

Forgiveness and Its Relation to Psychological Well-Being in Christians of Protestant Churches in Jakarta

Desiree Gracia¹ Pamela Hendra Heng^{1*}

¹*Faculty of Psychology, Universitas Tarumanagara, Jakarta, Indonesia*

^{*}*Corresponding author. Email: pamelah@fpsi.untar.ac.id*

ABSTRACT

This study looks at the relationship between forgiveness and psychological well-being of Christians from protestant churches in Jakarta. Many individuals find it difficult to forgive offenders who hurt them, even though the tendency to forgive has been proven to have a positive effect on well-being [1]. This research is a quantitative correlational research. The measuring instrument used was Transgression Related Interpersonal Motivations Inventory (TRIM-18) by Agita Nova Purba who adapted from McCullough, Root, and Cohen [2] and Psychological Well-Being (PWB) questionnaire from the Department of Research and Measurement in the Faculty of Psychology at Universitas Tarumanagara. The sampling technique used was purposive sampling. The subjects in this study were 267 Christians in young adulthood and middle adulthood age 20 - 65 years. The results showed that there was a significant negative relationship between forgiveness and psychological well-being ($r = -0.327$ and $p = 0.000 < 0.05$). However, a negative relationship is interpreted to the contrary, namely as positive.

Keywords: *Forgiveness, Psychological Well-Being, Young Adulthood, Middle Adulthood, Christians*

1. INTRODUCTION

Humans are social beings who interact and build relationships with one another. However, interaction with others could create conflicts. Conflicts are inevitable and normal, and must be faced across an entire lifetime. Despite the fact, negative feelings such as hurt, anger, wanting to avoid and blame others may arise [3]. When individuals encounter conflicts, their responses vary; they are either motivated to avoid, take revenge, or become benevolent toward their transgressors. It is common for people to say that they have forgiven their transgressors, while still showing negative responses when faced with stimuli related to their painful experience. In other cases, people are unable to stop thinking of painful events, causing them to not forgive or even cutting off relations with transgressors.

The act of not forgiving is referred to as unforgiveness. Unforgiveness is defined as a complex combination of delayed negative emotions, such as resentment, bitterness, hostility and hatred, towards someone who has broken the personal boundaries of others [4]. Negative emotions that are not appeased will continue to be felt and have an impact on physical as well as mental health. One way to reduce negative emotions is forgiveness. According to Worthington and Wade [4], forgiveness occurs if positive and negative emotions are aligned, which neutralizes some or even all negative emotions with positive ones.

The tendency to forgive has been shown to have a positive effect on well-being [1]. A study by Bono, McCullough, and Root [5] showed that forgiveness can be associated

with improved mental health, physical health, self-esteem, well-being, and life satisfaction. Previous studies have

shown a significant positive relationship between forgiveness and psychological well-being (PWB) [6-9]. Forgiveness is a central theme of Christian belief [10]. Brown as stated in Krause and Ellison [6] believes that this basic principle of faith lies in repentance and seeking forgiveness from God. Christ's Atonement forms the deepest foundation for forgiveness; Christians must forgive those who wronged them just as Christ forgave the sins of people on the cross [11]. In other words, people are expected to beg for forgiveness when they make mistakes, as well as forgive when being hurt. This stems from Christ's actions in replacing Christians on the cross to atone for their sins. Christ was then resurrected and ascended to heaven [10].

Christians received the gift of divine forgiveness and restored their relationship with God, until Christ returns (the second coming) to pick people up to God's kingdom [10]. From receiving the gift, Christians are expected to activate gratitude to God, which acts as the basis to provide mercy, grace, and forgiveness to others [10]. Christians are expected to show love for other Christians and members of outside groups [10]. However, the existence of these teachings does not rule out the possibility that individuals still tend to not forgive and continue to feel hurt and hurt others. Despite the relationship of Christians being restored through Christ's redemption, Christians continue to sin in everyday life and cause suffering for others.

1.1. Related Work

Bono, McCullough, and Root [5], states that forgiveness can be associated with improved mental health, physical health, self-esteem, well-being, and life satisfaction. Another study conducted by Raudatussalamah and Susanti [8] shows that there is a very significant relationship between forgiveness and psychological well-being (PWB) in female prisoners. Other studies show similar findings, showing a positive relationship between forgiveness and PWB in students who were victims of abuse [9] and women who got divorced [7].

1.2. Our Contribution

Drawing from the existing phenomenon, this research was conducted to see the relationship between forgiveness and PWB in Christians of the Protestant Church in Western Indonesia (GPIB) in Jakarta.

1.3. Paper Structure

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 discusses about forgiveness and psychological well-being, result tables with along with the discussion, conclusion, acknowledgement and references.

2. BACKGROUND

2.1 Forgiveness

Forgiveness in this study are divided into two point of views; Forgiveness from a psychological point of view and from a biblical point of view.

