Revista Latinoamericana de Psicología

https://revistalatinoamericanadepsicologia.konradlorenz.edu.co/

ORIGINAL

Using the Enright Forgiveness Inventory in Cuba: A validation study

Francisca Fariña [a,*], **Mercedes Novo** [b], **Xiang Zhao** [c], **Daniel Bulgado** [d]

[a] *University of Vigo, Spain*
[b] *University of Santiago de Compostela, Spain*
[c] *United Arab Emirates University, United Arab Emirates*
[d] *University of Medical Sciences of Villa Clara, Cuba*

Received 14 September 2025; ***accepted*** 28 November 2025

Abstract | **Introduction/ Objective:** Forgiveness not only plays a fundamental role in coexistence and the restoration of interpersonal relationships, but scientific evidence has also revealed its positive effects on health and well-being. There is a growing interest in having measurement instruments, particularly in certain contexts and countries where research is limited. This study aims to validate Enright's Forgiveness Inventory (Subkoviak et al., 1995), one of the most widely used instruments internationally in its shortened version (EFI-30, Enright et al., 2022), in the Cuban population. **Method:** A sample of 602 participants (61.6% women), between 18 and 87 years of age (*M* = 30.1 years; *SD* = 15.3), was used to validate the EFI-30 through confirmatory factor analysis and other correlational tests. **Results:** The original structure of the EFI-30 was confirmed, and both the fit indices and internal consistency were adequate. The construct validity and *partial* associations between the subconstructs of the EFI-30 and general health status were verified, highlighting its relevance for well-being. In addition, this study examined the differences in gender, age, and educational level. **Conclusions:** As the first study to validate the EFI-30 in the Cuban population, these findings support its usability in this cultural setting. It is concluded that the EFI-30 is a relevant tool for assessment and intervention in the clinical, psychosocial, and educational fields.

Keywords: Confirmatory factor analysis, Cuban validation, Enright Forgiveness Inventory-30 (EFI-30), forgiveness, psychometrics, well-being

© 2025 Fundación Universitaria Konrad Lorenz. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/).

Uso del Inventario del Perdón de Enright en Cuba: estudio de validación

Resumen | **Introducción/objetivo:** El perdón no solo desempeña un papel fundamental en la convivencia y en la restauración de las relaciones interpersonales, sino que la evidencia científica ha revelado sus efectos positivos en la salud y el bienestar. De interés creciente resulta contar con instrumentos de medida, en particular en algunos contextos y países en los cuales la investigación es limitada. Este artículo tiene como objetivo validar en población cubana el Inventario de Perdón de Enright (Subkoviak et al., 1995) uno de los instrumentos más ampliamente utilizados en el ámbito internacional, en su versión reducida (EFI-30, Enright et al., 2022). Método**:** Se contó con una muestra de 602 participantes (61.6 % mujeres), con edades comprendidas entre los 18 y los 87 años (*M* = 30.1 años; *DT* = 15.3), con la que se validó el EFI-30 mediante análisis factorial confirmatorio y otras pruebas correlacionales. **Resultados:** Se confirmó la estructura original del EFI-30, y tanto los índices de ajuste como la consistencia interna fueron adecuados. Se constató la validez de constructo y asociaciones parciales entre los subconstructos del EFI-30 y el estado de salud general, destacando su relevancia para el bienestar. Asimismo, en este estudio se examinaron las diferencias de género, edad y nivel educativo. **Conclusiones:** Como el primer

* Corresponding author.
E-mail: francisca@uvigo.es

https://doi.org/10.14349/rlp.2025.v57.15
0120-0534/© 2025 Fundación Universitaria Konrad Lorenz. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/).

estudio en validar el EFI-30 en una población cubana, estos hallazgos apoyan su condición de uso en este entorno cultural. Se concluye acerca de la relevancia del EFI-30 como herramienta útil para la evaluación e intervención en el ámbito clínico, psicosocial y educativo.

Palabras clave: Análisis factorial confirmatorio, validación cubana, Inventario del Perdón de Enright (EFI-30), perdón, psicometría, bienestar

© 2025 Fundación Universitaria Konrad Lorenz. Este es un artículo Open Access bajo la licencia CC BY-NC-ND (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/).

People inevitably cause and receive offenses on a daily basis (Suzuki & Jenkins, 2023). However, each person responds differently towards those who have harmed them (vanOyen Witvliet, Root Luna, VanderStoep et al., 2020). Interpersonal injustices can produce a high impact on the lives of those who receive them and also of the offending persons. There is scientific evidence for the benefits forgiveness has on mental health, well-being and mindfulness (e.g., Akhtar & Barlow, 2018; Gao et al., 2022; Rasmussen et al., 2019; Rohner et al., 2024). Interpersonal forgiveness, as well as self-forgiveness correlates significantly with subjective well-being (Liu, 2021). Meta-analytic studies (e.g., Akhtar & Barlow, 2018; Lundahl et al., 2008) found that, both in adults and youth, negative psychological health consequences of suffering harm and violence from others are mitigated by forgiveness (Yu et al., 2021). Forgiveness constitutes a psychological strength that can facilitate personal well-being, positive affect and social support (Fariña et al., 2024a). Therefore, people are increasingly seeking interventions that promote forgiveness to minimise the negative consequences of interpersonal offenses (vanOyen Witvliet, Root Luna, Vlisides-Henry et al., 2020). Thus, forgiveness, a relevant process in positive psychology and considered by conventional psychology and clinical science (Worthington Jr., 2024), was included as a measure in the Global Flourishing Study (VanderWeele et al., 2025). Without a doubt, the scientific evidence of the positive effects of forgiveness on the health and well-being of people has led to the fact that, in recent times, it can be considered relevant to public health (Ortega et al., 2024).

