

# UNDERSTANDING GRIEVANCE ATTITUDES IN YOUNG PEOPLE: A FOCUS ON GENDER, RELIGIOUS BELIEF, AND FAMILY SOCIAL CLIMATE

*Halperin, E. University of the Basque Country/Euskal Herriko Unibertsitatea,  
Spain*

## Abstract

The objectives of this study are to analyze the attitudes of young people to offenders situations in family context according to gender, religious beliefs and family social climate and, to study the predictive power of those variables on attitudes toward offenders. Participants were 230 young (mean age = 21.2), 130 women and 100 men who completed the CASA-F Questionnaire (Moreno & Pereyra, 2000) and the Family Social Climate Scale (Moss, Moss, & Trickett, 1995). We obtained differences in attitude towards offenders in terms of gender and religious beliefs and a significant relationship between prosocial attitudes towards offenders and family social climate. Finally, multiple regression analysis confirmed the predictive ability of gender, religious beliefs and the family social climate on prosocial attitudes of forgiveness and explanation.

**Keywords:** attitudes; offenders; family social climate; religious beliefs; forgiveness

---

## Introduction

The competencies and skills necessary to resolve conflictive interpersonal situations are basically acquired in the context of emotional relationships with

significant people, mainly in family relationships (Lafuente & Cantero, 2010). It is in this context of the closest emotional relationships, in which emotions and feelings are expressed and exchanged, experiences and experiences are shared, difficult situations arise and differences and encounters are generated that in some cases give rise to offenses (Mikulincer & Shaver , 2005; Pietromonaco, Greenwood, & Feldman, 2004). The study of emotional relationships and the conflicts associated with them therefore requires analyzing the attitudes with which we confront offenses.

According to the definition of the Dictionary of the Royal Spanish Academy, we define grievance or offense as 'the action and effect of offending, humiliating or hurting someone's self-esteem or dignity, or making it evident with words or actions' . The offense can lead to a critical point in the interpersonal bond. It must be taken into account that the offense is always inserted within a context, it takes place in a specific space and time that gives it meaning and meaning. Furthermore, it occurs within the framework of a web of interpersonal relationships that has a sociocultural and personal dimension that depends on values, norms, communication codes and evolutionary history and personal relationships (Vargas, 2009). In this sense, for example,

#### ***Attitudes in situations of grievance***

For Rokeach (1968), an attitude is a relatively long-lasting, irrational organization of beliefs that triggers a certain action with respect to an object or situation. In current social psychology, three dimensions of attitudes are postulated: direction (being for or against), intensity or degree, and centrality within the subject's attitude system. Attitudes towards situations of offense are personal predispositions to respond in a certain way when one is humiliated or the object of a personal insult. These are behavioral modalities that reflect



dispositions of mind, thought and will, which manifest themselves in different behaviors (Moreno & Pereyra, 2000, 2001; Vargas, 2009).

This work adopts the model of attitudes towards situations of grievance (MASA) by Moreno and Pereyra (2000). These authors, based on their work with the Attitudes to Situations of Offense Questionnaire (CASA), postulate the existence of three groups of responses to offenses that in turn configure seven specific modalities: passive responses (submission and denial), aggressive responses (hostility, resentment and revenge) and prosocial responses (demand for explanation and forgiveness).

Passive responses characterize people who choose a conformist attitude or acceptance of the offense. They manifest a tendency to hypercontrol to maintain the previous balance threatened by the altercation. In this dimension, we distinguish two modalities: submission and denial. In the attitude of submission, emotional control prevails, leaving the subject inhibited and without the necessary strength for an active response, making self-deprecating justifications, for example: "I deserve it" or "it's my fault." Overdemanding and a strong sense of duty are usually the main factors of submission (Vargas, 2009). Moreno & Pereyra (2000, p. 17) define the attitude of submission as "the behavior of subordination of judgment, Perceptual control prevails, distorting the representation of reality, in such a way that it ignores the disturbing situation, failing to perceive it as an offense; It is defined, therefore, "as the exclusion of awareness of the fact and the concomitant feelings related to the offensive act" (Moreno & Pereyra, 2000, p. 18). Perceptual control prevails, distorting the representation of reality, in such a way that it ignores the disturbing situation, failing to perceive it as an offense; It is defined, therefore, "as the exclusion of

awareness of the fact and the concomitant feelings related to the offensive act" (Moreno & Pereyra, 2000, p. 18).