According to Sanjay, Singh and Hooda [12], forgiveness is letting go of the past without forgetting what has happened. Furthermore, Thompson et. al. as mentioned in Weinberg, Harel, Shamani, Or-Chen, Ron, and Gil [13] defines forgiveness as a process when individuals turn negative emotions into neutral or positive emotions. Whereas according to Chan and Arvey in Weinberg et. al. [13] forgiveness is an internal resource for dealing with stress and trauma exposure.

According to McCullough and Bono [14], forgiveness is when revenge motivations and avoidance motivations subside, whereas benevolence motivations increase. Meanwhile, Enright and his colleagues as stated in Lijo [15] define forgiveness as the willingness to disregard the right to hate, but at the same time fostering the qualities of compassion, generosity, and love for transgressors. McCullough, Rachal, Sandage, Worthington, Brown, and Hight [16] stated that there are two dimensions of forgiveness namely avoidance motivations and revenge motivations, but in the year 2002, McCullough and Hoyt [17] stated that forgiveness has three dimensions, adding

one dimension to the previous research, namely benevolence motivations.

Avoidance motivations are defined as the desire to avoid transgressors. This dimension measures how motivated the victim is to avoid the transgressor. Furthermore, revenge motivations refer to the desire for revenge and the hope of danger to the transgressor. Lastly, benevolence motivations can be defined as motivations to behave positively or be kind to the transgressor. In other words, benevolence motivations are characterized by encouragement to do good to the transgressor. This dimension is directly related to the other two dimensions; If an individual forgives, high benevolence motivations should be expected, with low avoidance motivations and revenge motivations [14].

According to McCullough et al. [16] factors affecting forgiveness are divided into four categories namely personality determinant, offense related determinant, relational determinant, and social cognitive determinant. Personality influences individuals to take revenge, respond to offenders with anger, and withhold violent behavior based on religious norms adopted. Manger, Saxon, Hamil and Pannell as mentioned in McCullough et al. [16] revealed that the tendency to forgive lies in the agreeableness factor of The Big Five. Lastly, religiosity strengthens the view of forgiveness as a normative way to resolve transgressions or interpersonal feelings, as stated by Heider in McCullough et al. [16]

Offense related determinant is when the victim views the behavior caused by the transgressor to have an impact on the victim, making it more difficult for the victim to forgive. In this case, Girard and Mullet as mentioned in McCullough et al. [16] stated that the perceived severity of the offender and the direct impact on the relationship affect forgiveness; As the severity of violation or form of hurt committed increases, difficulty to forgive increases. In addition, the extent to which the offender apologizes for the deed is another important determinant.

Relational determinant looks at aspects of the relationship between the transgressor and the victim. Closer relationship between the transgressor and the victim can influence whether or not the transgressor can be forgiven. The level of intimacy and closeness in a relationship is positively related to forgiveness. Nelson's research in McCullough et al. [16] shows that one's willingness to forgive can be influenced by relationships marked by satisfaction, closeness and high commitment. McCullough et al. [16] believe that quality of relationship is associated with forgiveness in seven ways. First, individuals in close relationships are more willing to forgive and maintain relationships since it has been invested and relied upon. Second, individuals in high-quality relationships have long-term orientation that motivates them to ignore pain while maintaining relationships. Third, partners' interests in a high-quality relationship can be combined into one. Fourth, the quality of relationships increases the willingness to act in a way that is beneficial for their partner, even when it hurts.

Fifth, Batson and Shaw in McCullough et al. stated that individuals who are hurt in high-quality relationships have

a lot of shared history, causing them to have access to thoughts, feelings, and motivations of their partners to be used as a basis for empathy. Sixth, Heider in McCullough [16] stated in high-quality relationships, victims are more likely to be able to view some of the painful acts done as good for themselves. Finally, according to Hodgins, Liebeskind and Schwartz in McCullough et al. [16], in high-quality relationships, transgressors are more likely to apologize or communicate remorse (verbally or non-verbally) and try to correct the impact of violations made.

An important determinant for social cognitive determinant is empathy [16]. Forgiving in this determinant is also based on several attribution variables such as judgment of responsibility and blame, perceived intentionality, severity and availability of the offense [16]. Forgiving specific individuals in certain relationships is one aspect that is associated with this determinant [16]. Another determinant in this factor is rumination. According to Greenberg in McCullough et al. [16] rumination has a clear role in the containment of psychological stress and in increasing aggression after experiencing interpersonal stressors.

