**Religious Coping with Interpersonal Hurts: Psychosocial Correlates of the Brief RCOPE in Four Non-western Countries**

**SUPPLEMENTAL FILE**

**SUPPLEMENTAL METHOD**

**Participants and procedure**

Data were collected between November 2019 and May 2020. The total sample comprised university students in large metropolitan areas (Ukraine sites 1 and 2, Colombia, Indonesia), university faculty and staff recruited (Ukraine sites 1 and 2), and members of the general public (South Africa, Ukraine sites 1 and 2). Participants were recruited by university faculty, local research teams (Indonesia, Ukraine sites 1 and 2), email databases (Colombia, South Africa), social media campaigns, and snowball sampling via instant messaging and word of mouth (South Africa, Ukraine sites 1 and 2). Methods of data collection included paper-and-pencil (Indonesia), electronic via web-based software (e.g., GoogleForms) that participants accessed on their mobile devices or personal computers (Colombia, Ukraine 1 site, and South Africa), or a combination of paper-and-pencil and electronic methods (Ukraine site 2).

Only the South Africa site used the original English language versions of the measures. The other four sites translated each measure into the local language, including Russian (Ukraine 1 site), Ukrainian (Ukraine 2 site), Spanish (Colombia), and Indonesian (Indonesia). All measures were translated into the target language of each site, which were then back-translated into English using independent translators. Back-translated versions were then compared to the original English versions of each measure. Local professional translators, linguists, or social scientist consultants at each site assisted with ensuring the final translated version of each measure was semantically equivalent to the original English version. All measures were completed after participants recalled and wrote about a transgression in which they were hurt by another person, although the order in which participants completed each measure was not necessarily the same across the research sites.

**Measures**

***Brief RCOPE (Pargament et al., 1998)***

Participants completed the 14-item Brief RCOPE (see Introduction section for a detailed description of the measure). The Brief RCOPE was administered after participants recalled and wrote about a transgression in which they were hurt by another person, which prompted them to respond to the items by referencing the stress of being transgressed against.

***Brief Symptom Inventory-18 (BSI-18; Derogatis, 2001)***

The BSI-18 contains 18 items that capture three dimensions of distress experienced during the past seven days: anxiety, depression, and somatization. Each dimension is assessed via 6 items. In this study, participants completed all items included on the depression subscale (e.g., “Feeling no interest in things”) and 5 of the items from the anxiety subscale (e.g., “Nervousness or shakiness inside”)[[1]](#footnote-1). A five-point response format is used to rate each item (0 = *Not at all*; 4 = *Extremely*). In this study, relevant items were combined for indices of anxiety and depression, respectively.

***Transgression-Related Interpersonal Motivations Inventory-18 (TRIM-18; McCullough et al., 1998)***

The TRIM-18 was used to measure state forgiveness. The TRIM-18 consists of 18 items (e.g., “I’ll make him or her pay”) that are distributed across three subscales (i.e., revenge, avoidance, benevolence) that assess motivations theorized to underlie forgiveness (or a lack thereof). After describing a past event in which they were hurt by another person, participants in this study were prompted to respond to the TRIM-18 by reflecting on the person who had hurt them. Participants respond to each item using a five-point response format (1 = *Strongly disagree*; 5 = *Strongly agree*). Similar to prior studies (e.g., Cowden et al., 2019), we derived a composite index corresponding with state forgiveness by aggregating responses to each item after reverse scoring the items from the revenge and avoidance subscales. This is consistent with item-response theory analyses of the TRIM-18 by McCullough et al. (2010).

***Posttraumatic Growth Inventory (PGI; Tedeschi & Calhoun, 1996)***

The PGI is a 21-item measure that assesses perceptions of favorable outcomes of personal growth and improvement following a stressful or traumatic event. The measure consists of five factors (i.e., relating to others, new possibilities, personal strength, spiritual change, and appreciation of life) theorized to undergird the positive restructuring or strengthening of perceptions of self, others, and the meaning of events by individuals who successfully cope with adversity. Participants rate each item (e.g., “My priorities about what is important in life”) by considering the extent to which each of the changes occurred as a result of a specific crisis using a six-point response forms (0 = *I did not experience this change as a result of my crisis*; 5 = *I experienced this change to a very great degree as a result of my crisis*). In this study, responses to all 21 items were combined for a global measure of posttraumatic growth.