There is no consensus regarding the theoretical framework or conceptualisation of forgiveness (DenHartog, 2024). In the literature, forgiveness is commonly defined as the attenuation or elimination of negative emotions, cognitions, and behaviours directed towards the offender (McCullough et al., 1997), frequently accompanied by the emergence of more positive orientations towards them (Ghobari Bonab et al., 2021; McCullough et al., 2003). At first, for Enright (1996), the process of forgiveness necessarily requires the presence of positive affect, cognitions and behaviours towards the offender. However, forgiveness does not necessarily lead to reconciliation (Major et al., 2020) nor does it mean excusing, tolerating or forgetting the offense (Maganto & Garaigordobil, 2010). It entails generosity and grace towards others (Booker & Perlin, 2021; Peterson & Seligman, 2004) and stopping ruminating about the event or the person who caused the harm (Fariña et al., 2020). Enright and Fitzgibbons (2015) define forgiveness as a moral virtue associated with a psychological process of reducing negative attributes and increasing positive attributes towards a person who treated us unfairly. For McCullough et al. (2013), forgiveness is an evolutionary adaptation, a motivational shift from revenge to preservation of the relationship due to possible future needs or benefits (DenHartog, 2024). Forgiveness allows experiencing personal growth (Záhorcová et al., 2020). Nevertheless, carrying it out involves making an enormously difficult decision (Horowski & Jeziorański, 2024) however beneficial it may be. Enright and his team (e.g., Enright et al., 1989, 1998; Enright & Fitzgibbons, 2015; Enright & The Human Development Group, 1994) establish that forgiveness is more than a psychological construct. It is a moral virtue as per an Aristotelian perspective of virtue ethics (Kim et al., 2022), highlighting key characteristics such as motivation, thoughts, and voluntary actions aimed at doing good to offenders (Song et al., 2025). For them, interpersonal forgiveness occurs when a person voluntarily renounces the right to resentment, negative cognitions and behaviours towards the person who offended them unjustly and goes on to maintain compassion, mercy and even love towards the offender (Enright et al., 1998, 2000).

Scientific literature shows that the ability to forgive increases with age people (e.g., Allemand, 2008; Ghaemmaghami et al., 2011; Steiner et al., 2011; Tao et al., 2021), while educational status has no effect on interpersonal forgiveness but has an effect on situational forgiveness. Regarding the necessary gender perspective, scientific results are still inconclusive. The meta-analysis by Miller et al. (2008) showed that women forgave more than men although with a small effect size. Similarly, vanOyen Witvliet, Root Luna, VanderStoep et al. (2020) found indirect genetic and gender effects on forgiveness through empathy, with women scoring higher than men. Other studies (Fariña, Novo et al., 2024; Fehr et al., 2010) reported no significant differences between men and women regarding forgiveness although Kaleta and Mróz (2022) found that men showed a higher level of general forgiveness.

Professional practice in the psychological field requires reliable and valid instruments, which help in making decisions about the persons being evaluated (Muñiz et al., 2020) and are essential in research in order to generate useful (Salgado-Lévano & Riveros Paredes, 2024) and rigorous knowledge (Salgado-Lévano & Riveros Paredes, 2024). Among the most widely used instruments at the international level, the Enright Forgiveness Inventory (EFI) (Subkoviak et al., 1995) stands out. The first version of the EFI was composed of 60 items (Enright & Rique, 2004; Subkoviak et al., 1995) and later, Enright et al. (2022) reduced it to 30 items (EFI-30).

Enright and Fitzgibbons (2015) consider the need for the EFI to be validated in each country in which it is to be used. It is essential to find the EFI-30 reliable and valid for each culture or country (Rohner et al., 2024), for conducting research using forgiveness as a variable, and for determining the clinical efficacy of forgiveness interventions (Song et al., 2024). Thus, as a reduced version, the EFI-30 has been validated in different countries and languages [e.g., Austria, Brazil, South Korea, Israel, Norway, Pakistan, Taiwan and the United States (Enright et al., 2022), Spain (Fariña et al, 2023; Kasprzak, et al., 2023), Argentina (Fariña et al., 2024b), Ecuador (Fariña et al., 2024a), Mexico (Novo et al., 2024) and Morocco (Fariña, Novo et al., 2024), Slovakia (Záhorcová & Dočkal, 2022), Philippines, China, Saudi Arabia (Song et al., 2024)] with satisfactory results.

Rique et al. (2020) affirmed that in order to enrich conceptualisations of forgiveness, diverse cultural perspectives are needed, taking into account the ethical approaches in science. On the other hand, Salgado-Lévano and Riveros Paredes (2024) indicated that it would be optimal to have instruments specific to each culture to learn about their perceptions, attitudes, beliefs, behaviours and values as well as to evaluate the ethical component. However, this would not allow for research that compares the results of forgiveness between different countries. Recently, Freedman (2023) stated, in a critical review of several measures of interpersonal forgiveness, that more research on forgiveness measures with non-Western, well-educated, wealthy and democratic populations is needed. With these considerations, we think it pertinent and novel to validate the EFI-30 in Cuba, due to its cultural identity (Huepa et al., 2023) and its idiosyncratic social reality. This country "has been marked by processes that set it apart considerably from any other Hispanic American reality" (Sobrino, 2021, p. 19). Cuba's political and economic context has fostered a culture grounded in collectivism, in contrast to the individualism that characterises many other Latin American societies.