According to the Bible, there are several main reasons behind the obligation of Christians to forgive in cases of injustice that befalls, or when an individual has violated and exceeded the limits of a person's standard of behavior. First, forgiveness is a direct order from God (Matt. 5: 43-44; Matt. 6: 12; Matt. 6: 14-15; Matt. 18 : 21-22; Mark 11: 25; Luke 17: 3-4; Col. 3: 12-13; Gal. 5: 14) [11]. Christ encourages Christians to seek forgiveness when they have wronged someone (Matt 5: 23-24), and to forgive when someone has wronged them (Matt 18: 21-22). Forgiveness is seen as the main practice of the Christian faith, and has an importance in relationships with others also with God; Seeking and giving forgiveness is required to restore relationships when violations are committed [11]. Van der Walt et al. [11] added, forgiveness frees victims and transgressors by restoring human relations and also relations with God.

Second, there is a deep connection between being forgiven by God and forgiving others [11]. In Matthew 6: 14-15 has been stated, "For if you forgive others their trespasses, your heavenly Father will also forgive you, but if you do not forgive others their trespasses, neither will your Father forgive your trespasses". Christians find identity in Christ, and live according to his commandments (Eph 4: 17-24, 31-32; Eph 5: 1-2). One must forgive on the basis of loving others as he loves himself (2 Cor 2: 7-8), which is exemplified in another verse about healing the paralytic (Matt 9: 1-8), Christ staying at Zacchaeus's house (Luke 19: 1-10), and forgiveness given to a woman who committed adultery (John 8: 1-11). Based on the description of these bible verses, forgiveness imitates the radical love of Christ, which shows mercy to those who transgress or do wrong (James 2:13; 2 Cor 2:10) [11].

Third, forgiveness must be done to promote the coexistence of peace with others to glorify God and in his service (Romans 12:19) [11].

2.2 Psychological Well-Being

Psychological well-being (PWB) refers to positive mental health when individuals feel prosperous, able to accept their current and past selves, feel constantly developing, see life as meaningful and purposeful, able to establish good relationships with others, being independent in making decisions and able to understand and mastering the environment [18]

Sah and Marks in Dodge, Daly, Huyton, and Sanders [19] views well-being as an individual developing as a person, feeling fulfilled, and contributing to society. Well-being according to Ryff and Singer [20] is a concept that is formed from various experiences and functions of individuals as a whole human being. Ryff and Singer [20] define PWB as a result of a person's evaluation of herself or himself based on an evaluation of their life experiences. According to Ryff [21] PWB has six dimensions namely autonomy, environmental mastery, personal growth, positive relations with others, purpose in life, and self-acceptance.

Autonomy is having independence and the ability to self-regulate [22]. Autonomy measures whether individuals view themselves living according to personal beliefs [21]. Individuals with high autonomy determine their own decisions (self-determining) and have independence. Individuals are also able to withstand social pressure to think and act in certain ways, able to regulate behavior, and evaluate themselves with personal standards (personal standards). Meanwhile, individuals with low autonomy will show concern for the hopes and evaluations of others, depend on the judgment of others in making important decisions, and adjust to social pressures in terms of thinking and acting.

Environmental mastery measures how well individuals manage life situations [21]. Individuals with high scores have a sense of mastery and competence in managing the environment, can control events outside themselves, can take advantage of existing opportunities effectively, and are able to choose or create conditions that suit their needs and personal values. While low scores indicate difficulties in managing daily affairs, unable to change or improve conditions around them, are unaware of the opportunities that exist, and lack of control over events outside themselves.

The dimension of personal growth measures the extent to which individuals utilize their talents and potential. According to Ryff [21], individuals with high personal growth have the ability to see themselves growing and developing, are open to new experiences, realize their potential and weaknesses, are able to see self-improvement and behavior over time, and are able to be better selves. Low scorers do not see themselves growing, lack of sense of improvement, feel bored and are not interested in life, also unable to develop new attitudes or behaviors.

Positive relations with others measures the depth of an individual's connection with others [21]. Individuals with high positive relations with others have a warm, satisfying, and trusting relationship with others. Individuals have

concern for the welfare of others, have empathy, compassion and strong intimacy, while also understanding the concept of give and take in relationships [21]. Meanwhile, low scores have a few close friends and it is difficult to be warm, be open and to care for others. Furthermore, individuals can feel isolated and frustrated in interpersonal relationships, while not wanting to compromise to maintain relationships with others.

Purpose in life is the extent to which individuals feel as if their life has meaning, purpose and direction [21]. A high value in purpose in life is defined as having a sense of direction, having purpose in past and present life, having beliefs that make life meaningful, and having a purpose in life. Conversely, low scores indicate individuals have no purpose in life, have few goals or lack of direction, do not see the purpose from past and present lives.

Finally, self-acceptance is the knowledge and self-acceptance of individuals, including awareness of personal shortcomings [21]. A person with high self-acceptance has a positive attitude towards oneself. Individuals can acknowledge and accept many aspects of themselves including good and bad qualities, and feel positive about past life. A low sense of self-acceptance is characterized by feeling dissatisfied with oneself, being disappointed with past life, having problems with certain personal qualities, wanting to be different from what he is today.

