

A Personological Examination of Self- and Other-Forgiveness in the Five Factor Model

Scott R. Ross, Anna C. Kendall, and Kasee G. Matters

*Department of Psychology
DePauw University*

Thomas A. Wrobel

*Department of Psychology
University of Michigan–Flint*

Mark S. Rye

*Department of Psychology
University of Dayton*

In a sample composed of 147 undergraduates (age range 18 to 55 years; $M = 22$), we conducted an examination of the convergent and discriminant validity of self- and other-forgiveness in the Five-factor model of personality (FFM). Using multiple measures of each construct, principal components analysis (PCA) supported a 2-component model of forgiveness. Findings for the PCA and external correlates with the FFM provided evidence for a largely orthogonal relationship between self- and other-forgiveness. Specifically, self-forgiveness was negatively related to Neuroticism and unrelated to Agreeableness, whereas other-forgiveness was unrelated to Neuroticism and positively related to Agreeableness. Overlap between the constructs was found in which both self- and other-forgiveness were negatively related to the hostility facet of Neuroticism and the order facet from Conscientiousness and positively related to the warmth and positive emotions facet scales from the Extraversion domain of the Revised NEO Personality Inventory (Costa & McCrae, 1992). Overall, these findings suggest that self- and other-forgiveness, although seemingly similar, carry very different motivational underpinnings.

Early research exploring forgiveness has claimed benefits including a reduction of guilt, anger, anxiety, and the prevention of the ill effects of grief and remorse (Cerney, 1989; Human Development Study Group, 1991). These reports have laid the groundwork for the expansion of forgiveness therapy to specific clinical populations (Al-Mabuk & Downs, 1996; Worthington & DiBlasio, 1990). A number of intervention studies have arisen that provide empirical support for forgiveness as a psychological construct (Freedman & Enright, 1996; Rye & Pargamant, 2002). Typically, these studies have included interventions designed to facilitate forgiveness and to change levels of subjective distress through forgiveness. Most investigations have focused on the forgiveness of others (e.g., Freedman & Enright, 1996; McCullough, Worthington & Rachal, 1997), with a minority having examined the forgiveness of self (Al-Mabuk & Downs, 1996; Gerber, 1990). However, relatively little attention has been given to comparing forgiveness of self and others.

Although theorists have clarified the distinction between forgiveness and related constructs (e.g., reconciliation; Human Development Study Group, 1991; legal pardon; Enright, 1991; and empathy; McCullough, Worthington, & Rachal, 1997), the exact definition of what constitutes forgiveness and how to measure it is still open to debate. For example, the measurement of forgiveness has been complicated by those who suggested that “true forgiveness” is marked by the presence of positive affect as well as the absence of negative affect toward some transgressor (e.g., the Human Development Study Group, 1991). Others, however, have claimed that only an absence of negative affect is essential (Edwards et al., 2002), citing that emotional release from the transgression is the primary component of forgiveness. This dispute is currently without resolution, and measures of the construct reflect the discrepancy. Examples of scales that measure both positive and negative affect components include the Forgiveness Scale (FS; Rye

et al., 2001) and the Enright Forgiveness Inventory (Subkoviak et al., 1995).

In contrast to research focusing on the assessment of forgiveness toward specific people or wrongdoings, several researchers have developed scales to measure dispositional or trait forgiveness. One such example is the Willingness to Forgive Scale (Hebl & Enright, 1993), which asks how individuals would respond to hypothetical wrongdoings. Other dispositional measures have subsequently been developed. Recently, Berry, Worthington, Parrott, O'Connor, and Wade (2001) developed the Transgression Narrative Test of Forgiveness (TNTF) to assess this more global conceptualization of the construct. Similar to this scale, Rye et al. (2001) also recently developed the Forgiveness Likelihood Scale (FLS), which measures forgiveness across situations and circumstances as well. Previously, the Heartland Forgiveness Scale (HFS; Edwards et al., 2002), the Enright Willingness to Forgive, and the Other-Forgiveness subscale of Mauger's Forgiveness Scale (Mauger et al., 1992) had been developed to measure dispositional or trait forgiveness. However, none of these measures are widely used; they all seem to be idiosyncratic to the original study reporting their use and development.

