor). They were generally neutral toward statements related to possible obstacles to forgiveness, clear malevolence, extreme severity of consequences, or lack of repentance by the offender (the Obstacles factor).

Mullet, Barros, Usai, Neto and Shafighi (2003) assessed the relationship between religious involvement and forgiveness in three samples of Western Europeans living in a social environment dominated by the Catholic tradition. The
samples comprised non-believers/non-attendees, believers/non-attendees, believers/regular attendees, and religious people. Age and religious involvement were shown to affect the willingness to forgive in an interactive way: The effect of religious involvement was stronger for the elderly group. It was also found that what made the difference in the willingness to forgive was mainly the social commitment to religion (attendance in church and the taking of vows), not mere personal beliefs. In addition, age and religious involvement were found to affect blockage towards forgiveness in an additive way.

Exline, Baumeister, Zell, Kraft and Witvliet (2008) studied whether people are more forgiving toward transgressors if they see themselves as capable of committing similar offenses, as demonstrated in 7 studies. Methods included hypothetical scenarios, actual recalled offenses, individual and group processes, and correlational and experimental designs. Three factors mediated the link between personal capability and forgiveness: seeing the other's offense as less severe, greater empathic understanding, and perceiving oneself as similar to the transgressor. In terms of predicting forgiveness, it was important that people's own offenses were similar to the target offense in terms of both severity and type. The personal capability effect was independent of other established predictors of forgiveness and was more pronounced among men than women.

Barnes and Ryan (2010) conducted study using a newly devised method for testing multiple mediator models; two studies were to examine the hypothesis that religious people's forgiveness values mediate the relationship between religiosity and forgiveness forecasts, independent of self-perceived past forgiveness tendencies. The first study focused on predicted forgiveness of hypothetical offenders, and the second examined forecasted forgiveness of those responsible for the terrorist attacks against the United States on September 11, 2001. In both studies, the mediating role of forgiveness values (independent of past forgiveness tendencies) was established, suggesting a value-congruent bias in religious people's forgiveness forecasts.

Wade, Meyer, Goldman and Post, (2008) analyzed archival data (N = 249) from two forgiveness intervention studies to examine the relationship between religious commitment, religious affiliation, and forgiveness-related variables. Results indicated that religious affiliation was related to rumination about the offense prior to
treatment and that, for Christians, religious commitment was related to change in revenge following treatment. The disposition to forgive fully mediated the relationship between religious commitment and revenge and religious commitment and rumination, but only for Christians.

Etienne Mullet, Barros, Veronic, Neto and Shafighi (2003) assessed the relationship between religious involvement and forgiveness in three samples of Western Europeans living in a social environment dominated by the Catholic tradition. The samples compared on-believers/non-attendees, believers/non-attendees, believers/regular attendees, and religious people. Age and religious involvement were shown to affect the willingness to forgive in an interactive way: The effect of religious involvement was stronger for the elderly group. We also found that what made the difference in the willingness to forgive was mainly the social commitment to religion (attendance in church and the taking of vows), not mere personal beliefs. In addition, age and religious involvement were found to affect blockage towards forgiveness in an additive way.

Paza, Netoa and Mulletb (2007) examined possible differences in dispositional forgiveness among Buddhists, Christians, and Buddhist Christians living in China. It used the Forgivingness Scale, Religious involvement and the forgiving personality. The three-factor structure already evidenced in many other studies—lasting resentment, sensitivity to circumstances, and willingness to forgive—was also evidenced in the present study. The Buddhist participants were shown to be slightly (but significantly) more resentful and less forgiving than the Christian participants. The responses of the Buddhist-Christian participants were closer to the Buddhists' responses for lasting resentment and closer to the Christians' responses for willingness to forgive.

Witvliet, Hinze and Worthington (2008) examined the religious commitment levels of 57 (M=27, F=30) self-identified Christian young adults in the context of considering an unresolved injustice. Religious commitment was unrelated to self-reported dispositional anger, but positively associated with higher dispositional interpersonal forgiveness and lower rumination. When imagining a property crime and its unresolved aftermath, greater religious commitment was associated with the inhibition of revenge-seeking and cultivation of empathy and forgiveness.
Foxa and Thomasa (2008) studied the link between religiosity and forgiveness among Christian, Muslim, Jewish and secular affiliations. Measures of forgiveness included attitudes towards forgiveness (attitudinal) and tendencies to forgive transgressions in the past (behavioural) and future (projective). Religious faith, interpretation, prayer and religious service attendance were used to measure religiosity. Four hundred and seventy-five Christian, Muslim, Jewish and secular individuals participated and completed an internet-based questionnaire. This study found religiosity positively correlated with forgiveness. Religious groups reported significantly higher attitudinal and projective forgiveness than the secular group. Among religious groups, religiosity was a stronger determinant of forgiveness than the specific religion an individual was affiliated.

Mullet, Barros, Usai, Neto and Shafiqi (2003) assessed the relationship between religious involvement and forgiveness in three samples of Western Europeans living in a social environment dominated by the Catholic tradition. The samples comprised nonbelievers/non-attendees, believers/non-attendees, believers/regular attendees, and religious people. Age and religious involvement were shown to affect the willingness to forgive in an interactive way: The effect of religious involvement was stronger for the elderly group. It was found that what made the difference in the willingness to forgive was mainly the social commitment to religion (attendance in church and the taking of vows), not mere personal beliefs. In addition, age and religious involvement were found to affect blockage towards forgiveness in an additive way.

Edwards, Rincker, Moe, Rehfelt, Ryder, Brown and Lopez (2002) investigated the relationship between religious faith and forgiveness in a sample (N=196) of college students. Students were asked to complete the Heartland Forgiveness Scale and the Santa Clara Strength of Religious Faith Questionnaire. Analyses of scores on both measures revealed a positive, significant correlation between these constructs, suggesting that there is a meaningful relationship between religious faith and the tendency to forgive.