There are several factors that affect a person's PWB. These factors are age, gender, education, socioeconomic status (SES), social support, life experience, culture, and religiosity. According to Pourebrahim and Rasouli [23] adults in the 45-60 age group has higher PWB than adults aged 60-90 years old, as well as stating that PWB and its components varied between men and women aged 45-90 except for the purpose in life dimension in men. According to Ryff [24], environmental mastery and autonomy increase with age, as for personal growth and purpose in life decreases with age, while there was no significant difference in positive relations with others and self-acceptance throughout all age groups. He suggested that women of all ages consistently valued themselves higher in positive relations with others compared to men. Women also tended to have higher scores than men in personal growth. Ryff [24] revealed that in four other dimensions (self-acceptance, autonomy, environmental mastery and purpose in life), gender differences consistently showed insignificant differences between women and men.

Ryff [24] also examines aspects of PWB in the United States (US) and Korea. Results show that Koreans scored the highest in personal growth and self -acceptance. Compared to the US, personal growth has the highest score, especially for women, as for the lowest is autonomy. In addition, no differences were found between gender and well-being in the two cultures studied. Ryff [24] stated that American and Korean women score higher than men in positive relations with others and personal growth.

Socioeconomic status (SES) generally includes education, income and occupational standing. Its impact on PWB has been investigated in Wisconsin Longitudinal Study of Educational and Occupational Attainment [20]. The

sample used is adults in middle adulthood, who has been studied since high school. Based on the sample used in the study, high well-being values were seen in educated individuals, with differences seen in purpose in life and personal growth for men and women [20]. High levels of well-being are also evident for individuals who have higher employment status [20].

Social support includes a sense of comfort, attention, appreciation, or help that someone gets from a relationship with a partner, family, friends, co-workers, doctors, and social organizations [25]. Social and emotional support from others can maintain health, but as people age, less social support is received [23].

The participants of this study are Christians in young adulthood and middle adulthood aged 20 – 65 years old of the Protestant Church in Western Indonesia (GPIB) in Jakarta. Gender, ethnicity, occupation and educational background are not limited by the author. Total participants obtained are 267 people.

Table 1 Participants Based on Gender

Gender	Amount	Percentage (%)
Male	115	43.1
Female	152	56.9
Total	267	100.0

Table 2 Participants Based on Age Group

Age Group	Amount	Percentage (%)
20 – 40 tahun	175	65.5
41 – 65 tahun	92	34.5
Total	267	100.0

Table 3 Participants Based on Academic Background

Academic Background	Amount	Percentage (%)
High School	98	36.7
Above High School	169	63.3
Total	267	100.0

Table 4 Participants Based on Occupation

Occupation	Amount	Percentage (%)
Undergraduate	59	22.1
Private company employee	118	44.2
Government company employee	11	4.1
Entrepreneur	22	8.2
Housewife	19	7.1
Retired	7	2.6
Unemployed	9	3.4
Others	22	8.2
Total	267	100.0

Table 5 Participants Based on Church Location

Church Location	Amount	Percentage (%)
North Jakarta	38	14.2
East Jakarta	62	23.2
South Jakarta	40	15.0
West Jakarta	89	33.3

Central Jakarta	38	14.2
Total	267	100

This study used quantitative research with non-experimental method. The type of research used is correlational, with the aim of finding out the relationship between forgiveness and PWB in Christians of the Protestant Church in Western Indonesia (GPIB) in Jakarta. The sampling technique used is purposive sampling. Data was obtained by distributing Google Forms questionnaires online through instant messaging application and social media.

This study was conducted in Jakarta, from April to May 2020. The research instruments consisted of five parts: a cover letter, informed consent, subject's personal data, Transgression Related Interpersonal Motivations Inventory (TRIM-18) questionnaire and Psychological Well-Being (PWB) questionnaire. Another instrument used is the Statistical Product and Service Solution (SPSS) 26th to process and analyse research data using Kolmogorov-Smirnov, One-Sample Test, Non-Parametric Spearman, Mann Whitney U and Kruskal Wallis because data were not normally distributed.

Forgiveness was measured using TRIM – 18 consisting of three dimensions (avoidance motivations, revenge motivations and benevolence motivations) and 18 positive items. Avoidance motivations and revenge motivations are negative dimensions, whereas benevolence motivations is positive. TRIM – 18 is a five point likert scale translated by Agita Nova Purba who adapted from McCullough et al. [2]. Since benevolence motivations is a positive dimension, to make it equivalent to the other two dimensions, the items have to be reverse-coded.

PWB questionnaire is a five point likert scale developed by the Department of Research and Measurement in the Faculty of Psychology at Universitas Tarumanagara. It has six dimensions, namely autonomy, environmental mastery, personal growth, positive relations with others, purpose in life, and self-acceptance [21].

