

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 344 131

CG 024 124

AUTHOR Subkoviak, Michael J.; And Others  
 TITLE Measuring Interpersonal Forgiveness.  
 PUB DATE Apr 92  
 NOTE 27p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (San Francisco, CA, April 20-24, 1992).  
 PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)  
 EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.  
 DESCRIPTORS College Students; Correlation; Depression (Psychology); Higher Education; Parents; Personality Traits  
 IDENTIFIERS \*Forgiveness

ABSTRACT

The field of moral development has broadened recently from its traditional Kohlbergian emphasis on justice to include other constructs such as caring and forgiveness. The utility of forgiveness has been recognized recently by physicians working with cancer patients, and by therapists interested in anger reduction in clients. This study attempted to construct a measure of psychological forgiveness. Initial reliability and validity estimates are described for one of six cross-cultural samples. A total of 394 subjects provided data for the analysis. Half of the subjects were college students, and the other half were their same-gender parents. The following questionnaires were given to each subject: the Enright Forgiveness Inventory (EFI); a background information scale; Spielberger State-Trait Anxiety Scale; Beck Depression Inventory (BDI); and a one-item forgiveness question. The internal consistency reliability for the 60-item scale was exceptionally high. There appears to be no general relationship between the EFI and psychological depression. However, there is a moderate relation when focus is on the middle-aged and their severe problems, specifically with family members. This strongly suggests that models of forgiveness must be developed that take into account not only degree of forgiveness given to an offender, but also a person's age, who hurt him or her, and the severity of hurt experienced. The clinical consequences are different depending on these variables. (LLL)

\*\*\*\*\*  
 \* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made \*  
 \* from the original document. \*  
 \*\*\*\*\*

ED 344 124

# Measuring Interpersonal Forgiveness

Michael J. Subkoviak  
Robert D. Enright  
Ching-Ru Wu  
Elizabeth A. Gassin  
Suzanne Freedman  
Leanne M. Olson  
Issidoros Sarinopoulos

Department of Educational Psychology  
University of Wisconsin-Madison

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
Office of Educational Research and Improvement  
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION  
CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as  
received from the person or organization  
originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve  
reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-  
ment do not necessarily represent official  
OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS  
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Michael J. Subkoviak

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES  
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association,  
San Francisco, April, 1992.

## Measuring Interpersonal Forgiveness

### Abstract

The construct of interpersonal forgiveness is operationalized and tested with 197 college students and 197 of their same-gender parents in the Midwestern United States. The Enright Forgiveness Inventory (EFI) showed strong internal consistency reliability. The EFI correlates significantly and negatively with anxiety particularly when a person is experiencing deep hurt in a developmentally relevant area. Developmental differences also were observed. Again, particularly when the hurt concerns a developmentally relevant area, college students are less forgiving and have more anxiety than their same-gender parents. The EFI thus appears to have sound psychometric properties.

### Background and Purpose

The field of moral development has broadened recently from its traditional Kohlbergian emphasis on justice to include other constructs such as caring (Brabeck, 1989; Gilligan, Ward, & Taylor, 1988) and forgiveness (Enright and the Human Development Study Group, 1991). The utility of forgiveness has been recognized recently by physicians working with cancer patients (Phillipps & Osborne, 1989) and by therapists interested in anger reduction in clients (Fitzgibbons, 1986; Hope, 1987; Kaufman, 1984). Despite the recent accolades in applied communities, we are only beginning to develop a knowledge base in this potentially useful area of moral development. The purpose of this presentation is to describe a pioneering attempt to construct a measure of psychological forgiveness. Initial reliability and validity estimates will be described for one of six cross-cultural samples that comprise the data set. The measure is intended for both basic research and applied settings in which forgiveness is involved.

A working definition of forgiveness, drawn principally from North (1987), is this. Forgiveness is the overcoming of resentment toward an offender, not by denying ourselves the right to such feelings, but by endeavoring to view the offender with benevolence, compassion, and even love, while recognizing that he or she has abandoned the right to them. The important points of this definition are as follows: a) one who forgives has suffered a deep hurt, thus showing resentment; b) the offended person has a moral right to resentment, but overcomes it nonetheless; c) a new response to the other accrues, including compassion and love; d) this loving response occurs despite the realization that there is no obligation to love the offender.