In addition, it will be analysed whether gender, educational status and age lead to differences in the six dimensions of the EFI-30 Scale (positive affect, negative affect, positive behaviour, negative behaviour, positive cognition and negative cognition) and the Forgiveness item. Whether these six dimensions of forgiveness and the Forgiveness item are related to subjective well-being is also to be determined.

Method

Procedure and participants

The survey was conducted in Spanish and administered online through Google Forms. A research team from Cuba, randomly contacted teachers who, in turn, invited their undergraduate students to participate. Participants were also encouraged to extend the invitation to family and friends.Participants received informed consent. The study was conducted in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki and approved by the Research Ethics Committee of the Faculty of Education and Sport Sciences of the UV, Spain (Ref. 11-250322).

We received 657 complete cases whose country of origin is Cuba. Following the filtering rule of the EFI-30, 602 participants remained given that their "pseudo-forgiveness" score is under 20.

Among the final sample, participants' ages ranged from 18 to 87 years (M = 30.1, SD = 15.3). More than half (51.2%) of those surveyed were under 23 years old. The majority of respondents were female (61.6%), followed by males (35.7%), with a small percentage (2.7%) preferring not to disclose their sex. Similarly, 61.8% of respondents identify as women, while 34.9% identify as men; 1.3% of the respondents chose "Other", and 2.0% preferred not to disclose their gender. Regarding education level, 78.2% had a higher education or university degree, while 20.1% had only completed secondary or intermediate education; only 1.7% of the respondents had no more than a primary or basic education.

Measures

The EFI-30 (Enright et al., 2022) was applied, using a Spanish adaptation (Fariña et al., 2023), as well as an adaptation to Cuban idiomatic expressions. Two Cuban health professionals examined and cross-checked the Spanish translation in detail within the Cuban context. The EFI-30 evaluates the degree of forgiveness that a person presents after experiencing a situation that they consider was unfair. The instrument is divided into three parts: the Presentation, the Inventory (30 items) and the measure of forgiveness (1 Forgiveness Item). The Presentation includes introductory questions that collect information on: (1) the degree of pain felt after the unfair situation (from no pain [1] to a lot of pain [5]), (2) who caused the pain and (3) how long ago the event occurred. It also asks for a brief description of the event. The inventory consists of 30 questions, which make up six subscales (with five questions each): positive affect, negative affect, positive behaviour, negative behaviour, positive cognition and negative cognition. The 30 questions must be answered on a 6-point Likert scale: strongly disagree (1), disagree (2), slightly disagree (3), slightly agree (4), agree (5) and strongly agree (6). In addition to the 30 items, the inventory has another five items that make up an internal validity scale of the responses, denominated pseudo-forgiveness, which are answered following the same Likert scale. This scale evaluates the consistency of the respondent's answers to the presentation and to the 30 items. If the participant obtains a total score of 20 or more on the pseudo forgiveness scale, in research studies, they should be eliminated from the sample, and in the professional setting, whoever uses it should consider that a high score suggests that the person does not see the event as an injustice or perceive a serious problem in what happened (Enright et al., 2022). Following this rule, 55 cases have been removed from analysis.

To assess social desirability, the brief Spanish version of the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale (MC-SDS; Crowne & Marlowe, 1960; Gutiérrez et al., 2016) was used. Mental health was assessed with the General Health Questionnaire (GHQ-12), developed by Goldberg (1978); in this study, the Cuban adaptation was applied (García-Viniegras, 1999).

In addition, participants reported their age, country of origin, sex (male or female), gender identity (male, female or other), and level of education (primary, secondary or above).

Data analysis

Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was used to examine construct validity. Model fit was evaluated using the criteria put forth by Hu and Bentler (1999). Cronbach's alpha (α) was calculated for internal consistency. Each item's correlation with their sub-scores was also calculated. Furthermore, the associations between EFI-subscores and the one-item forgiveness measure, social desirability, general health and demographic variables were evaluated. All items were required responses; therefore, no missing data were observed. R4.4.1 was used to conduct the analysis; package "lavaan" 0.6-17 (Rosseel, 2012) was used for CFA.

Results

Scale validity

As shown in Table 1, six constructs showed good internal consistency for the total scale, α = .95, ranging for factors from .87 to .92 (see Table 1) as well as strong

Table 1. Statistical Indices of the Enright Forgiveness Inventory–30 (EFI-30)

Subscale	Item number and name	λ	r
Positive Affect (α = .92)	1. Warm	.76	.83
	2. Tender	.77	.85
	7. Caring	.88	.89
	8. Affectionate	.88	.89
	9. Friendly	.84	.86
Negative Affect (α = .89)	3. Unloving	.73	.80
	4. Repulsed	.86	.89
	5. Cold	.84	.87
	6. Disliking	.84	.87
	10. Disgusting	.71	.76
Positive Behaviour (α = .90)	11. Showing friendship	.81	.82
	16. Lending him/her a hand	.77	.84
	17. Establishing good relations with him/her	.86	.86
	19. Doing a favour	.81	.88
	20. Helpinghim/her when in trouble	.79	.85
Negative Behaviour (α = .92)	12. Avoid	.81	.85
	13. Ignore	.89	.91
	14. Neglect	.82	.87
	15. Not attend to him/her	.83	.87
	18. Stay away	.81	.84
Positive Cognition (α = .87)	22. Of good quality	.81	.82
	25. A good person	.86	.84
	27. Wish him/her well	.62	.78
	29. Think favourably of him/her	.86	.85
	30. Hope he/she succeeds	.59	.76
Negative Cognition (α = .90)	21. Horrible	.82	.86
	23. Dreadful	.82	.86
	24. Worthless	.88	.89
	26. A bad person	.83	.86
	28. Disapproving of him/her	.70	.78

Note. N = 602. λ = standardised factor loading; r = corrected item-total subscale correlation; α = Cronbach's α. All factor loadings and item-total correlations showed statistical significance (i.e., $p < .01$).

item-total subscale correlations ($r \geq .76$). The six-factor structure had an adequate fit (Hu & Bentler, 1999), Robust RMSEA = .08, Robust CFI/TLI = .91/.90, SRMR = 0.08, with most standardised factor loadings above .70.