***Flourishing Index (FI; VanderWeele, 2017)***

The FI was used to assess well-being. The measure contains 10 questions and items (e.g., “Overall, how satisfied are you with life as a whole these days?”) that broadly capture five domains (i.e., happiness and life satisfaction, mental and physical health, meaning and purpose, character and virtue, and close social relationships) that are theorized to reflect complete well-being. Items are rated on an 11-point response scale (from 0 to 10), with orienting labels presented alongside anchor points at each end of the scale. For the purposes of this study, we derived a general index of well-being by summing responses to each of the FI items.

**SUPPLEMENTAL TABLES**

|  |
| --- |
| Table S1*Sample Characteristics* |
| Characteristic | Colombia | Indonesia | South Africa | Ukraine site 1 | Ukraine site 2 | Total  |
| **Validation sample** | *n* = 524 | *n* = 217 | *n* = 472 | *n* = 177 | *n* = 231 | *n* = 1,621 |
| Age, *M* ± *SD* (range) | 21.67 ± 3.86 (18-61) | 19.62 ± 1.66 (18-33) | 38.39 ± 13.69 (18-72) | 29.79 ± 12.00 (18-64) | 25.53 ± 10.00 (18-62) | 27.71 ± 12.02 (18-72) |
| Sex, *n* (%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Female | 341 (65.08) | 173 (79.72) | 317 (67.16) | 107 (60.45) | 173 (74.89) | 1111 (68.54) |
| Male | 182 (34.73) | 40 (18.43) | 155 (32.84) | 70 (39.55) | 58 (25.11) | 505 (31.15) |
| **Cross-validation sample** | *n* = 524 | *n* = 217 | *n* = 473 | *n* = 178 | *n* = 231 | *n* = 1,623 |
| Age, *M* ± *SD* (range) | 21.65 ± 4.01 (18-50) | 19.33 ± 1.12 (18-25) | 37.11 ± 13.89 (18-74) | 29.54 ± 11.42 (18-70) | 26.94 ± 10.11 (18-59) | 27.47 ± 11.73 (18-74) |
| Sex, *n* (%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Female | 333 (63.55) | 177 (81.57) | 299 (63.21) | 120 (67.42) | 183 (79.22) | 1112 (68.52) |
| Male | 189 (36.07) | 36 (16.59) | 174 (36.79) | 58 (32.58) | 48 (20.78) | 505 (31.12) |
| **Total sample** | *n* = 1,048 | *n* = 434 | *n* = 945 | *n* = 355 | *n* = 462 | *N* = 3,244 |
| Age, *M* ± *SD* (range) | 21.66 ± 3.93 (18-61) | 19.47 ± 1.42 (18-33) | 37.75 ± 13.80 (18-74) | 29.67 ± 11.70 (18-70) | 26.23 ± 10.07 (18-62) | 27.59 ± 11.88 (18-74) |
| Sex, *n* (%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Female | 674 (64.31) | 350 (80.65) | 616 (65.19) | 227 (63.94) | 356 (77.06) | 2223 (68.53) |
| Male | 371 (35.40) | 76 (17.51) | 329 (34.81) | 128 (36.06) | 106 (22.94) | 1010 (31.13) |
| *Note*. *M* = mean, *n*/*N* = sample size, *SD* = standard deviation. Percentages are unweighted and may not add up to 100% due to missing values. |