Enright et al. (1991), using the basic premises of North, expanded the definition of forgiveness. While North acknowledges changes in the forgiver's affect toward an offender,

Enright et al. (1991) also included judgments (how the forgiver thinks about the offender) and behavior (how the forgiver acts toward the offender) in the forgiveness process.

It also should be noted that North acknowledges two psychological characteristics of a forgiver's affect: a cessation of negative affect (resentment, anger) and the presence of positive affect (compassion, love). The same can hold for judgments or cognitive components. There is the cessation of condemning judgments and the presence of more positive judgments (Enright et al., 1991). There also can be the cessation of negative behaviors (revenge, for example) and the presence of positive behaviors (helpfulness, overtures toward reconciliation). In sum, as Enright et al. (1991) describe, a psychological response that is forgiveness includes six components: absence of negative affect, judgment, and behavior toward an offender and the presence of positive affect, judgment, and behavior toward the same offender. These occur in the face of deep, unfair hurt.

Because forgiveness as conceived here is a universal construct, not specific to one nation or group, we decided to develop the forgiveness measure within six different cultures: Brazil, Israel, Korea, Saudi Arabia, Taiwan, and the United States. This selection includes Northern and Southern communities, Asian, Middle-Eastern, and Western cultures. The cultures represent different religious affiliations: Buddhist, Christian, Jewish, and Muslim. Within each culture 200 college students and their same-gender parents (400 total) will be given the following: a 150-item forgiveness scale, depression, anxiety, and social desirability scales, and a one-item forgiveness question. Depression and anxiety were included because, in theory, as counselors Hope (1987) and Fitzgibbons (1986) report, clients who forgive deep injustices demonstrate a decrease in anxiety and depression. Two pilot studies have empirically demonstrated the relationship between forgiveness (as described here) and these variables (Al-Mabuk, 1990; and Hebl, 1990). Social desirability was included to minimize

faking as much as possible by eliminating those forgiveness items that have a significant relation with social desirability.

## Methods

### Subjects

The present paper focuses on outcomes for the United States sample only. Data collection within the other cultures is not yet complete. A total of 394 subjects (204 females and 190 males) provided data for the analyses reported below. Half the subjects were college students, and the other half were their same-gender parents. The average age within college was 22.1 (S.D. = 4.7) and within the parent sample was 49.6 (S.D. = 9.6). All college students were from a larger public university in the Midwestern United States. College students and their same-gender parents were chosen to standardize as much as possible relative social class standing within culture, to control education across cultures, and to make more accurate developmental comparisons possible.

### Instruments

The following questionnaires were given to each subject: the Enright Forgiveness Inventory (EFI), a background information scale, Spielberger State-Trait Anxiety Scale, Beck Depression Inventory (BDI), a hope scale, and a one-item forgiveness question. The hope scale proved to have little variability across the college sample and so was eliminated from the study.

Enright Forgiveness Inventory. Potential items for the EFI were generated by a panel of faculty and graduate students. All were versed in the psychology and philosophy of forgiveness, and one was a specialist in measurement. Items were created to assess the six areas noted above: absence of negative affect (NA), presence of positive affect (PA), absence of negative cognition (NC), presence of positive cognition (PC), absence of negative

behavior (NB), presence of positive behavior (PB) all toward the offending person. The panel generated 25 potential items per area (150 items total), each representing a specific situation that might occur under the given condition (e.g., "I think of ways to get even" assessed the presence of negative cognitions about the offender). Subjects focused on a particular experience of someone hurting them and responded to each statement on a six-point scale of agreement-disagreement, which is scored so that larger values indicate a more forgiving response. Items for the final form of the EFI were selected from the pool of 150 items on the basis of high correlation with the appropriate affect, cognition or behavior subscale score and low correlation with a social desirability measure. The final form contains 60 items evenly divided among the six areas noted above. The range of scores for the 60-item form is from 60 to 360 (10-60 within each of the six subscales).

Prior to considering the forgiveness items each subject was asked on the EFI to think of the most recent experience of someone hurting you deeply and unfairly. Next, the person rated the degree of hurt on a 1 (no hurt) to 5 (a great deal of hurt) scale. They then reported who hurt them (friend, spouse, employer, and so forth). The person then responded to the following: Is the person living? How long ago was the offense (in days, weeks, months or years). He or she then briefly described the offense.