Six sub-scores were inter-correlated, as indicated in Table 2. All sub-scores were associated with the one-item forgiveness score, showing a good convergent validity.

Correlational examination

As shown in Table 2, social desirability relates negatively with scores on positive affect, positive cognition, positive behaviour and one-item forgiveness, and shares less than 1% of the variance with dimensions. Thus, forgiveness measures are not explained by social desirability (Cea et al., 2025). Psychological well-being (GHQ-12) was significant and positively related to positive affect and positive behaviour of the EFI (predictive validity), while social functioning (GHQ-12) was not related with both positive and negative measures of forgiveness (the correlation between social functioning and positive cognition was significant, but the effect is trivial: the confidence interval for the observed effect size, -.09, 95% CI [-.17, -.01], has .05; Fandiño et al., 2021), providing evidence of discriminant validity. Women reported significantly higher scores on positive attributes of forgiveness, and participants with higher education level registered greater scores on positive cognition.

Discussion

This study aimed to validate a Cuban adaptation of the Enright Forgiveness Inventory (EFI-30). The results showed a good internal consistency for the total score of EFI-30, α =.95, and $\alpha \geq .87$ for the factors. The six first-order factors structure (positive affect, negative affect, positive behaviour, negative behaviour, positive cognition and negative cognition) was validated by data (construct validity). The contributions of the individual items to the overall score are satisfactory, except with 2 items of the positive cognition factor, in which low values were obtained ("Wishing her well" and "Hoping she succeeds"). In line with what has been proposed for other countries (e.g., Enright et al., 2022; Fariña et al, 2024b; Novo et al, 2024), we consider that practitioners and researchers can use the EFI-30 in Cuba. It can be useful in clinical counselling and mindfulness-based intervention programmes as a screening tool, as well as in other social contexts in which the forgiveness process can intervene (e.g., restorative justice and therapeutic jurisprudence, mediation and conflict management and forgiveness education programmes).

Unexpectedly, the results showed negative correlations between three subscales of EFI-30 (positive affect, positive cognition and positive behaviour) and the one-item forgiveness with the measure of social desirability, an interesting finding that supports the discriminant validity of the EFI, as forgiveness does not appear

Table 2. Descriptive statistics and correlations among main study variables

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
1. Positive affect	—													
2. Negative affect	−.46**	—												
3. Positive behaviour	.75**	−.33**	—											
4. Negative behaviour	−.49**	.76**	−.41**	—										
5. Positive cognition	.68**	−.25**	.77**	−.26**	—									
6. Negative cognition	−.47**	.70**	−.40**	.70**	−.42**	—								
7. EFI – total score	.37**	.51**	.50**	.47**	.54**	.40**	—							
8. One-item forgiveness score	.48**	−.33**	.52**	−.29**	.52**	−.39**	.18**	—						
9. Social desirability	.02	.01	.09*	−.06	.07	−.05	.03	.12**	—					
10. GHQ – psychological well-being	.13**	−.03	.14**	.04	.06	.02	.13**	.02	−.26**	—				
11. GHQ – social functioning	.01	−.01	.01	.05	−.09*	.07	.01	−.07	−.30**	.68**	—			
12. Age	−.07	−.00	−.01	−.00	−.06	.07	−.03	.03	.20**	−.04	−.03	—		
13. Gender	.09*	−.02	.11**	−.02	.10*	−.04	.08	.10*	.01	.04	−.00	−.07	—	
14. Education	.02	.00	.04	−.03	.09*	−.06	.02	.04	.09*	.00	−.05	−.28**	.17**	—
Mean	2.97	3.19	3.59	3.18	3.71	2.86	3.25	2.81	9.44	5.84	4.80	30.12	1.64	2.77
Standard Deviation	1.52	1.47	1.50	1.53	1.41	1.44	0.69	1.40	2.92	3.23	3.32	15.27	0.48	0.46
Median	2.70	3.00	3.60	3.00	3.70	2.60	3.43	3.00	9.00	6.00	4.00	22.00	2.00	3.00
Range	1–6	1–6	1–6	1–6	1–6	1–6	1–4.53	1–5	2–18	0–17	0–17	18–87	1–2	1–3

Note. *p < .05. **p < .01. GHQ: General Health Questionnaire (GHQ-12). Gender: 1 = man, 2 = woman.

to be influenced by socially desirable responses. In the first international validation of the EFI (Enright et al., 2022), in general, no significant correlations were found between the measure of social desirability and the EFI, with the exception of the Australian sample where significant positive correlations were obtained with positive behaviour, and with the samples from Brazil, South Korea and Taiwan with negative behaviour. Novo et al. (2024) found a positive and significant correlation with negative affect, although very weak. These results may reflect the view of forgiveness as a moral virtue (Song et al., 2025).