Mauger et al. (1992) were the first to compose a validated set of scales for the forgiveness of both self and others that also measures dispositional forgiveness. Additionally, Snyder et al. (as cited in Edwards et al., 2002) developed a well-validated and concise measure of self-forgiveness, other-forgiveness, and also situational forgiveness. Called the HFS, it was intended for use in nonclinical populations. Based on the relationships of self- and other-forgiveness scales with measures of psychopathology, Mauger et al. suggested that self-forgiveness reflects an *intropunitive style*, whereas other-forgiveness represents an *extrapunitive style*. An *extrapunitive style* is one in which the person seeks revenge, holds grudges, and blames others for apparent transgressions. In contrast, an *intropunitive style* is one in which the person often sees himself or herself as damaged, unworthy of acceptance, and with a tendency to internalize blame.

Maltby, Macaskill, and Day (2001), in an effort to elaborate on the theoretical implications of Mauger et al. (1992), conducted one of the first studies examining self- and other-forgiveness in terms of basic personality. Using the Revised Eysenck Personality Questionnaire (EPQ-R; Eysenck & Eysenck, 1994), Maltby et al. (2001) found that self-forgiveness was negatively related to Neuroticism, consistent with their hypothesis that failure to forgive one's self is indicative of an *intropunitive style*. In addition, other-forgiveness was positively related to Extraversion in men and negatively related to Psychoticism in women. Although one of the main objectives of the study was to explore and further identify differences in punitive style among those persons who fail to forgive themselves versus others, the EPQ-R does not provide a specific measure of anger. This aspect of personality should be an important component to

the *extrapunitive style* theorized to be complementary to the failure to forgive others. If other-forgiveness is characterized by a tendency to blame others, it should be related more to anger than other aspects of negative affect reflecting internalization (e.g., anxiety and depression). Although Maltby et al.'s study was useful in clarifying the importance of self- and other-forgiveness in relation to negative affect, it says little about the relationship of these constructs to other aspects of personality.

One trait model that may be helpful in further delineating similarities and differences between self- and other-forgiveness is the Five-factor model of personality (FFM). A recently revived model for describing the basic traits composing normal personality (Costa & McCrae, 1992; Digman & Takemoto-Chock, 1981; Goldberg, 1990), the FFM has received some attention in previous studies of forgiveness. Although different investigators have variously referred to the "Big Five" personality traits, they include the following dimensions: Neuroticism–Emotional Stability, Extraversion–Introversion, Openness–Closedness to Experience, Agreeableness–Antagonism, and Conscientiousness–Undirectedness (Costa & McCrae, 1992). Because the FFM provides a common framework from which to describe other personality constructs, the FFM may be useful in the validation of new constructs. On the Big Five Personality Inventory (John, Donahue, & Kentle, 1991), neuroticism is negatively related to forgiveness (Ashton, Paunonen, Helmes, & Jackson, 1998; Berry et al., 2001). Additionally, a number of researchers believe that acts of forgiveness are motivated by prosocial behaviors, reflecting high Extraversion (interpersonal warmth and positive emotions) and Agreeableness (trust, love, compassion, and empathy toward a transgressor; McCullough et al., 1997). Ashton et al. (1998), Berry et al. (2001), and John (1990) found a positive relationship between forgiveness and Agreeableness. Finally, Sweet (2001) found that the domains of Neuroticism and Agreeableness on the Revised NEO Personality Inventory (NEO-PI-R; Costa & McCrae, 1992) significantly predicted forgiveness of others in a sample of young adults. It is important to note, however, that the studies by Ashton et al., Berry et al., John, and Sweet did not explicitly distinguish between self- and other-forgiveness. Mixed findings for previous studies examining forgiveness vis-à-vis the FFM may be due to use of different FFM measures as well as the inclusion of forgiveness measures that tap varying levels of self- and other-forgiveness.

In this study, we examined the distinctiveness of self- and other-forgiveness. Little consideration has been given to the assessment of these constructs, and the general thrust of forgiveness studies has largely focused on treatment rather than assessment (Al-Mabuk & Downs, 1996; Gerber, 1990). In addition to examining the validity of self- and other-forgiveness as distinct constructs, we explored in this study the relationship between forgiveness and the FFM. Most previous studies of forgiveness have relied on the use

of one or two measures of forgiveness rather than multiple measures of the construct. In an effort to account for the lack of standardized measurement, a number of measures are used in this study to assess the constructs of self- and other-forgiveness. In light of previous investigations, we propose the following hypotheses: (a) self- and other-forgiveness, although modestly related ($r > .10$ but $< .30$; Cohen, 1988), represent largely independent constructs; (b) other-forgiveness is related to an *extrapunitive style*, whereas self-forgiveness is related to an *intropunitive style*. Consequently, other-forgiveness should be more closely related to the Agreeableness domain and the Hostility facet of the Neuroticism domain, whereas self-forgiveness should be more related to the Neuroticism domain, showing strong relationships to Anxiety and Depression facets (Maltby et al., 2001). Additionally, we also examine relationships between self- and other-forgiveness to other domain and facet scales of the NEO-PI-R in an effort to further explicate the nature of these two aspects of forgiveness.