|  |
| --- |
| Table S2*Summary Statistics for Categories of Interpersonal Transgressors* |
| Transgressor | Colombia |  | Indonesia |  | South Africa |  | Ukraine site 1 |  | Ukraine site 2 |  | Total |
| *n* | % |  | *n* | % |  | *n* | % |  | *n* | % |  | *n* | % |  | *n* | % |
| Unclear  | 588 | 56.11 |  | 0 | 0.00 |  | 340 | 35.98 |  | 79 | 22.25 |  | 150 | 34.27 |  | 1,157 | 35.67 |
| Romantic partner/spouse | 132 | 12.60 |  | 74 | 17.05 |  | 195 | 20.63 |  | 66 | 18.59 |  | 74 | 16.02 |  | 541 | 16.68 |
| Non-spouse family member | 120 | 11.45 |  | 69 | 15.90 |  | 144 | 15.24 |  | 64 | 18.03 |  | 70 | 15.15 |  | 467 | 14.40 |
| Friend | 125 | 11.93 |  | 211 | 48.62 |  | 90 | 9.52 |  | 81 | 22.82 |  | 74 | 16.02 |  | 581 | 17.91 |
| Acquaintance | 15 | 1.43 |  | 9 | 2.07 |  | 31 | 3.28 |  | 9 | 2.54 |  | 16 | 3.46 |  | 80 | 2.47 |
| Peer | 46 | 4.39 |  | 52 | 11.98 |  | 10 | 1.06 |  | 16 | 4.51 |  | 9 | 1.95 |  | 133 | 4.10 |
| Work colleague | 5 | 0.48 |  | 5 | 1.15 |  | 54 | 5.71 |  | 16 | 4.51 |  | 6 | 1.30 |  | 86 | 2.65 |
| Authority figure | 16 | 1.53 |  | 8 | 1.84 |  | 36 | 3.81 |  | 22 | 6.20 |  | 53 | 11.47 |  | 135 | 4.16 |
| Service provider | 0 | 0.00 |  | 3 | 0.69 |  | 4 | 0.42 |  | 2 | 0.56 |  | 9 | 1.95 |  | 18 | 0.55 |
| Stranger | 8 | 0.76 |  | 2 | 0.46 |  | 36 | 3.81 |  | 1 | 0.28 |  | 2 | 0.43 |  | 49 | 1.51 |
| Group(s) of people | 0 | 0.00 |  | 2 | 0.46 |  | 8 | 0.85 |  | 2 | 0.56 |  | 0 | 0.00 |  | 12 | 0.37 |
| *Note*. *n* = number of descriptions coded into each category. Transgressors may have been coded into more than one category or there may have been more than one transgressor mentioned. The total percentage may exceed 100%. |