Thus, for the first time, social desirability was found to correlate with the three positive subscales of the EFI and with one-item forgiveness, with a small effect size. The meta-analysis by Miller et al. (2008) showed that women were more forgiving than men, although with a small effect size. In the same way, vanOyen Witvliet, Root Luna, VanderStoep et al. (2020) found indirect genetic and gender effects on forgiveness through empathy, with higher scores for women than for men. However, other studies (Fariña, Novo, et al., 2024; Fehr et al., 2010) reported no significant differences between men and women in terms of forgiveness. On the other hand, Kaleta and Mróz (2022) found that men showed a higher level of overall forgiveness.

The results show that women reported higher scores than men on the three positive factors of the EFI-30 (positive affect, positive behaviour and positive cognition) as well as on the one-item forgiveness. However, these differences were associated with very small effect sizes. These results are in agreement with those obtained by Miller et al. (2008) and vanOyen Witvliet, Root Luna, VanderStoep et al. (2020). However, they do not coincide with those obtained by Fariña, Novo et al. (2024) and Kaleta and Mróz (2022). Fariña, Novo et al. (2024) found, using the EFI-30 as a measuring instrument, that men showed higher scores on the forgiveness item, although they did not find significant differences in the six dimensions of the EFI-30 inventory. Kaleta and Mróz (2022), using other measures of forgiveness, found that men showed a higher level of general forgiveness and a greater willingness to overcome unforgiveness than women, but found no significant differences in the positive facets of willingness to forgive.

Regarding age, contrary to what scientific literature shows (e.g., Allemand, 2008; Ghaemmaghami et al., 2011; Steiner et al., 2011; Tao et al., 2021), no significant differences were found in any of the six forgiveness factors or in the one-item forgiveness. These results indicate that, at least in this initial sample, the Cuban people's capacity for forgiveness does not increase with age.

With respect to educational status, a significant correlation, .09, CI [.01, .17], was found with the Positive Cognition factor, although with a trivial effect size (the CI has .05; Fandiño et al., 2021). The results illustrate that the higher the educational status, the higher the Positive Cognition. Research on educational status and forgiveness is very limited and limited mainly to diseases and not related to harm caused by people. Further research addressing educational status and forgiveness with different samples and forgiveness measurement instruments is needed to draw conclusions regarding how educational status affects the forgiveness process.

Finally, and in line with what the literature establishes (e.g., Akhtar & Barlow, 2018; Gao et al., 2022; Rohner et al., 2024), forgiveness was found to correlate positively and significantly with the psychological well-being factor of the GHQ-12. Specifically, it was found to correlate with the positive affect and positive behaviour factors of the EFI-30. Thus, the greater the positive affect and positive behaviour, the greater the psychological well-being. However, no significant correlations were found between psychological well-being with positive cognition or with negative affect, cognition and behaviour. Regarding the social functioning factor of the GHQ-12, a significant negative correlation with the positive cognition factor was obtained in an unexpected way. The other five factors of the EFI did not show significant correlations; neither did the One-item forgiveness score correlate significantly with psychological well-being and social functioning of the GHQ-12. Given these results, it may be thought that the GHQ-12 questionnaire is not appropriate for this type of research or even that the adaptation made by García-Viniegras (1999) for the Cuban population could be improved (Lobos-Rivera & Gutiérrez-Quintanilla, 2021) and, as a result, needs to be revised. In our opinion, this should be taken into account for future research. Now, considering all the results found in this study, it should be appreciated that forgiveness has cultural aspects (Rohner et al., 2023; Toro et al., 2023). Thus, the results of the meta-analysis conducted by Hanke and Vauclair (2016) led them to conclude that the importance of forgiveness as a value is not significantly associated with the sociopolitical indicator, but with contextual variables such as economic vitality and the level of human development. It is well known that Cuba has its own cultural identity, and that it suffers from a highly adverse socioeconomic reality. This could explain why the results obtained in this study were different from those found in other countries. Therefore, we agree with Freedman (2023) that there is a clear need for more research on forgiveness measures with non-Western, well educated, rich, democratic populations. In particular, we consider the need to promote scientific studies of forgiveness in Cuba this is the first published study. On the other hand, we also consider it necessary to validate the MC-SDS questionnaire (Crowne & Marlowe, 1960) in Cuba, and to study the behaviour that the social desirability variable may have on forgiveness and other constructs both in Cuba and in other Caribbean countries.

Funding

This research has been partially sponsored by a grant from the Consellería de Cultura, Educación e Universidade of the Xunta de Galicia (Code: ED431B 2023/09)

References

Akhtar, S., & Barlow, J. (2018). Forgiveness therapy for the promotion of mental well-being: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Trauma Violence & Abuse*, *19*(1), 107-122. https://doi.org/10.1177/1524838016637079

Allemand, M. (2008). Age differences in forgivingness: The role of future time perspective. *Journal of Research in Personality*, *42*(5), 1137-1147. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2008.02.009

Booker, J. A., & Perlin, J. D. (2021). Using multiple character strengths to inform young adults' self-compassion: The potential of hope and forgiveness. *The Journal of Positive Psychology*, *16*(3), 379-389. https://doi.org/10.1080/17439760.2020.1716048

Crowne, D. P., & Marlowe, D. (1960). A new scale of social desirability independent of psychopathology. *Journal of Consulting Psychology*, *24*(4), 349-354. https://doi.org/10.1037/h0047358

Cea, B., Montes, A., Trinidad, A., & Arce, R. (2025). Forensic psychological harm in victims of child sexual abuse: A meta-analytic review. *European Journal of Psychology Applied to Legal Context, 17*(2), 111-129. https://doi.org/10.5093/ejpalc2025a10

DenHartog, C. A. (2024). Qualitative exploration into how teachers understand and practice forgiveness. *Educational Sciences*, *14*(9), 923. https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci14090923

Enright, R. D. (1996). Counseling within the forgiveness triad: On forgiving, receiving forgiveness, and self-forgiveness. *Counseling and Values*, *40*(2), 107-126. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.2161-007X.1996.tb00844.x

Enright, R. D., & Fitzgibbons, R. P. (2015). Forgiveness therapy: An empirical guide for resolving anger and restoring hope. *American Psychological Association*. https://doi.org/10.1037/14526-000

Enright, R. D., & Rique, J. (2004). *Manual for the Enright Forgiveness Inventory*. Mind Garden.