Tripathi and Mullet (2010) explored the conceptualizations about forgiveness of Indians from the Hindu community by using the Conceptualizations of Forgiveness Questionnaire. As expected, the four-factor structure of conceptualizations found
among Western Europeans from Christian backgrounds (Encourages Repentance, Immoral Behavior, Broad Process, and Change of Heart) fit the data collected among the Hindus. Hindus’ propensity to forgive was also explored using the Forgivingness Questionnaire. As expected, the three-factor structure of forgivingness found among Europeans (Lasting Resentment, Sensitivity to Circumstances, and Unconditional Forgiveness) fit the data collected among the Hindus. Finally, it was shown that, among Hindus, the relationships between conceptualizations about forgiveness and propensity to forgive were basically the same as the ones found among Western Europeans.

Sandage and Jankowski (2010) tested the interdisciplinary formulation based on psychology and theology that Differentiation of self (DoS) served as a mediator variable by which dispositional forgiveness is associated with indices of spiritual and mental health. Data were collected in a sample of 213 of graduate students, mean age = 34.46 years at a Protestant-affiliated university in the United States. Results supported the hypotheses with DoS mediating the relationship between dispositional forgiveness and (a) spiritual instability, (b) mental health symptoms, and (c) psychological well-being. Implications were considered for future research on forgiveness, as well as clinical interventions to self-regulation and trauma symptoms. Dos was also proposed as a useful construct for understanding interdisciplinary relations.

Paz, Neto and Mullet (2007) examined possible differences in dispositional forgiveness among Buddhists, Christians, and Buddhist Christians living in China. The Forgivingness Scale was used. The three-factor structure already evidenced in many other studies lasting resentment, sensitivity to circumstances, and willingness to forgive was also evidenced in the present study. The Buddhist participants were shown to be slightly (but significantly) more resentful and less forgiving than the Christian participants. The responses of the Buddhist–Christian participants were closer to the Buddhists’ responses for lasting resentment and closer to the Christians’ responses for willingness to forgive.

Tongeren, Welch, Davisc, Green and Worthington (2012) studied forgiveness, justice and religious individuals. Participants were primed with either forgiveness or retributive justice and made moral judgments of individuals. Experiment 1 demonstrated that religious participants recalling an experience of
forgiveness reported more favorable attitudes toward moral transgressors than did those recalling an experience of retributive justice. Experiment 2 replicated the priming effect on moral judgments using a subtle prime of either forgiveness or justice (word search) and a different dependent measure. Experiment 3 employed a more religiously diverse sample and revealed the moderating role of religious commitment. These results suggest that salience of forgiveness leads to more favorable evaluations of moral transgressors compared to retributive justice for religious individuals.

Hui, Watkins, Wong and Sun (2006) investigated the relationship between religion and forgiveness in a sample of 230 Hong Kong Chinese teachers and 714 students. Findings indicated some influence from Chinese cultural values in the conceptualization of forgiveness. Religious affiliation was the strongest predictor of concepts of forgiveness, whereas religious practice predicted attitudes toward “forgivingness” and the practice of forgiveness. No significant difference in forgiveness between believers and non-believers in real life situations was reported.

Worthington, Wade, Terry, McCullough, Berry, Schmitt, Berry, Bursley and O'Connor (2003) reported the development of the Religious Commitment Inventory—10, used in 6 studies. Sample size were 150 college students, 240 Christian church-attending married adults, 468 undergraduates including (among others) 52 Buddhists, 12 Muslims, 10 Hindus and 117 nonreligious and 217 clients and 52 counselors in a secular or 1 of 6 religious counseling agencies. Scores on the RCI-10 had strong estimated internal consistency, 3-week and 5-month test–retest reliability, construct validity, and discriminant validity. Exploratory (Study 1) and confirmatory (Studies 4 and 6) factor analyses identified 2 highly correlated factors, suggesting a 1-factor structure as most parsimonious. Religious commitment predicted response to an imagined robbery (Study 2), marriage (Study 4), and counseling (Study 6).

Wade and Kidwell (2012) explored the ways religious people think about forgiveness and make use of forgiveness to deal with hurtful experiences. How do religious people think about and make use of forgiveness in their lives? Do religious beliefs promote forgiveness, and if so, how? Through qualitative analysis of in-depth interviews with 10 religious individuals, results indicated that for all participants their
motivations and strategies to forgive could be classified as both secular and sacred. The results also highlight the specific motivations to forgive and strategies used by religious individuals to achieve forgiveness, even for some terrible injustices. In addition to elaborating the why and how of forgiveness, the results highlight the fact that religious individuals are able to make use of the resources that their religious traditions have to offer while integrating these with secular motivations and strategies.

Brose, Rye, Zois and Ross (2005) examined the relationship between forgiveness of others (i.e., situational and dispositional) and the five-factor model of personality by using a sample of 275 college students. All forgiveness measures were negatively correlated with Neuroticism and positively correlated with Agreeableness. Extraversion was positively related to one forgiveness measure. None of the forgiveness measures were related to Openness or Conscientiousness. However, Conscientiousness showed suppression effects and was negatively correlated with one situational and one dispositional forgiveness measure when included in multiple regression equations. Several facets of the five-factor domains were significantly correlated with forgiveness in the expected direction. The five-factor domains uniquely contributed to the prediction of forgiveness beyond demographics, empathy, religiousness, and social desirability.

Azar and Mullet (2001) studied the willingness to forgive a severe offense in a sample of 48 participants from the three Lebanese Islamic communities of Druze, Shiite, and Sunni. Results were compared with those obtained by Azar, Mullet, and Vinsonneau (1999) based on a sample of Catholics, Maronites, and Orthodox Christians. The study considers the effects of a number of circumstances on the willingness to forgive such as intent to harm, cancellation of consequences, religious and social similarity to the offender, and apologies from the offender, as well as variations of these effects as a function of age, gender, and educational level. An application of Norman Anderson's functional theory of cognition was employed. Twenty-four stories were constructed by varying systematically the levels of each of the four circumstances quoted above. In each case, participants were asked to rate their willingness to forgive on a forgiveness scale. The more important results concern (a) the overall level of willingness to forgive, which was practically
equivalent in each of the six religious subgroups, (b) the impact of the religious similarity factor (Christian versus Islamic), which was very weak in every group, and (c) the effect of the apologetic factor which remained consistently important.