|  |
| --- |
| Table S3*Summary Statistics for Types of Transgressions* |
| Transgression | Colombia |  | Indonesia |  | South Africa |  | Ukraine site 1 |  | Ukraine site 2 |  | Total |
| *n* | % |  | *n* | % |  | *n* | % |  | *n* | % |  | *n* | % |  | *n* | % |
| Unclear  | 374 | 35.69 |  | 1 | 0.23 |  | 132 | 13.97 |  | 52 | 14.65 |  | 74 | 16.02 |  | 633 | 19.51 |
| Infidelity | 64 | 6.11 |  | 27 | 6.22 |  | 112 | 11.85 |  | 25 | 7.04 |  | 14 | 3.03 |  | 242 | 7.46 |
| Deception | 36 | 3.44 |  | 25 | 5.76 |  | 83 | 8.78 |  | 29 | 8.17 |  | 34 | 7.36 |  | 207 | 6.38 |
| Broken promise(s) | 4 | 0.38 |  | 6 | 1.38 |  | 24 | 2.54 |  | 17 | 4.79 |  | 11 | 2.38 |  | 62 | 1.91 |
| Disclosed a secret(s) | 25 | 2.39 |  | 1 | 0.23 |  | 13 | 1.38 |  | 4 | 1.13 |  | 3 | 0.65 |  | 46 | 1.42 |
| Unspecified betrayal | 91 | 8.68 |  | 6 | 1.38 |  | 41 | 4.34 |  | 23 | 6.48 |  | 62 | 13.42 |  | 223 | 6.87 |
| Sexual abuse/violence | 5 | 0.48 |  | 1 | 0.23 |  | 39 | 4.13 |  | 1 | 0.28 |  | 1 | 0.22 |  | 47 | 1.45 |
| Physical abuse/violence | 31 | 2.96 |  | 8 | 1.84 |  | 72 | 7.62 |  | 13 | 3.66 |  | 9 | 1.95 |  | 133 | 4.10 |
| Verbal/emotional abuse | 61 | 5.82 |  | 52 | 11.98 |  | 62 | 6.56 |  | 36 | 10.14 |  | 13 | 2.81 |  | 224 | 6.91 |
| Unspecified abuse/violence | 41 | 3.91 |  | 7 | 1.61 |  | 31 | 3.28 |  | 3 | 0.85 |  | 6 | 1.30 |  | 88 | 2.71 |
| Inappropriate communication/harassment | 188 | 17.94 |  | 93 | 21.43 |  | 100 | 10.58 |  | 46 | 12.96 |  | 30 | 6.49 |  | 457 | 14.09 |
| Discrimination | 21 | 2.00 |  | 11 | 2.53 |  | 22 | 2.33 |  | 4 | 1.13 |  | 11 | 2.38 |  | 69 | 2.13 |
| Exploitation | 0 | 0.00 |  | 19 | 4.38 |  | 4 | 0.42 |  | 7 | 1.97 |  | 8 | 1.73 |  | 38 | 1.17 |
| Act of war/violent hostility/rioting | 1 | 0.10 |  | 0 | 0.00 |  | 3 | 0.32 |  | 0 | 0.00 |  | 0 | 0.00 |  | 4 | 0.12 |
| Gaslighting/distancing/ignoring | 35 | 3.34 |  | 80 | 18.43 |  | 39 | 4.13 |  | 18 | 5.07 |  | 43 | 9.31 |  | 215 | 6.63 |
| Stalking | 1 | 0.10 |  | 0 | 0.00 |  | 1 | 0.11 |  | 1 | 0.28 |  | 0 | 0.00 |  | 3 | 0.09 |
| Sabotage of social connections/defamation of reputation | 77 | 7.35 |  | 48 | 11.06 |  | 100 | 10.58 |  | 27 | 7.61 |  | 26 | 5.63 |  | 278 | 8.57 |
| Threats to property/resources | 19 | 1.81 |  | 11 | 2.53 |  | 66 | 6.98 |  | 12 | 3.38 |  | 17 | 3.68 |  | 125 | 3.85 |
| Accusations/moral affronts | 26 | 2.48 |  | 43 | 9.91 |  | 79 | 8.36 |  | 35 | 9.86 |  | 60 | 12.99 |  | 243 | 7.49 |
| Indifference | 31 | 2.96 |  | 28 | 6.45 |  | 101 | 10.69 |  | 28 | 7.89 |  | 20 | 4.33 |  | 208 | 6.41 |
| Harm to another person(s) | 43 | 4.10 |  | 12 | 2.76 |  | 53 | 5.61 |  | 8 | 2.25 |  | 8 | 1.73 |  | 124 | 3.82 |
| Insensitive communication/behavior | 0 | 0.00 |  | 0 | 0.00 |  | 0 | 0.00 |  | 8 | 2.25 |  | 22 | 4.76 |  | 30 | 0.92 |
| *Note. n* = number of descriptions coded into each category. Offenses may have been coded into more than one category or multiple offenses may have been mentioned. The total percentage may exceed 100%. |

