



Is the concept of forgiveness universal? a cross-cultural perspective comparing western and eastern cultures

Man Yee Ho¹ · Everett L. Worthington Jr²

Published online: 28 May 2018

© Springer Science+Business Media, LLC, part of Springer Nature 2018

Abstract

To understand the conceptualizations of forgiveness more comprehensively, both the cognitive and emotional aspects of forgiveness were investigated across different cultures. Two studies examined cultural similarities and differences in the conceptualizations of forgiveness. In Study 1, we compared idioms of the Chinese and English languages. In Study 2, we compared transgression-related writings between Hong Kong Chinese and Americans. In Study 1 ($N=204$), we found that the basic presumptions of forgiveness (i.e., the recognition of transgression and the idea of cancelling debt) were similar across cultures. The cognitive dimension of forgiveness (which involves virtues that preserve social relationships) was more frequently observed in Chinese idioms than English idioms. In Study 2 ($N=68$), we found that similar emotional responses (e.g., shame and guilt) arose across cultures following one's own wrongdoing. Chinese writers were more likely to adopt higher cognitive processing in understanding forgiveness than American writers, as was reflected in their writings.

Keywords Forgiveness · Cross-cultural comparison · Idioms · Transgression-related writings

Introduction

Forgiveness is considered a virtue or character strength that is locally embedded in specific cultural contexts (Sandage et al. 2003). Culture may play an important role in social interaction and thus shape what is considered to be “forgiveness”; therefore, research on forgiveness should take culture into account when conceptualizing forgiveness. Previous literature has shown similarities and differences in the conceptualizations of forgiveness across cultures. On one hand, behavioral and emotional reactions toward the wrongdoer have been found to be similar across cultures. For example, forgiveness leads to changes in responses (decreased negative responses and increased positive responses), and emotions (increased feelings of compassion and empathy) toward the wrongdoer. These have been found to be important in both Korea and the U.S. (Owen 2008).

On the other hand, cross-cultural differences in identifying the importance of letting go of resentment toward the wrongdoer have been found. For instance, Americans considered giving up resentment toward the wrongdoer to be the most important aspect of their concept of forgiveness, while Koreans considered a decrease in negative emotions toward the wrongdoer the most important aspect of their concept of forgiveness (Owen 2008). However, a comprehensive comparison of the concepts relating to forgiveness between Eastern and Western cultures has not been undertaken. For example, the ideas of benevolence, grace (cf. Patrick et al. 2013), tolerance, and harmony (cf. Karremans et al. 2011) are highly valued in Chinese culture, but those concepts have seldom been examined in forgiveness studies. The purpose of the present research, therefore, was to explore cultural similarities and differences in the conceptualizations of forgiveness by comparing Chinese and English idioms, and transgression-related writings from both Hong Kong Chinese and Americans.

✉ Man Yee Ho
my.ho@cityu.edu.hk

¹ Department of Applied Social Sciences, City University of Hong Kong, Tat Chee Avenue, Kowloon, Hong Kong

² Virginia Commonwealth University, Richmond, VA, USA

The Conceptualizations of Forgiveness in the East and the West

In Western literature, forgiveness is generally defined as a reduction of negative feeling and an increase in positive feeling toward the transgressor (McCullough et al. 2000).

Baumeister et al. (1999) described two dimensions of forgiveness: intrapsychic and interpersonal. The intrapsychic dimension of forgiveness involves a change in the victim's inner emotional and cognitive states, such as making a conscious choice to forgo destructive thoughts and feelings. The interpersonal dimension associated with forgiveness involves social or behavioral responses within an ongoing relationship, such as engaging in constructive responses (e.g., reconciliation). Augsburger (1996) argued that intrapsychic and interpersonal dimensions of forgiveness vary according to culture. In individualistic cultures (e.g., American), forgiveness can be used as a conflict-resolution tool that focuses on intrapsychic dynamics (at the individual level) rather than being an interpersonal issue. In fact, many forgiveness researchers treat it as a completely intrapsychic experience that occurs in an interpersonal context, thus separating the interpersonal from the definition of forgiveness. In contrast, in collectivistic cultures (e.g., China), forgiveness is not seen as a private act of intrapsychic release (though that is expected, as Owen observed). Rather, forgiveness is seen as an integral part of an interpersonal transaction of reconciliation (Augsburger 1996).