2.4 Studies on Transgression Related Interpersonal Motivations

Ortha, Berkingb, Walkerc, Meierc and Znojc (2008) surveyed 347 individuals who had experienced a recent interpersonal transgression on four occasions over the course of six weeks. Forgiveness was assessed with scales measuring interpersonal avoidance and revenge motivation and psychological adjustment was assessed with scales measuring depression and rumination. Latent growth curve analyses showed that intra-individual changes in forgiveness were positively correlated with changes in adjustment. Analyses indicated that adjustment predicted subsequent change in forgiveness, but that forgiveness did not predict subsequent change in adjustment. The results suggest that adjustment facilitates forgiveness, but not that forgiveness facilitates adjustment.

Hui and Bond (2009) proposed the following a transgression, as a victim's perceived face loss increased, the victim would show (i) less forgiveness towards the perpetrator; (ii) increased motivation to retaliate; and (iii) reduced desire to maintain the damaged relationship. Moreover, an interdependent self-construal was hypothesized to strengthen these associations. Results from Hong Kong Chinese and American university students revealed that greater face loss directly reduced forgiveness. For Hong Kong Chinese, face loss also indirectly lowered forgiveness through retaliatory and relationship maintenance motivations. Self-construals, however, did not account for such cultural-specific findings.

Wenzel, Turner and Okimoto (2010) tested two causal directions that, forgiveness is often understood as the outcome of socio-cognitive processes including appraisals of transgression severity and offender responsibility, rumination, and empathy for the offender. Alternatively, forgiveness may be understood as the initiator of such socio-cognitive processes; a decision, intuition, or act that elicits reappraisals, reduces ruminative thought, and leads to a repositioning to the offender. The authors tested these two causal directions in a three-wave longitudinal study capturing 112 participant's thoughts and feelings in the first 3 days immediately following an interpersonal transgression. Forgiveness significantly predicted an
increase in empathy and a decrease in perceived severity over time. Conversely, initial rumination significantly predicted change in forgiveness; interestingly, counter to conventional theoretical views, rumination facilitated an increase in forgiveness over time. The findings indicate that, in the dynamic period following a transgression, forgiveness plays an active role and initiates socio-cognitive changes in victims.

Mullet, Anne, Sophie and Michelle (1998) examined individual differences in the effect of external circumstances on forgivingness, focusing on reducing the circumstances to a subset of forgivingness factors, reducing the circumstances to a subset of forgivingness factors, and studying the way age and other characteristics were related to the resulting factorial structure. A questionnaire was constructed containing items related to social proximity, severity of consequences, intent to harm, revenge, cancellation of consequences, apologies, pressures from close others and from religious authorities, mood, and personality philosophy and faith. 474, 18–90 yr olds were divided into 4 age groups (18–25-, 26–40-, 41–65-, and 65+ yr olds). The factorial structure of these circumstances was shown, as well as the link between age and the different factors. Four factors were extracted: (1) A Revenge Vs Forgiveness factor, reflecting a general tendency in people to forgive regardless of circumstances; (2) A Personal and Social Circumstances factor synthesizing the effects of various incentives from the social environment of the person; (3) an Obstacle to Forgiveness factor synthesizing the effects of the circumstances linked to the offense; and (4) A Forgiveness Block factor. Age appeared as the strongest determinant of forgiveness.

Wol and McGrath (2007) assessed the temporal unfolding of forgiveness and found that forgiveness becomes more likely as time distances the victim from the transgression. These findings lend credence to the axiom “time heals all wounds.” This research examines the effect of time perception on forgivingness of others by experimentally manipulating temporal distance. In Experiment 1, respondents reported greater willingness to forgive the transgressor when more time had elapsed since the transgression. Experiments 2 and 3 determined the influence of subjective temporal distance on willingness to forgive.

McCullough and Hoyt (2002) evaluated the contribution of individual differences to people’s transgression-related interpersonal motivations (TRIMs) by using generalizability analyses. Individual differences accounted for 22% to 44% of
the variance in participants' TRIMs (i.e., avoidance, benevolence, and revenge). Although revenge motivation is apparently more cross-situationally consistent than either avoidance or benevolence, estimating people's dispositions on the basis of their responses to single transgressions will lead to perilously undependable estimates for all three TRIMs. Agreeableness consistently predicted revenge, whereas both Neuroticism and Agreeableness predicted avoidance and benevolence. The association of Neuroticism, but not Agreeableness, with people's TRIMs appeared to be mediated by appraisals of transgression severity. Differences in people's responses to historical versus fictional transgressions suggest that transgression-related motivational dispositions should probably be estimated with responses to historical rather than fictional transgressions.

McCullough, Fincham and Tsang (2003) proposed that transgression-related interpersonal motivations result from 3 psychological parameters: forbearance (abstinence from avoidance and revenge motivations, and maintenance of benevolence), trend forgiveness (reductions in avoidance and revenge, and increases in benevolence), and temporary forgiveness (transient reductions in avoidance and revenge, and transient increases in benevolence). In 2 studies, the investigators examined this 3-parameter model. Initial ratings of transgression severity and empathy were directly related to forbearance but not trend forgiveness. Initial responsibility attributions were inversely related to forbearance but directly related to trend forgiveness. When people experienced high empathy and low responsibility attributions, they also tended to experience temporary forgiveness.

McCullough, Rachal, Sandage, Worthington, Brown and Hight (1998) examined the extent to which forgiving could be predicted with Relationship-level variables such as Satisfaction, Commitment, and Closeness; Offense-level variables such as Apology and Impact of the offense; and Social-cognitive variables such as Offender-focused empathy and Rumination about the offense. Also described is the development of the transgression-related interpersonal motivations inventory—a self-report measure designed to assess the 2-component motivational system (Avoidance and Revenge) posited to underlie forgiving. The measure demonstrated a variety of desirable psychometric properties, commending its use for future research. As
predicted, empathy, apology, rumination, and several indexes of relationship closeness were associated with self-reported forgiving.

Ballester, Chatri, Sastre, Riviere and Mullet (2011) assessed the structure of the motives invoked by people for forgiveness and for un-forgiveness and the relationships between these motives and demographic characteristics, conceptualizations of forgiveness, forgivingness, personality and culture were examined. Forgiveness appeared to be fueled mainly by three largely independent kinds of motives: Having recovered sympathy for a repentant offender, applying a moral principle and preserving a meaningful relationship. Forgiveness may sometimes, however, amount to exploiting the offense for dominating or for challenging the offender as well as others. Un-forgiveness appeared to be fueled mainly by Persistent anger and irritation, more associated with the desire for Self-affirmation and Self-protection, and, in a few participants, it was the only response to out-group members. For each kind of invoked motive a meaningful pattern of relationships with the other measurements, including culture, was found.