METHOD

Participants

One hundred forty-seven undergraduate students enrolled in Psychology courses at two universities were recruited and awarded compensation in the form of extra credit for their participation. Mean age for the group was 22.26 years, and ages ranged from 18 to 55; 77% of the sample were women. Ninety-two percent were White. Participants also indicated the following religious affiliations: Protestant (44%), Catholic (27%), Judaism (1%), and Other (28%). Participants rated their level of activity in organized religious activities on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (*not at all active*) to 5 (*extremely active*); the mean was 2.10 ($SD = .94$), indicating that most are *rarely active*.

Measures

Heartland Forgiveness Scale (HFS). This scale measures forgiveness of self and others and “situational forgiveness” as separate constructs (Edwards et al., 2002). The scale includes 18 true–false statements (6 for each subscale). A sample item for self-forgiveness is, “It is really hard to accept myself after I have messed up.” A sample item for other-forgiveness is, “When someone disappoints me, I can eventually move past it.” A sample item for situational forgiveness is, “In time, I can be understanding of bad circumstances in my life.” Test–retest reliability has been reported at .82, with Cronbach’s alphas ranging between .84 and .87 for the total scale score (Edwards et al., 2002).

Mauger Forgiveness Scale. This scale contains two subscales. The Forgiveness of Self scale consists of 15

true–false statements designed to measure self-forgiveness. Examples include, “I often feel like I have failed to live the right kind of life.” For the Forgiveness of Self scale, test–retest reliability has been reported at .67, with a Cronbach’s alpha of .82 (Mauger et al., 1992). The Forgiveness of Others scale is composed of 15 true–false statements including, “If another person hurts you first, it is all right to get back at him or her.” Test–retest reliability has been reported at .94, with a Cronbach’s alpha of .79 (Mauger et al., 1992).

Forgiveness Likelihood Scale (FLS). This scale was used to assess participants’ likelihood to forgive others across various situations (Rye et al., 2001). It contains 10 brief descriptions of hypothetical offenses using a Likert-type format with responses ranging from 1 (*not at all likely*) to 5 (*extremely likely*). A sample question is, “A friend breaks a promise to you and tells other people about your situation. What is the likelihood that you would choose to forgive your friend?” Rye et al. (2001) reported a test–retest reliability of .81 and Cronbach’s alpha of .85.

Forgiveness Scale (FS). This scale was used to measure forgiveness as defined by both absence of negative affect, cognition, and behavior and presence of positive affect, cognition, and behavior (Rye et al., 2001). Participants were asked to refer to a person who has wronged them and answer 15 Likert-type items, with responses varying from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*). Sample items include, “I can’t stop thinking about how I was wronged by this person.” Rye et al. (2001) reported a test–retest correlation of .80 and Cronbach’s alpha of .87.

Transgression Narrative Test of Forgivingness (TNTF). Similar to the FLS, this scale was also developed to measure forgiveness as a cross-situational disposition (Berry et al., 2001). It consists of five hypothetical scenarios in which participants are to indicate how likely they would be to forgive, also using a Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (*definitely not forgive*) to 5 (*definitely forgive*). Sample scenarios include, “A friend asks to borrow a paper you have written for class to get an idea of what to write about, you agree. They simply copy your paper and turn it in to the professor. The professor accuses you both of cheating. How likely are you to forgive the person?” Test–retest reliability for the scale has been reported at .95 (Berry et al., 2001), with a Cronbach’s alpha at .73.

NEO-PI-R. This inventory (Costa & McCrae, 1992) was used to assess the FFM personality traits. The NEO-PI-R consists of 240 items on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*) that measure these five basic personality domains. In addition, each domain scale is composed of six facet scales. For example, the domain scale of Neuroticism is composed of facet scales of anxiety, angry-hostility, depression, self-consciousness, impulsiveness, and vulnerability.

Procedure

Students anonymously completed the aforementioned measures of forgiveness and personality in small group sessions of 5 to 20 persons. To prime the general construct of forgiveness, participants were first asked to think about a time when someone wronged them and write a brief paragraph describing the upset. Participants also rated their opinion of the severity of the offense on a scale ranging from 1 (*not at all severe*) to 4 (*very severe*). The mean of all participants was 2.97 ($SD = .90$), indicating recall of a moderately severe wrongdoing. Participants then completed the NEO-PI-R followed by forgiveness measures. Order of administration of the forgiveness measures was counterbalanced using a Latin square design.