|  |
| --- |
| Table S4*Means and Standard Deviations for all Items on the Positive and Negative Religious Coping Subscales in the Validation, Cross-validation, and Total Samples* |
| **Validation sample** | Colombia | Indonesia | South Africa | Ukraine site 1 | Ukraine site 2 | Total  |
| *Positive religious coping* |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Looked for a stronger… | 3.47 ± 0.81 | 3.20 ± 0.66 | 3.29 ± 1.01 | 1.98 ± 1.02 | 2.09 ± 1.04 | 3.02 ± 1.08 |
| 2. Sought God’s love… | 3.47 ± 0.80 | 3.45 ± 0.65 | 3.34 ± 0.98 | 1.93 ± 1.09 | 2.09 ± 1.04 | 3.07 ± 1.09 |
| 3. Sought help from God… | 3.33 ± 0.92 | 3.47 ± 0.67 | 3.34 ± 0.99 | 1.95 ± 1.08 | 2.02 ± 1.08 | 3.01 ± 1.13 |
| 4. Tried to put my plans… | 3.53 ± 0.78 | 3.34 ± 0.70 | 3.20 ± 1.05 | 2.07 ± 1.13 | 2.01 ± 1.08 | 3.03 ± 1.11 |
| 5. Tried to see how God… | 3.48 ± 0.79 | 3.49 ± 0.66 | 3.23 ± 1.04 | 1.92 ± 1.07 | 2.16 ± 1.14 | 3.05 ± 1.11 |
| 6. Asked forgiveness… | 3.57 ± 0.77 | 3.59 ± 0.69 | 3.22 ± 1.06 | 2.32 ± 1.14 | 2.46 ± 1.17 | 3.18 ± 1.07 |
| 7. Focused on religion… | 2.84 ± 1.07 | 3.22 ± 0.76 | 2.91 ± 1.16 | 1.66 ± 0.95 | 1.52 ± 0.82 | 2.59 ± 1.18 |
| *Negative religious coping* |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8. Wondered whether God… | 2.30 ± 1.18 | 2.04 ± 0.98 | 2.00 ± 1.13 | 1.50 ± 0.88 | 1.54 ± 0.82 | 1.98 ± 1.10 |
| 9. Felt punished by God… | 2.12 ± 1.12 | 2.46 ± 1.00 | 1.84 ± 1.09 | 1.50 ± 0.83 | 1.59 ± 0.85 | 1.94 ± 1.08 |
| 10. Wondered what I did… | 2.11 ± 1.13 | 2.29 ± 1.00 | 1.82 ± 1.09 | 1.69 ± 0.92 | 1.84 ± 1.00 | 1.96 ± 1.08 |
| 11. Questioned God’s love… | 1.87 ± 1.10 | 1.94 ± 1.01 | 1.77 ± 1.07 | 1.49 ± 0.85 | 1.60 ± 0.95 | 1.77 ± 1.04 |
| 12. Wondered whether my religious community… | 1.57 ± 0.93 | 1.70 ± 0.91 | 1.58 ± 0.95 | 1.32 ± 0.76 | 1.30 ± 0.73 | 1.52 ± 0.90 |
| 13. Decided the devil… | 1.68 ± 0.99 | 1.81 ± 1.03 | 1.92 ± 1.09 | 1.34 ± 0.68 | 1.33 ± 0.71 | 1.68 ± 0.99 |
| 14. Questioned the power… | 1.54 ± 0.96 | 1.63 ± 0.93 | 1.50 ± 0.94 | 1.50 ± 0.89 | 1.71 ± 1.04 | 1.56 ± 0.96 |
| **Cross-validation sample** | Colombia | Indonesia | South Africa | Ukraine site 1 | Ukraine site 2 | Total  |
| *Positive religious coping* |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Looked for a stronger… | 3.36 ± 0.87 | 3.24 ± 0.68 | 3.24 ± 1.03 | 2.04 ± 1.15 | 2.06 ± 1.02 | 2.98 ± 1.10 |
| 2. Sought God’s love… | 3.38 ± 0.85 | 3.48 ± 0.63 | 3.32 ± 0.96 | 2.04 ± 1.11 | 2.04 ± 1.04 | 3.04 ± 1.08 |
| 3. Sought help from God… | 3.24 ± 0.96 | 3.48 ± 0.70 | 3.36 ± 0.97 | 2.03 ± 1.15 | 1.97 ± 1.05 | 2.99 ± 1.13 |
| 4. Tried to put my plans… | 3.46 ± 0.82 | 3.37 ± 0.73 | 3.23 ± 1.04 | 2.13 ± 1.16 | 2.05 ± 1.08 | 3.03 ± 1.11 |
| 5. Tried to see how God… | 3.41 ± 0.83 | 3.53 ± 0.65 | 3.30 ± 1.00 | 1.99 ± 1.08 | 2.13 ± 1.10 | 3.06 ± 1.10 |
| 6. Asked forgiveness… | 3.44 ± 0.83 | 3.64 ± 0.63 | 3.31 ± 1.04 | 2.29 ± 1.17 | 2.39 ± 1.15 | 3.15 ± 1.08 |
| 7. Focused on religion… | 2.74 ± 1.05 | 3.27 ± 0.81 | 2.84 ± 1.19 | 1.61 ± 0.93 | 1.56 ± 0.85 | 2.55 ± 1.18 |
| *Negative religious coping* |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8. Wondered whether God… | 2.25 ± 1.15 | 1.90 ± 1.05 | 2.06 ± 1.20 | 1.56 ± 0.91 | 1.56 ± 0.85 | 1.97 ± 1.12 |
| 9. Felt punished by God… | 2.13 ± 1.10 | 2.36 ± 1.11 | 1.89 ± 1.10 | 1.57 ± 0.84 | 1.49 ± 0.82 | 1.94 ± 1.08 |
| 10. Wondered what I did… | 2.07 ± 1.13 | 2.23 ± 1.06 | 1.92 ± 1.14 | 1.67 ± 0.91 | 1.72 ± 0.94 | 1.95 ± 1.09 |
| 11. Questioned God’s love… | 1.84 ± 1.07 | 1.95 ± 1.07 | 1.86 ± 1.14 | 1.42 ± 0.76 | 1.41 ± 0.74 | 1.76 ± 1.04 |
| 12. Wondered whether my religious community… | 1.57 ± 0.91 | 1.59 ± 0.86 | 1.57 ± 1.03 | 1.28 ± 0.64 | 1.29 ± 0.68 | 1.50 ± 0.89 |
| 13. Decided the devil… | 1.67 ± 0.99 | 1.74 ± 0.98 | 1.96 ± 1.15 | 1.37 ± 0.74 | 1.35 ± 0.72 | 1.68 ± 1.01 |
| 14. Questioned the power… | 1.56 ± 0.95 | 1.67 ± 0.97 | 1.56 ± 1.00 | 1.53 ± 0.95 | 1.65 ± 1.03 | 1.59 ± 0.98 |
| **Total sample** | Colombia | Indonesia | South Africa | Ukraine site 1 | Ukraine site 2 | Total  |
| *Positive religious coping* |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Looked for a stronger… | 3.41 ± 0.84 | 3.22 ± 0.67 | 3.27 ± 1.02 | 2.01 ± 1.09 | 2.07 ± 1.03 | 3.00 ± 1.09 |
| 2. Sought God’s love… | 3.43 ± 0.82 | 3.47 ± 0.64 | 3.33 ± 0.96 | 1.99 ± 1.10 | 2.07 ± 1.04 | 3.05 ± 1.09 |
| 3. Sought help from God… | 3.28 ± 0.94 | 3.48 ± 0.69 | 3.35 ± 0.98 | 1.99 ± 1.12 | 1.99 ± 1.07 | 3.00 ± 1.13 |
| 4. Tried to put my plans… | 3.50 ± 0.80 | 3.36 ± 0.71 | 3.21 ± 1.04 | 2.10 ± 1.14 | 2.03 ± 1.08 | 3.03 ± 1.11 |
| 5. Tried to see how God… | 3.45 ± 0.81 | 3.51 ± 0.65 | 3.27 ± 1.02 | 1.96 ± 1.08 | 2.15 ± 1.12 | 3.05 ± 1.10 |
| 6. Asked forgiveness… | 3.51 ± 0.80 | 3.61 ± 0.66 | 3.27 ± 1.05 | 2.30 ± 1.15 | 2.43 ± 1.16 | 3.17 ± 1.07 |
| 7. Focused on religion… | 2.79 ± 1.06 | 3.24 ± 0.78 | 2.87 ± 1.17 | 1.63 ± 0.94 | 1.54 ± 0.83 | 2.57 ± 1.18 |
| *Negative religious coping* |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8. Wondered whether God… | 2.27 ± 1.17 | 1.97 ± 1.02 | 2.03 ± 1.16 | 1.53 ± 0.89 | 1.55 ± 0.83 | 1.98 ± 1.11 |
| 9. Felt punished by God… | 2.13 ± 1.11 | 2.41 ± 1.05 | 1.86 ± 1.10 | 1.54 ± 0.83 | 1.54 ± 0.84 | 1.94 ± 1.08 |
| 10. Wondered what I did… | 2.09 ± 1.13 | 2.26 ± 1.03 | 1.87 ± 1.11 | 1.68 ± 0.91 | 1.78 ± 0.97 | 1.96 ± 1.08 |
| 11. Questioned God’s love… | 1.86 ± 1.08 | 1.95 ± 1.04 | 1.82 ± 1.11 | 1.45 ± 0.81 | 1.50 ± 0.85 | 1.76 ± 1.04 |
| 12. Wondered whether my religious community… | 1.57 ± 0.92 | 1.65 ± 0.89 | 1.58 ± 0.99 | 1.30 ± 0.70 | 1.29 ± 0.71 | 1.51 ± 0.90 |
| 13. Decided the devil… | 1.67 ± 0.99 | 1.77 ± 1.00 | 1.94 ± 1.12 | 1.36 ± 0.71 | 1.34 ± 0.71 | 1.68 ± 1.00 |
| 14. Questioned the power… | 1.55 ± 0.96 | 1.65 ± 0.95 | 1.53 ± 0.97 | 1.51 ± 0.92 | 1.68 ± 1.04 | 1.57 ± 0.97 |
| *Note*. *M* = mean, *SD* = standard deviation. See Pargament et al. (2011) for complete items. |