Enright, R. D., & The Human Development Group. (1994). Piaget on the moral development of forgiveness: Identity or reciprocity? *Human Development, 37*(2), 63-80. https://doi.org/10.1159/000278239

Enright, R. D., Freedman, S., & Rique, J. (1998). The psychology of interpersonal forgiveness. In R. D. Enright & J. North, J. (Eds.), *Exploring forgiveness* (pp. 46-62). University of Wisconsin Press.

Enright, R., Rique, J., Lustosa, R., Song, J. Y., Komoski, M. C., Batool, I., Bolt, D., Sung, H., Huang, S. T., Park, Y., Leer-Salvesen, P. E., Andrade, T., Naeem, A., Viray, J., & Costuna, E. (2022). Validating the Enright Forgiveness Inventory- 30 (EFI-30): International studies. *European Journal of Psychological Assessment*, *38*(2), 113-123. https://doi.org/10.1027/1015-5759/a000649

Enright, R. D., Rique, J., & Coyle, C. T. (2000). *The Enright Forgiveness Inventory (EFI) user's manual*. International Forgiveness Institute.

Enright, R. D., Santos, M. J. D., & Al-Mabuk, R. (1989). The adolescent as forgiver. *Journal of Adolescence*, *12*(1), 95-110. https://doi.org/10.1016/0140-1971(89)90092-4

Fandiño, R., Basanta, J., Sanmarco, J., Arce, R., & Fariña, F. (2021). Evaluation of the executive functioning and psychological adjustment of child to parent offenders: Epidemiology and quantification of harm. *Frontiers in Psychology, 12*, 616855. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.616855

Fariña, F., Novo, M., Rique, J., Lustosa, R., & Enright, R. D. (2023). Enright Forgiveness Inventory (EFI-30): Propiedades psicométricas de la adaptación española [Forgiveness inventory (EFI30): Psychometric properties of the Spanish adaptation]. *Acción Psicológica*, *20*(2), 1-18. https://doi.org/10.5944/ap.20.2.39142

Fariña, F., Novo, M., Zhao, X., Benaisa-Mimon, M., & Mohamed-Mohand, L. (2024). Validating the Enright Forgiveness Inventory in Morocco: Religion and forgiveness. *Pastoral Psychology, 73*, 833–845. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11089-024-01170-7

Fariña, F., Oyhamburu, M. S., & Vázquez, M. J. (2020). El perdón: un proceso relevante para la Justicia Terapéutica [Forgiveness: A relevant process for therapeutic jurisprudence]. *Quaderni Di Conciliazione*, *14*, 67-79.

Fariña, F., Zhao, X., Novo, M., & Acurio, G. (2024a). Validating the Enright Forgiveness Inventory in Ecuador. *PsyCh Journal*, *13*(4), 692-694. https://doi.org/10.1002/pchj.740

Fariña, F., Zhao, X., Novo, M., Rique, J., & Oyhamburu, M. S. (2024b). Development and validation of the Enright Forgiveness Inventory 30-item version in Argentina. *Current Psychology*, *43*, 23053-23060. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-024-06049-7

Fehr, R., Gelfand, M. J., & Nag, M. (2010). The road to forgiveness: A meta-analytic synthesis of its situational and dispositional correlates. *Psychological Bulletin, 136*(5), 894-914. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0019993

Freedman, S. (2023). The measurement of forgiveness. In G. Pettigrove & R. Enright (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of the philosophy and psychology of forgiveness* (1st ed., pp. 445-460). Routledge.

Gao, F., Li, Y., & Bai, X. (2022). Forgiveness and subjective well-being: A meta-analysis review. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *186*, Part B, 111350. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2021.111350

García-Viniegras, C. R. V. (1999). Manual para la utilización del cuestionario de salud general de Goldberg. Adaptación cubana. *Revista Cubana de Medicina General Integral*, *15*(1), 88-97.

Ghaemmaghami, P., Allemand, M., & Martin, M. (2011). Forgiveness in younger, middle-aged and older adults: Age and gender matters. *Journal of Adult Development*, *18*, 192-203. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10804-011-9127-x

Ghobari Bonab, B., Khodayarifard, M., Geshnigani, R. H., Khoei, B., Nosrati, F., Song, M. J., & Enright, R. D. (2021). Effectiveness of forgiveness education with adolescents in reducing anger and ethnic prejudice in Iran. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *113*(4), 846-860. https://doi.org/10.1037/edu0000622

Goldberg, D. (1978). *Manual of the General Health Questionnaire*. NFER-NELSON Publishers.

