

Correct Classification Level of Young Adults Who Abuse and Do Not Abuse Their Partner in The Romantic Relationship of Forgiveness

Erhan Tunçⁱ
Gaziantep Univesity

Yasemin Kaygasⁱⁱ
Gaziantep Hasan Kalyoncu Univesity

Abstract

In this study, the correct classification level of whether forgiving oneself, others and the situation is abusing their partners was determined by logistic regression analysis. There are 221 young adults ranging from 19-30 in this study, which was designed in the scanning model. Heartland Forgiveness Scale and Information Form were used in the study. In the initial model of the analysis, all participants were classified in the group that exploited their partner, with a classification percentage of 62.9%. The biggest contribution to the initial model comes from the variable of forgiving others, respectively, the variables of self-forgiveness and forgiveness. Cox & Snell RSquare value for the final model was calculated as .10. This finding shows that when the predictor variables are included in the model, 10% of the predicted variable is explained. Accordingly, the model has a good fit. Of the 82 individuals who did not abuse the result model, 34 were classified correctly and 48 were incorrect, with a percentage of correct classification of 41.5%. Of 139 individuals abused, 120 were correct and 19 were incorrectly classified, with an accurate classification percentage of 86.3%. One-unit increase in the self-forgiveness variable is 7.90% in the odds of abuse [(1-.921).100]; One-unit increase in forgiveness to others causes an 8.10% [(1-.919).100] increase in exploit odds. Findings show that the variables of self-forgiveness and forgiveness for others make significant contributions to classifying individuals who abuse and do not. The variables of forgiving yourself and others increase the predictive power of the model created.

Keywords: Self-Forgiveness, Forgiving Others, Forgiving The Situation, Romantic Relationship,

DOI: 10.29329/ijpe.2021.375.1

ⁱ **Erhan Tunç**, Assoc. Prof. Dr., Educational Science, Gaziantep University, ORCID: 0000-0002-6328-8545

Correspondence: erhantunc25@gmail.com

ⁱⁱ **Yasemin Kaygas**, Exp.Psy.Couns., Educational Science, Gaziantep Hasan Kalyoncu University, ORCID: 0000-0002-9264-2486

INTRODUCTION

Close relationships have an important place in human life. Romantic relationships that affect individuals mentally and physically as well as family and friendship relationships are extremely important in human life (Kantarci, 2009). In a romantic relationship, partners experience problems from time to time. One of the problems experienced in romantic relationships is the violence of the partners towards each other. Violence mostly affects adolescents and young people (Makepeace, 1987). In romantic relationships in young adulthood, individuals can behave verbally, threaten, intimidate, slap or force sexual intercourse to their partners in the face of their problems (Malik, Sorenson & Aneshensel, 1997). In romantic relationships, abuse involves malicious and compulsive behaviors of individuals, including physical, emotional and sexual assault against their partners (Offenhauer & Buchalter, 2011).

Physical abuse is in the person's body by hitting, pushing, shaking, burning or biting by hand or any device for damaging to leave a mark (Kaplan, Pelcovitz & Labruna, 1999). Emotional abuse can be expressed as shouting, rejecting, humiliating, swearing, leaving alone, intimidating, threatening, not fulfilling emotional needs, not valuing, caring, humiliating, mocking speech, nicknames, excessive pressure and authority, dependency and overprotection. It can be explained as exposure (Runyan, Corrine, Ikeda, Hassan & Ramiro, 2002). Sexual abuse is the use of a person by force or persuasion for sexual satisfaction (Nurcombe, 2000). Since abuse behaviors in romantic relationships affect individuals negatively, abuse in romantic relations is seen as a preventable society problem in most countries (Creasey & Ladd, 2004). When the literature is examined, it has been determined that the abuse of romantic relationship causes psychological disorders such as anxiety, depression, sleep problems (Felitti, Anda, Nordenberg, Williamson, Spitz, Edwards & Marks, 1998). Abusive behaviors in romantic relationships can occur in the form of physical, emotional and sexual abuse (Eaton, Davis, Barrios, Brener & Noonan, 2007).

One of the variables whose relationship with romantic relationship abuse is examined is forgiveness. When the literature is examined, it shows that the abuse of romantic relationship is related to forgiveness (Davidson, Lozano, Cole & Gervais, 2014). Partners in romantic relationships can react differently when faced with hurtful events or situations. Forgiveness is one of these reactions. Relationships may end in cases of injury between partners, or the injured party may choose to forgive the other party and maintain the relationship (Şamatacı, 2013). Forgiveness also provides the continuation of the relationship by removing the barriers between the injuries caused by the other person (Fincham, 2000). Conflicts between partners can lead to problems that negatively affect relationships. Forgiveness behavior has a key role in the relationship so that the course of the relationship turns positive (Hodgson & Wertheim, 2007). By Hargrave and Sells (1997), forgiveness is defined as the healing process of frustrations caused by reorganizing relationships and hurt, leaving the feeling of anger and revenge towards the person who made the mistake. In cases of abuse in romantic relationships, forgiveness takes the form of reassessing the event, rather than changing the cognitive processes of abuse (Davidson, Lozano, Cole & Gervais, 2014). The benefits of forgiveness are less when the behaviors involving abuse are intense in the relationship of the partners (Fincham & Beach, 2005).