RESULTS

Means, standard deviations, and Cronbach's alphas for forgiveness and NEO-PI-R domain scales are reported in Table 1. In general, internal consistency was adequate for most measures with alpha levels in the .70 and .80 range.

To determine the relationship between self- and other-forgiveness, bivariate correlations were computed between the forgiveness measures to determine the convergent and discriminant validity of these measures. Results are shown in Table 2. Fisher's r -to- z transformation was used to determine whether correlations for self- and other-forgiveness were significantly different from each other (Hays, 1988). As expected, measures of self-forgiveness were more highly correlated with each other (median $r = .55$, $p < .001$) than they were to measures of other-forgiveness (median $r = .10$, $p > .20$; Fisher's r -to- z transformation for the median r , $z = 6.27$, $p < .001$). Con-

versely, we also found that measures of other-forgiveness were more highly correlated with each other (median $r = .62$, $p < .001$) than with measures of self-forgiveness (median $r = .10$, $p > .20$; $z = 7.59$, $p < .001$).

To reduce the number of forgiveness variables that would be used in subsequent analyses, we performed a principal components analysis of all forgiveness scales. Examination of the scree plot and eigenvalues suggested that a two-factor solution best fit the data. The first factor, Other-Forgiveness, had an eigenvalue of 3.17 and accounted for 39.6% of the variance. The second factor, Self-Forgiveness, had an eigenvalue of 1.77 and accounted for an additional 22.1% of the variance. Third and fourth components had eigenvalues of .93 and .72. An oblique rotation was performed on the covariance matrix despite the modest correlations exhibited between measures of self- and other-forgiveness. This method for rotating the factor solution assumes that the resulting factors are correlated with each other. Generally, the analysis using oblique (Δ set at 0) yielded high loadings for each forgiveness measure on one of two factors; measures of other-forgiveness loaded on Factor 1 (range = .72 to .84), whereas measures of self-forgiveness loaded on Factor 2 (range = .70 to .84). Also, no double loadings (greater than .40) were noted across factors. The following measures loaded on Factor 1: Mauger Other-Forgiveness scale (.74), Heartland Other-Forgiveness scale (.84), FLS (.73), FS (.72), and the TNTF (.79). Only Mauger Self-Forgiveness (.84) and the Heartland Self-Forgiveness (.82) and Situational Forgiveness (.70) scales loaded on Factor 2.¹ The correlation between Factor 1 and Factor 2 was—at best—modest at .17, in keeping with the results reported in Table 2.

To further examine the construct validity of these constructs, we examined the correlations for regression-based factor scores representing measures of self- and other-forgiveness, respectively, with domain and facet scales of the NEO-PI-R. These correlations along with z values for the differences in correlation coefficients for self- and other-forgiveness, respectively, are presented in Table 3. Forgiveness of self was negatively correlated with Neuroticism ($r = -.62$, $p < .001$) but positively and to a lesser degree correlated with the Extraversion ($r = .26$, $p < .01$) and Conscientiousness domains ($r = .19$, $p < .05$). As expected, forgiveness of others was correlated with Agreeableness ($r = .51$, $p < .001$); a modest but significant relationship was also noted with the Extraversion domain ($r = .19$, $p < .05$).

Among the facet scales of the NEO-PI-R, expected correlations were found with both self- and other-forgiveness. Self-forgiveness was negatively correlated with all facets of

TABLE 1
Means, Standard Deviations, and Alpha Estimates of Reliability for Forgiveness Measures and T Scores of NEO-PI-R Domain Scales

Scale	M	SD	Cronbach's α
Heartland	94.5	13.1	.83
Heartland Self	32.7	5.5	.76
Heartland Other	30.3	5.8	.80
Heartland Situational	31.5	6.3	.79
Mauger Other-Forgiveness	10.0	2.7	.68
Mauger Self-Forgiveness	10.2	3.1	.73
Forgiveness Likelihood Scale	26.8	6.6	.85
Forgiveness Scale	46.9	10.6	.87
Transgression Narrative Test of Forgivingness	14.6	3.5	.74
NEO-PI-R Neuroticism	50.2	9.3	.90
NEO-PI-R Extraversion	50.9	9.8	.91
NEO-PI-R Openness	51.7	10.1	.90
NEO-PI-R Agreeableness	51.6	10.4	.90
NEO-PI-R Conscientiousness	49.8	9.1	.87

Note. $N = 147$. NEO-PI-R = Revised NEO Personality Inventory.