Gutiérrez, S., Sanz, J., Espinosa, R., Gesteira, C., & García-Vera, M. P. (2016). La escala de deseabilidad social de Marlowe-Crowne: Baremos para la población general española y desarrollo de una versión breve [The Marlowe-Crowne social desirability scale: Norms for the Spanish general population and development of a short version]. *Anales de Psicología, 32*(1), 206-217. https://doi.org/10.6018/analesps.32.1.185471

Hanke, K., & Vauclair, C. M. (2016). Investigating the human value "forgiveness" across 30 countries: A cross cultural meta-analytical approach. *Cross-Cultural Research*, *50*(3), 215-230. https://doi.org/10.1177/1069397116641085

Horowski, J., & Jeziorański, M. (2024). Forgiveness and its value from the perspective of educational relationship. *Journal of Beliefs & Values, 45*(4), 603-619. https://doi.org/10.1080/13617672.2023.2207150

Hu, L. T., & Bentler, P. M. (1999). Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural Equation Modeling: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, *6*(1), 1-55. https://doi.org/10.1080/10705519909540118

Huepa, D. M., Sánchez, M. D. L. Á., & Sánchez, B. A. (2023). La formación y evolución de la identidad cultural cubana y el desempeño profesional pedagógico. Varona. *Revista Científico-Metodológica*, *77*, 1-13.

Kaleta, K., & Mróz, J. (2022). Gender differences in forgiveness and its affective correlates. *Journal of Religion and Health*, *61*(4), 2819-2837. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10943-021-01369-5

Kasprzak, A., Martínez-Diaz, P., Caparrós, C. M., & Enright, R. (2023). Interpersonal forgiveness: Validation of the Enright Forgiveness Inventory (EFI-30) in the Spanish sample. *Anales de Psicología/Annals of Psychology*, *39*(3), 364-373. https://doi.org/10.6018/analesps.522011

Kim, J. J., Volk, F., & Enright, R. D. (2022). Validating the Enright Self-Forgiveness Inventory (ESFI). *Current Psychology*, *41*, 7604-7617. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-020-01248-4

Liu, J. X. (2021). Social support mediates the effect of forgiveness on subjective well-being in college students. *Social Behavior and Personality: An International Journal*, *49*(5), 1-9. https://doi.org/10.2224/sbp.10177

Lobos-Rivera, M. E., & Gutiérrez-Quintanilla, J. R. (2021). Adaptación psicométrica del Cuestionario de Salud General (GHQ-12) en una muestra de adultos salvadoreños. *Revista Entorno*, *71*, 91-104. https://doi.org/10.5377/entorno.v1i71.14330

Lundahl, B. W., Taylor, M. J., Stevenson, R., & Roberts, K. D. (2008). Process-based forgiveness interventions: A meta-analytic review. *Research on Social Work Practice*, *18*(5), 465-478. https://doi.org/10.1177/1049731507313979

Maganto, C., & Garaigordobil, M. (2010). Evaluación del perdón: Diferencias generacionales y diferencias de sexo. *Revista Latinoamericana de Psicología, 42*(3), 391-403.

Major, J. L., Wade, N. G., & Brenner, R. E. (2020). Self-construal and forgiveness revisited: Replication and extension. *Counseling and Values*, *65*(2), 170-188. https://doi.org/10.1002/cvj.12136

McCullough, M. E., Worthington, E. L., & Rachal, K. C. (1997). Interpersonal forgiving in close relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 73*(2), 321-336. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.73.2.321

McCullough, M. E., Fincham, F. D., & Tsang, J. A. (2003). Forgiveness, forbearance, and time: The temporal unfolding of transgression-related interpersonal motivations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 84*(3), 540-557. https://doi.org/10.1037//0022-3514.84.3.540

McCullough, M. E., Kurzban, R., & Tabak, B. A. (2013). Putting revenge and forgiveness in an evolutionary context. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences, 36*(1), 41-58. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0140525X12001513

Miller, A. J., Worthington, E. L., Jr., & McDaniel, M. (2008). Forgiveness and gender: meta-analytic review and research agenda. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, *27*(8), 843-876. https://doi.org/10.1521/jscp.2008.27.8.843

Muñiz, J., Hernández, A., & Fernández-Hermida, J. R. (2020). Utilización de los test en España: El punto de vista de los psicólogos [Use oftests in Spain: Thepsychologists' pointofview]. *Papeles del Psicólogo*, *41*(1), 1-15.

Novo, M., Fariña, F., Lustosa, R., Morales, L. A., & Rique, J. (2024). El proceso de perdón, un mecanismo terapéutico: adaptación de la escala EFI-30 en México. In F. Fariña, M. Novo, D. Seijo, & R. Arce (Eds.), *Teoría e investigación sobre Justicia Terapéutica en Iberoamérica: ámbito penal y criminológico* (pp. 253-272). La Ley Soluciones Legales.

Ortega, A., Chen, Z. J., Cowden, R. G., Worthington, E. L. Jr., Toussaint, L., Rodriguez, N., Guzman, H., Ho, M. Y., Mathur, M. B., & VanderWeele, T. J. (2024). Do forgiveness campaign activities improve forgiveness, mental health, and flourishing? *International Journal of Public Health*, *69*, 1605341. https://doi.org/10.3389/ijph.2024.1605341

Peterson, C., & Seligman, M. E. P. (2004). *Character strengths and virtues: A handbook and classification*. American Psychological Association, Oxford University Press.

Rasmussen, K. R., Stackhouse, M., Boon, S.D., Comstock, K., & Ross, R. (2019). Meta-analytic connections between forgiveness and health: The moderating effects of forgiveness-related distinctions. *Psychology and Health*, *34*(5), 515-534. https://doi.org/10.1080/08870446.2018.1545906

Rique, J., Losano de Abreu, E., & Klatt, J. (2020). Theories and empirical research on forgiveness in South America and Latin Europe: Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Spain, and Portugal. In E. L. Worthington Jr., & N. G. Wade (Eds.), *Handbook of forgiveness* (2nd ed., pp. 242-252). Routledge/Taylor & Francis Group.