By conducting a systematic review of the literature on interpersonal relationships, Hook et al. (2009) compared forgiveness in collectivistic societies to individualistic societies. They found differences in forms of forgiveness in the two types of societal structure. Even though some researchers have considered forgiveness as a relational virtue in Western societies (Day and Acock 2013), in individualistic cultures, individuals mainly focus on distinguishing oneself from others and striving for personal goals. Those personal goals, such as personal/emotional well-being, means that people may attend more to the emotional aspect of forgiveness. In contrast, in collectivistic cultures, individuals emphasize collective norms and relationships; social well-being may be more important for them. The motivation to maintain and restore social harmony is strong for collectivists, because the view of social relationships from a collectivistic framework is more communal than in the US (Sandage and Wiens 2001); therefore, the decision or motivation to forgive would be highly emphasized.

In order to reach a more comprehensive understanding of forgiveness than currently exists, forgiveness is conceptualized within the individualistic-collectivistic framework. Worthington and colleagues (Exline et al. 2003) have argued that there are two dimensions of forgiveness: decisional and emotional. Decisional forgiveness is a behavioral intention that one will let go of resentment and thoughts of revenge toward the person who has wronged you. Emotional forgiveness involves replacing negative, unforgiving emotions with positive, other-oriented ones.

Thus, a two-dimensional model focusing on the cognitive and emotional aspects of forgiveness is proposed.

Basic Presumptions of Forgiveness across Cultures

Forgiveness is often assumed to be adaptive for psychological and social adjustment following interpersonal transgression (McCullough et al. 2009; Orth et al. 2008). Although individualistic and collectivistic societies have different views of transgression (Hook et al. 2009), people from both cultures acknowledge the existence of conflict or transgression in interpersonal relationships. Interpersonal transgressions occur when individuals violate implicit or explicit relational norms or rules (Emmers-Sommer 2003). Following a transgression, individuals perceive that another individual has harmed them in a way that they consider both painful and morally wrong (McCullough et al. 2006). Most common forms of transgressions include romantic infidelity; insults by a friend or betrayals of a confidence; rejection, neglect, or insult by a family member; and neglect or insult by a romantic partner (McCullough et al. 2006). Hui and Bond (2009) compared interpersonal transgression profiles between Hong Kong Chinese and American people, finding that there was no cultural difference in the type of relationship with the perpetrator and the amount of perceived emotional harm produced by the transgression. As there must be an injustice gap that occurs or a violation of relational norms (i.e., transgression) that is situated in an interpersonal context (i.e., family members, romantic partners, friends) before an individual considers exercising forgiveness or not, we theorized that the recognition of transgressions and cancellation of debt are the basic and universal presumptions of forgiveness across cultures.

Nevertheless, it has been suggested that individuals from different cultures might have different motivations for forgiveness. Forgiveness is primarily motivated by interpersonal reasons in collectivistic cultures, such as restoring harmony and conforming to societal norms (Fu et al. 2004), and intrapersonal reasons in individualistic cultures, such as relief from resentment, anger, and other unpleasant negative feelings (Wade and Worthington 2003). An emphasis on social harmony is an essential feature of the traditional Chinese culture; benevolence, grace, forbearance, and harmony are common virtues that preserve social relationships in Chinese society. In contrast, an emphasis on personal responsibility and personal well-being prevails in Western cultures; the alleviation or expression of anger and the motivation for payback, getting even, or revenge are typical responses following a transgression in Western societies. These distinctions can be considered different dimensions of forgiveness, namely cognitive and emotional aspects of forgiveness.