¹When we rotated the matrix using varimax that treats components as independent constructs, the results remained essentially unchanged. Overall, the pattern of loadings for scales on the latent components was highly similar to the pattern of loadings across the two components when using oblique rotation. Again, no double loadings ($> .40$) were found for any scale across varimax rotated components.

TABLE 2
Pearson Product–Moment Correlations Among Measures of Self- and Other-Forgiveness

Measure	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1. Heartland Self-Forgiveness	1.00	.22**	.39***	.10	.55***	.09	.10	-.04
2. Heartland Other-Forgiveness		1.00	.34***	.62***	.08	.47***	.52***	.56***
3. Heartland Situational			1.00	.15	.40***	.20*	.31***	.12
4. Mauger Other-Forgiveness				1.00	.18*	.35***	.47***	.42***
5. Mauger Self-Forgiveness					1.00	-.02	.20*	-.05
6. Forgiveness Likelihood						1.00	.42***	.56***
7. Forgiveness Scale							1.00	.43***
8. Transgression Narrative Test of Forgiveness								1.00

Note. *N* = 147.

p* < .05. *p* < .01. ****p* < .001.

Neuroticism (see Table 3). Forgiveness of self was also positively correlated with several facets of the Conscientiousness factor (e.g., Competence, Achievement Striving, and Self-Discipline) and the Trust and Modesty facets of the Agreeableness domain, respectively.

Other-forgiveness was positively correlated with the domain scales of Extraversion and Agreeableness, whereas self-forgiveness was negatively correlated with Neuroticism and positively correlated with Extraversion and Conscientiousness. In terms of facet scales, other-forgiveness was negatively correlated with the Hostility facet of the Neuroticism factor ($r = -.38, p < .001$), but all other correlations with Neuroticism facets were nonsignificant. Forgiveness of others was also correlated with all facets of Agreeableness. In addition, the Values ($r = -.19, p < .05$) facet of the Openness to Experience domain and the Order ($r = -.18, p < .05$) facet of the Conscientiousness domain were correlated with other-forgiveness. In contrast, self-forgiveness was negatively correlated with all facets of Neuroticism. Additionally, facets of Trust ($r = .29, p < .001$) and Modesty ($r = -.16, p < .05$) from the Agreeableness domain were correlated with self-forgiveness. Furthermore, gregariousness ($r = .17, p < .05$) from Extraversion and the three facets of Competence ($r = .35, p < .001$), Achievement Striving ($r = .22, p < .05$), and Self-Discipline ($r = .21, p < .05$) from the Conscientiousness domain were also correlated with self-forgiveness. Finally, self- and other-forgiveness were both positively correlated with the warmth and positive emotions facets of the Extraversion domain.

When examining the differences between self- and other-forgiveness, all but one facet (Hostility) of Neuroticism domain were more highly correlated with self- versus other-forgiveness. In contrast, all of the facets of Agreeableness were more highly correlated with other- versus self-forgiveness. Sporadic differences between self- and other-forgiveness were also found for Extraversion, Openness, and Conscientiousness.

To determine which domains and facets of the NEO–PI–R best predict forgiveness of others and self, several multiple regression (MR) analyses were conducted. MR analysis was used to determine which domains and facets were most im-

TABLE 3
Correlations Between Forgiveness Factors and NEO–PI–R Domains and Facets

Domain and Facet	Factor		Difference <i>z</i> Score
	Other-Forgiveness	Self-Forgiveness	
Neuroticism	-.12	-.62***	7.35***
Anxiety	-.06	-.47***	5.42***
Hostility	-.38***	-.33***	0.72
Depression	-.06	-.66***	8.80***
Self-consciousness	-.03	-.44***	5.30***
Impulsiveness	-.01	-.23***	2.65***
Vulnerability	.01	-.47***	6.02***
Extraversion	.19*	.26**	.84
Warmth	.36***	.24**	1.69
Gregariousness	.15	.17*	0.24
Assertiveness	-.05	.03	0.96
Activity	.09	.11	0.24
Excitement seeking	-.11	.12	2.77**
Positive emotions	.33***	.39***	0.84
Openness	.10	-.04	1.69
Fantasy	.16	-.10	3.13***
Aesthetics	.08	.01	0.84
Feelings	.13	-.13	3.13***
Actions	.14	.09	0.60
Ideas	.06	-.02	0.96
Values	-.19*	.00	2.29*
Agreeableness	.50***	.09	5.54***
Trust	.46***	.29***	2.41**
Straightforwardness	.28***	.11	2.17**
Altruism	.30***	.11	2.41**
Compliance	.46***	.05	5.42***
Modesty	.27***	-.16*	5.18***
Tender-mindedness	.38***	-.03	5.18***
Conscientiousness	.05	.19*	1.69
Competence	.06	.35***	3.49**
Order	-.18*	-.18*	0.00
Dutifulness	.12	.04	0.96
Achievement	.09	.22*	1.57
Striving			
Self-discipline	.04	.21*	2.04*
Deliberation	.12	.09	0.36