TRIM-18 has a hypothetical mean of 3. Avoidance motivations have an empirical mean score of 3.0460 (SD = 0.77052) which is higher than the hypothetical mean score. Thus, the subject's avoidance motivations are high. Whereas revenge motivations, has an empirical mean score of 2.0479 (SD = 0.74920) and benevolence motivations has an empirical mean score of 2.3814 (SD = 0.68420); both below the hypothetical mean. However, a low score of benevolence motivations is interpreted to the contrary, which is high since it is reverse-coded; lower scores imply higher benevolence motivations, and vice versa. This rule also applies to forgiveness as a whole.

The empirical mean score for forgiveness is lower than the hypothetical mean score. However, due to reverse-coding done on benevolence motivations, the scores obtained by forgiveness are stated to be high. Table 6 shows the empirical mean of each dimension and total forgiveness.

Table 6 Empirical Mean of Forgiveness

Dimension	Hypothetical Mean	Empirical Mean	Std. Deviation	Meaning
Avoidance Motivations	3	3.046	0.77052	High
Revenge Motivations	3	2.0479	0.7492	Low
Benevolence Motivations	3	2.3814	0.6842	Low
Total Forgiveness	3	2.4918	0.61942	Low

In the next section, empirical mean of PWB is discussed. PWB questionnaire uses a scale of 1 to 5 with a hypothetical mean of 3. All dimensions have scores above the hypothetical mean, meaning that they are considered to be high. Therefore, overall PWB is considered to be high. As shown in Table 7

Table 7 Empirical Mean of PWB

Dimension	Hypothetical Mean	Empirical Mean	Std. Deviation	Meaning
Autonomy	3	3.2481	0.7091	High
Personal Growth	3	4.4916	0.41208	High
Purpose in Life	3	3.847	0.5223	High
Self – Acceptance	3	3.8966	0.58717	High
Environmental Mastery	3	3.8532	0.7021	High
Positive Relations with Others	3	4.0277	0.57881	High
Total PWB	3	3.894	0.3921	High

Before further analysis, normality testing was carried out using the Kolmogorov-Smirnov One-Sample Test to determine the correlation technique that will be used. If the significance score (p) is greater than 0.05, then the data are normally distributed. If the significance score (p) is smaller than 0.05, then the data are not normally distributed. Forgiveness has a significance value of $p = 0.022 < 0.05$, meaning that the data are not normally distributed whereas PWB has a significance value of $p = 0.200 > 0.05$, meaning that the data is normally distributed. Based on the results the overall data is not normally distributed because one of the variables has a p value below 0.05. Table 8 shows these findings.

Table 8 Normality Test Results for Forgiveness and PWB

Variable	Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z	Sig. (2-tailed)	Meaning
Forgiveness	0.060	0.022	Not Normal
Psychological Well-Being	0.032	0.200	Normal

With the data not being normally distributed, the correlation between forgiveness and PWB is calculated using Spearman correlation. If the significance score (p) is greater than 0.05, then there is no significant relationship. If the significance score (p) is smaller than 0.05 (< 0.05), then there is a significant relationship. Results show that there is a significant negative relationship between forgiveness and PWB based on the value of $r = - 0.327$ and the value of $p = 0.000 < 0.05$. However, this finding is caused by reverse-coded items done to benevolence motivations. The resulting negative relationship actually shows a significant positive relationship; decreased forgiveness score implies higher forgiveness and vice

versa. In conclusion, there is a positive relationship between forgiveness and PWB. As shown in Table 9.

Table 9 Results of Main Data Analysis

Variable	Sig. (2-tailed)	Correlation Coefficient (r)	Meaning
<i>Forgiveness and Psychological Well – Being</i>	0.000	- 0. 327	Has significant correlation

Based on the analysis of additional data through the processing of forgiveness differences test based on gender, Mann Whitney U was used. Results show the value of $p = 0.003 < 0.05$, meaning that there are significant differences in forgiveness based on gender. Female has a higher mean score (146.00) than male (118.13). As shown in Table 10.

Table 10 Forgiveness Based on Gender

Gender	N	Mean Rank	Sig. (2-tailed)
Male	115	118.13	0.003
Female	152	146.00	
Total	267		

Mann Whitney U was used in the processing of PWB differences test based on gender, Results show the value of $p = 0.218 > 0.05$; There are no significant differences in PWB based on gender. Male has a higher mean score of 140.70, while female scored 128.93, as shown in Table 11.

Table 11 PWB Based on Gender

Gender	N	Mean Rank	Sig. (2-tailed)
Male	115	140.70	0.218
Female	152	128.93	
Total	267		

Based on the analysis of additional data through the processing of forgiveness differences test based on age groups, Mann Whitney U was used. Results show the value of $p = 0.002 < 0.05$, meaning that there are significant differences in forgiveness based on age groups. The 20-40 age group has a higher mean score (144.81), while the 41-65 age group has a lower mean score (113.44). The findings are shown in Table 12.