|  |
| --- |
| Table S5*Summary Statistics for Confirmatory Factor Analyses and Measurement Invariance Testing Using WLSMV Estimation with Ordinal Indicators in the Cross-Validation Sample* |
| Model | Overall fit indices |  | Change in fit indices |
| χ2 (*df*) | CFI | RMSEA [90% CI] | SRMR |  | Δ CFI | Δ RMSEA | Δ SRMR |
| **Site-level** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Single group CFA* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ukraine site 1 (*n* = 178) | 123.00 (64) | .993 | .072 [.053, .091] | .065 |  |  |  |  |
| Ukraine site 2 (*n* = 231) | 139.57 (64) | .988 | .072 [.055, .088] | .065 |  |  |  |  |
| *Measurement invariance* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Configural (*n* = 409) | 261.60 (128) | .991 | .072 [.059, .084] | .065 |  |  |  |  |
| Metric (*n* = 409) | 287.27 (139) | .990 | .072 [.061, .084] | .070 |  | -.001 | .000 | .005 |
| Scalar (*n* = 409) | 287.34 (163) | .992 | .061 [.049, .073] | .065 |  | .002 | -.011 | -.005 |
| **Country-level** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Single group CFA* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Colombia (*n* = 524) | 246.80 (64) | .995 | .074 [.064, .084] | .060 |  |  |  |  |
| Indonesia (*n* = 217) | 136.02 (64) | .984 | .072 [.055, .089] | .067 |  |  |  |  |
| South Africa (*n* = 473) | 231.67 (64) | .992 | .075 [.064, .085] | .075 |  |  |  |  |
| Ukraine (*n* = 409) | 190.01 (64) | .991 | .069 [.058, .081] | .056 |  |  |  |  |
| *Measurement invariance* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Configural (*n* = 1,623) | 799.99(256) | .993 | .072 [.067, .078] | .064 |  |  |  |  |
| Metric (*n* = 1,623) | 1113.30 (289) | .989 | .084 [.079, .089] | .077 |  | -.004 | .012 | .013 |
| Scalar (*n* = 1,623) | 1216.70 (361) | .989 | .077 [.072, .081] | .065 |  | .000 | -.007 | -.012 |
| *Note*. CFA = confirmatory factor analysis, CFI = comparative fit index, CI = confidence interval, *df* = degrees of freedom, *n* = sample size, RMSEA = root mean square error of approximation, SRMR = standardized root mean square residual, WLSMV = robust diagonally weighted least-squares mean- and variance-adjusted estimator, χ2 = Chi-square test statistic. *p*-values for all Chi-square goodness of fit statistics < .001. |