Mellor and Fung (2012) studied a sample of 233 Malaysian undergraduate students, 100 males and 133 females, recruited from four English-mediated universities completed the Interpersonal Reactivity Index and the Transgression-Related Interpersonal Motivations Inventory to assess dimensions of empathy and forgiveness. Women exhibited greater empathic concern than men, but not greater perspective-taking. Men were less forgiving in terms of revenge-seeking behaviour, but men and women did not differ in avoidance of transgressors. The relationships between empathic concern and both facets of forgiveness were similar for men and women, as was the relationship between empathic concern and avoidance. However, the relationship between perspective-taking and avoidance was stronger among men than women. It was found little support for the prediction that in this collectivist cultural context, perspective-taking would play a greater role than empathic concern in forgiveness.

McCullough, Bono and Root (2007) investigated the associations between interpersonal forgiveness and psychological well-being. Cross-sectional and prospective multilevel analyses demonstrated that increases in forgiveness (measured as fluctuations in individuals' avoidance, revenge, and benevolence motivations...
toward their transgressors) were related to within-persons increases in psychological well-being (measured as more satisfaction with life, more positive mood, less negative mood, and fewer physical symptoms). Moreover, forgiveness was more strongly linked to well-being for people who reported being closer and more committed to their partners before the transgression and for people who reported that their partners apologized and made amends for the transgression.

Rangganadhan and Todorov (2010) focused on the neglected component of the forgiveness construct, self-forgiveness, and its relationship to shame, guilt, empathy, and conciliatory behavior. A section of a theoretical model of self-forgiveness, proposed by Hall and Fincham (2005), was compared with a new model, to ascertain the role these emotional and behavioral factors played in influencing self-forgiveness. Participants were 91 first-year undergraduate psychology students and a community sample of 59 who completed self-report measures of each variable. Structural equation modeling revealed that the Hall and Fincham model did not provide an adequate fit to the empirical data until the covariance between shame and guilt was incorporated into the model. Unlike their findings, shame-proneness and personal distress empathy, rather than guilt and other-oriented empathy, emerged as the key personality traits involved in inhibiting self-forgiveness.

Orcutt (2006) examined the prospective relation of forgiveness to psychological distress symptoms (depression, anxiety and stress) at a later time of point (an average of 36 weeks later) in a sample of 182 female undergraduate students. Through use of structural equation modeling, it was observed that offense-specific (as compared with dispositional) forgiveness toward an offender of a self-identified interpersonal transgression was significantly negatively related to psychological distress symptoms at Time 2, above and beyond the impact of symptom levels at Time 1. Perceived severity and time since the offense at Time 1 were examined as possible moderators of this relationship; time since offense was found to moderate the relationship between forgiveness and change in psychological distress symptoms between Time 1 and Time 2.

Norton (2009) examined the effects of empathy, purportedly the only manipulation known to increase forgiveness in an experimental setting, and elevation, a moral emotion that, like empathy, focuses on others, on forgiveness. It was
hypothesized that empathy and elevation would increase forgiveness. 96 undergraduates viewed an amusing, elevating, or neutral video. They completed an empathy-building or neutral writing task. They completed the Transgression-Related Interpersonal Motivations Inventory (TRIM) once before and once after these manipulations. A lack of participants forced collapsing across writing conditions. An analysis of mean TRIM difference score showed that the elevation condition was significantly greater than the neutral condition.

Schoulté, Schultz and Altmaier (2011) investigated prevalence and impact of cultural micro-aggressions among adults. When participants were asked to describe a time when they had been wronged by another person, approximately 7% identified a cultural micro-aggression. Adults who experienced a cultural micro-aggression reported significant levels of distress and moderate levels of unforgiveness (revenge and avoidance) toward the perpetrator. Victims also reported moderate levels of forgiveness about the event. There were no significant differences between victims of cultural micro-aggressions and victims of other interpersonal offenses in measures of event-related distress and forgiveness. Results are discussed in the context of better understanding the responses of forgiveness after the experience of micro-aggressions predicated on the victim’s status in a non-majority group.

Ghaemmaghami, Allemand and Martin (2011) investigated age and gender differences in forgiveness of real-life transgressions. Emerging and young, middle-aged, and older adults recalled the most recent and serious interpersonal transgression and then completed the Transgression-Related Interpersonal Motivations Inventory (TRIM-18), which measured their avoidance, revenge, and benevolence motivation toward an offender and indicated to what extent they are generally concerned with the subject of forgiveness. The results revealed a trend among middle-aged adults to express more avoidance than younger adults. Moreover, young men had a greater motivation to seek revenge than middle-aged and older men. Additionally, forgiveness was a more manifest subject in everyday life for middle-aged adults and women.

Rijave, Jurse, Mijocevi, Kasic and Zagre (2010) investigated the role of gender in the relationship between these two types of motivation and well-being. The sample consisted of 600 college students. There were 300 females and 300 males who
ranged in age from 19 to 28 years. The students responded to two self-report questionnaires. Forgiving was measured with the Transgression-Related Interpersonal Motivations (TRIM) Inventory, and well-being with Short Depression-Happiness Scale. Regression analyses showed that both revenge and avoidance motivation were significant predictors of depression for males, while for females only revenge motivation proved to be significant. Neither revenge nor avoidance motivation predicted happiness. It can be concluded that being prone to revenge and avoidance can be related to depression, but that does not mean that less avoidance and revenge will be necessarily related to more happiness.

Strelan, Feather and McKee (2008) used a 3 (justice prime: restorative, retributive, no prime) × 3 (contextual prime: criminal justice system, intimate relationship, workplace) experimental design with 173 participants reading hypothetical transgression scenarios to test the hypothesis that people associate forgiveness more with restorative justice than with retributive justice, and that such relationships hold regardless of the social context. As predicted, there were main effects for justice prime, with participants more likely to associate benevolent responding, and less likely to associate revenge and avoidant responses, with restorative justice than with retributive justice. They were also more likely to associate benevolence, and less likely to associate revenge and avoidant responses, with intimate relationships than with criminal justice and the workplace. Also as predicted, there was no interaction between justice and context for benevolence and revenge.