Forgiveness is explained in four dimensions by Toussaint & Jorgensen (2008). The first dimension is for the individual to forgive someone who hurt him/her. The second dimension is a mistake made by the individual in the past, forgiving him/her for an event that creates regret. The third is the belief that a sin committed will be divinely forgiven by God. The fourth is to initiate the process of forgiveness and forgiveness for forgiveness.

Forgiving others focuses on the response to hurt when someone has to forgive another person, while forgiveness focuses on the emotions that arise as a result of the person hurt himself/herself or someone else. In forgiving others, the person tries to get rid of the negative reactions he has to those who hurt him/her and to forgive them. Self-forgiveness involves the regulation of negative reactions towards the person, such as anger and hatred towards him/her or accusing himself/herself (Bugay &

Demir, 2012). There are very few definitions and explanations in the literature on the concept of self-forgiveness. Because the concept of self-forgiveness has remained a neglected concept for many years (Hall & Fincham, 2005). An important part of the researches focuses on the perspective of the injured or injured person, so what the person doing or injuring is in the background of self-forgiveness remains behind (Bassett, Bassett, Lloyd & Johnson, 2006; Hall & Fincham, 2005).

Self-forgiveness is the motivation of the person to move away from the situation he cannot forgive about himself/herself and the feeling of helping him/her by leaving behind his sense of revenge and anger towards him/her (Hall & Fincham, 2005). There are two different types of forgiveness. The first is forgiveness of the individual for the harm he/she has done to him/her, and the second is forgiveness of himself/herself for the harm he/she caused to the person against the individual. The process of self-forgiveness is a decrease in the negative emotions towards him/her as a result of confronting the person's error, and the increase of their positive emotions towards him/her (Enright & The Human Development Study Group, 1996). Self-forgiveness occurs when he sees himself as responsible for the event and believes that he has done wrong. Because of this situation, the person experiences negative feelings and thoughts such as guilt, shame or regret (Milam, 2017). The concepts of forgiving others and self-forgiveness are mostly included in researches. However, the concept of forgiveness has not been a topic frequently researched in the literature. Many researchers have not even mentioned the concept of forgiving the situation. The situation in the concept of forgiving the situation and the events that are beyond the control of the person such as illness and natural disaster were discussed. A disease or natural disaster can cause negative reactions in the person. Due to this situation, a person may experience angry and sad feelings. Forgiveness of the situation is when the individual turns his negative responses into situations into neutral or positive (Thompson, Snyder, Hoffman, Michael, Rasmussen, & Billings, 2005). Studies for forgiveness show that it makes it easier to overcome the hurtful or abusive situations that arise in romantic relationships (Coyle & Enright, 1997; DiBlasio & Benda, 2002; Reed & Enright, 2006; Rye, Pargament, Pan, Yingling, Shogren & Ito, 2005).

Some studies show that forgiveness is effective in decreasing post-traumatic stress disorder and depression levels and increasing self-confidence of individuals who experience emotional abuse in their romantic relationships (Berry, Worthington, O'Connor, Parrott & Wade, 2005; Freedman & Knupp, 2003; Özgün, 2010). Based on the results of the research, it is seen that there is a significant relationship between forgiveness and psychological health, forgiveness and well-being (McCullough, Bono & Root, 2007; Thompson, Snyder, Hoffman, Michael, Rasmussen & Billings, 2005). Barcaccia, Schneider, Pallini and Baiocco (2017) discussed forgiveness as a variable that mediates the negative effects of abuse. According to the results of the research, forgiveness decreases the behaviors of taking revenge or flight from the abuser, and increases psychological well-being. When studies are examined in general, it is understood that forgiveness is important and necessary for the psychological health of individuals and the quality of romantic relationships.

In this study on young adults with romantic relationships, the following questions were sought:

1. At what accuracy level do self-forgiveness scores classify young people in romantic relationships as individuals who abuse their partners and those who do not?
2. At what accuracy level does the forgiveness scores of others classify young people in romantic relationships as individuals who abuse their partners and do not?
3. At what accuracy level do the situation forgiveness scores classify young people in romantic relationships as individuals who abuse their partners and do not?