Aggressive responses involve offensive emotions towards the aggressor that provoke physical and/or verbal aggression or resentment that predisposes to a lasting enmity. Aggressive responses include: hostility and resentment. The first is defined as an "impulsive, immediate and reactive behavior that attempts to harm the aggressor, attacking him in the same act of the offense" (Moreno & Pereyra, 2000, p. 19). It is associated with a wide variety of emotions: irritability, anger, rage, anger, disgust, cynicism, among others (Vargas, 2009). On the other hand, the attitude of resentment is defined as "the bitter and deep-rooted memory of a particular injury for which one wishes to satisfy oneself" (Moreno & Pereyra, 2000, p. 20). Finally, revenge, in which violence does not have a defensive function but is irrational, it is defined as "the intentional and planned search for revenge, trying to provide the offender with a punishment similar or superior to that suffered" (Moreno & Pereyra, 2000, pp. 20-21). Normally, the individual with an adapted life experience does not feel that need, even if he has been insulted or harmed.

Finally, there are prosocial responses, which are aimed at facing the conflict assertively and aimed at both expressing the feelings produced by the offense, and at reestablishing the relationship with the other person to the extent possible, or at least , to restore the emotional damage caused by the offense (Moreno & Pereyra, 2000). Among these responses are the search for explanation, an attitude that leads to clarifying the discord by facing the conflict, focusing on the problem instead of on the emotion and on the bond instead of on repression or aggression (Vargas, 2009). . The demand for an explanation is defined as: "the attitude of demanding from the offender

justifications and reasons that explain his actions, demanding to recover or repair, totally or partially, the damage caused,

Attitudes towards situations of injury are influenced by the learning, modeling and parenting practices of parents, religious beliefs, the family social climate, and in general, by the customs and values promoted by the social group to which one belongs. the person (Moreno & Pereyra, 2000; Pereyra, 2003; Rodríguez & Moreno, 2011; Vargas, 2009).

### ***Attitudes towards grievance and gender***

Fehr, Gelfand & Nag's (2010) meta-analytic study analyzed 175 papers to determine the interpersonal correlates of forgiveness. The results showed in addition to the multifaceted nature of forgiveness, that situational constructs explain more variance than victim characteristics and that the effects of variables such as gender and age are insignificant. Another meta-analytic study, carried out by Miller, Worthington & McDaniel (2008) found that women forgive more than men, and that there are wide gender differences in the attitude of revenge. Functional differences in forgiveness processing, dispositional qualities, and situational indicators are suggested as moderating influences on gender differences.

Toussaint & Webb's (2005) study examines gender differences in levels of empathy and forgiveness and whether the association between the latter two differs by gender. The results show that women are more empathetic than men, but that there are no gender differences in forgiveness. Empathy was associated with forgiveness for males, but not for females.

Likewise, different research indicates that both the repression or denial of aggressiveness and the violent externalization of hostile emotions can be associated with serious mental and physical health disorders (Pereyra, 2003;

Pereyra & Agüero de Kerbs, 1998). From this it is inferred that the behaviors of dialogue, forgiveness and reconciliation would correspond to good mental health. In the research carried out by Pereyra & Agüero de Kerbs (1998) with a sample of young adults, it was found that those who reported having more psychosomatic symptoms exhibited higher scores on the revenge and resentment scales. On the contrary, forgiveness/reconciliation responses correlated negatively with symptoms of neuroticism. At the same time, in Rijavec's study,

***Attitudes towards grievance and religious belief***

In relation to the importance of religious belief, Pereyra (2003), in a study carried out with 863 participants of different religious convictions from five American countries, found highly significant differences in all attitudes towards the offense. Non-believing participants obtained higher scores in attitudes such as revenge, resentment and hostility, while believers showed a greater willingness to submit, deny and behave towards dialogue (explanation), forgiveness and reconciliation. Sheldon & Honeycutt's (2011) study on the analysis of the impact of gender and religiosity on the communication of forgiveness finds a positive relationship between religiosity and non-verbal strategies to express forgiveness. Besides,

In the Spanish context, the work of García-Alandete & Pérez-Delgado (2005) analyzes the relationship between religious attitudes and values in young university students, concluding that young people with greater religiosity are more concerned with achieving the respect of others, be helpful, obedient, polite and controlled. We consider these values to not correspond to aggressive attitudes in offensive situations.

***Attitudes towards grievance and family social climate***

In relation to the family social climate, a study carried out by Vargas (2009) with 140 young people between 18 and 24 years old showed that young people who perceive a better family climate are more willing to forgive. Along these lines, the study by Pichardo, Fernández & Azmecua (2002) shows that adolescents whose family climate is perceived as high in cohesion, expressiveness, organization, participation in intellectual activities and who attribute importance to practices and values of type ethical or religious, as well as with low levels of conflict, show greater general adaptation than their peers whose perception of the family is, on the contrary, of low cohesion and expressiveness or very high conflict.