Orth, Berking, Walker, Meier and Znoj (2008) assessed forgiveness. Forgiveness is often assumed to be adaptive for psychological adjustment following interpersonal transgressions. 147 individuals who had experienced a recent interpersonal transgression were surveyed on four occasions over the course of six weeks. Forgiveness was assessed with scales measuring interpersonal avoidance and revenge motivation and psychological adjustment was assessed with scales measuring depression and rumination. Latent growth curve analyses showed that intra-individual changes in forgiveness were positively correlated with changes in adjustment. Latent difference score analyses indicated that adjustment predicted subsequent change in forgiveness, but that forgiveness did not predict subsequent change in adjustment.
McCullough, Racha, Sandage, Worthington, Brown and Hight (1998) conceptualized interpersonal forgiving was in the context of a 2-factor motivational system that governs people's responses to interpersonal offenses. Four studies were conducted to examine the extent to which forgiving could be predicted with relationship-level variables such as satisfaction, commitment, and closeness; offense-level variables such as apology and impact of the offense; and social-cognitive variables such as offender-focused empathy and rumination about the offense. Also described is the development of the transgression-related interpersonal motivations inventory—a self-report measure designed to assess the 2-component motivational system (Avoidance and Revenge) posited to underlie forgiving. The measure demonstrated a variety of desirable psychometric properties, commending its use for future research. As predicted, empathy, apology, rumination, and several indexes of relationship closeness were associated with self-reported forgiving.

Santos (2012) compared 184 Filipino and 132 American responses to a hurtful transgression from someone they knew. High levels of communal motives and concern for another’s face, along with low levels of endorsement of hierarchy values and concern for one’s own face predicted forgiveness. Other cultural values and religiosity did not play a significant role. In addition, high levels of forgiveness led to increases in positive emotions, decreases in negative emotions, and improved relationship satisfaction. Avoidance also led to positive emotional outcomes but resulted in a less satisfactory relationship. This process generally operated in the same way across both cultural contexts, with the exception of the motive to seek vengeance. Although communal motives fostered forgiveness in both American and Filipino contexts, only Filipinos attended to their desire to be close to the offender when deciding whether or not to seek vengeance.

Maltby, Wood, Day, Kon, Colley and Linley (2008) explored whether the domains and facets of the five-factor model of personality predicted motivational states for avoidance and revenge following a transgression at a second temporal point distant from the original transgression. A sample of 438 university students, who reported experiencing a serious transgression against them, completed measures of avoidance and revenge motivations around the transgression and five-factor
personality domains and facets at time 1, and measures of avoidance and revenge motivations two and a half years later. The findings suggest that neuroticism, and specifically anger hostility, predicts revenge and avoidance motivations two and a half years later.

McCullough and Hoyt (2002) used Generalizability analyses to evaluate the contribution of individual differences to people’s transgression-related inter-personal motivations (TRIMs). Individual differences accounted for 22% to 44% of the variance in participants’ TRIMs (avoidance, benevolence, and revenge). Although revenge motivation is apparently more cross-situationally consistent than either avoidance or benevolence, estimating people’s dispositions on the basis of their responses to single transgressions will lead to perilously undependable estimates for all three TRIMs. Agreeableness consistently predicted revenge, whereas both Neuroticism and Agreeableness predicted avoidance and benevolence.

McCullough, Root and Cohen (2006) examined the effects of writing about the benefits of an interpersonal transgression on forgiveness. 304 Participants were randomly assigned to one of three 20-min writing tasks in which they wrote about either (a) traumatic features of the most recent interpersonal transgression they had suffered, (b) personal benefits resulting from the transgression, or (c) a control topic that was unrelated to the transgression. Participants in the benefit-finding condition became more forgiving toward their transgressors than did those in the other 2 conditions, who did not differ from each other. In part, the benefit-finding condition appeared to facilitate forgiveness by encouraging participants to engage in cognitive processing as they wrote their essays.

2.5 Studies on Decisional Forgiveness and Emotional Forgiveness

Watkins, Hui, Luo, Worthington, Hook and Davis (2011) examined the practice of forgiveness in Nepal. A model relating collectivism and forgiveness was examined. Participants 221 completed measures of collectivism, individualism, forgiveness, conciliatory behavior, and motivations for avoidance and revenge toward the offender. Collectivism was positively related to forgiveness. Forgiveness was strongly related to conciliatory behavior and motivations for avoidance and revenge toward the offender. Decisional forgiveness was a stronger predictor of motivations for revenge than was emotional forgiveness.
Burnette, McCullough, VanTongeren and Davis (2012) examined the independent and interactive effects of relationship value and exploitation risk across two studies. In Study 1, controlling for other constructs related to forgiveness, the authors assessed relationship value and exploitation risk. In Study 2, participants experienced experimental manipulations of relationship value and exploitation risk. Across studies, using hypothetical and actual offenses and varied forgiveness measures, the combination of low exploitation risk and high relationship value predicted the greatest forgiveness.

Chong (2009) investigated the psychometric utility of several psychological instruments for the Korean population and explored the relationship between acculturation, religiosity, unforgiveness, forgiveness style, and general health of Koreans. Confirmatory Factor Analyses (CFA) were conducted to investigate the appropriateness of the Religious Commitment Inventory-10, the Transgression-Related Interpersonal Motivations Scale – 12-Item Form, the Rumination about an Interpersonal Offense Scale, the Decisional Forgiveness Scale, and the Emotional Forgiveness Scale with collected data from 273 Korean Americans and Koreans. Several instruments required item adjustments to meet CFA criteria. Multiple regression analyses indicated that factors of unforgiveness were the most direct and consistent predictors of health, and acculturation and religious commitment also were associated with health status.