Purpose of the research

In this research, young adults with romantic relationships; It has been tried to determine the level of accuracy that the scores related to the levels of self-forgiveness, others and the situation are classified as “those who exploit their partner” and “those who do not abuse their partner”.

METHOD

Model of the Research

This research is a survey model that examines the level of accuracy that young adults in romantic relationships classify themselves, others and the partners of their level of forgiveness as individuals who abuse and do not. Screening models are evaluated as research methods aiming to describe a current or past situation as it exists (Karasar, 2000). Survey research is studies that aim to collect data to determine certain characteristics of a group (Büyüköztürk, Kılıç Çakmak, Akgün, Karadeniz & Demirel, 2013).

Research Group

The sample of the study consists of 221 young adults aged 19-30. While determining the sample in the research, criteria sampling, which is one of the purposeful sampling methods, was used.

Table 1. Demographic information on the research group

	non-abusing group	abusing group	Total
Female	55	76	131
Male	27	63	90
Total	82	139	221

As seen in Table 1, 67% of the non-abusing group consists of female, 33% are males, 55% of the abusing group is female and 45% are males.

Data Collection Tools

In this research, “Heartland Forgiveness Scale and Personal Information Form” were used to collect data.

Heartland Forgiveness Scale

The 18-item Heartland Forgiveness Scale developed by Thompson, Snyder, Hoffman, Michael, Rasmussen, & Billings (2005) was used to determine the tendency to forgive young adults with romantic relationships. 7-point Likert type scale; It has 3 sub-dimensions: self-forgiveness, forgiving others and forgiving the situation. The first 6 items of the scale are items that measure forgiveness, the second 6 items forgive others, and the third 6 items measure forgiveness. The lowest score that can be obtained from the sub-scales of the scale is 6 and the highest score is 42, while the lowest score that can be obtained from the total of the scale is 18 and the highest score is 126. In the overall scoring of the scale, items 2, 4, 6, 7, 9, 11, 13, 15 and 17 are scored in reverse.

The translation and suitability of the scale for Turkish culture was carried out by Bugay & Demir (2010) on 376 university students. As a result of confirmatory factor analysis, goodness of fit index (GFI) .92; comparative fit index (CFI) .90; root mean square approach error (RMSEA) = .06. The construct validity of the scale was found to be sufficient (Meydan & Şeşen, 2015). Cronbach alpha coefficient was calculated for the reliability of the Turkish form of the scale. Cronbach alpha values for the subtests of the scale are .64 for self-forgiveness, respectively; original study (Bugay & Demir, 2010) was calculated as .79 for forgiveness of others, .76 for forgiveness, and .81 for total forgiveness score. It was determined that the scale has a 3-factor structure in accordance with the

original and is suitable for the Turkish sample. [$\chi^2 (124) = 289.49, p = .00; \chi^2 / df\text{-ratio} = 2.33; GFI = .92, CFI = .90, RMSEA = .06$]

Table2. Goodness of fit values (Meydan & Şeşen, 2015)

Measurement (Compliance statistics)	Good fit	Acceptable Compliance
χ^2	$p > .05$	-
χ^2/sd	≤ 3	$\leq 4-5$
RMSEA	≤ 0.05	0.06 – 0.08
SRMR	≤ 0.05	0.06 – 0.08
GFI	≥ 0.90	0.89 – 0.85
IFI	≥ 0.95	0.94 – 0.90
TLI	≥ 0.95	0.94 – 0.90
CFI	≥ 0.97	≥ 0.95

Personal Information Form

The personal information form was created by the researcher in order to determine the variables of the research group such as gender and age. Information on what the abuse is and the types of abuse are explained in the personal information form. However, the variables of gender and age were requested only to describe the research sample.

Data Analysis

In this study, the level of accuracy of young adults who have a romantic relationship to forgive themselves, others and the situation classifies individuals who “abuse their partner” and “those who do not abuse their partner” by Logistic Regression Analysis. During the analysis of the data, 8 missing forms were removed from the dataset before proceeding to logistic regression analysis. Then, it was checked whether the distribution is compatible with the assumptions of Logistic Regression Analysis. Logistic Regression Analysis does not need to meet assumptions in linear regression models (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013). However, in Logistic Regression Analysis, assumptions regarding sample size, extreme values and multiple connection problem should be taken into consideration. In this context, the data set was examined in terms of extreme value and it was observed that there was no extreme value that could negatively affect the analysis. According to Çokluk, Şekercioğlu & Büyüköztürk (2012), in order to achieve stable results in Logistic Regression Analysis, there should be at least 50 groups in each independent variable. In this context, it can be said that the sample is of sufficient size. The multiple connection problem was evaluated by examining the correlation values between variables and VIF and tolerance values. Considering all the bilateral correlations in the data set, multiple connection problems can be mentioned in cases where the correlation is greater than .90 and the VIF values are greater than 10 and the tolerance values are less than .10 (Çokluk, Şekercioğlu & Büyüköztürk, 2012). In this study, all binary correlations are less than .90 and all VIF values of independent variables are less than 10 and tolerance values are greater than .10 (Table 3).