|  |
| --- |
| Table S6*Summary Statistics for Confirmatory Factor Analyses and Measurement Invariance Testing Using MLR Estimation with Continuous Indicators in the Cross-Validation Sample* |
| Model | Overall fit indices |  | Change in fit indices |
| χ2 (*df*) | CFI | RMSEA [90% CI] | SRMR |  | Δ CFI | Δ RMSEA | Δ SRMR |
| **Site-level** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Single group CFA* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ukraine site 1 (*n* = 178) | 117.01 (64) | .946 | .068 [.052, .084] | .067 |  |  |  |  |
| Ukraine site 2 (*n* = 231) | 88.28 (64) | .977 | .041 [.023, .056] | .060 |  |  |  |  |
| *Measurement invariance* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Configural (*n* = 409) | 204.40 (128) | .963 | .054 [.043, .065] | .059 |  |  |  |  |
| Metric (*n* = 409) | 218.67 (139) | .961 | .053 [.042, .063] | .065 |  | -.002 | -.001 | .006 |
| Scalar (*n* = 409) | 234.38 (150) | .959 | .052 [.042, .063] | .066 |  | -.002 | -.001 | .001 |
| **Country-level** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Single group CFA* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Colombia (*n* = 524) | 261.75 (64) | .950 | .077 [.068, .086] | .048 |  |  |  |  |
| Indonesia (*n* = 217) | 189.97 (64) | .904 | .095 [.081, .110] | .055 |  |  |  |  |
| South Africa (*n* = 473) | 207.76 (64) | .957 | .069 [.059, .079] | .061 |  |  |  |  |
| Ukraine (*n* = 409) | 139.51 (64) | .962 | .054 [.044, .063] | .054 |  |  |  |  |
| *Measurement invariance* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Configural (*n* = 1,623) | 776.04(256) | .951 | .071 [.066, .076] | .051 |  |  |  |  |
| Metric (*n* = 1,623) | 876.14 (289) | .944 | .071 [.066, .076] | .066 |  | -.007 | .000 | .015 |
| Scalar (*n* = 1,623) | 1225.50 (322) | .914 | .083 [.079, .088] | .076 |  | -.030 | .012 | .010 |
| *Note*. CFA = confirmatory factor analysis, CFI = comparative fit index, CI = confidence interval, *df* = degrees of freedom, MLR, robust maximum likelihood estimator, *n* = sample size, RMSEA = root mean square error of approximation, SRMR = standardized root mean square residual, χ2 = Chi-square test statistic. *p*-values for all Chi-square goodness of fit statistics < .001. |