Worthington, VanOyen, Pietrini and Miller (2007) studied the extant data linking forgiveness to health and well-being point to the role of emotional forgiveness, particularly when it becomes a pattern in dispositional forgivingness. Both are important antagonists to the negative affect of unforgiveness and agonists for positive affect. One key distinction emerging in the literature is between decisional and emotional forgiveness. Decisional forgiveness is a behavioral intention to resist an unforgiving stance and to respond differently toward a transgressor. Emotional forgiveness is the replacement of negative unforgiving emotions with positive other-oriented emotions. Emotional forgiveness involves psychophysiological changes, and it has more direct health and well-being consequences. While some benefits of forgiveness and forgivingness emerge merely because they reduce unforgiveness, some benefits appear to be more forgiveness specific. We review research on peripheral and central nervous system correlates of
forgiveness, as well as existing interventions to promote forgiveness within divergent health settings.

Chon (2012) investigated the psychometric utility of several psychological instruments for the Korean population and explored the relationship between acculturation, religiosity, forgiveness style, and general health of Koreans. Confirmatory Factor Analyses (CFA) were conducted to investigate the appropriateness of the Religious Commitment Inventory-10, the Transgression-Related Interpersonal Motivations Scale – 12-Item Form, the Rumination about an Interpersonal Offense Scale (RIO), the Decisional Forgiveness and the Emotional Forgiveness Scale, with collected data from 273 Korean Americans and Koreans. Several instruments required item adjustments to meet CFA criteria. Multiple regression analyses indicated that factors of un-forgiveness were the most direct and consistent predictors of health, and acculturation and religious commitment also were associated with health status.

Loraine (2011) examined the relationships between decisional and emotional forgiveness and a set of forgiveness-related factors, including external factors (i.e. perceived severity, hurt, wrongness and intentionality, pre-transgression closeness with the transgressor and post-transgression commitment to the transgressor), internal factors (self-esteem, attachment, emotion regulation, agreeableness and harmony) and personal factors (i.e. age, gender and religious commitment), among 209 adolescent students and 99 college students from Hong Kong, participated in the survey study. Correlational analyses revealed (i) decisional forgiveness to be more strongly related to age, religious commitment, agreeableness and value of harmony than emotional forgiveness, while (ii) emotional forgiveness to be more strongly related to perceived severity, hurt, wrongness, post-transgression commitment to transgressor, self-esteem and emotion regulation through reappraisal than decisional forgiveness. (iii) Both decisional forgiveness and emotional forgiveness were correlated with perceived severity, hurt, wrongness and intentionality, pre-transgression closeness with the transgressor, post-transgression commitment to the transgressor and positive attachment to others.

Root (2008) investigated how motivations underlying the decision to forgive affected outcomes for forgivers. Using a web-based study, 185 undergraduates who
had been hurt by someone close to them were randomly assigned to either a control condition or a condition focusing on one of the following motivations for forgiving: personal benefit, moral obligation, and goodwill. Compared to the control group, all three forgiveness conditions reported higher forgiveness levels, more pro-forgiveness attitudes and less negative emotions toward the transgressor. The forgiveness conditions did not differ except for perceived autonomy in the decision to forgive, for which the personal benefit group ranked highest. Gender acted as a moderator on participants' response to forgiveness conditions. Females did not respond to the conditions differently, while males in the forgiveness conditions the goodwill condition in particular reported higher levels of forgiveness and lower negative emotions toward the transgressor as compared to the control group.

### 2.6 Studies on Anger and Forgiveness

**Brown, Wohl and Exline (2008)** examined the role of social identification in secondhand forgiveness. Study 1 showed that the effects of apologies on secondhand victims are moderated by level of identification with the wronged group. Study 2 showed that identification with the United States was associated with less forgiveness and greater blame and desire for retribution directed at the 9/11 terrorists, and these associations were primarily mediated by anger. Finally, Study 3 showed that participants whose assimilation needs were primed were less forgiving toward the perpetrators of an assault on in-group members than participants whose differentiation needs were primed, an effect that was mediated by empathy for the victims.

**VanOyen, Hinze and Worthington (2008)** examined the religious commitment levels of 57 (M=27, F=30) self-identified Christian young adults in the context of considering an unresolved injustice. Religious commitment was unrelated to self-reported dispositional anger, but positively associated with higher dispositional interpersonal forgiveness and lower rumination. When imagining a property crime and its unresolved aftermath, greater religious commitment was associated with the inhibition of revenge-seeking and cultivation of empathy and forgiveness.

**Konstam, Chernoff and Deveney (2001)** explored forgiving and its relationship to adaptive moral emotional processes: proneness to shame, guilt, anger, and empathic responsiveness. Gender differences associated with forgiving were analyzed. Participants were 138 graduate students in a large northeastern urban
university. Results revealed that guilt-proneness was positively related to Total Forgiveness, as were Empathetic Concern and Perspective Taking. A positive relationship between anger reduction and Overall Forgiveness was found. Guilt-proneness, anger reduction, and detachment informed the process of forgiveness for women.

Zechmeister and Catherine (2002) studied relationship between forgiveness and anger. In this study participants wrote 2 narratives that described an incident in which they angered or hurt someone (offender) or in which someone angered or hurt them (victim) and the offense was forgiven or not forgiven. Victims portrayed the offense as continuing (open), and offenders portrayed the offense as over (closed). Forgiveness narratives portrayed offenses as closed and with positive outcomes; however, for some victims, forgiveness coincided with continued anger, suggesting incomplete forgiveness. Offenders' empathy for victims was associated with less self-forgiveness.

McCullough, Bono and Root (2007) investigated whether within-persons increases in rumination about an interpersonal transgression were associated with within-persons reductions in forgiveness. Results supported this hypothesis. The association of transient increases in rumination with transient reductions in forgiveness appeared to be mediated by anger, but not fear, toward the transgressor. The association of rumination and forgiveness was not confounded by daily fluctuations in positive affect and negative affect, and it was not moderated by trait levels of positive affectivity, negative affectivity, or perceived hurtfulness of the transgression.

Tam, Hewstone, Cairns, Tausch, Maio and Kenworthy (2010) focused their attention on changing attitudes toward out groups, other outcome variables may also be important. Two studies showed that both the specific intergroup emotion of anger and infra humanization (the attribution of more human emotions to the in-group than to the out group) predicted decreased intergroup forgiveness in Northern Ireland. Results revealed intergroup contact as a potential means of reducing anger toward the out-group and improving attitudes toward them.