Rohner, R. P., Ali, S., & Lansford, J. E. (2024). Memories of parental acceptance and rejection predict forgiveness and vengeance in the Muslim world: Introduction and overview. *The Journal of Genetic Psychology*, *185*(3), 155-161. https://doi.org/10.1080/00221325.2023.2292031

Rosseel, Y. (2012). Lavaan: An R package for structural equation modeling. *Journal of Statistical Software, 48*(2), 1-36. https://doi.org/10.18637/jss.v048.i02

Salgado-Lévano, C., & Riveros Paredes, P. N. (2024). Systematic review of psychometric research on forgiveness in the Americas: An instrumental review. *European Psychologist, 29*(3), 186-198. https://doi.org/10.1027/1016-9040/a000531

Sobrino, R. (2021). *Cuba: realidades e imaginarios lingüísticos*. Peter Lang Verlag. https://doi.org/10.3726/b18392

Song, J., Enright, R. D., & Kim, J. (2025). Definitional drift within the science of forgiveness: The dangers of avoiding philosophical analyses. *Journal of Theoretical and Philosophical Psychology, 45*(1), 3-24. https://doi.org/10.1037/teo0000278

Song, J. Y., Lustosa, R., Rique, J., Klatt, J., Yu, L., Mandurah, N., Kim, J. J., & Enright, R. D. (2024). Expanding the cross-cultural validity of the Enright Forgiveness Inventory short form. *Clinical Psychology & Psychotherapy, 31*(1), Article 2960. https://doi.org/10.1002/cpp.2960

Steiner, M., Allemand, M., & McCullough, M. E. (2011). Age differences in forgivingness: The role of transgression frequency and intensity. *Journal of Research in Personality, 45*(6), 670-678. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2011.09.004

Subkoviak, M. J., Enright, R. D., Wu, C.-R., Gassin, E. A., Freedman, S., Olson, L. M., & Sarinopoulos, I. (1995). Measuring interpersonal forgiveness in late adolescence and middle adulthood. *Journal of Adolescence*, *18*(6), 641-655. https://doi.org/10.1006/jado.1995.1045

Suzuki, M., & Jenkins, T. (2023). Apology-forgiveness cycle in restorative justice, but how? *International Review of Victimology*, *29*(2), 259-276. https://doi.org/10.1177/02697580221079994

Tao, L., Zhu, T., Min, Y., & Ji, M. (2021). The older, the more forgiving? Characteristics of forgiveness of Chinese older adults. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *12*, 732863. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.732863

Toro, R., Barreto-Zambrano, M. L., Garzón-Velandia, D. C., Sandoval-Escobar, M., Pineda-Marín, C., O'Sullivan, C., Taylor, L., Kerezsy-Morales, G. K., Giraldo-Puerto, M. A., Cárdenas-Ruiz, S., Ramírez-Sierra, Y. V., Alfonso, D. D., Valderrama, J. V., & Niño-Amézquita, J. L. (2023). Empatía, agresividad y perdón en contextos de vulnerabilidad, hostilidad y seguridad en niños y adolescentes. *Revista Latinoamericana de Psicología*, *55*(1), 18-28. https://doi.org/kt64

VanderWeele, T. J., Johnson, B. R., Bialowolski, P. T., Bonhag, R., Bradshaw, M., Breedlove, T., Case, B., Chen, Y., Chen, Z. J., Counted, V., Cowden, R. G., de la Rosa, P. A., Felton, C., Fogleman, A., Gibson, C., Grigoropoulou, N., Gundersen, C., Jang, S. J., Johnson, K. A., … & Yancey, G. (2025). The Global Flourishing Study: Study profile and initial results on flourishing. *Nature Mental Health*, *3*, 636-653. https://doi.org/10.1038/s44220-025-00423-5

vanOyen Witvliet, C., Root Luna, L. M., VanderStoep, J. L., Gonzalez, T., & Griffin, G. D. (2020). Granting forgiveness: State and trait evidence for genetic and gender indirect effects

through empathy. *The Journal of Positive Psychology, 15*(3), 390–399. https://doi.org/10.1080/17439760.2019.1615108

vanOyen Witvliet, C., Root Luna, L. M., Vlisides-Henry, R. D., & Griffin, G. D. (2020). Consecutive reappraisal strategies strengthen and sustain empathy and forgiveness: Utilizing compassion and benefit finding while holding offenders accountable. *The Journal of Positive Psychology, 15*(3), 362–372. https://doi.org/10.1080/17439760.2019.1615104

Worthington Jr., E. L. (2024). Weaknesses of positive psychology might beovergeneralized: Forgiveness studies as a counter to thecritiques. *International Journal of Applied Positive Psychology*, *9*, 1293-1312. https://doi.org/10.1007/s41042-024-00166-1

Yu, L., Gambaro, M., Song, J. Y., Teslik, M., Song, M., Komoski, M. C., Wollner, B., & Enright, R. D. (2021). Forgiveness therapy in a maximum-security correctional institution: A randomized clinical trial. *Clinical Psychology & Psychotherapy, 28*(6), 1457-1471. https://doi.org/10.1002/cpp.2583

Záhorcová, L., & Dočkal, V. (2022). Slovak validation of the Enright Forgiveness Inventory-30. *Československá Psychologie*, *66*(6), 568-587. https://doi.org/10.51561/cspsych.66.6.568

Záhorcová, L., Halama, P., & Enright, R. D. (2020). Forgiveness as a factor of adjustment in bereaved parents. *Journal of Loss and Trauma*, *25*(2), 188-203. https://doi.org/10.1080/15325024.2019.1664786