Taking into account the impact that different types of response to offense have on personal well-being and adequate interpersonal relationships, the objectives of this work were, first of all, to analyze the attitudes of young people towards situations of offense that arise. occur in the family context depending on gender, religious belief and the family social climate and, secondly, analyze the predictive power of these three variables on attitudes towards the grievance.

## **Method**

### ***Participants***

The participants were 230 young people, 100 men (43.5%) and 130 women (56.5%) with ages between 18 and 28 years and an average of 21.2 years ( $SD = 2.9$ ). The type of sampling is incidental in nature. Informed consent was requested from young people aged 18 years and older to mark the legal point of entry into adulthood. The mean age of men was 22.3 ( $SD = 3.2$ ) and that of women was 20.3 ( $SD = 2.4$ ). 81.3% ( $n = 187$ ) had secondary education, 10% ( $n = 23$ ) had university studies, and 8.7% ( $n = 20$ ) had basic studies.

### ***Instruments and variables***



***Questionnaire of Attitudes towards Situations of Offense Family version (CASA-F) (Moreno & Pereyra, 2000)***

The CASA-F consists of 42 items and evaluates seven attitudes in situations of offense in the family environment: denial, submission, revenge, resentment, hostility, explanation and forgiveness. The seven scales (attitudes) are grouped into three factors: Passive, Aggressive and Prosocial Attitudes. The first factor includes the denial and submission scales and is defined as the willingness to internalize hostile impulses, repressing or denying them. The second groups the attitudes of revenge, hostility and resentment, the three manifestations of externalization of aggressiveness in an offensive situation. And the third factor groups the attitudes of explanation and forgiveness, which reflect the tendency to use dialogue and negotiation when overcoming interpersonal conflicts.

The test consists of six short stories, five specific to the CASA-F in which offending situations occur in the family environment and one from the original CASA which is incorporated as a measure of reliability. The stories focus on: 1) fraternal relationship, 2) parent-child relationship, 3) couple relationship, 4) friendship relationship (story from the original CASA), 5) grandfather-grandson relationship and 6) relationship of the entire family with the neighbors. As an example, in story 1 the offensive situation that arises is: "In the most difficult moment of my life, my brother refused to give me the support I needed. That's why...". For each story, the subject must identify with the offended person and respond to seven items according to a four-point Likert scale (*never, almost never, frequently and always*). Each item, identified with a lowercase letter, represents an attitude toward the offense: denial (eg, story 1/item e: "I will try to forget his behavior"), submission (eg, story 1/item d: "I will accept his behavior because maybe I did something that bothered him"), revenge (eg, story 1/item b



"I will do the same with him, when he finds himself in a similar situation), resentment (eg, story1/item f: "I will take into account what he did while viva"), hostility (eg, story1/item c: "I will express all the pain and anger that he made me feel", explanation (eg, story1/item a: "I will ask him about what he did when the opportunity arises" ) and forgiveness (eg, story1/item g: "I will look for the right moment to try to restore the relationship").

Taking into account that there is no version adapted to the Spanish spoken in Spain, the CASA-F Questionnaire was given to two judges in order to evaluate the vocabulary and wording of the items. Both considered it convenient to adapt some expressions of the language of some of the stories to make them understandable to the Spanish population. For example, story 5: "My grandmother did not remember my birthday, however she gives many gifts to my cousins" was modified by "My grandmother did not remember my birthday, however she gives many gifts to my cousins." ". In turn, story 4: "A friend of mine, at a social gathering, humiliated me by publicly magnifying the negative traits of my personality, he made me look ridiculous in front of those present" was modified by "A friend of mine,

***Family Social Climate Scale (FES) by Moos, Moos & Trickett (1984, adapted to the Spanish population by TEA publications, 1995)***

In this research, only the three subscales of the relationships dimension have been used: cohesion, expressiveness and conflict, which evaluate the degree of communication and free expression within the family and the degree of conflictive interaction that characterizes it. The internal consistency indices in the Spanish adaptation (TEA, 1995) are 0.78 in the cohesion subscale, 0.69 in the expressiveness subscale and 0.75 in the conflict subscale. The family cohesion variable of the FES evaluates the degree to which family members are

connected and help and support each other. The expressiveness variable assesses the degree to which family members are allowed and encouraged to act freely and directly express their feelings. Finally, the conflict variable measures the degree to which anger is freely and openly expressed,

### ***Sociodemographic data questionnaire***

It collects information on the variables age, educational level, profession and religious belief. The religious belief variable was evaluated from the question: "Your religious belief occupies a place in practice: *important, unimportant* or *not at all important*." The variable was operationalized based on the choice made by the subject.