The word "forgiveness" was not mentioned anywhere in the scale. In fact, the EFI was simply labeled "Attitude Scale." The first 50 items comprised the Affect subscales, in which all 50 positive and negative items were presented together. The directions and sample items are in Table 1. The Behavior subscales (50 items) were next followed by the Cognition subscales (50 items).

Eight additional items were given at the end of the scale. Five assessed pseudo-forgiveness (Augsburger, 1981; Hunter, 1978). Pseudo-forgiveness here includes denial and

condonation. We included these because a person who sees no problem certainly may express a "forgiving" attitude toward an "offender" because the deep hurt is masked. We eliminated a subject's data along with his or her matched parent or college student when the pseudo-forgiveness score was 20 or higher. The minimal cut-off indicates an agreement with the pseudo-forgiveness statements.

The other three items were repeated from the EFI as a consistency check. There was one item each repeated from the three 50-item subscales. An inconsistency was defined as a response not being on the same side (agree or disagree) as the original rating of the item. Two inconsistencies eliminated that subject's data (and same-gender match) from analysis. Nine pairs were eliminated through these procedures.

Background Information. This questionnaire asked for the demographics of age, gender, educational level, religious affiliation, and one's own behavioral practice within that religion. Because of time and space limitations here, we will not report the findings on religion.

Spielberger State-Trait Anxiety Scale. This is a 40-item self-report scale measuring one's immediate state of anxiety and the more pervasive trait of anxiety (Spielberger, Gorsuch, Lushene, Vagg, & Jacobs, 1983). Each statement is rated on a 4-point Likert scale. The range of scores is from 40 (low) to 160 (high anxiety)<sup>1</sup>. This is a widely used, valid instrument. Means, standard deviations, and Cronbach's alphas of internal consistency for our sample are in Table 2.

Beck Depression Inventory. This is a 21-item self report scale of psychological depression (Beck & Steen, 1987). We eliminated item 21 dealing with sexuality because its inclusion would not be appropriate for some cultures in which we are data-gathering. There is precedence in the published literature for eliminating this item (Reynolds & Coates, 1986).



The scale ranges from 0 (low depression) to 60 (high depression). This, too, is widely used and valid.

Crowne-Marlowe Social Desirability Scale. This is a 33-item, true-false inventory that assesses the degree to which a person is "faking good" on test items (Crowne & Marlowe, 1960).

One-item Forgiveness Question. This was a validity check on the EFI. It was worded as follows: To what extent have you forgiven the person you rated on the Attitude Scale [EFI]? It was rated on a 5-point Likert scale from "not at all" to "complete forgiveness."

### Testing Methods

Each subject individually filled out the questionnaires. College students were tested in groups of about 10-20. The children gave the packets of materials to the parents. When this was not possible we mailed the packets to the parents. A detailed set of instructions for individual administration was provided to all subjects. The questionnaires were randomly ordered for each subject. The only exception is that the one-item forgiveness question was always given as the last question in the packet. This was done to avoid entirely the direct mention of "forgiveness" throughout testing.

## Results

### Item Selection in the EFI

The final affect, cognition, and behavior subscales of the EFI were constructed by selecting items having high correlation with the corresponding subscale score and low correlation with the Crowne-Marlowe Social Desirability Scale, with the added constraint that half the items selected for each subscale be positive and the other half negative in connotation. For example, 10 positive and 10 negative affect items were selected from the potential item pool of 50 affect items. The selected items each correlated above +.75 with

the affect subscale score based on 50 items, and each correlated below  $+ .10$  with the social desirability measure. Items for the cognition and behavior subscales were selected in the same way. Thus, the current, experimental form of the EFI contains 60 items representing both positive and negative affect, cognition, and behavior. Each selected item correlates above  $+ .65$  with its respective subscale score based on 50 items and correlates below  $+ .17$  with the Crowne-Marlowe Social Desirability Scale.