Berry, Worthington, O'Connor, Parrott and Wade (2005) defined forgiveness as the replacement of negative unforgiving emotions with positive and
other-oriented emotions, rumination has been suggested as a mediator between forgivingness and emotional outcomes; it was suggested that different content of rumination leads to different outcomes after transgressions. In four studies of 179, 233, 80, and 66 undergraduate students, trait forgivingness was negatively correlated with trait anger, hostility, neuroticism, fear, and vengeful rumination and was positively correlated.

Witvliet, Worthington, Sato, Ludwig and Exline (2008) assessed the emotional self-reports and physiology of justice outcomes and forgiveness responses to a common crime, using a three Justice (retributive, restorative, no justice) and 2 Forgiveness (forgiveness, none) repeated-measures design. 27 male, 29 female participants imagined their residence was burglarized, followed by six counterbalanced justice-forgiveness outcomes. Imagery of justice especially restorative and forgiveness each reduced unforgiving motivations and negative emotion (anger, fear), and increased prosocial and positive emotion (empathy, gratitude). Imagery of granting forgiveness (versus not) was associated with less heart rate reactivity and better recovery; less negative emotion expression at the brow (corrugator EMG); and less aroused expression at the eye (lower orbicularis oculi EMG when justice was absent).

Romero and Mitchell (2008) examined forgiveness of specific offenses in two samples Roman Catholic women. Participants wrote about an interpersonal offense and completed a multi-dimensional measure of forgiveness with regard to the offense. On 5 of 10 dimensions, older 26 women, mean age = 74 years were significantly more forgiving of specific offenses than were younger 37 women, mean age = 19 years. Religiousness/spirituality and current hurt/anger about the offense partially mediated the associations between age group and forgiveness. The results support models of successful aging, with older women showing greater likelihood of responding to interpersonal conflicts with forgiveness.

Barber, Maltby and Macaskill (2005) examined the relationship between a two dimensional model of forgiveness and Sukhodolsky et al. (2001) 4-factor model of anger rumination among 200 university students. Anger memories were found to be the most important aspects in forgiving oneself, and dealing with revenge thoughts were found to be crucial when exploring issues around forgiving another person. The
present findings suggested the importance of cognitive aspects as portrayed by Sukhodolsky et al. (2001) model of anger rumination to explore in greater depth the cognitive processes involved in forgiveness of self and others.

2.7 Need for the study

Hook et al. (2009) theorized, based on their review of literature, that Collectivistic people seemed more prone to make decisions to forgive based on maintaining group harmony and promoting the collective good, but Collectivistic people seemed less prone to experience emotional forgiveness to accompany the decision to forgive. Instead, Collectivistic forgivers practiced forbearance—the tendency to stifle one’s negative behavior and expression of negative emotion, and to internalize it—often with psychosomatic expressions of stress. In the present study, we examine the hypothesis that Collectivistic and Individualistic forgivers experience different types of forgiveness. In addition, Collectivistic people might reasonably be assumed to interpret events relative to the collective more than relative to themselves individually.

Thus, if an offender offends the individual, a Collectivistic person might not interpret the transgression as hugely offensive. An Individualistic person might interpret this as a serious assault on the self. However, if the offender explicitly states or was thought to have directed the offense against the Collectivistic person’s group (of which the offended person happens to be the targeted member), then the Collectivistic person is hypothesized to react strongly, where the Individualistic person is hypothesized not to react as strongly.

Despite the review of literature and theorizing by Hook et al. (2009), no direct test of this theorizing has been conducted to this point. The present study is the first to attempt such a test. Supportive results would suggest that there are implications about dealing with hate crimes in Collectivistic societies and that there are health implications to Collectivistic people, especially if they do not experience emotional forgiveness to accompany decisional forgiveness.

2.8 Objectives of the Study

1) To find whether Collectivistic forgivers (Hindus, Muslims and Christians) (Students and Community Members) might hold more un-forgiveness than
Individualistic (Hindus, Muslims and Christians) (Students and Community Members) if the offense is one against the collective than if the offense is either (a) against the person or (b) done simply for self-interested motives by the offender (c) for political reason

2) To find whether more Collectivistic individuals might (Hindus, Muslims and Christians) (Students and Community Members) (a) make a decision to forgive more readily than Individualistic people in order to preserve group harmony, but (b) not experience as much emotional response as Individualistic people with three different conditions (Hindus, Muslims and Christians) (Students and Community Members)

3) To identify personal factors such as Age, Gender, Education, Income, Domicile, Religion Affiliation, Occupation, Frequency of attending religious meetings of self and family, Religious Activities to self and family and Importance of religion to self and family which influence significantly to Avoidance, Revenge, Conciliation, Benevolence, State Anger, Decisional and Emotional Forgiveness of Individualistic Forgivers (Students and Community Members) (Hindus, Muslims and Christians) And Collectivistic Forgivers (Students and Community Members) (Hindus, Muslims and Christians).

2.9 Research Questions

The problem under the investigation comprises following major questions

1) Do Collectivistic (Hindus, Muslims and Christians) (Students and Community Members) forgivers hold more un-forgiveness if the offense is one against the collective than Individualistic (Hindus, Muslims and Christians) (Students and Community Members) if the offense is either (a) against the person or (b) done simply for self-interested motives by the offender (c) For political reason?

2) Do more Collectivistic (Hindus, Muslims and Christians) (Students and Community Members) individuals might (a) make a decision to forgive more readily than Individualistic people in order to preserve group harmony, but (b) not experience as much emotional response as Individualistic people with three different conditions(Hindus, Muslims and Christians) (Students and Community Members)?
3) Do factors such as Age, Gender, Education, Income, Domicile, Religion Affiliation, Occupation, Attendance of self and family, Religious Activities to self and family and Importance of religion to self and family significantly contribute to Avoidance, Revenge, Conciliation, Benevolence, State Anger, Decisional and Emotional Forgiveness of Individualistic Forgivers (Students and Community Members) (Hindus, Muslims and Christians) And Collectivistic Forgivers (Students and Community Members) (Hindus, Muslims and Christians)?