Cultural Similarities and Differences between English and Chinese Idioms and Transgression-Related Writings

Language is a medium used by humans for communicating information and exchanging ideas, which can serve as a bridge between different cultures. Idioms are a special form of language that carries a lot of cultural information and heritage (e.g., history, religion, customs, and thought patterns). Idioms are usually highly specialized in meaning and closely tied to distinctive cultural beliefs and features (Shi 2015). Therefore, we can learn about social customs and culture through studying idioms. People use idioms in conversations every day, and mostly without realizing it. English and Chinese are rich in idiomatic expressions that are a vital aspect of language. Idioms are specific to cultural contexts, so comparing English and Chinese idioms can help enhance our understanding of the similarities and differences in the concepts of forgiveness between the East and the West (Study 1).

In addition, people use language to communicate with others, as well as to think and to create the foundation for shaping one's standpoint and outlook on life. Culture plays an important role in language. Language symbolizes a cultural reality (Kramsch 1998), in which the vocabulary in a language highlights words that are considered to be adaptively important to the corresponding culture. Therefore, comparing transgression-related text between American and Hong Kong Chinese participants can add to our understanding of the concepts of forgiveness across cultures (Study 2).

Based on a review of literature, some fundamental concepts of forgiveness are found to be universal; therefore, we hypothesized that, *H1*: the basic presumptions of forgiveness (i.e., the recognition of transgression and types of transgression) do not differ across the two cultural groups. In addition, because Chinese people are more likely to focus on virtues that preserve social relationships and put emphasis on the cognitive aspect of transgression than are Westerners, and because these cultural differences would be expected to be reflected in people's use of idioms and writing, we further hypothesized that, *H2a*: Chinese people are more likely to focus on the cognitive aspect of forgiveness (i.e., virtues that preserve social relationships and adaptation of cognitive justification) than are American people. *H2b*: American people are more likely to focus on the emotional aspect of forgiveness (i.e., responses to relieve social pain, e.g., revenge and anger) than are Chinese people.

In Study 1, both Chinese and English idioms that related to interpersonal relationships were examined to understand the concepts of forgiveness in both Eastern and Western cultures. In Study 2, we further investigated the concepts of forgiveness in the East and the West by comparing transgression-related text between the two cultural groups (U.S. and China).

Study 1

In Study 1, we examined the similarities and differences in the concepts of forgiveness in the East and the West by comparing English and Chinese idioms. Two independent coders who were fluent in both Chinese and English completed the coding of idioms.

Method

Materials

Two dictionaries of idioms published by well-known publishers were used in this study: in English, the Oxford dictionary of idioms (2nd ed.), published by Oxford University Press; in Chinese, the *Inhua Yanyu Cidian*, published by Commercial Press (H.K.) Ltd. There are about 5000 entries in each idiom dictionary. To avoid experimenter bias, the same set of criteria was used for selecting both English and Chinese idioms prior to coding. In both the English and Chinese idiom dictionaries, the categories of idioms relevant to forgiveness in an interpersonal context were identified. These categories include forgiveness; revenge and retribution; anger and annoyance; argument and conflict; justice, mercy, and grace; tolerance or forbearance; benevolence and kindness; generosity; hatred; and harmony. A total of 103 English idioms and 101 Chinese idioms from the above categories were identified and were used in further analyses in the current study.

Procedure

A coding scheme was developed based on conceptualizations of forgiveness in both the East and the West, as found in previous literature. The meaning of idioms was coded based on the following criteria: (1) Transgressions – idiom involves quarrel, conflict, offense, and transgression situations, and their causes, and consequences; (2) Cancellation of debt – idiom implies that someone is forgiven of anything owed the issuer; the debt from one to another is wiped away; (3) (Not) Taking revenge – idiom refers to (stopping oneself from) seeking vengeful retribution, retaliation, or punishment against a transgressor; (4) Alleviation/expression of anger – idiom involves expressing anger toward a transgressor to dispel one's own discomfort or to vent onto another; (5) Benevolence – idiom involves acts of well-wishing, kindness, or generosity; (6) Grace/mercy – idiom involves offering mercy (e.g., not administering deserved punishment) and grace (e.g., giving an unmerited gift) toward a transgressor; (7) Tolerance/forbearance – idiom implies tolerance (e.g., restrained or reluctant acceptance) or forbearance (e.g., bearing with and curtailing negative emotional expression) in an interpersonal

context; and (8) Harmony – idiom involves living peaceably and working toward similar ends in relationships with others.