### Reliability of the EFI

Alpha coefficients and other statistics associated with the various scales of the EFI are shown in Table 3. All scales obviously possess a high degree of internal consistency. In fact, it appears that each item functions as a slight variation on the singular theme of forgiveness. However, these alpha coefficients are upper bounds in the sense that they are based on the sample data used to select the items, i.e., the data for which the items had optimal statistical properties. Alpha coefficients based on other samples are likely to be somewhat lower.

A small-scale study of the EFI's test-retest reliability over a four week interval is in progress. The test-retest reliability coefficients are likely to be smaller than the alpha coefficients in Table 3 for a number of reasons. For example, subjects' forgiveness scores may vary over time due to true change in attitude as well as random error, which will reduce the correlation between the two test administrations. The outcomes of this study will be available soon.

### Validity of the EFI

Correlations among the EFI's final affect, cognition, and behavior subscales are substantial ( $.80 - .87$ ); thus there is ample justification for creating an EFI total score (see Table 3) by summing the subscales. However, the individual subscales also appear to have

value for studying further the concept and process of forgiveness. For example, note the difference between subscale means in Table 3, especially the mean for affect which is lower than the other subscales.

As previously mentioned, at the conclusion of the data collection procedure, subjects responded on a five-point scale to the following item: "To what extent have you forgiven the person rated on the Attitude Scale" (EFI)? Direct evidence that the EFI scales measure the intended construct is provided by the substantial correlations (.60 to .68) with this item, as shown in Table 4. These correlations are especially impressive given the fact that the reliability of this single Likert item is probably about .50, which places an upper bound of about .70 on its correlation with other variables. Incidentally, enhanced reliability and correlations with other variables is one important reason for using a collection of items, such as the EFI, to measure forgiveness rather than a single forgiveness item.

As indicated in Table 4, the EFI scales have near zero correlations (-.01 to .02) with the Crowne-Marlowe Social Desirability Scale, as expected. Thus, responses to EFI items are not substantially influenced by the social desirability response set. By design, any such items were identified and eliminated via the item analysis procedure used in constructing the EFI scales.

Differences Among Subscales of the EFI. Despite the very high internal consistency, which might suggest that there are no valid subscales within the EFI, matched-pairs t-tests across these subscales do indicate meaningful differences among them. We did nine matched-pairs t-test comparisons: negative vs. positive affect, negative vs. positive cognition, negative vs. positive behavior, all pairwise negative subscales, all pairwise positive subscales. Of the nine comparisons, all were statistically significant for the full sample (N = 394). Because we in all likelihood have too much statistical power here, we reduced the sample to

only those reporting a great deal of hurt ( $N = 117$ ). With this sample, seven of the nine comparisons were significant with a two-tailed test. See Table 5. As can be seen, people tend not to let go very easily of negative affect or to express positive affect toward the one who hurt them. They tend most easily to eliminate negative judgments toward an offending person.

Relation of Forgiveness to Anxiety. The published literature, as previously stated, suggests a link between forgiveness and anxiety in that people who experience serious interpersonal injustice and who do not forgive are high in anxiety (Fitzgibbons, 1986). We thus tested this relationship in five ways. Table 6 summarizes the results we will now report. First, we examined the general relation between the EFI and anxiety for all 394 subjects. This is not an adequate test of the relationship because most of the subjects did not report a great deal of hurt on the EFI. Only 117 of the 394 checked "a great deal of hurt." As Smedes (1984) and others (Hope, 1987; Hunter, 1978) instruct, forgiveness should be negatively related to anxiety when deep and unjust hurts are involved. Thus most of the subjects were not in such conflict as to be anxious over the problem reported. Under these circumstances, the Pearson  $r$  between the EFI and the anxiety scale was  $-.15$ ,  $p < .01$ . Even though this is statistically significant (because of the large sample size), the correlation is low.

As a second step, we selected only those subjects ( $N = 117$ ) who experienced a great deal of hurt from the reported incident. Here the correlation was  $-.25$ ,  $p < .01$ . The correlation is stronger, but still not of moderate size primarily because within the 117 subjects some were hurt by employees (which does not relate to anxiety), while others were hurt by family members. These different sources of hurt certainly may be seen as differing in degree of injustice. For example, with a spouse one is in (or should be in) a moral and contractual relationship of equality. When this is breached the injustice may be seen as severe.