## **Results**

### ***Preliminary analyses: validity and reliability of the CASA-F***

The lack of previous validation studies of the CASA-F in Spain meant that we set out as a collateral objective of the study to analyze the validity and reliability of the questionnaire in this context. To study the construct validity, a principal components analysis with orthogonal rotation (VARIMAX) was carried out, following the procedure of the reference authors (Moreno & Pereyra, 2000). The statistical package SPSS 19.0 for Windows was used. The acceptable Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin index ( $KMO = 0.713$ ) and Bartlett's test of sphericity ( $\chi^2(861, N = 230) = 27683 p < 0.001$ ), indicated the statistical possibility of factoring the questionnaire items. After the initial analysis, Cattell's "Scree Test" criterion (1966) was applied to determine the number of factors to be considered in the subsequent rotation. The graphical representation of the eigenvalues indicated that the three-factor solution was the appropriate factorial solution, coinciding with previous studies and the assumptions of the theoretical framework. The first factor (eigenvalue 5.4) grouped together almost



all of the items from the revenge, resentment and hostility scales, belonging to the dimension of aggressive responses to offensive situations, with a common explained variance of 11.1%. The second factor (eigenvalue 4.0) grouped the items of prosocial attitudes, that is, explanation and forgiveness, with a common explained variance of 9.5%. Finally, the third factor (eigenvalue 2.4) grouped the items from the subjugation and denial of passive attitudes scales, with an explained variance of 7.7%. The [Table 1](#) summarizes the CASA-F items and the factor saturations obtained.

**TABLA 1**

*Saturaciones factoriales de los ítems del CASA-F agrupados por factores y escalas*

Factores	Escalas (Actitudes)	Saturaciones e ítems
1. Actitudes Agresivas	Venganza	(0.464) Ítem 1b. Haré lo mismo con él, cuando se encuentre en una situación similar. (0.375) Ítem 2a. Le haré sufrir oportunamente por lo que hizo. (0.419) Ítem 3g. Haré lo mismo cuando tenga la oportunidad. (0.606) Ítem 4f. Pondré en evidencia sus defectos ante quien más le moleste. (0.409) Ítem 5e. Haré lo mismo el día de su cumpleaños. (0.418) Ítem 6d. Pondré música a todo volumen cuando sepa que están durmiendo.
	Rencor	(0.611) Ítem 1f. Tendré en cuenta lo que hizo mientras viva. (0.421) Ítem 2e. Recordaré toda la vida lo que me hizo. (0.489) Ítem 3d. Tendré en cuenta lo que hizo mientras dure nuestra relación. (0.475) Ítem 4c. Tendré en cuenta que me humilló cada vez que me encuentre con él. (0.516) Ítem 5b. Tendré presente esta ofensa mientras ella viva. (0.101) Ítem 6a. Recordaré cada vez que los vea los momentos que me han hecho pasar.
	Hostilidad	(0.307) Ítem 1c. Le manifestaré todo el dolor y la rabia que me hizo sentir. (0.592) Ítem 2b. Me defenderé insultándolo. (0.301) Ítem 3a. Le diré lo ingrato/a y traicionero/a que fue. (0.368) Ítem 4g. Inmediatamente le diré todo lo que pienso de él. (0.364) Ítem 5f. Le expresaré todo mi enojo. (0.013) Ítem 6e. Intentaré reunir a los vecinos para tomar medidas al respecto.
2. Actitudes Prosociales	Explicación	(0.634) Ítem 1a. Le preguntaré por lo que hizo cuando se dé la oportunidad. (0.619) Ítem 2g. Le preguntaré, cuando se tranquilice, porqué reaccionó de esta manera. (0.337) Ítem 3f. Le pediré oportunamente, una explicación sobre su conducta. (0.565) Ítem 4e. Le pediré una explicación sobre su proceder. (0.668) Ítem 5d. Le preguntaré oportunamente porqué actuó de esa manera. (0.460) Ítem 6c. Aprovecharé para preguntarles, en una ocasión propicia, si tienen algún problema con nosotros.
	Perdón	(0.338) Ítem 1g. Buscaré el momento adecuado para intentar restaurar la relación. (0.484) Ítem 2f. Hablaré con él sobre lo ocurrido para hacer las paces. (0.204) Ítem 3e. Dialogaré para buscar una solución que mejore nuestra relación. (0.528) Ítem 4a. Buscaré a través del diálogo la forma de reestablecer la amistad. (0.608) Ítem 5c. Intentaré que reconsidere su proceder para mejorar la relación. (0.308) Ítem 6f. Los invitaré a casa para intentar mejorar la relación.
3. Actitudes Pasivas	Sometimiento	(0.414) Ítem 1d. Aceptaré su proceder porque quizá hice algo que le molestó. (0.537) Ítem 2c. Aceptaré su proceder porque los padres tienen autoridad para reaccionar así. (0.203) Ítem 3b. Pensaré que quizá se ha sentido solo/a por mi culpa. (0.537) Ítem 4d. Aceptaré su proceder porque a veces a uno le toca ser el centro de la crítica. (0.297) Ítem 5g. Aceptaré lo que me hizo, dado que los ancianos se olvidan de las cosas. (0.495) Ítem 6b. Lo tomaré como una falta de adaptación al barrio, debido al poco tiempo que llevan en él.
	Negación	(0.416) Ítem 1e. Trataré de olvidar su proceder. (0.668) Ítem 2d. Trataré de olvidar lo ocurrido. (0.410) Ítem 3c. Haré como si nada hubiera ocurrido. (0.555) Ítem 4b. Trataré de olvidar lo ocurrido. (0.335) Ítem 5a. Trataré de olvidar lo que me hizo. (0.454) Ítem 6g. Ignoraré su conducta.