If the criteria were met, idioms were coded as “1”. Idioms not meeting at least one of the eight criteria from the above coding scheme (e.g., conflict, taking revenge, tolerance, generosity, etc.) were discarded from subsequent analyses.

Results

The total number of idioms used in this study was 204, $N = 101$ (Chinese idioms) and $N = 103$ (English idioms). A statistical measure of inter-rater reliability was used, Cohen’s kappa. Kappa quantifies chance-adjusted agreement between two coders on the assignment of variables into categories. The two bilingual coders were graduates from local universities and have been exposed to both Chinese and Western cultures.

Typically, kappas are smaller in magnitude than estimates of reliability like Cronbach’s alpha. The inter-rater reliability for the coders (i.e., kappa) was found to be substantial, with an average kappa = 0.68 ($p < .001$), 95% CI (0.504, 0.848). Disagreements between raters were resolved by consensus. See examples of Chinese and English idioms in Table 1.

Similarities in Basic Presumptions of Forgiveness

A series of Chi-square tests were performed to evaluate whether conceptualizations of forgiveness are the same across two different cultures (Chinese vs. Western). The language of idioms (Chinese vs. English) and the recognition of transgressions in interpersonal relationships were not significantly related, $\chi^2(1, N = 204) = 4.71, p = .57$. Language of idioms and the cancellation of debts were not significantly related, $\chi^2(1, N = 204) = 1.06, p = .34$. Thus, the proportion of Chinese idioms that involved transgressions and the idea of cancellation of debt were not significantly different from the English idioms (see Table 2).

Differences in Cognitive and Emotional Aspects of Forgiveness

A series of Chi-square tests were conducted to assess whether Chinese people (reflected in Chinese idioms) focused more on the cognitive aspect of forgiveness, such as social virtues that preserve social relationships (i.e., benevolence, grace, tolerance, and harmony) than Westerners, and whether Westerners (reflected in English idioms) focused more on the emotional aspect of forgiveness, such as responses to relieve social pain (e.g., revenge, anger) than did Chinese people.

The language of idioms (Chinese vs. English) and the four cognitive aspects of forgiveness (i.e., benevolence, grace, tolerance, and harmony) were found to be significantly related, $\chi^2(1, N = 204) = 17.71, 4.81, 25.93$ and 5.84 , respectively; all $ps < .05$. In Chinese (versus English), 15.8% (versus 0%) of the idioms involved the meaning of benevolence, 6.9% (versus 1%) involved the meaning of grace, 24.8% (versus 1%) involved the meaning of tolerance, and 7.9% (versus 1%) involved the meaning of harmony. Thus, the proportion of Chinese idioms that involved the meanings of benevolence, grace, tolerance, and harmony, were significantly higher than the English idioms.

The language of idioms (Chinese versus English) and the emotional aspect of forgiveness (responses to relieve social pain, e.g., revenge and anger) were found to be significantly related, $\chi^2(1, N = 204) = 5.06$ and 25.77 , respectively; both $ps < .05$. In Chinese (versus English), 9.9% (versus 21.4%) of the idioms involved the meaning of revenge, and 7.9% (versus 37.9%) involved the meaning of anger. Thus, the proportion of Chinese idioms that involved the ideas of revenge and anger was significantly lower than for the English idioms.