Table 12 Forgiveness Based on Age Group

Age Group	N	Mean Rank	Sig. (2-tailed)
20 – 40 years old	175	144.81	0.002
41 – 65 years old	92	113.44	
Total	267		

Differences test was performed on PWB based on age group using Mann Whitney U. The results show the value of $p = 0.000 < 0.05$, so it can be concluded that there are significant differences of PWB based on age groups. The 20-40 age group has the lowest mean score with a score of 121.23, while the 41-65 age group has a score of 158.29. As shown in Table 13.

Table 13 PWB Based on Age Group

Age Group	N	Mean Rank	Sig. (2-tailed)
20 – 40 years old	175	121.23	0.000
41 – 65 years old	92	158.29	
Total	267		

Differences test was conducted to forgiveness based on academic background using Mann Whitney U. Results show the value of $p = 0.227 > 0.05$; in conclusion, there are no significant differences in forgiveness based on recent education. The following is a table of the rest results based on academic background.

Table 14 Forgiveness Based on Academic Background

Academic Background	N	Mean Rank	Sig. (2-tailed)
High School	98	141.50	0.227
Above High School	169	129.65	
Total	267		

Differences test was conducted to PWB based on academic background using Mann Whitney U. Results show the value of $p = 0.004 < 0.05$, meaning that there are significant differences in PWB based on academic background. Participants with a high school academic background have the lowest mean score (116.10) compared to participants who have higher academic backgrounds (144.38). As shown in Table 15.

Table 15 PWB Based on Academic Background

Academic Background	N	Mean Rank	Sig. (2-tailed)
High School	98	116.10	0.004
Above High School	169	144.38	
Total	267		

The analysis of additional data of differences in forgiveness based on occupation was conducted using Kruskal Wallis. Results show the value of $p = 0.072 > 0.05$; there are no significant differences in forgiveness based on occupation. Undergraduates have the highest mean score (154.82) whereas participants who have retired score the lowest (97.21). As shown in Table 16.

Table 16 Forgiveness Based on Occupation

Occupation	N	Mean Rank	Sig. (2-tailed)
Undergraduate	59	154.82	0.072
Private company employee	118	134.31	
Government company employee	11	111.09	
Entrepreneur	22	103.93	
Housewife	19	146.50	
Retired	7	97.21	
Unemployed	9	151.78	
Others	22	111.66	
Total	267		

Analysis of additional data of PWB differences was conducted based on occupation using Kruskal Wallis. Results show the value of $p = 0.013 < 0.05$; there are significant differences in the results. The analysis showed that government company employee scored the highest (172.27) with participants who are unemployed scoring the (85.00). As shown in Table 16.

Table 17 PWB Based on Occupation

Occupation	N	Mean Rank	Sig. (2-tailed)
Undergraduate	59	106.44	0.072
Private company employee	118	142.18	
Government company employee	11	172.27	
Entrepreneur	22	130.48	
Housewife	19	138.89	
Retired	7	161.14	
Unemployed	9	85.00	
Others	22	155.59	
Total	267		

Differences test of forgiveness was performed based on the location of the church using Kruskal Wallis. Results show the value of $p = 0.498 > 0.05$, meaning there is no significant difference in forgiveness based on the location of the church. Christians in South Jakarta obtained the highest mean score of 149.04 and North Jakarta with the lowest mean score (122.99). As shown in Table 17.

Table 18 Forgiveness Based on Church Location

Church Location	N	Mean Rank	Sig. (2-tailed)
North Jakarta	38	122.99	0.498
East Jakarta	62	128.33	

South Jakarta	40	149.04	
West Jakarta	89	131.57	
Central Jakarta	38	144.13	
Total	267		

Lastly, based on the analysis of additional data through the processing of PWB differences test based on church locations, results show the value of $p = 0.374 > 0.05$, meaning there is no significant difference in PWB based on the location of the church. Central Jakarta obtained the highest mean score (149.74), while Christians in West Jakarta scored the lowest (123.64). As shown in Table 18.

Table 19 PWB Based on Church Location

Church Location	N	Mean Rank	Sig. (2-tailed)
North Jakarta	38	143.75	0.374
East Jakarta	62	137.70	
South Jakarta	40	127.10	
West Jakarta	89	123.64	
Central Jakarta	38	149.74	
Total	267		

Based on the results of this study, forgiveness has a significant relationship with PWB. This finding is supported by previous studies [6-9]. Forgiveness in Christians of GPIB is relatively low with high avoidance motivations as well as low revenge motivations and benevolence motivations. Low forgiveness and benevolence motivations mean the opposite; are considered high. The results of this research go in line with McCullough and Bono's statement [14], except for high avoidance motivations.

Based on culture, Tjosvold and Sun [26] state that the collectivist values of Eastern culture show that avoiding conflict can be done to support relationships [26]. Tjosvold and Sun's opinion [26] applies to Indonesian culture which is a collective culture [27].