Note. *N* = 147. NEO–PI–R = Revised NEO Personality Inventory.

p* < .05. *p* < .01. ****p* < .001.

portant in describing self- or other-forgiveness. In the first, all five domains of the NEO-PI-R were entered simultaneously in an effort to predict Factor 2 (Self-Forgiveness) scores. The R^2 for this model was .40, $F(5, 141) = 17.93, p < .001$. The Neuroticism domain was the single significant predictor in this model ($\beta = -.62, p < .001$). In performing the same analyses for Factor 1 (Other), an R^2 of .29 was found, $F(5, 141) = 10.99, p < .001$, with the Agreeableness domain as the sole predictor of forgiving others ($\beta = .50, p < .001$).

For domain scales that were significantly correlated with forgiveness scores in the bivariate analyses, we performed follow-up MR analyses in which all six facets from the corresponding domain scale were entered in stepwise fashion to predict self- or other-forgiveness. Using this method, three stepwise MR analyses were conducted for self-forgiveness and two for other-forgiveness. For self-forgiveness, two significant facets—Depression and Impulsiveness—emerged as predictors from the Neuroticism domain. These two facets combined yielded an R^2 of .46, $F(2, 144) = 60.68, p < .001$. Depression was the best predictor of self-forgiveness ($\beta = -.64, p < .001$), with Impulsiveness being a secondary, modest predictor ($\beta = -.14, p < .05$). Additionally, Positive Emotions ($\beta = -.64, p < .001$) was the best predictor ($R^2 = .15$), $F(1, 145) = 26.08, p < .001$ of self-forgiveness from the Extraversion domain. In terms of Conscientiousness, competence ($\beta = .37, p < .001$) followed by Order ($\beta = .15, p < .05$) were the best predictors of self-forgiveness ($R^2 = .14$), $F(2, 144) = 12.08, p < .001$.

In terms of other-forgiveness, stepwise MR revealed the Compliance facet ($\beta = .26, p < .005$) followed by Trust ($\beta = .25, p < .005$) and Tender-Mindedness ($\beta = .19, p < .01$) to be the best predictors from the Agreeableness domain ($R^2 = .30$), $F(3, 143) = 21.59, p < .001$. Finally, Warmth ($\beta = .29, p < .005$), Excitement Seeking ($\beta = -.23, p < .005$), and Positive Emotions ($\beta = .20, p < .05$) were the best predictors ($R^2 = .20$), $F(3, 143) = 11.70, p < .001$ of other-forgiveness from the Extraversion domain. Examination of follow-up diagnostics for each regression equation revealed no multivariate outliers, points of influence, or multicollinearity among predictor variables.

DISCUSSION

In this study, we found that measures of self- and other-forgiveness represent distinct dimensions within the more general construct of forgiveness. Specifically, we found that measures of these respective constructs load on separate factors with none showing double loadings (i.e., exhibited loadings greater than .40 on both factors). These findings are in keeping with those of Mauger et al. (1992) who discussed the importance of this potential dichotomy in the forgiveness literature. Additionally, zero order correlations between measures of self- and other-forgiveness were modest to nonsignificant, indicating that these are largely different con-

structs and should be considered separately in studies of forgiveness. Of interest is that the situational subscale of the HFS loaded cleanly on the self-forgiveness factor.

In addition, we also found that self- and other-forgiveness demonstrated theoretically predicted differences with modest similarities in the FFM. When examining forgiveness of self, the Neuroticism domain was the only significant predictor. Nonetheless, it accounted for almost 40% of the variance in self-forgiveness. This result suggests that those who lack emotional stability are also those for whom forgiveness of self is most difficult. Furthermore, Depression, Anxiety, and Vulnerability appear to be most indicative of failure to forgive self. The pattern of facets typifies an emotionally fragile and guilt-prone person. Among the facets of this domain, low Depression was the best predictor of self-forgiveness followed by low Impulsiveness. The significant relationship demonstrated with depression supports the views of Maltby et al. (2001) as well as Mauger et al. (1992) who found a relationship between failure to forgive self and an *intropunitiv* style (punishment or blame directed toward the self for wrongdoings or life upsets). Those persons who have the greatest difficulty forgiving themselves tend to be those who also view themselves negatively, experiencing feelings of guilt and worthlessness associated with depression. Possibly, this attitude may lead to a sense of helplessness when facing one's own wrongful actions and impede the forgiveness process indefinitely.