Discussion

In Study 1, we examined how cultural orientations influence forgiveness by comparing idioms related to forgiveness in an

Table 1 Examples of Chinese and English Idioms

Language Meanings	Chinese	English
Transgressions	Men do not fight with women	Battle of the giants
Cancellation of debts	Good people do not blame the bad people for their wrongdoings)	Let bygone be bygone
Benevolence	Where it is possible to let people off, one should spare them	–
Grace	Grace widely carried out	Hold out (offer) an olive branch
Tolerance	Making concessions can settle a dispute	Count to ten
Harmony	Family harmony	Bury the hatchet

Table 2 Basic Presumptions of Forgiveness in Study 1

Basic presumptions Frequency	Chinese	English
Recognition of Transgressions	41.6%	36.9%
Cancellation of debts	10.9%	6.8%

interpersonal context from Chinese and English idiom dictionaries. The findings supported our hypothesis that the basic presumptions of forgiveness do not differ across the two cultural groups, as represented by the idioms in the two languages (Chinese vs. English) (*H1*). The basic presumption of forgiveness, which includes recognition of transgressions and cancellation of debts, seems to be universal. Consistent with previous research, people from different cultures acknowledge the existence of conflict or transgression in interpersonal relationships (Hook et al. 2009) and emotional harm after the transgression (Mullet et al. 2003).

Our findings also support our hypotheses that Chinese are more likely to focus on the cognitive aspect of forgiveness than are Americans, as reflected in their usage of idioms. In particular, virtues that preserve social relationships, such as benevolence, grace, forbearance, and harmony, were more frequently observed in the Chinese language (*H2a*), while responses to relieve social pain, such as the expression of anger and seeking revenge, were more frequently observed in the English language (*H2b*).

Study 2

We built upon the results from Study 1. In Study 2, we further investigated the two dimensions (emotional and cognitive aspects) of forgiveness in the East and the West by comparing transgression-related text between the two cultural groups (U.S. and China). Recollection of prior transgressions or actively reconstructed memories of transgressions may reflect people's mental schemas on forgiveness. Previous research has shown that recalling one's own past transgressions might have important implications for forgiveness (McCullough et al. 2007). Hence, in Study 2, we sought to understand the concept of forgiveness through comparing the transgression-related writing between the East and the West.

Method

Participants Participants consisted of college students at the Chinese University of Hong Kong ($n = 35$) and the Virginia Commonwealth University ($n = 33$). A total of 68 college students were recruited to participate in the study through the psychology subject pool system. The mean age of the participants was 19.87 ($SD = 2.81$) years, and 59% were female.

Participation in this study was completely voluntary. Participants gave consent to participate before they could proceed. This study was performed with the approval of the Virginia Commonwealth University ethics committee.

Procedure Participants spent 5 min recalling and writing about a time in which they had hurt or offended someone else (i.e., recalling the self as a transgressor). The average length of the paragraph written by participants was 47 words.

A coding scheme was developed based on the two-dimensional model of forgiveness in Study 2. The two-dimensional model of forgiveness mainly emphasizes the cognitive and emotional components of forgiveness. Decisional forgiveness is a cognitive decision to forgive the other person, whereas emotional forgiveness is the replacement of negative emotions with more positive ones toward the other person (Worthington 2006). As the two-dimensional model of forgiveness seems to be more applicable in real-life settings, the coding scheme of Study 2 was focused on the cognitive and emotional aspects of forgiveness. The transgression-related writings were coded based on the following criteria: (1) Cognitive justification – justifying why he or she has done the wrong; (2) Consequences of wrongdoing – identifying the negative consequences of one's wrongdoing (e.g., other people's suffering); and (3) Emotions arising from one's wrongdoing – recognize negative emotions (including shame and guilt) arising from one's wrongdoing. If the criteria were met, the text was coded as "1". Criteria 1 and 2 are based on the cognitive aspect of forgiveness, and criterion 3 is based on the emotional aspect of forgiveness.

Results

The estimated inter-rater reliability for the coders was very good. The average kappa = 0.94 ($p < .001$), 95% CI (0.895, .985).

A series of Chi-square tests were conducted to evaluate whether the conceptualizations of forgiveness were the same across two different cultures (Chinese vs. Western). The type of transgressions reported by both Hong Kong Chinese and American participants (reflected from their writings) were not significantly different, $\chi^2(4, N = 62) = 2.77, p = .91$. The most frequently quoted transgressions in both cultures were bullying/teasing, arguments, and rejection. Negative emotions (i.e., shame and guilt) arising from one's wrongdoing, as reported by both Chinese and Americans were not significantly different, $\chi^2(1, N = 68) = .01, p = .91$ and $\chi^2(1, N = 68) = .01, p = .96$.