Thus we next selected only those subjects ( $N = 52$ ) who reported the interpersonal difficulty with a spouse regardless of the degree of hurt. We could not select only severe hurt with spouse because of inadequate sample size. Nonetheless, the correlation of forgiveness and anxiety was  $r = -.37, p < .01$ . Within the State-Anxiety subscale (how one feels right now)  $r = -.44, p < .001$ . As you can see, as we select for deep or very unjust hurt, the correlations of forgiveness and anxiety increase in the negative direction.

For our fourth and fifth analyses here we selected particular problems within college and within the middle adult samples that would be developmentally appropriate for that age group. An important developmental task (and the most frequently reported area of hurt) within the college sample is in navigating through male-female relationships. Those reporting a great deal of hurt ( $N = 29$ ) were chosen. This time only the affect (both positive and negative) subscale was used because clinicians' reports are that it is the residual anger or hatred left over in unforgiveness that is debilitating. Here the correlation between affect of the EFI and anxiety was  $r = -.53, p < .01$ , a moderate to strong relationship. College students with severe hurt over an opposite gender friendship who do not forgive via their feelings have high anxiety. Those who do forgive by releasing negative affect and increasing positive affect toward the one who hurt them have reduced anxiety.

An important developmental task (and the most frequently reported area of hurt) within the middle adult sample is in navigating through relationships with spouse, children, parents, and relatives. Those reporting a great deal of hurt ( $N = 34$ ) within the negative affect subscale (those items concerned with anger, bitterness, or hatred) were selected. Positive affect was eliminated because, regardless of degree of hurt, within a family system there is little variability in positive affect; most have positive feelings toward the offending one. Here the correlation between negative affect of the EFI and anxiety was  $r = -.53, p < .001$ . Within the State-Anxiety subscale the  $r$  of negative affect

and anxiety =  $-.60$ ,  $p < .001$ . Those who do forgive by releasing negative affect toward the one who hurt them have reduced anxiety.

In summary, as the patterns in Table 6 indicate, when we move toward deep, unjust hurt in developmentally important relationships we see that forgiveness (the Affect subscale in particular) is inversely related to anxiety. The more one forgives, the less anxiety one has. We should be cautious until replication occurs because the  $N$  falls from a high of 394 to a low of 29 in these comparisons. Also, each case of a strengthened relation between forgiveness and anxiety is consistent with current theoretical expectations.

Developmental Analyses Between Forgiveness and Anxiety. The moral judgment literature suggests that forgiveness is developmental (Enright, Santos & Al-Mabuk, 1989; Piaget, 1932/1965). Our expectation was that as people gain maturity, they may be more willing to forgive a deep offense against them. We tried to eliminate as many confounding factors as we could in our developmental analysis by choosing to match college students with their same-gender biological parent. We further tried to control differences in educational level, degree of hurt experienced, and time since the reported hurt in a 2 x 2 (college vs. parent and male vs. female) analysis of covariance design.

Further, we chose those areas of hurt that were particularly developmentally appropriate for each group. We retained only those college students who experienced hurt within a male-female friendship (the most frequently occurring category for this age group). We retained only those parents who experienced hurt within their relationships with spouse or child (also the most frequently occurring category for this age group).

The analysis of covariance with the EFI total score as the dependent variable showed a significant main effect for age group  $F(1,154) = 7.23$ ,  $p < .008$ . The  $\bar{X}$  EFI total score for college was 273.21 (SD = 62.42, N = 85); the  $\bar{X}$  for parents was 292.87 (SD = 60.08, N = 78). No significant gender or interaction effects were observed.

Because the Affect subscales showed the lowest scores of all the subscales, we performed the above ANCOVA within Negative Affect and again had statistical significance for age group,  $F(1,154) = 6.84, p < .01$ , and for Positive Affect  $F(1,154) = 6.47, p < .02$ . In both cases the college students ( $\bar{X} = 41.84, SD = 14.50$  for Negative;  $\bar{X} = 40.32, SD = 13.17$  for Positive Affect) showed more negative and less positive affect toward an offending other than did their parents ( $\bar{X} = 46.22, SD = 12.72$  for Negative;  $\bar{X} = 44.44, SD = 12.99$  for Positive Affect).