It was also found that Agreeableness from the NEO-PI-R was the best predictor of other-forgiveness, accounting for 29% of the variance. This result suggests that persons who are highly agreeable also tend to be those who are more likely to forgive others when they have been wronged. Within the Agreeableness domain, positive relationships were found between other-forgiveness and all Agreeableness facets. However, Trust, Compliance, and Tender-Mindedness were the best predictors of the tendency to forgive another. This pattern of facets suggests that those who are more likely to forgive others assume that those who commit misdeeds against them do not do so out of malevolent intent. This interpretation makes conceptual sense. After all, if an individual views a misdeed as a mistake (i.e., situational) rather than indicative of a stable trait of the person, it seems it would be difficult to harbor a grudge. Although no other significant domain predictors were found for other-forgiveness, a single significant correlation within the Neuroticism domain was found on the Hostility facet as predicted. This relationship is supported by Maltby et al. (2001) and Mauger et al. (1992) who suggested that those who have difficulty forgiving others have a more *extrapunitiv* style—one indicative of revenge seeking, holding grudges, and experiencing anger, all of which are reflected by this facet. In contrast, the pattern of findings for the NEO-PI-R and self-forgiveness suggest that those who have difficulty forgiving one's self experience more diffuse negative affectivity. Instead of externalizing,

those who fail to forgive themselves appear to have a damaged sense of self and a tendency to internalize blame. The positive relationship of other-forgiveness to Agreeableness emphasizes the interpersonal (e.g., altruism, tenderheartedness) as well as intrapersonal (e.g., trust, patience) nature of forgiving others.

Both self- and other-forgiveness, however, were positively related to Extraversion and the Warmth and Positive Emotions facets of this domain. Additionally, self- and other-forgiveness were also negatively related to the order facet of Conscientiousness and hostility facet of Neuroticism. Although Hostility was comparably related to self-forgiveness and other-forgiveness, the observed relationship of this facet with self-forgiveness is likely due to the more general effect of Neuroticism rather than a specific effect of Hostility. Despite these modest similarities, the differences in external correlates between forgiveness constructs and the FFM provide strong support for a dichotomy in the global forgiveness construct as theorized by Mauger et al. (1992). Specifically, Neuroticism clearly marked self-forgiveness, whereas Agreeableness was the FFM marker of other-forgiveness. What is interesting is that these results clearly point to a largely orthogonal relationship between self- and other-forgiveness in the FFM in which each construct—when examined in relation to external constructs—is characterized by relationships (e.g., self-forgiveness to Neuroticism; other-forgiveness to Agreeableness) that are independent of one another. These results for the FFM, in conjunction with the principal components analysis, indicate that self- and other-forgiveness do not simply represent different ends of a common continuum, but are largely independent constructs (despite, at best, modest zero order correlations between measures of the constructs).

Our study is unique in that it employed multiple measures of both self- and other-forgiveness in an attempt to comprehensively measure these psychological constructs. Of these measures, we found that both Mauger's Forgiveness Scale and the Heartland Self-Forgiveness scales loaded highly on the Self-Forgiveness factor, whereas the Heartland Other-Forgiveness scale, followed closely by the TNTF, loaded most highly on the Other-Forgiveness factor. Consequently, these scales seem to be the best measures of their purported constructs of self- and other-forgiveness. Additionally, these findings suggest that self- and other-forgiveness, although similarly named, reflect largely orthogonal constructs. Although this study is exploratory, future studies employing confirmatory factor analysis would be welcome and add support to these results. This study is limited not only by the homogeneity of the sample employed but by the use of a single method (e.g., self-report) to assess self- and other-forgiveness, respectively. In this regard, observer reports for self- and other-forgiveness would go a long way toward further establishing construct validity via a multitrait-multimethod matrix.