The frequency of using cognitive justification (to justify why he or she has done the wrong) was significantly different between cultures, $\chi^2(1, N = 68) = 4.79, p < .05$, respectively. Chinese participants (38%) used more cognitive justification

compared with American participants (24%). The frequency of mentioning consequences (consequences of wrongdoing) were significantly different between cultures, $\chi^2(1, N = 68) = 8.54, p < .05$. Chinese participants (20.6%) mentioned more negative consequences of the transgression compared with American participants (8.8%).

Discussion

In Study 2, we examined how cultural orientations influence forgiveness. We compared transgression-related writing from two different cultures (U.S. and China). The findings support our hypothesis that the basic presumptions of forgiveness do not differ across the two cultural groups, as represented by the writings of participants in the two languages (Chinese vs. English) (*H1*). In Study 2, we further examined emotional responses following wrongdoing from the perspective of a transgressor. Surprisingly, different from our expectations (*H2b*), American participants did not use more emotional words arising from ones' wrongdoing compared with Chinese participants. Emotional responses (i.e., shame and guilt) arising following wrongdoing seem to be universal. This is consistent with previous literature, where universal moral laws have been found to govern people's moral standards, meaning that they will experience shame and guilt after wrongdoing (Tangney et al. 2007). Specifically, when we transgress, aversive feelings of shame and guilt will arise.

The results of this study also support our hypotheses that Chinese are more likely to focus on cognitive aspects of forgiveness than Americans (*H2a*), as reflected in their writings. In particular, the use of higher cognitive processes within transgression-related writings (i.e., cognitive justification and consequences of transgression) was more frequently observed in the Chinese writings than the English ones.

General Discussion

Previous research has shown similarities and differences in the conceptualizations of forgiveness across cultures; however, a comprehensive comparison of the concepts relating to forgiveness between Eastern and Western cultures has not been thoroughly investigated. Hence, the purpose of this research was to explore cultural similarities and differences in the conceptualizations of forgiveness by using both Chinese and English idioms (Study 1) and transgression-related writings (Study 2) from Hong Kong Chinese and Americans students.

Cultural Similarities in Forgiveness

According to Owen (2008), behavioral and emotional reactions toward transgressors are similar across cultures. The findings of the present studies support the notion that the basic presumptions of forgiveness do not differ across the two cultural groups. Specifically, recognition of transgressions, cancellation of debts, and types of transgression were similar across cultures. Interestingly, emotions arising following one's own wrongdoing appear to be universal across cultures.

Cultural Differences in Forgiveness

Additionally, past research found significant cross-cultural differences in the conceptualizations of forgiveness (Owen 2008). The results of the present studies support the theory that higher cognitive processes involved in understanding forgiveness can differ across cultures. Specifically, virtues that preserve social relationships, such as benevolence, grace, forbearance, and harmony, were more frequently observed in Chinese idioms than in English idioms. The emotional aspect of forgiveness (i.e., responses to relieve social pain—like revenge and anger) was more frequently observed in English idioms than in Chinese idioms.

Moreover, Hong Kong Chinese were more likely to attend to virtues that preserve social relationships and adopt higher cognitive functioning (i.e., cognitive justification and recognizing the consequences of transgression) than Americans when understanding forgiveness. In collectivistic cultures, individuals emphasize collective norms and relationships (Ho and Fung 2011). Hook et al. (2013) also found that collectivism was positively related to decisional forgiveness among the Chinese. It is therefore plausible that the cognitive aspect of forgiveness is more prominent in Chinese societies—and this might be particularly true in Hong Kong.

