

Supplemental Materials

A. Tests of dimensionality

We ran confirmatory factor analyses using Amos 24 (Arbuckle, 2014) to test the dimensionality of all scales used in the analyses reported in this paper. Fit statistics are reported below.

DASS-18 Anxiety subscale (single factor model)

$\chi^2(11, N = 92) = 13.10, p = .29, \chi^2/df = 1.19$

GFI = .96

CFI = .99

RMSEA = .05

RMR = .02

DASS-18 Depression subscale (single factor model)

$\chi^2(14, N = 93) = 24.64, p = .04, \chi^2/df = .74$

GFI = .93

CFI = .98

RMSEA = .09

RMR = .02

UCLA Loneliness (single factor model)

$\chi^2(141, N = 79) = 165.72, p = .08, \chi^2/df = 1.18$

GFI = .84

CFI = .98

RMSEA = .05

RMR = .03

Perceived injustice

$\chi^2(11, N = 89) = 8.46, p = .67, \chi^2/df = .77$

GFI = .98

CFI = 1.00

RMSEA = .00

RMR = .05

Unforgiveness Measure

Theoretically, the Unforgiveness Measure (Stackhouse, Jones Ross, & Boon, 2018) assesses three related but distinct dimensions of unforgiveness. We used CFA to confirm the proposed three-factor structure fit the data better than either a single-factor structure in which the three dimensions form a single higher-order factor or a two-factor structure in which the two more cognitively-oriented dimensions (cognitive-evaluative unforgiveness and offender reconstrual form a single factor and emotional-ruminative unforgiveness forms a second factor. Note that this two-factor model is based on theorizing in Stackhouse et al., not the observed correlations among the dimensions). As the fit statistics below indicate, the three-factor model fits better than either of the other models we tested, justifying our decision to analyze the three dimensions individually in the parallel mediator model tested in the paper. We confirmed this conclusion by

conducting χ^2 difference tests testing the improvement in fit moving from a single- to a two-factor model (χ^2 difference = 117.11, $p < .05$ with 1 df) and from a two- to a three-factor model (χ^2 difference = 35.53, $p < .05$ with 2 df).

Single factor model

$\chi^2(20, N = 83) = 187.95, p < .001, \chi^2/df = 9.40$

GFI = .72

CFI = .49

RMSEA = .32

RMR = .56

Two-factor model (offender reconstrual and cognitive-evaluative as one factor, emotional-ruminative as second factor)

$\chi^2(19, N = 83) = 70.84, p < .001, \chi^2/df = 3.73$

GFI = .84

CFI = .84

RMSEA = .18

RMR = .34

Three-factor model

$\chi^2(17, N = 83) = 35.31, p = .006, CMIN/df = 2.08$

GFI = .91

CFI = .95

RMSEA = .12

RMR = .30

Psychological wellbeing

Given that the correlations among the three psychological wellbeing variables were significant and substantial, we used CFA to determine whether it might be appropriate to combine them for analysis. We tested whether a single-factor structure in which the three variables form a single higher-order factor was superior to a two-factor structure in which the two subscales from the DASS-18 formed a first factor and the UCLA loneliness scale formed the second factor as well as whether a three-factor solution in which each scale was its own factor was superior to the two-model factor. As the fit statistics below indicate, the three-factor model fits better than either of the other models we tested. Accordingly, we tested our conceptual model separately for each individual psychological wellbeing measure. We confirmed this conclusion by conducting χ^2 difference tests testing the improvement in fit moving from a single- to a two-factor model (χ^2 difference = 143.71, $p < .05$ with 1 df) and from a two- to a three-factor model (χ^2 difference = 29.16, $p < .05$ with 2 df).

One-factor model

$\chi^2(27, N = 78) = 208.46, p < .001, \chi^2/df = 7.73$

GFI = .65

CFI = .74

RMSEA = .30

RMR = .06

Two-factor model

$\chi^2(26, N = 78) = 64.75, p < .001, \chi^2/df = 2.49$

GFI = .84

CFI = .95

RMSEA = .14

RMR = .03

Three-factor model

$\chi^2(24, N = 78) = 35.59, p = .06, \chi^2/df = 2.09$

GFI = .91

CFI = .98

RMSEA = .08

RMR = .03

References:

Arbuckle, J. L. (2016). Amos (Version 25.0) [Computer Program]. Chicago: IBM SPSS.

Stackhouse, M. R. D., Jones Ross, R. W., & Boon, S. D. (2018). Unforgiveness: Refining theory and measurement of an understudied construct. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 57, 130–153. [doi:10.1111/bjso.12226](https://doi.org/10.1111/bjso.12226)

Items used in the Perceived Injustice index (items 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 17 from Q4.48 in the survey)

The XXX Church was right in excommunicating me.

Members of the XXX Church are right in shunning me.

The XXX Church treated me very badly.

The XXX Church treated me extremely unfairly.

The XXX Church invalidated my personal feelings.

I was traumatized by the way the XXX Church treated me.

I didn't trust the ministers in the XXX Church.

I was treated disrespectfully by the XXX Church.

Subscales for the Unforgiveness Measure as used in this study (adapted from Stackhouse et al., 2018).

Cognitive-Evaluative Unforgiveness

1. I have no desire to forgive my former church.
2. I am unwilling to forgive my former church.
3. I see no benefit in forgiving my former church who wronged me.
4. What my former church did is unforgiveable.

Emotional-Ruminative Unforgiveness

5. This transgression no longer has any negative effects on my well-being.*
6. I continue to feel hurt by what happened.
7. I don't let this event get me down.*
8. It's hard for me to let go of this event.
9. I rarely think about this event in my daily life.*
10. I often worry about how this event will affect me in the future.

Offender Reconstrual

11. It's hard to separate my former church from what it did.
12. This event has forever altered my perception of my former church.
13. The event changed the way I see my former church.

*reverse-coded prior to aggregating