Table 3. Correlation values of scores

	Self-forgiveness	Forgiving others	Forgiving the situation	Total forgiveness
Self-forgiveness	1	.178**	.415**	.662**
Forgiving others		1	.578**	.796**
Forgiving the situation			1	.849**
Total forgiveness				1

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

At what level of accuracy does it classify the states of self-forgiveness, forgiveness, and forgiveness, which are the sub-dimensions of forgiveness, whether the partners are abusive in romantic relationships? In this research, in which an answer to the question was sought; Logistic Regression Analysis was performed. First of all, individuals who abuse their partner at least once are

coded as "1" and individuals who do not abuse are coded as "0". Then, regression analysis was carried out using the "Enter" method. In the analysis, -2LL (-2log likelihood) was examined first. In Logistic Regression Analysis, two values related to -2LL are calculated. The first of these values is only the value of the model with the constant term as the value belonging to the baseline model. The second value for -2LL is the value of the result model (the model formed by the predictive variables entering the model). By comparing these two values related to -2LL, the improvement in the model due to the predictive variables can be evaluated (Çokluk, Şekercioğlu & Büyüköztürk, 2012).

RESULTS

In this study, in which the accuracy level of the sub-dimensions of forgiveness, self-forgiveness, forgiveness of others and forgiveness of the situation, whether or not partners engage in abusive behaviors in romantic relationships were analyzed, first descriptive findings related to the predictive variables, followed by the findings of logistic regression analysis were included. Then logistic regression analysis results are explained.

Findings related to the variables of forgiveness of self, forgiveness of others and the situation are given in Table 4.

Table 4. Findings related to the predictor variables

N=221	Mean	Sd	Min	Max
Self-forgiveness	27.55	5.61	14.00	41.00
Forgiving others	25.16	6.78	6.00	42.00
Forgiving the situation	26.50	5.33	10.00	42.00

When Table 4 was examined, the mean scores of the sample for forgiveness were found to be 27.55 (Sd= 5.61), the mean of forgiveness of others scores as 25.16 (Sd = 6.78), and the mean of forgiveness scores of 26.50 (Sd = 5.33). When the sub-dimensions of forgiveness are evaluated; It is observed that the mean scores of self-forgiveness are higher for forgiving others and without forgiving the situation.

Findings regarding the accuracy level at which the sub-dimensions of forgiveness, such as self-forgiveness, forgiveness of others, and forgiveness of the situation, classify the abusive behaviors of partners in romantic relationships are given below.

Table 5 explains the initial model for the fixed term. The initial model is the model created in order to make comparisons with the model entered by the independent variables in the next steps.

Table 5. First classification table

	Observed	Expected			
		Whether to abuse		Correct Classification Percentage	
		I didn't abuse	I abused		
Step 1	I abused	I didn't abuse	0	82	0
		I abused	0	139	100.0
Percentage of Total Correct Classification					62.9

In this study, -2LL value was calculated as 291.502 in the starting model. When Table 5 is examined, all participants were classified in the group that exploited their partner with a percentage of 62.9% in the starting model. In the study, $c^2_{bo} = 22,295$ ($p = .000$). This finding shows that the predictive variables to be added to the model will improve the predictive power of the model. Variables not included in the equation in the starting model are presented in Table 5. Score values given in Table 5 and p values related to this value indicate whether the predictive variables contribute to the model. When the p values of c^2_{bo} statistics are examined, it is seen that the variables of self-

forgiveness, forgiving others and forgiving the situation contributed significantly to the model ($p = .000$).

Up to this stage, only the analyzes related to the starting model in which the constant term is included are mentioned. In the next analysis, the findings of the result model formed by including the predictive variables are presented. In the final model, the Omnibus Test results were examined first. In this study, model chi-square values for the omnibus test were determined to be 23.582 ($p = .000$). The -2LL value, which was calculated as 291.502 in the initial model, was determined as 267.920 in the final model. The -2LL difference between the initial model and the final model was calculated as $291.502 - 267.920 = 23.582$. The fact that this difference is significant shows that the predictive variables in the result model increase the predictive power of the model. Cox & Snell R Square value for the final model was calculated as .10. This finding shows that when the predictive variables are included in the model, 10% of the predicted variable (whether or not to exploit it) is explained. The fact that the Hosmer and Lemeshow Test, which evaluates the fit of the logistic regression model as a whole, is meaningless ($p > .05$) indicates that the model has acceptable fit. In this study, chi-square value of Hosmer and Lemeshow Test was determined as 4.570 ($p > .05$). Accordingly, the model has a good fit.