Collectivism involves valuing the group's claim on behavior beyond the claims of individual rights and responsibilities. In collectivistic cultures, personal competitiveness is usually minimized for the benefit of the group, and relationships take precedence over self-satisfaction (Belgrave and Allison 2010). However, who belongs within one's collective identity may be construed differently from group to group, and tensions certainly exist across groups. But, even within a group, conflict might exist hand-in-hand with collectivism, which can lead to *enemyship*. Enemyship is a personal relationship of hatred and malice in which an individual wishes for the downfall of others or strives to undermine another person's progress (Adams 2005; Wiseman and Duck 1995). Enemyship is a product of being in tightly committed collectivistic relationships but dealing with inevitable negativity toward another

person or group seen as an enemy, whose downfall is desired (Adams and Plaut 2003; Wiseman and Duck 1995). In Africa, for example, *Ubuntu* holds the collective together, even when enemyship creates personal animosities. Historic colonial injustices coupled with the cultural mores prioritizing *Ubuntu*, may challenge Westernized notions of forgiveness among Africans (Mukashema and Mullet 2010).

In cultures like the People's of Republic of China (PRC), other historically originated pressures might exist. For example, Confucianism and competency-based civil service leadership has led to a prizing of the intellect in Chinese society. Furthermore, the communist dominance of China has minimized much of the prior influence of Christianity in the PRC, and that differs substantially from Chinese culture in Hong Kong (with previous British rule) and Taiwan. Lingering Christian influences make forgiveness more salient, unlike the PRC where forbearance might be more prevalent than forgiveness as a response to conflict and transgressions.

In the present study, we compared two cultures, each of which is far from monolithic in itself, on conceptions of forgiveness. We easily could see that each of those cultures could differ from African conceptions of forgiveness and even from Taiwanese.

In conclusion, to fully capture the concept of forgiveness, both social and cultural contexts should be taken into account when investigating the conceptualizations of forgiveness. The present research adds to existing literature by conceptualizing forgiveness in a different way (cognitive and emotional aspects of forgiveness) and expands our understanding of cultural similarities and differences in defining forgiveness. A systematic analysis of both Chinese and English idioms and transgression-related writings from the two cultural groups (U.S. and China) also gives us insights into how people perceive forgiveness from different cultures.

Compliance with Ethical Standards

Conflict of Interest On behalf of all authors, the corresponding author states that there is no conflict of interest. Both authors declare that both of them have no conflict of interest.

References

- Adams, G. (2005). The cultural grounding of personal relationship: Enemyship in north American and west African worlds. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 88(6), 948–968.
- Adams, G., & Plaut, V. C. (2003). The cultural grounding of personal relationship: Friendship in north American and west African worlds. *Personal Relationships*, 10, 333–348.