Results show that all dimensions of and overall PWB are high and can be defined by Ryff's definition of PWB [18]. The results also show forgiveness in women is higher than men. This may be explained by Gilligan's statement stated in Rey and Extremera, [28] that men tend to seek justice or seek revenge, while women want to maintain relationships while encouraging higher forgiveness. In addition, Ghaemmaghami et al. [3] shows men have higher revenge motivations than women.

Furthermore, women on average are more forgiving than men and may be influenced by sociological or religious factors [29]. While in terms of religion, Freese in Miller et al. [29] stated that women are often declared to be more religious than men, while according to McCullough and Worthington in Miller et al., forgiveness is often labelled as a religious value [29].

Culture can also affect individual forgiveness [29]. According to Hook, Worthington, Utsey in Miller et al. [29] forgiveness in a collective culture or collectivistic forgiveness, is described as an effort to improve and

maintain group harmony. Women tend to be more relationship oriented, and can be influenced by or adhere to collective forgiveness and be more forgiving.

Results show the 20-40 age group has higher forgiveness. Adults in middle adulthood tend to have a high level of avoidance motivations compared to early adult [3] due to facing various responsibilities related to stress as stated by Willis and Martin in Ghaemmaghani et al. [3].

Young adults do not show high avoidance motivations, appear to have greater difficulty in accepting the end of friendship or intimate relationships and are more motivated to forgive mistakes [3]. Building intimate relationships is the main development subject of this age group according to Subkoviak et al in Ghaemmaghani et al. [3] and Erikson in Papalia and Martorell [31].

Results show the 41-65 age group has higher PWB than the 20-40 age group. Culture affects PWB. Karasawa, Curhan, Markus, Kitayama, Love, Radler and Ryff examine the inter-cultural welfare of the United States and Japan as stated in Ryff [21], and their results support that age and well-being vary depending on the cultural context. High levels of well-being are also evident for individuals with higher employment status [20] and high socioeconomic status [30] which can be attributed to middle adult age group since this age group may have stable jobs and higher education. Early adulthood is a busy period that often causes individuals to not get enough sleep affecting physical, cognitive, emotional and social functioning [31]. Furthermore, individuals at this stage have the highest poverty rates and the lowest level of ownership of health insurance compared to other age groups [31]. Data analysis results of PWB based on education and employment show significant differences. Education has a strong connection with well-being [20], as well as having entertainment [23] and high SES [30].

3. CONCLUSION

There is a significant relationship between forgiveness and psychological well-being (PWB) as shown in Christians of the Protestant Church in Western Indonesia (GPIB) in Jakarta. Based on additional data analysis tests, there are significant differences in forgiveness in terms of gender and age. Furthermore, additional data analysis tests on PWB showed that there were significant differences in terms of age, last education, and occupation.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The author would like to express deepest appreciation to all the participants involved during data collection for this study, specifically to everyone at the Protestant Church in Western Indonesia (GPIB) in Jakarta. Also extending deepest gratitude and appreciation to the Faculty of Psychology in Universitas Tarumanagara.

REFERENCES

- [1] E. L. Jr. Worthington, C. V. O. Witvliet, P. Pietrini, A. J. Miller, Forgiveness, health, and well-being: A review of evidence for emotional versus decisional forgiveness, dispositional forgivingness, and reduced unforgiveness, *Journal Of Behavioral Medicine* 30(4) (2007) 291-302.
- [2] M. E. McCullough, L. M. Root, A. D. Cohen, Writing about the personal benefits of a transgression facilitates forgiveness, *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 74 (2006) 887-897.
- [3] P. Ghaemmaghani, M. Allemand, M. Martin, Forgiveness in younger, middle-aged and older adults: Age and gender matters, *Journal of Adult Development* 18 (2011) 192-203. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10804-011-9127-x>
- [4] E. L. Jr. Worthington, M. Scherer, Forgiveness is an emotion-focused coping strategy that can reduce health risks and promote health resilience: Theory, review, and hypotheses, *Psychology and Health*, 19(3) (2004) 385-405. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/0887044042000196674>
- [5] G. Bono, M. E. McCullough, L. M. Root, Forgiveness, feeling connected to others, and well-being: Two longitudinal studies, *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 34(2) (2008) 182-195. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167207310025>
- [6] N. Krause, C. G. Ellison, Forgiveness by God, forgiveness of others, and psychological well-being in late life, *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 42(1) (2003) 77.
- [7] M. Maulida, K. Sari, Hubungan memaafkan dengan kesejahteraan psikologis pada wanita yang bercerai, *Jurnal Ilmiah Mahasiswa Psikologi* 1(3) (2016) 7-18.
- [8] Raudatussalamah, R. Susanti, Pemaafan (forgiveness) dan psychological wellbeing pada narapidana wanita, *Marwah*, 8(2) (2014) 219 – 234.
- [9] V. R. Juwita, E. R. Kustanti, Hubungan antara pemaafan dengan kesejahteraan psikologis pada korban perundungan, *Jurnal Empati* 7(1) (2018) 274-282.
- [10] E. L. Jr. Worthington, S. Y. Rueger, D. B. Edward, J. Wortham, "Mere" christian forgiveness: An ecumenical christian conceptualization of forgiveness through the lens of stress-and-coping theory, *Religions* 10(44) (2019) 1-15, DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3390/re110010044>
- [11] J. Van Der Walt, B. de Muynck, N. Broer, C. Wolhuter, F. Potgieter, The need for and possibility of a christian forgiveness education in schools, *Journal of*