Fuente: elaboración propia

Most of the items reached saturations greater than or close to 0.3 on the scales to which they were assigned in the original study by Moreno and Pereyra (2000), overall supporting the factorial structure of the CASA-F questionnaire in young Spaniards. Only two items did not reach significant saturation on the expected scales: items 6a and 6e of the Aggressive Attitudes factor. Item 6a ("I will remember every time I see them the moments they have put me through") and item 6e ("I will try to gather the neighbors to take action about it") are not understood as aggressive responses of resentment and hostility, respectively. Item 6a did not saturate significantly in any factor, however, the highest saturation was obtained in the Aggressive Attitudes factor (0.101). so we consider that it can be maintained at that factor. On the other hand, item 6e significantly saturated the Prosocial Attitudes factor (0.42), which leads us to conclude that in our context, the wording of that item is not appropriate to measure hostility and is understood as a negotiation attitude. It is necessary to reformulate its wording, focusing on the aspect of hostility that it originally intended to evaluate. The proposal would be: "I will try to gather the neighbors to take intimidating measures in this regard." influencing the aspect of hostility that it originally intended to evaluate. The proposal would be: "I will try to gather the neighbors to take intimidating measures in this regard." influencing the aspect of hostility that it originally intended to evaluate. The proposal would be: "I will try to gather the neighbors to take intimidating measures in this regard."

Secondly, correlational analyzes were carried out with the objective of analyzing the convergent validity of the CASA-F scales. Significant positive correlations were obtained between the attitudes of the same factor, all of them compatible with the theoretical framework. That is, there is a strong positive

relationship between the attitudes of explanation and forgiveness ( $r = 0.56, p < 0.05$ ), both of a prosocial nature; between denial and submission ( $r = 0.52, p < 0.05$ ), both passive attitudes, and between revenge, resentment and hostility, all three of an aggressive type ( [Table 2](#)). These correlations indicated adequate convergent validity. Likewise, significant negative correlations were obtained between attitudes of different factors, a result also consistent with the theoretical framework. For example, between the three aggressive attitudes (revenge, resentment and hostility) and the two passive attitudes (submission and denial). On the other hand, three results are worth highlighting: 1) that the attitude of explanation (prosocial) correlated positively with that of hostility (aggressive) ( $r = 0.39, p < 0.01$ ), 2), the attitude of forgiveness (prosocial) correlated positively with the two passive attitudes, submission ( $r = 0.19, p < 0.01$ ) and denial ( $r = 0.24, p < 0.01$ ) and 3) negatively with those of revenge ( $r = -0.32, p < 0.01$ ) and resentment ( $r = -0.25, p < 0.01$ ), two of the Aggressive Attitudes.

**TABLA 2**  
*Coefficientes de correlación de Pearson entre las escalas del CASA-F*

Escalas	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. Sometimiento	-					
2. Negación	0.52**					
3. Venganza	-0.17**	-0.33**				
4. Rencor	-0.17**	-0.43**	0.48**			
5. Hostilidad	-0.14*	-0.27**	0.36**	0.33**		
6. Explicación	-0.08	-0.11	-0.08	-0.07	0.39**	
7. Perdón	0.19**	0.24**	-0.32**	-0.25**	0.1	0.56**

\* $p < 0.05$  \*\* $p < 0.01$

Fuente: elaboración propia

Finally, the reliability analysis was carried out. Table [3](#) shows the means, standard deviations and Cronbach's alphas obtained in the internal consistency study of the CASA-F scales. As can be seen, Cronbach's alphas were obtained that ranged between 0.48 and 0.68. The submission and hostility scales obtained



the lowest indices, 0.48 and 0.52, respectively. The resentment and explanation scales obtained the highest indices, 0.68 and 0.66, respectively. The internal consistency indices reached higher values when the analysis was carried out by grouping the scales into the three factors. Thus, the factor that groups Aggressive Attitudes obtained a Cronbach's alpha of 0.75, the Passive Attitudes factor of 0.75 and the Prosocial Attitudes factor of 0.71.