2.10 Hypotheses

Ha1: Collectivistic forgivers (Students) (Hindus Muslims Christians, with all three conditions) will experience greater unforgiving motivations for “political reasons” beating than robbery but not hurt you personally. Individualistic forgivers (Students) will produce greater unforgiving motives for the hurt you personally” reason, but equal and less unforgiving motives for “political reasons” and “robbery”

Ha2: Collectivistic forgivers (Students) (Hindus Muslims Christians, with all three conditions) will have high decisional forgiveness but low emotional forgiveness, but that Individualistic forgivers will have both high decisional and emotional forgiveness

Ha3: Collectivistic forgivers (Community Members) (Hindus Muslims Christians with, all three conditions) will experience greater unforgiving motivations for “political reasons” beating than robbery but not hurt you personally. Individualistic forgivers (Community Members) will produce greater unforgiving motives for the hurt you personally” reason, but equal and less unforgiving motives for “political reasons” and “robbery”

Ha4: Collectivistic forgivers (Community Members) (Hindus Muslims Christians, with all three conditions) will have high decisional forgiveness but low emotional forgiveness, but that Individualistic forgivers (Community Members) will have both high decisional and emotional forgiveness

Ha5: Factors such as Age, Gender, Education, Income, Domicile, Occupation, Frequency of attending religious meetings of self and family, Religious Activities to self and family and Importance of Religion to self and family
significantly contribute to Avoidance Motivation, Revenge Motivation, Conciliation Motivation, Benevolence Motivation, State Anger, Decisional Forgiveness and Emotional Forgiveness of Individualistic Forgivers (Hindus, Muslims and Christians)

Further, in order to know the influence of these demographic factors to each of the variables being studied, the following specific hypotheses are framed

Ha5.1: Factors such as Age, Gender, Education, Income, Domicile, Occupation, Frequency of attending religious meetings of self and family, Religious Activities to self and family and Importance of Religion to self and family significantly contribute to Avoidance Motivation of Individualistic Forgivers (Hindus, Muslims and Christians)

Ha5.2: Factors such as Age, Gender, Education, Income, Domicile, Occupation, Frequency of attending religious meetings of self and family, Religious Activities to self and family and Importance of religion to self and family significantly contribute to Revenge Motivation of Individualistic Forgivers (Hindus, Muslims and Christians)

Ha5.3: Factors such as Age, Gender, Education, Income, Domicile, Occupation, Frequency of attending religious meetings of self and family, Religious Activities to self and family and Importance of religion to self and family significantly contribute to Conciliation Motivation of Individualistic Forgivers (Hindus, Muslims and Christians)

Ha5.4: Factors such as Age, Gender, Education, Income, Domicile, Occupation, Frequency of attending religious meetings of self and family, Religious Activities to self and family and Importance of religion to self and family significantly contribute to Benevolence Motivation of Individualistic Forgivers (Hindus, Muslims and Christians)

Ha5.5: Factors such as Age, Gender, Education, Income, Domicile, Occupation, Frequency of attending religious meetings of self and family, Religious Activities to self and family and Importance of religion to self and family significantly contribute to State Anger of Individualistic Forgivers (Hindus, Muslims and Christians)
Ha₅.₆: Factors such as Age, Gender, Education, Income, Domicile, Occupation, Frequency of attending religious meetings of self and family, Religious Activities to self and family and Importance of religion to self and family significantly contribute to Decisional Forgiveness of Individualistic Forgivers (Hindus, Muslims and Christians)

Ha₅.₇: Factors such as Age, Gender, Education, Income, Domicile, Occupation, Frequency of attending religious meetings of self and family, Religious Activities to self and family and Importance of religion to self and family significantly contribute to Emotional Forgiveness of Individualistic Forgivers (Hindus, Muslims and Christians)

Ha₆: Factors such as Age, Gender, Education, Income, Domicile, Occupation, Frequency of attending religious meetings of self and family, Religious Activities to self and family and Importance of Religion to self and family significantly contribute to Avoidance Motivation, Revenge Motivation, Conciliation Motivation, Benevolence Motivation, State Anger, Decisional Forgiveness and Emotional Forgiveness of Collectivistic Forgivers (Hindus, Muslims and Christians)

Further, in order to know the influence of these demographic factors to each of the variables being studied, the following specific hypotheses are framed

Ha₆.₁: Factors such as Age, Gender, Education, Income, Domicile, Occupation, Frequency of attending religious meetings of self and family, Religious Activities to self and family and Importance of Religion to self and family significantly contribute to Avoidance Motivation of Collectivistic Forgivers (Hindus, Muslims and Christians)

Ha₆.₂: Factors such as Age, Gender, Education, Income, Domicile, Occupation, Frequency of attending religious meetings of self and family, Religious Activities to self and family and Importance of religion to self and family significantly contribute to Revenge Motivation of Collectivistic Forgivers (Hindus, Muslims and Christians)
Ha6.3: Factors such as Age, Gender, Education, Income, Domicile, Occupation, Frequency of attending religious meetings of self and family, Religious Activities to self and family and Importance of religion to self and family significantly contribute to Conciliation Motivation of Collectivistic Forgivers (Hindus, Muslims and Christians)

Ha6.4: Factors such as Age, Gender, Education, Income, Domicile, Occupation, Frequency of attending religious meetings of self and family, Religious Activities to self and family and Importance of religion to self and family significantly contribute to Benevolence Motivation of Collectivistic Forgivers (Hindus, Muslims and Christians)

Ha6.5: Factors such as Age, Gender, Education, Income, Domicile, Occupation, Frequency of attending religious meetings of self and family, Religious Activities to self and family and Importance of religion to self and family significantly contribute to State Anger of Collectivistic Forgivers (Hindus, Muslims and Christians)

Ha6.6: Factors such as Age, Gender, Education, Income, Domicile, Occupation, Frequency of attending religious meetings of self and family, Religious Activities to self and family and Importance of religion to self and family significantly contribute to Decisional Forgiveness of Collectivistic Forgivers (Hindus, Muslims and Christians)

Ha6.7: Factors such as Age, Gender, Education, Income, Domicile, Occupation, Frequency of attending religious meetings of self and family, Religious Activities to self and family and Importance of religion to self and family significantly contribute to Emotional Forgiveness of Collectivistic Forgivers (Hindus, Muslims and Christians)

***