The findings related to the classification obtained as a result of the logistic regression model are presented in Table 6.

Table 6. Findings related to classification

	Observed	Expected			
		Whether to abuse		Correct Classification Percentage	
		I didn't abuse	I abused		
Step 1	I abused	I didn't abuse	34	48	41.5
		I abused	19	120	86.3
Percentage of Total Correct Classification					69.7

As seen in Table 6, 34 of 82 non-abused individuals were classified correctly and 48 were classified incorrectly. Individuals who are not abused are classified with an accurate classification percentage of 41.5%. Of the 139 individuals who abused, 120 were classified correctly and 19 were misclassified. Individuals who are abused are classified with an accurate classification percentage of 86.3%. In the initial model, 139 individuals who abused and 82 individuals who did not abuse were classified with an estimate of 62.9%.

In Table 7, findings related to the coefficient estimates regarding Wald statistics and result model are presented.

Table 7. Coefficient estimates of variables related to the result model

		B	Standart error	Wald	sd	p	Exp(β)
Step 1	Self-forgiveness	-.082	.030	7.459	1	.006	.921
	Forgiveness for others	-.084	.028	8.845	1	.003	.919
	Forgiveness for situation	.018	.037	.235	1	.628	1.018
	Constant	4.496	.983	20.930	1	.000	89.650

$p < .05$

As can be seen in Table 7, a one-unit increase in self-forgiveness variable abuse (coded as "1") odds of 7,90% [(1-.921) .100]; one-unit increase in the predictor of forgiving others causes an increase in exploit odds of 8.10% [(1-.919) .100]. These findings show that self-forgiveness and forgiveness for others make significant contributions to classifying individuals who abused and not.

CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION

Forgiving himself/herself, forgiving others and forgiving the situation correctly classifies people who abused and did not use their partner in their romantic relationship by 69.7%. The variables

of self-forgiveness and forgiveness for others make significant contributions to this classification. The biggest contribution to the classification percentage comes from the variable of forgiving others. The variable forgiving others follows the variable forgiving yourself. As a result of this study it can be said that forgiving others and self-forgiveness have a critical effect on the classification of individuals who abuse and do not abuse their partner. When the literature is examined, there is no study that classifies whether forgiveness has been abused in a romantic relationship. In romantic relationships, partners can experience conflicts due to their disagreements. Various problems may arise in the relationship due to conflicts. According to Etchevery, Le & Charania (2008), romantic relationships, which are one of the most important development tasks of young adulthood, can sometimes accommodate abuse. The reactions of individuals who have a romantic relationship after the abuse can be very diverse. In some cases, partners can continue their relationships and in others, they can end their relationships. One of the reactions that the partners can give after abuse is forgiveness. In many studies Allemann, Hill, Ghaemmaghami & Martin, 2012; Bono, McCullough & Root, 2005; Karremans, Van Lange, Ouwerkerk & Kluwer, 2003) examining the relationship between forgiveness and abuse or perception of abuse, it is stated that there is a significant relationship between these two variables.

Fincham and Beach (2002) found that there is a negative relationship between forgiveness and abuse, and as forgiveness increases, abuse decreases. In their study, Davidson Lozano, Cole & Gervais (2014) show that there is a negative and significant relationship between forgiveness of themselves, someone else and situations and abuse. McCullough et al., (1997) stated in their research that the general condition of the partner and the relationship is effective in forgiving the abuser. It is also very important that the person who hurt the opposite party in the process of forgiveness said that he/she regretted it. It is easier for both parties to put aside their anger and desire to take revenge. According to Eaton, Struthers & Santelli (2006), the person who hurts the opposite party does something to correct this situation and the degree of responsibility of the person who made the mistake is affected by forgiveness. Forgiveness helps restore trust between partners, despite the hurtful behavior that a person is exposed to by their partner. It also allows both the hurt and hurt person to think about the situation they live in and improve their relationship (Hargrave & Sells, 1997). In order to talk about forgiveness, there is a decrease in feelings of anger, revenge and avoidance while an increase in positive emotions is required (Worthington, 1988). According to Murray (2002), forgiveness is not to deny crime. Thanks to forgiveness, the negative cycle in the person is destroyed and a healthy start is created. Forgiveness is a conscious and freely given gift that the person offers to the person who is hurt. Especially in the experiences of abuse, the ability of people to forgive themselves is much more important than forgiving the perpetrator of abuse (Van Der Kolk, 2018).