REFERENCES

- Al-Mabuk, R. H., & Downs, W. R. (1996). Forgiveness therapy with parents of adolescent suicide victims. *Journal of Family Psychotherapy, 7*, 21–39.
- Ashton, M. C., Paunonen, S. V., Helmes, E., & Jackson, D. N. (1998). Kin altruism, reciprocal altruism, and the Big Five personality factors. *Evolution and Human Behavior, 19*, 243–255.
- Berry, J. W., Worthington, L. W., Parrott, L., O'Connor, L. E., & Wade, N. G. (2001). Dispositional forgivingness: Development and construct validity of the Transgression Narrative Test of Forgivingness (TNTF). *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 27*, 1277–1290.
- Cerney, M. (1989). "If only ..." Remorse in grief therapy. *Psychotherapy Patient, 5*, 235–248.
- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Costa, P. T., & McCrae, R. R. (1992). *The Revised NEO Personality Inventory (NEO-PI-R) professional manual*. Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources.
- Digman, J. M., & Takemoto-Chock, N. (1981). Factors in the natural language of personality: Reanalysis; comparison; and the interpretation of six major studies. *Multivariate Behavioral Research, 16*, 149–170.
- Edwards, L. M., Lapp-Rincker, R. H., Magyar-Moe, J. L., Reinfeldt, J. D., Ryder, J. A., Brown, J. C., et al. (2002). A positive relationship between religious faith and forgiveness: Faith in the absence of data? *Pastoral Psychology, 50*, 147–152.
- Enright, R. D. (1991). The moral development of forgiveness. In W. Kurtines & J. Gewirtz (Eds.), *Moral behavior and development* (Vol. 1, pp. 123–152). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Eysenck, H. J., & Eysenck, S. B. G. (1994). *Manual of the Eysenck Personality Scales-Revised*. San Diego, CA: Educational and Industrial Testing Service.
- Freedman, S. R., & Enright, R. D. (1996). Forgiveness as an intervention goal with incest survivors. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 64*, 983–992.
- Gerber, L. A. (1990). Transformations in self-understanding in surgeons whose treatment efforts were not successful. *American Journal of Psychotherapy, 44*, 75–84.
- Goldberg, L. R. (1990). An alternative "description of personality": The Big Five factor structure. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 59*, 1216–1229.
- Hays, W. L. (1988). *Statistics* (4th ed.). Orlando, FL: Harcourt Brace Javanovich.
- Hebl, J. H., & Enright, R. D. (1993). Forgiveness as a psychotherapeutic goal with elderly females. *Psychotherapy, 30*, 658–667.
- Human Development Study Group. (1991). Five points on the construct of forgiveness within psychotherapy. *Psychotherapy, 28*, 493–496.
- John, O. P. (1990). The "Big Five" factor taxonomy: Dimensions of personality in the natural language and in questionnaires. In L. A. Pervin (Ed.), *Handbook of personality: Theory and research* (pp. 66–100). New York: Guilford.
- Maltby, J., Macaskill, A., & Day, L. (2001). Failure to forgive self and others: A replication and extension of the relationship between forgiveness, personality, social desirability and general health. *Personality and Individual Differences, 30*, 881–885.
- Mauger, P. A., Perry, J. E., Freeman, T., Grove, D. C., McBride, A. G., & McKinney, K. E. (1992). The measurement of forgiveness: Preliminary research. *Journal of Psychology and Christianity, 11*, 170–180.
- McCullough, M. E., Worthington, E. L., & Rachal, K. C. (1997). Interpersonal forgiving in close relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 73*, 321–336.
- Rye, M. S., & Pargament, K. I. (2002). Forgiveness and romantic relationships in college: Can it heal the wounded heart? *Journal of Clinical Psychology, 58*, 419–441.

- Rye, M. S., Loiacono, D. M., Folck, C. D., Olszewski, B. T., Heim, T. A., & Madia, B. (2001). Evaluation of the psychometric properties of two forgiveness scales. *Current Psychology, 20*, 260–277.
- Subkoviak, M. I., Enright, R. D., Wu, C., Gassin, E. A., Freedman, S., Olson, L. M., et al. (1995). Measuring interpersonal forgiveness in late adolescence and middle adulthood. *Journal of Adolescence, 18*, 641–655.
- Sweet, L. A. (2001). *The relationship between forgiveness and personality traits*. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Dayton, Dayton, OH.
- Worthington, E., & DiBlasio, F. (1990). Promoting mutual forgiveness within the fractured relationship. *Psychotherapy, 27*, 219–223.

Scott R. Ross
DePauw University
Department of Psychology
Greencastle, IN 46135
E-mail: srross@DePauw.edu

Received August 9, 2002
Revised October 1, 2003