Because forgiveness is developmental and related to anxiety, it follows that anxiety itself may show age differences. Using the same ANCOVA design, we see that anxiety, in fact, does differ between the age groups,  $F(1,154) = 5.10, p < .03$ . The college students ( $\bar{X} = 78.92, SD = 20.36, N = 85$ ) are more anxious than their parents ( $\bar{X} = 70.42, SD = 20.17, N = 78$ ). Spielberger et al. (1983) give percentile ranks for college students and 40-49 year old working adults. The college students in this subsample are between the 58th and 68th percentile, while the adults are between the 50th and 65th percentile, suggesting heightened anxiety in both groups.

The above analyses suggest that when there is self-reported interpersonal hurt within developmentally normative relationships that those in later adolescence have a harder time navigating through those difficulties. They are less forgiving and more anxious.

Relation of Forgiveness to Depression. We had a statistical artifact in this sample: virtually no variability in the depression scale. In hindsight, this is not unusual because we did not include a clinical subsample. The mean of the BDI was only 5.85. The range of scores for moderate-severe depression is 19-29 (Beck & Steer, 1987). It is clear that our sample on the average is far from this even when one adds the standard deviation to the mean in this sample. We have a floor effect in these data that will attenuate the correlation.

It is not surprising, then, to find no statistically significant relationship between forgiveness and depression in the full sample ( $N = 394$ ). We, however, do find a relationship when we center only on the middle-aged adult sample who report a great deal of hurt from a family member ( $N = 34$ ). The

Negative Affect subscale of the EFI and the BDI correlate  $-.43, p < .01$ . The college sample, in contrast, does not show such a relationship when severely hurt by an opposite-gender friend.

### Discussion

This initial attempt to devise a psychometrically sound measure of interpersonal forgiveness is encouraging. The internal consistency reliability for the 60-item scale is exceptionally high. Even though we expect some attenuation with subsequent samples, those reliabilities should remain high. The scale, despite its socially sensitive content, is not contaminated by a social desirability bias. Respondents answer honestly.

Even with the high internal consistency reliabilities, the EFI subscales do appear to be distinguishable from one another. People seem to be most positive toward those who hurt them first in how they think about the offender. How one feels about the other appears most negative. This is important information because it is the Affective subscale that is most consistently and negatively related to anxiety.

There appears to be no general relationship between the EFI and psychological depression. However, there is a moderate relation when we focus on the middle-aged and their severe problems specifically with family members. This strongly suggests that we must develop models of forgiveness that take into account not only degree of forgiveness given to an offender, but also a person's age, who hurt him or her, and the severity of hurt experienced. The clinical consequences are different depending on these variables.

Further, we need to focus on developmental issues when assessing whether forgiveness is to be used as a coping strategy in counseling. Forgiveness seems particularly appropriate for college students who are experiencing severe hurt within the developmentally significant male-female relationship. Those experiencing such difficulties may be feeling heightened anxiety as well. Middle-aged adults also may benefit from counseling that emphasizes forgiveness when experiencing severe hurt within developmentally significant family relationships. The developmental analyses here suggest that the college students are generally more deeply affected when so hurt as seen in their lower



forgiveness and higher anxiety levels. Yet, in the middle-age sample, those with deep hurts within a family context are prone to both anxiety and psychological depression.

For the future, we hope to develop an international version of the Enright Forgiveness Inventory. In the ideal, we will select the 60 best items across all six cultures so that direct comparisons can be made among cultures with one scale. This, of course, will take time, but the preliminary results here suggest that this endeavor will be worthwhile.

## Footnote

<sup>1</sup> Although the vast majority of scholars do not add State and Trait anxiety scores into a global measure of anxiety, we have chosen to so add. There are four reasons for this. First, the combination stabilizes the score, resulting in a more general measure of anxiety, which is our goal here. We have such a goal because theory does not dictate that a particular anxiety subscale should be more strongly related to forgiveness than the other subscale. An analogy for us is the Wechsler IQ test which combines the apparently disparate verbal and performance subscales into a general measure of intelligence. Second, the correlations between State and Trait subscales in the Spielberger et al. (1983) manual are sufficiently high to warrant combining them. Third, our alpha of internal consistency across all items of both subscales is .95, strongly suggesting a unitary construct. Fourth, the field is moving beyond the idea that anxiety is a personality trait. We say this because the DSM-III-R classifies an anxiety disorder within the affective, not the personality disorders (American Psychiatric Association, 1987).