**TABLA 3**  
Medias, desviaciones estándar y alfa de Cronbach de las escalas del CASA-F

Escalas CASA-F	M	DE	alfa de Cronbach España / México*	
Sometimiento	13.35	2.66	0.48	0.43
Negación	15.36	3.23	0.62	0.53
Venganza	9.69	2.6	0.56	0.62
Rencor	12.9	3.26	0.68	0.68
Hostilidad	13.62	3.08	0.52	0.55
Explicación	17.65	3.46	0.66	0.71
Perdón	17.14	2.8	0.57	0.66
<b>Factores CASA-F</b>				
Pasivas	34.78	5.56	0.76	0.64
Agresivas	36.19	6.87	0.75	0.82
Prosociales	28.72	5.13	0.71	0.79

\* alfa de Cronbach en muestra mexicana (Pereyra, 2009).

Fuente: elaboración propia

If we compare the Cronbach's alphas of our sample with those of a study carried out in Mexico with 415 adult subjects with an average age of 38 years (Pereyra, 2009), we observe high levels of agreement. We can conclude that the internal consistency indices of the CASA-F in the Spanish population are similar to those obtained in previous studies carried out in other contexts.

### ***Attitudes in situations of grievance based on gender and religious belief***

A 2x3 multifactorial MANOVA was carried out taking gender and religious belief as grouping variables (*not at all important*, *unimportant* and *very important*) and as dependent variables the seven attitudes towards situations of grievance ( [Table 4](#) ). The multivariate contrast showed statistically significant differences between men and women ( $\lambda = 0.91, F_{(7,209)} = 3.13, p < 0.01$ ,  $\text{partial } \eta^2 =$



0.1) and between the groups of the religious belief variable ( $\lambda = 0.86, F_{(14,418)} = 1.7, p < 0.001$ ,  $\eta^2_{\text{partial}} = 0.07$ ), but not in the interaction between both variables ( $\lambda = 0.95, F_{(14,418)} = 7.1, p < 0.05$ ,  $\eta^2_{\text{partial}} = 0.03$ ).

**TABLA 4**

*Comparación de medias entre los grupos de las variables género y creencia religiosa en las actitudes ante situaciones de agravio*

Actitudes	Género		$\eta^2$	Importancia de la creencia religiosa			$\eta^2$
	Hombre	Mujer		Nada	Poco	Mucho	
	M (DE)	M (DE)		M (DE)	M (DE)	M (DE)	
Sometimiento	13.3 (2.6)	13.3 (2.7)	0.001	12.9 (2.7)	13.6 (2.6)	13.8 (2.4)	+ 0.02
Negación	15.2 (3.1)	15.4 (3.3)	0.001	15 (3.4)	15.3 (3.2)	16 (2.9)	0.01
Venganza	10.2 (2.8)	9.3 (2.4)	* 0.02	10.1 (2.9)	9.7 (2.6)	8.9 (1.8)	0.03
Rencor	12.7 (3.1)	13.2 (3.4)	0.006	13.1 (3.3)	13.4 (3.3)	11.6 (2.8)	** 0.04
Hostilidad	13.3 (2.8)	13.8 (3.3)	0.005	13.5 (3.3)	14.1 (3.2)	12.7 (2.2)	+ 0.02
Explicación	16.8 (3.5)	18.3 (3.3)	** 0.034	17.1 (3.8)	18.2 (3.1)	18 (3.3)	0.01
Perdón	16.9 (2.8)	17.3 (2.8)	0.005	16.2 (3)	17.8 (2.4)	17.8 (2.6)	** 0.08

Nota. Hombres:  $N = 94$ . Mujeres:  $N = 127$ . Nada de importancia religiosa:  $N = 100$ . Poca:  $N = 81$ . Mucha:  $N = 40$ .

+  $p = 0.07$  \*  $p < 0.05$  \*\*  $p < 0.01$ .  $\eta^2$ : eta cuadrado parcial.