References

Cowden, R. G., Worthington, E. L., Jr., Joynt, S., & Jakins, C. (2019). Do congruent apologies facilitate forgiveness? *South African Journal of Psychology, 49*, 403-416. https://doi.org/10.1177/0081246318807800

Derogatis, L. R. (2001). *Brief Symptom Inventory (BSI)-18: Administration, scoring and procedures manual.* NCS Pearson.

Pargament, K. I., Smith, B. W., Koenig, H. G., & Perez, L. (1998). Patterns of positive and negative religious coping with major life stressors. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*., *37*, 710-724.

McCullough, M. E., Luna, L. R., Berry, J. W., Tabak, B. A., & Bono, G. (2010). On the form and function of forgiving: Modeling the time-forgiveness relationship and testing the valuable relationships hypothesis. *Emotion, 10*, 358-376.

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

Tedeschi, R.G., & Calhoun, L.G. (1996). The Posttraumatic Growth Inventory: Measuring the positive legacy of trauma. *Journal of Traumatic Stress*, *9*, 455-471. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02103658

VanderWeele, T. J. (2017). On the promotion of human flourishing. *PNAS, 114*(31), 8148–8156. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1702996114

1. Due to a clerical error, the fourth anxiety item (i.e., “Feeling so restless you couldn’t sit still”) was not administered to participants. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)