## REFERENCES

- Al-Mabuk, R. H. (1990). The commitment to forgive in parentally love-deprived college students. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Wisconsin-Madison.
- American Psychiatric Association (1987). Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders (third edition - revised). Washington, DC: American Psychiatric Association.
- Augsburger, D. (1981). Caring enough to not forgive. Scottsdale, PA: Herald.
- Beck, A. T., & Steer, R. A. (1987). Beck depression inventory. San Antonio: Psychological Corporation.
- Brabeck, M. M. (Ed.) (1989). Who cares? New York: Praeger.
- Crowne, D. P., & Marlowe, D. (1960). A new scale of social desirability independent of psychopathology. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 24, 349-354.
- Enright, R. D., and the Human Development Study Group (1991). The moral development of forgiveness. In W. Kurtines & J. Gewirtz (Eds.), Handbook of moral behavior and development (Vol. 1). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Enright, R. D., Santos, M., & Al-Mabuk, R. (1989). The adolescent as forgiver. Journal of Adolescence, 12, 95-110.
- Fitzgibbons, R. P. (1986). The cognitive and emotional uses of forgiveness in the treatment of anger. Psychotherapy, 23(4), 629-633.
- Gilligan, C., Ward, J. V., & Taylor, J. M. (Eds.) (1988). Mapping the moral domain. Cambridge, MA: Center for the Study of Gender, Education, and Human Development.
- Hebl, J. H. (1990). Forgiveness as a counseling goal with elderly females. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Wisconsin-Madison.
- Hope, D. (1987). The healing paradox of forgiveness. Psychotherapy, 24(2), 240-244.
- Hunter, R. C. A. (1978). Forgiveness, retaliation, and paranoid reactions. Canadian Psychiatric Association Journal, 23, 167-173.

- Kaufman, M. E. (1984). The courage to forgive. Israeli Journal of Psychiatry and Related Sciences, 21, 177-187.
- North, J. (1987). Wrongdoing and forgiveness. Philosophy, 62, 499-508.
- Phillipps, L. J., & Osborne, J. W. (1989). Cancer patients' experiences of forgiveness therapy. Canadian Journal of Counselling, 23, 236-251.
- Piaget, J. (1965). The moral judgment of the child. New York: Free Press (original work published 1932).
- Reynolds, W. M., & Coates, K. I. (1986). The comparison of cognitive-behavior therapy and relaxation training for the treatment of depression in adolescents. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 54, 653-660.
- Smedes, L. B. (1984). Forgive & forget: Healing the hurts we don't deserve. San Francisco: Harper & Row.
- Spielberger, C. D., Gorsuch, R. L., Lushene, R., Vagg, P. R., & Jacobs, G. A. (1983). State-trait anxiety inventory (form y): Self evaluation questionnaire. Palo Alto CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.

Table 1

Examples of Items from the Enright Forgiveness Inventory (EFI)

(Examples from the Affect Subscale)

This set of items deals with your current feelings or emotions right now toward the person. Try to assess your actual feeling for the person on each item. For each item please check the appropriate line that best describes your current feeling. Please do not skip any item. Thanks.

I feel \_\_\_\_\_ toward him/her. (Place each word in the blank when answering each item)

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
1. warm	0	1	2	3	4	5
9. repulsed	0	1	2	3	4	5
12. angry	0	1	2	3	4	5
15. caring	0	1	2	3	4	5

(Examples from the Behavioral Subscale)

This set of items deals with your current behavior toward the person. Consider how you do act or would act toward the person in answering the questions. For each item please check the appropriate line that best describes your current behavior or probable behavior: Please do not skip any items. Thanks.

Regarding the person, I do or would \_\_\_\_\_. (Place each word or phrase in the blank when answering each item).

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
21. show friendship	0	1	2	3	4	5
22. avoid	0	1	2	3	4	5
25. help	0	1	2	3	4	5
29. speak ill of him/her	0	1	2	3	4	5

(continued on next page)

[Table 1 continued]

## (Examples from the Cognition Subscale)

This set of items deals with how you currently think about the person. Reflect on the kinds of thoughts that occupy your mind right now regarding this particular person. For each item please check the appropriate line that best describes your current thinking. Please do not skip any item. Thanks.