Fuente: elaboración propia

Regarding gender, the univariate contrasts reached statistical significance in two of the attitudes analyzed: revenge ( $F_{(1,215)} = 4.4, p < 0.05$ ;  $\eta^2_{\text{partial}} = 0.02$ ), and explanation ( $F_{(1,220)} = 7.5, p < 0.01$ ;  $\eta^2_{\text{partial}} = 0.03$ ). Men scored significantly higher in the revenge attitude (man:  $M = 10.2, SD = 2.8$ ; women:  $M = 9.3, SD = 2.4$ ) and women in the explanation attitude (woman:  $M = 18.3, SD = 3.3$ ) ; male:  $M = 16.8, SD = 3.5$ ). Regarding religious belief, the univariate contrasts reached significance in the attitude of resentment ( $F_{(2,215)} = 4.9, p < 0.01$ ;  $\eta^2_{\text{partial}} = 0.04$ ) and forgiveness ( $F_{(2,215)} = 9, p < 0.001$ ;  $\eta^2_{\text{partial}} = 0.08$ ). *Scheffe's post-hoc* comparison tests indicated that young people who gave no or little importance to religious belief scored significantly higher on resentment than those who gave it a lot of importance (mean diff. = 1.59,  $p < 0.05$ ; *diff.* means = 1.88,  $p < 0.05$ , respectively) and the young people who did not give importance to religious belief scored significantly lower in forgiveness than

those who gave little and a lot of importance to religious belief (mean diff. = -1.6,  $p < 0.01$ ; *diff.* means = -1.6,  $p < 0.01$ , respectively).

***Relationship between attitudes towards situations of grievance and the family social climate***

Prior to the analysis of the relationship between the variables of attitudes towards situations of grievance and the perceived family social climate, a descriptive analysis of these latter variables was carried out, controlling for differences based on gender. A MANOVA was carried out, taking gender as a grouping variable and as dependent variables, the three variables of the social-family climate (cohesion, expressiveness and conflict). The multivariate MANOVA contrast did not show statistically significant differences between men and women in the perception of their family social climate ( $\lambda = 0.98$ ,  $F_{(3,226)} = 1.45$ ,  $p > 0.05$ ;  $\text{partial } \eta^2 = 0.02$ ).

Secondly, the relationships between attitudes towards offending situations and the three family social climate variables were analyzed using correlational analyses. As seen in [Table 5](#), significant correlations were obtained between prosocial attitudes and the family social climate variables: positive with cohesion ( $r = 0.25$ ;  $p < 0.01$ ) and expressiveness ( $r = 0.26$ ;  $p < 0.01$ ) . ) and negative type with conflict ( $r = -0.17$ ;  $p < 0.01$ ). No significant correlations were obtained between Passive and Aggressive Attitudes considered as a whole and the family social climate variables. However, if we consider the passive and aggressive attitudes separately, the attitudes of submission ( $r = 0.15$ ;  $p < 0.05$ ) and revenge ( $r = 0.14$ ;  $p < 0.05$ ) correlated positively with the perception of family conflict and the attitude of resentment correlated negatively with family expressiveness ( $r = -0.15$ ;  $p < 0.05$ ).

TABLA 5

Coeficientes de correlación de Pearson entre las variables de clima social y las Actitudes ante Situaciones de Agravio

Actitudes	Clima social familiar		
	Cohesión	Expresividad	Conflicto
Sometimiento	-0.04	0.09	0.15*
Negación	-0.01	0.03	0.06
Venganza	-0.10	-0.10	0.14*
Rencor	-0.06	-0.15*	0.01
Hostilidad	0.06	0.10	0.04
Explicación	0.24**	0.20**	-0.18**
Perdón	0.19**	0.28**	-0.12
Pasivas	-0.03	0.07	0.11
Agresivas	-0.04	-0.07	0.07
Prosociales	0.25**	0.26**	-0.17**

Nota. \* $p < 0.05$  \*\* $p < 0.01$

Fuente: elaboración propia

### *Predictive capacity of gender, religious belief and family social climate on attitudes towards situations of grievance*

Finally, to analyze the predictive capacity of gender, religious belief and family social climate on prosocial, aggressive and passive attitudes in situations of offense, three multiple hierarchical regressions were carried out using the stepwise method . In the three analyses, block 1 considered gender and religious belief as explanatory variables, while block 2 considered the three family social climate variables (cohesion, expressiveness and conflict). In the first analysis, a multiple correlation with the criterion of 0.4 and a corrected  $R^2$  of 0.15 was obtained in the final model ( $F_{(4,220)} = 10.5, p < 0.001$ ). The results of this first analysis are shown in [Table 6](#) . The variables religious belief ( $\beta = 0.19, p < 0.011$ ), gender ( $\beta = 0.17, p < 0.01$ ), and expressiveness ( $\beta = 0.27, p < 0.001$ ) and family conflict ( $\beta = -0.15, p < 0.05$ ). The final model explained 16% of the criterion variance, with the family expressiveness variable being the one that explained the greatest percentage of variance (Step 3: Change  $R^2 = 0.08, F_{(3,221)} = 11.9, p < 0.001$ ).