Research on Christian Education 27(1) (2018) 101–118.
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/10656219.2018.1446854>

[12] Sanjay, R. Singh, R. S. Hooda, Forgiveness: A theoretical perspective, *International Journal of Social Sciences Review* 7(4) (2019) 687–689.

[13] M. Weinberg, H. Harel, M. Shamani, K. Or-Chen, P. Ron, S. Gil, War and Well-Being: The Association between forgiveness, social support, posttraumatic stress disorder, and well-being during and after war, *Social Work* 62(4) (2017) 341–348.

[14] M. E. McCullough, G. Bono, Positive responses to benefit and harm: Bringing forgiveness and gratitude into cognitive psychotherapy, *Journal of Cognitive Psychotherapy: An International Quarterly* 20(2) (2006) 1 – 10.

[15] K. J. Lijo, Forgiveness: Definitions, perspectives, contexts and correlates, *J Psychol Psychother*, 8 (2018) 342. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.4172/2161-0487.1000342>

[16] M. E. McCullough, K. C. Rachal, S. J. Sandage, E. L. Jr. Worthington, S. W. Brown, T. L. Hight, Interpersonal forgiving in close relationships: II. Theoretical elaboration and measurement, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 75(6) (1998) 1586-1603. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.75.6.1586>

[17] M. E. McCullough, W. T. Hoyt, Transgression-Related Motivational Dispositions: Personality substrates of forgiveness and their links to the big five, *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 28(11) (2002) 1556-1573. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/014616702237583>

[18] C. D. Ryff, C. L. Keyes, The structure of psychological well-being revisited, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 64(4) (1995) 719-727.

[19] R. Dodge, A. Daly, J. Huyton, L. Sanders, The challenge of defining wellbeing, *International Journal of Wellbeing* 2(3) (2012) 222-235. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5502/ijw.v2i3.4>

[20] C. D. Ryff, B. Singer, Psychological well-being: Meaning, measurement, and implications for psychotherapy research, *Psychotherapy and Psychosomatics* 65 (1996) 14-23.

[21] C. D. Ryff, Psychological well-being revisited: Advances in the science and practice of eudaimonia. *Psychotherapy and Psychosomatics* 83 (2014) 10-28. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1159/000353263>

[22] R. Haryanto, P. T. Y. S. Suyasa, Persepsi terhadap job characteristic model, psychological well-being dan

performance (studi pada karyawan PT. X), *Phronesis Jurnal Ilmiah Psikologi Industri dan Organisasi* 9(1) (2007) 67 – 92.

[23] T. Pourebrahim, R. Rasouli, Meaning of life and psychological well-being during adult, older adult, and oldest adult, *Elderly Health Journal* 5(1), (2019) 40-46. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.18502/ehj.v5i1.1198>

[24] C. D. Ryff, Psychological well-being in adult life, *Current Directions in Psychological Science* 4(4), (1995) 99-104.

[25] F. S. Lakoy, Psychological well-being perempuan bekerja dengan status menikah dan belum menikah, *Jurnal psikologi* 7(2) (2009) 38-47.

[26] D. Tjosvold, H. F. Sun, Understanding conflict avoidance: Relationship, motivations, actions, and consequences, *The International Journal of Conflict Management* 13(2) (2002) 142 – 164.

[27] D. Jatmika, Hubungan budaya individualis-kolektif dan motivasi berbelanja hedonik pada masyarakat kota Jakarta, *Jurnal Psikologi Psibernetika* 10(1), (2017) 9 – 19.

[28] L. Rey, N. Extremera, Agreeableness and interpersonal forgiveness in young adults: the moderating role of gender, *TERAPIA PSICOLÓGICA* 33(3), (2016) 103 – 110.

[29] A. J. Miller, E. L. Jr. Worthington, M. A. McDaniel, Gender and forgiveness, a meta-analytic review and research agenda, *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 27(8), (2008) 843 – 876.

[30] I. Fassbender, B. Leyendecker, Socio-economic status and psychological well-being in a sample of Turkish immigrant mothers in Germany, *Frontiers in Psychology* 9(1586) (2018) 1-9. DOI: [10.3389/fpsyg.2018.01586](https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2018.01586)

[31] D. E. Papalia, G Martorell, Experience human development. 13 ed., New York, NY: McGraw-Hill Education, 2014.