In many romantic relationships, the relationship between the parties is not limited to control behaviors or aggressive behaviors aimed at gaining power and control, but also coercive and malicious behaviors in the form of violence or abuse are observed in the relationship (Cofone, 2011). Kaura & Lohman (2009) stated in their study that being a victim during romantic relationship abuse is also related to the level of commitment to the relationship.

It is stated that being exposed to abuse in a romantic relationship is the most important determinant in turning into a perpetrator (O'Keefe, 1998). Johnson et al. (2005) state that the male perpetrator of violence in a romantic relationship resorts to abuse as a way of displaying power over his partner, but women consider this situation as a sign of love or commitment. All these show that abusers and victims interpret the abusive behavior differently. It is thought that studies on this subject will have a special importance in order to prevent the spread of abuse.

It can be observed that individuals exposed to abuse-type behaviors give different reactions. One of them is the forgiveness response. Although abusive behaviors in romantic relationships have serious negative consequences, some partners who are exposed can be forgiving. As in the research that states that it is very difficult to forgive abuse in a romantic relationship (Tsang & Stanford, 2007), it is stated that the abused partner's thoughts and approaches to forgiveness are effective when deciding to continue or terminate the relationship (Gordon, Burton, & Porter, 2007).

When individuals in relationship experience negative events such as abuse, they may see themselves as responsible not only for someone else but also for the incident. In this forgiveness process, it is important for the individual to forgive himself/herself as well as forgiving the partner (Hall & Fincham, 2005). Self-forgiveness can be one of the coping responses that result from the negative event(s) of the victim who has been subjected to abuse. It is easier for an individual to forgive someone else after negative experiences such as abuse without forgiving himself/herself. The individual can criticize, judge and even punish himself/herself in such cases. Due to the negative event, the individual can blame someone else and hold him/her responsible for the abuse process. Self-forgiveness Hall and Fincham (2005) is a process in which an increase in anger, guilt feelings, self-harming behaviors and desire to self-punishment increase in positive emotions and thoughts. When the person exploits his partner in the relationship, he/she can blame himself/herself for hurting the other party. Or he may regret what he/she did. In such cases, self-forgiveness appears as a key concept. The person may feel the need to forgive himself/herself. He/She gives up his feelings of sadness, anger and grudge due to the situation he/she had forgiven him/her.

The fact that forgiveness can classify whether to exploit or not exploit in a romantic relationship shows that the role of forgiveness in romantic relationships is an important factor.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. It can be said that the subject of forgiveness in romantic relationships should be included in the psychoeducational studies aimed at raising awareness on the role of forgiving oneself, others and the situation in romantic relationships that can be experienced in life and especially in young adulthood and after.
2. As a result of this research, group guidance studies should be carried out to increase awareness about forgiveness, especially in young adulthood, when romantic relationships are important.
3. In this direction, it can be said that by increasing their awareness of concepts in the field of positive psychology such as mindfulness and forgiveness, they will be more forgiving and take more responsibility for their lives, thus contributing to social mental health.
4. Statistical modeling or experimental studies can be done on some concepts in the field of mental health (psychological resilience, mindfulness, spirituality...) that are thought to be related to forgiveness.

REFERENCES

- Allemand, M., Hill, P. L., Ghaemmaghami, P., & Martin, M. (2012). Forgiveness and subjective well-being in adulthood: The moderating role of future time perspective. *Journal of Research in Personality, 46*(1), 32–39. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2011.11.004>
- Barcaccia B., Schneider B.H., Pallini S. & Baiocco R. (2017). Bullying and the detrimental role of unforgiveness in adolescents' wellbeing. *Psicothema, 29*, 217–222. doi:10.7334/psicothema2016.251
- Basset, R.L., Bassett, K.M., Lloyd, M.W. & Johnson, J. L. (2006). Seeking forgiveness: Considering the role of moral emotions. *Journal of Psychology and Theology, 34*(2), 111-124.
- Berry, J. W., Worthington, E. L., Jr., O'Connor, L., Parrott, L. III, & Wade, N. G. (2005). Forgiveness, vengeful rumination, and affective traits. *Journal of Personality, 73*(1), 183-226.
- Bugay, A. & Demir, A. (2010). A Turkish version of heartland forgiveness scale. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences, 5*, 1927-1931.