- Augsburger, D. W. (1996). *Helping people forgive*. Westminster: John Knox Press.
- Baumeister, R. F., Exline, J. J., & Sommer, K. L. (1999). The victim role, grudge theory, and two dimensions of forgiveness. In E. L. Worthington Jr. (Ed.), *Dimensions of forgiveness: Psychological research and theological perspectives* (pp. 79–104). Philadelphia: Templeton Foundation Press.
- Belgrave, F. Z. (2010). In K. W. Allison (Ed.), *African American psychology: From Africa to America*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Day, R. D., & Acock, A. (2013). Marital well-being and religiousness as mediated by relational virtue and equality. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 75, 164–177.
- Emmers-Sommer, T. M. (2003). When partners falter: Repair after a transgression. In D. J. Canary & M. Dainton (Eds.), *Maintaining relationships through communication: Relational, contextual, and cultural variations* (pp. 185–205). Mahwah: Erlbaum.
- Exline, J. J., Worthington Jr., E. L., Hill, P., & McCullough, M. E. (2003). Forgiveness and justice: A research agenda for social and personality psychology. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 7, 337–348.
- Fu, H., Watkins, D., & Hui, E. K. F. (2004). Personality correlates of the disposition towards interpersonal forgiveness: A Chinese perspective. *International Journal of Psychology*, 39, 305–316.
- Ho, M. Y., & Fung, H. H. (2011). A dynamic model of forgiveness: A cross-cultural perspective. *Review of General Psychology*, 15, 77–84.
- Hook, J., Worthington, E. L., Davis, D. E., Watkins, D., Hui, E., Luo, W., Fu, H., Shulruf, B., Morris, P., & Reyna, S. H. (2013). A China-New Zealand comparison of forgiveness. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology*, 16(4), 286–291.
- Hook, J., Worthington, E. L., & Utsey, S. O. (2009). Collectivism, forgiveness, and social harmony. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 37, 821–847.
- Hui, V. K. Y., & Bond, M. H. (2009). Target's face loss, motivations, and forgiveness following relational transgression: Comparing Chinese and US cultures. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 26, 123–140.
- Karremans, J. C., Regalia, C., Paleari, F. G., Fincham, F. D., Cui M., & Takada, N. et al. (2011). Maintaining harmony across the globe: The cross-cultural association between closeness and interpersonal forgiveness. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, 2, 443–451.
- Kramsch, C. (1998). Language and culture. *Oxford: Oxford University Press*.
- McCullough, M. E., Pargament, K. I., & Thoresen, C. E. (2000). The psychology of forgiveness: History, conceptual issues, and overview. In M. E. McCullough, K. I. Pargament, & C. E. Thoresen (Eds.), *Theory, research and practice* (pp. 1–16). New York & London: The Guilford Press.
- McCullough, M. E., Bono, G., & Root, L. M. (2007). Rumination, emotion, and forgiveness: Three longitudinal studies. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 92, 490–505.
- McCullough, M. E., Root, L. M., & Cohen, A. D. (2006). Writing about the benefits of an interpersonal transgression facilitates forgiveness. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 74, 887–897.
- McCullough, M. E., Root, L. M., Tabak, B., & Witvliet, C. V. O. (2009). Forgiveness. In S. J. Lopez (Ed.), *Handbook of positive psychology* (2nd ed., pp. 427–435). New York: Oxford.
- Mukashema, I., & Mullet, E. (2010). Reconciliation sentiment among victims of genocide in Rwanda: Conceptualizations, and relationships with mental health. *Social Indicators Research*, 99(1), 25–39.
- Mullet, E., Barros, J., Frongia, L., Usai, V., Neto, F., & Rivièrè-Shafighi, S. (2003). Religious involvement and the forgiving personality. *Journal of Personality*, 71, 1–19.

- Orth, U., Berking, M., Walker, N., & Znoj, H. (2008). Forgiveness and psychological adjustment following interpersonal transgressions: A longitudinal analysis. *Journal of Research in Personality, 42*, 365–385.
- Owen, A. D. (2008). *A cross-cultural study of the concept and process of forgiveness*. Ph.D. dissertation. University of Wisconsin-Madison.
- Patrick, S., Beckenbach, J., Sells, J., & Reardon, R.F. (2013). An empirical investigation into justice, grace, and forgiveness: Paths to relationship satisfaction. *The Family Journal: Counselling and Therapy for Couples and Families, 21*, 146-153.
- Sandage, S. J., Hill, P. C., & Vang, H. C. (2003). Toward a multicultural positive psychology: Indigenous forgiveness and Hmong culture. *The Counseling Psychologist, 31*, 564–592.
- Sandage, S. J., & Wiens, T. W. (2001). Contextualizing models of humility of forgiveness : A reply to Gassin. *Journal of Psychology and Theology, 29*, 201–211.
- Shi, W., & Yuhong, J. (2015). Comparison and contrast between English and Chinese idioms from cultural connotation perspective. *Studies in Literature and Language, 10*, 102–113.
- Tangney, J. P., Stuewig, J., & Mashek, D. J. (2007). Moral emotions and moral.
- Wade, N. G., & Worthington, E. L. (2003). Overcoming interpersonal offenses: Is forgiveness the only way to deal with unforgiveness? *Journal of Counseling and Development, 81*, 343–353.
- Wiseman, J. P., & Duck, S. (1995). Having and managing enemies: A very challenging relationship. In S. Duck & J. T. Wood (Eds.), *Confronting relationship challenges* (pp. 43–72). Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Worthington Jr., E. L. (2006). *Forgiveness and reconciliation*. New York: Taylor & Francis Group.