I think he or she is \_\_\_\_\_. (Place each word or phrase in the blank when answering each item).

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
45. worthy of respect	0	1	2	3	4	5
52. corrupt	0	1	2	3	4	5

Regarding the person, I \_\_\_\_\_.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
54. wish him/her well	0	1	2	3	4	5
55. disapprove of him/her	0	1	2	3	4	5

In thinking through the person and event you just rated, please consider the following final questions:

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
61. There really was no problem now that I think about it. (condonation)	0	1	2	3	4	5
64. My feelings were never hurt. (denial)	0	1	2	3	4	5

Note. All of these are drawn from the 65 item EFI.

Table 2

## Descriptive Statistics for Scales Used as Correlates

Scale	Items	Mean	St. Dev.	Alpha
Spielberger	40	74.54	19.55	.95
Trait Anxiety	20	37.94	9.95	.92
State Anxiety	20	36.60	11.04	.93
Beck	20	5.85	4.95	.81
Crowne-Marlowe	33	14.93	5.54	.79

Table 3

## Descriptive Statistics for Scales of the Enright Forgiveness Inventory (EFI)

Scale	Items	Mean	St. Dev.	Alpha
Positive Affect	10	36.73	14.14	.96
Negative Affect	10	39.60	13.97	.95
Total Affect	20	76.34	27.06	.97
Positive Behavior	10	43.89	12.76	.96
Negative Behavior	10	43.12	11.71	.93
Total Behavior	20	87.02	23.24	.97
Positive Cognition	10	45.18	12.16	.96
Negative Cognition	10	48.02	11.76	.95
Total Cognition	20	93.20	23.11	.97
EFI Total	60	256.55	69.43	.98

Note. This is for the full sample of 394.



Table 4

## Validity Coefficients for Scales of the Enright Forgiveness Inventory (EFI)

EFI	Forgiveness Item	Crowne- Marlowe
Affect	.68	-.01
Behavior	.64	.02
Cognition	.60	.02
EFI Total	.68	-.00

Note. This is with the full sample of 394.

Table 5  
Matched-pairs t-test comparisons of the Subscales within  
the Enright Forgiveness Inventory

Comparison	Means	t-value	df	2-tail probabilities
NA vs. PA	35.8 (NA), 34.9 (PA)	1.31	116	.192
NC vs. PC	45.7 (NC), 43.9 (PC)	3.08	116	.003
NB vs. PB	41.1 (NB), 41.8 (PB)	-.87	116	.387
NA vs. NB	35.8 (NA), 41.1 (NB)	-6.43	116	.0001
NA vs. NC	35.8 (NA), 45.7 (NC)	-9.74	116	.0001
NB vs. NC	41.1 (NB), 45.7 (NC)	-5.64	116	.0001
PA vs. PB	34.9 (PA), 41.8 (PB)	-9.56	116	.0001
PA vs. PC	34.9 (PA), 43.9 (PC)	-10.20	116	.0001
PB vs. PC	41.8 (PB), 43.9 (PC)	-3.10	116	.002

Note. The comparisons are for N = 117 (those expressing a great deal of hurt). NA = absence of negative affect toward the offending person; PA = presence of positive affect toward him/her; NC = absence of negative cognition toward him/her; PC = presence of positive cognition; NB = absence of negative behavior; PB = presence of positive behavior toward him/her.

Table 6  
Correlations Between Forgiveness and Anxiety

Relationship Examined	Pearson correlation value
Forgiveness and Anxiety for entire sample	$r = -.15, p < .01$ (N = 394)
Forgiveness and Anxiety for those reporting a great deal of hurt	$r = -.25, p < .01$ (N = 117)
Forgiveness and Anxiety for those hurt by spouse regardless of degree of hurt	$r = -.37, p < .01$ (N = 52)
Affective forgiveness and Anxiety for college students reporting a great deal of hurt in male-female friendships	$r = -.53, p < .01$ (N = 29)
<u>Negative</u> affect within forgiveness and Anxiety for middle-aged adults reporting a great deal of hurt within a family context	$r = -.53, p < .001$ (N = 34)