- Bugay, A. & Demir, A. (2012). Can forgiveness be increased? Group to develop forgiveness. *Turkish Psychological Counseling and Guidance Journal*, 4 (37), 96- 106.
- Büyüköztürk, Ş., Kılıç Çakmak, E., Akgün, Ö. E., Karadeniz, Ş. & Demirel, F. (2013). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemleri* (14. Baskı), PEGEM Yayıncılık.
- Cofone, K. (2011). Understanding college students perceptions of unhealthy dating relationships. Social work thesis. Providence College.
- Coyle, C. T. & Enright, R.D. (1997). Forgiveness intervention with postabortion men. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 65, 1042-1046.
- Creasey, G. & Ladd, A. (2004). Negative mood regulation expectancies and conflict behaviors in late adolescent college student romantic relationships: The moderating role of generalized attachment representations. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 14(2), 235-255. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1532-7795.2004.01402005.x>
- Çokluk Ö., Şekercioğlu G. & Büyüköztürk (2012). *Multivariate statistics for social sciences: SPSS and LISREL Applications*, PEGEM Publishing.
- Davidson J. R. T., Stein D. J., Shalev A. Y. & Yehuda R. (2004). Posttraumatic stress disorder: acquisition, recognition, course, and treatment. *The Journal of Neuropsychiatry and Clinical Neurosciences*; 16, :135–147.
- Davidson, M. M., Lozano, N. M., Cole, B. P. & Gervais, S. J. (2014). Relations between intimate partner violence and forgiveness among college women. *Journal of interpersonal violence*, 1-27
- DiBlasio, F. A. & Benda, B. B. (2002). The effect of forgiveness treatment on selfesteem of spouses: Initial experimental results. *Marriage and Family: A Christian Journal*, 5, 511- 523.
- Eaton, D.K., Davis, K.S., Barrios L., Brener N.D., & Noonan, R.K., (2007). Associations of dating violence victimization with participation, co-occurrence, and early initiation of risk behaviors among U.S. high school students. *J Interpers Violence*. 22(5): 585-602.
- Eaton, J., Struthers, C. W. & Santelli, A. G. (2006). Dispositional and state forgiveness: The role of self-esteem, need for structure, and narcissism. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 41(2), 371-380. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2006.02.005>
- Enright, R. D. & The Human Development Study Group. (1996). Counseling within the forgiveness triad: On forgiving, receiving forgiveness, and self-forgiveness. *Counseling and Values*, 40, 107–126.
- Etchevery, P. E., Le, B. & Charania, M. R. (2008). Perceived versus reported social referent approval and romantic relationship commitment and persistence. *Personal Relationships*, 15, 281–295.
- Felitti, V. J., Anda, R. F., Nordenberg, D., Williamson, D. F., Spitz, A. M., Edwards, V. & Marks, J. S. (1998). Relationship of childhood abuse and household dysfunction to many of the leading causes of death in adults: The adverse childhood experiences study. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, 14, 245-258.
- Field, A. (2005). *Reliability analysis*. In: Field, A., Ed., *Discovering Statistics Using SPSS*. 2nd Edition, Sage, London, Chapter 15.

- Fincham, F. D. (2000). The kiss of the porcupines: From attributing responsibility to forgiving. *Personal Relationships*, 7, 1-23.
- Fincham, F. D. & Beach, S. R. H. (2002). Forgiveness in marriage: Implications for psychological aggression and constructive communication. *Personal Relationship*, 9, 239-251.
- Fincham, F. D., Jackson, H. & Beach, S. R. H. (2005). Transgression severity and forgiveness: Different moderators for objective and subjective severity. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 24, 860-875.
- Freedman, S. R. & Knupp, A. (2003). The impact of forgiveness on adolescent adjustment to parental divorce. *Journal of Divorce and Remarriage*, 39, 135- 165.
- Gordon, C., & Porter, K.L. (2004), "Predicting the intentions of women in domestic violence shelters to return to partners: does forgiveness play a role?". *Journal of Family Psychology*, Vol. 18, No. 2, pp. 331-338.
- Hall, J. H. & Fincham, F. D. (2005). Self-forgiveness: The stepchild of forgiveness research. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 24(5), 621-637.
- Hargrave, T. D. & Sells, J. N. (1997). The development of a forgiveness scale. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy*, 23(1), 41-63. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1752-0606.1997.tb00230.x>
- Hodgson, L. K. & Wertheim, E. H. (2007). Does good emotion management aid forgiving? Multiple dimensions of empathy, emotion management and forgiveness of self and others. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 24(6), 931-949. doi: 10.1177/0265407507084191
- Johnson, A., Salvador, G., Kenney, J., Robbins, J., Kraus, S., Landry, S. & Clapham, P., (2005). Fishing gear involved in entanglements of right and humpback whales. *Marine Mammal Science*, 21(4):635-645
- Kantarıcı, D. (2009). *Evli bireylerin bağlanma stillerine göre aldatma eğilimleri ve çatışma yönetim biçimlerinin incelenmesi*, Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İstanbul Üniversitesi, İstanbul.
- Kaplan, S. J., Pelcovitz, D. & Labruna, V. (1999). Child and adolescent abuse and neglect research: A review of the past 10 years. Part I: Physical and emotional abuse and neglect. *Journal of the American Academy of Child & Adolescent Psychiatry*, 38(10), 1214-1222.
- Karasar, N. (2000). *Scientific Research Method. (10th Edition)*. Nobel Publishing.
- Karremans, J.C., Van Lange, P.A.M., Ouwerkerk, J.W., & Kluwer, E. S. (2003). When forgiving enhances psychological well-being: The role of interpersonal commitment. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 84(5), 1011-1026. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.84.5.1011>
- Kaura, S. A., & Lohman, B. J. (2009). Does acceptability of violence impact the relationship between satisfaction, victimization, and commitment levels in emerging adult dating relationships?. *Journal of Family Violence*, 24(6), 349-359. doi:10.1007/s10896-009-9234-7
- Makepeace, J. (1987). Social factors and victim offender differences DN courtship violence. *Family Relations*, 36, 87-91.
- Malik, S., Sorenson, S. B. & Aneshensel, C. S. (1997). Community and dating violence among adolescents: Perpetration and victimization. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 21(5), 291-302.

- McCullough, M. E., Worthington, E. L., Jr., & 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., Bono, G., & Root, L.M. (2005). Religion and Forgiveness. In R. F. Paloutzian & C. L. Park (Eds.), *Handbook of the psychology of religion and spirituality* (pp. 394–411). 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.
- Mertler, C. A., & Vannatta, R. A. (2005). *Advanced and multivariate statistical methods: Practical application and interpretation* (3rd ed.). Glendale, CA: Pyrczak Publishing
- Meydan, C. H. ve Şeşen H. (2015). *Yapısal eşitlik modellemesi AMOS uygulamaları. (İkinci Baskı)* Ankara: Detay Yayıncılık
- Murray, R. J. (2002). Forgiveness as a therapeutic option. *The Family Journal: Counseling and Therapy for Couples and Families* 10(3), 315-321.
- Nurcombe B. (2000). Child sexual abuse I: Psychopathology. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Psychiatry*, 34, 85-91.
- Offenhauer, P. & Buchalter, A. (2011). *Teen dating violence: A Literature review and annotated bibliography*. Library of Congress, Federal Research Division, 92 pgs.
- O'Keefe, (1998). Factors Mediating the Link Between Witnessing Interparental Violence and Dating Violence. *Journal of Family Violence* volume 13, pages39–57.
- Özgün, S. (2010). *The predictors of the traumatic effect of extramarital infidelity on married women: coping strategies, resources, and forgiveness*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Middle East Technical University, Ankara.
- Reed, G. L. & Enright, R. D. (2006). The effects of forgiveness therapy on depression, anxiety, and posttraumatic stress for women after spousal emotional abuse. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 74(5), 920-929.
- Runyan, D., Corrine. W., Ikedai R., Hassan, F., & Ramiro, L., (2002). *Child abuse and neglect by parents and other caregivers*. Krug E.G, Dahlberg L.L, Mercy J.A.(Eds), World report on violence and health, WHO, Geneva
- Rye, M. S., Pargament, K. I., Pan, W., Yingling, D. W., Shogren, K. A., & Ito, M. (2005). Can group interventions facilitate forgiveness of an ex-spouse?: A randomized clinical trial. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 73, 880-892.
- Singleton Jr., R. A., & Straits, B. C. (2005). *Approaches to social research* (4th edition). New York, NY: Oxford University Press
- Şamatacı, G. (2013). *Romantik ilişkilerde affetme: Transaksiyonel analiz ego*. Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi. Marmara Üniversitesi, İstanbul.
- Tabachnick, B. G. & Fidell, L. S. (2013). *Using Multivariate Statistics* (6th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson.

- Thompson, L. Y., Snyder, C. R., Hoffman, L., Michael, S. T., Rasmussen, H. N. & Billings, L. S. (2005). Dispositional forgiveness of self, others, and situations. *Journal of Personality*, 73, 313-359.
- Toussaint, L. & Jorgensen, K. M. (2008). Inter-parental conflict, parent-child relationship quality, and adjustment in Christian adolescents: Forgiveness as a mediating variable. *Journal of Psychology and Christianity*, 27, 337–346.
- Tsang, J.-A., & Stanford, M. S. (2007). Forgiveness for intimate partner violence: The influence of victim and offender variables. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 42(4), 653–664. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2006.08.017>
- <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-0167.35.2.166>
- Van der Kolk, B. A. (2018). *Beden kayıt tutar: Trravmanın iyileşmesinde beyin, zihin ve beden.* (N. C. Meral, Çev.). Ankara: Nobel Yayıncılık.
- Worthington, E. L. (1988). Understanding the values of religious clients: A model and its application to counseling. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 35(2), 166-174.