TABLA 6

Análisis de regresión múltiple de las variables predictoras de las actitudes prosociales

Variable	B	SEB	$\beta$	R <sup>2</sup>	CambioR <sup>2</sup>
Variables predictoras del factor Actitudes Prosociales					
Paso 1				0.04	0.04**
Creencia religiosa	1.4	0.49	0.19		
Paso 2				0.06	0.02*
Creencia religiosa	1.4	0.49	0.18		
Género	1.7	0.73	0.15		
Paso 3				0.14	0.08***
Creencia religiosa	1.4	0.47	0.19		
Género	1.9	0.7	0.17		
Expresividad	0.87	0.19	0.28		
Paso 4				0.16	0.02*
Creencia religiosa	1.4	0.46	0.19		
Género	1.9	0.7	0.17		
Expresividad	0.82	0.19	0.27		
Conflicto	-0.51	0.22	-0.15		
Variables predictoras de la actitud de perdón					
Paso 1				0.06	0.06***
Creencia religiosa	0.92	0.24	0.25		
Paso 2				0.14	0.08***
Creencia religiosa	0.94	0.23	0.25		
Expresividad	0.44	0.1	0.29		
Variables predictoras de la actitud de explicación					
Paso 1				0.04	0.04**
Género	1.4	0.46	0.21		
Paso 2				0.09	0.05***
Género	1.4	0.44	0.19		
Cohesión	0.37	0.1	0.23		
Paso 3				0.1	0.02*
Género	1.5	0.44	0.21		
Cohesión	0.27	0.11	0.16		
Expresividad	0.28	0.13	0.15		

Nota. \*  $p < 0.05$  \*\*  $p < 0.01$  \*\*\*  $p < 0.001$  N = 226.

Fuente: elaboración propia

In the second analysis, where the predictive capacity of the two blocks of variables on aggressive attitudes was evaluated, only religious belief was introduced as a significant predictor ( $\beta = -0.14$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ), explaining only 1.5 % . of the variance (*corrected*  $R^2 = 0.015$ ,  $F_{(1,223)} = 4.47$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ). Finally, the predictive capacity of the variables of gender, religious belief and family social climate on passive attitudes was not confirmed.

In order to delve deeper into the results related to prosocial attitudes, two new hierarchical regression analyzes were carried out considering the two prosocial attitudes, forgiveness and explanation, respectively, as criterion variables. Regarding the predictive capacity on the attitude of forgiveness, a multiple correlation with the criterion of 0.38 and a corrected  $R^2$  of 0.13 was found in the final model ( $F_{(2, 222)} = 18.3, p < 0.001$ ). The results are shown in [Table 6](#). The religious belief variables were confirmed as significant predictors of the forgiveness attitude in the final model (step 2) ( $\beta = 0.19, p < 0.011$ ) and expressiveness ( $\beta = 0.29, p < 0.001$ ). The religious belief variable explained 6% of the criterion variability and the expressiveness variable significantly increased the percentage of explained variance by 8%. Finally, regarding the explanation attitude, a multiple correlation with the criterion of 0.33 and a corrected  $R^2$  of 0.1 was obtained in the final model ( $F_{(3,223)} = 9.3, p < 0.001$ ), being introduced as significant predictors in the equation the variables gender ( $\beta = 0.21, p < 0.01$ ), cohesion ( $\beta = 0.16, p < 0.05$ ) and expressiveness ( $\beta = 0.15, p < 0.05$ ). Family cohesion and expressiveness increased by 5% ( $F_{(2,224)} = 11.5, p < 0.001$ ) and by 2% ( $F_{(3,223)} = 9.3, p < 0.001$ ), respectively, the variance explained in step 1 by the gender variable.

### Discussion and Conclusions

The study of attitudes towards situations of injury in the family environment and the analysis of its relationship with gender, religious belief and the family social climate has been the central axis of this work. To do this, first of all, it was considered appropriate to check how the dimensions of the CASA-F (Moreno & Pereyra, 2000) operated in young Spaniards. The results in terms of construct validity and internal consistency are similar to those of other contexts studied. The results of the internal consistency study of the questionnaire have

obtained poor Cronbach's alphas in some scales, however, this result is similar to that obtained in previous studies carried out in other contexts (Canales, 2011; Pereyra, 2009). Nevertheless, Adequate internal consistency has been obtained in the second-order scales (passive, aggressive or prosocial attitudes) where indices greater than 0.7 are reached. It is considered advisable to carry out future validation studies of this instrument.

Regarding the study of convergent validity, a significant relationship has been found between the CASA-F scales, coinciding with the results of the validation of the instrument in the Argentine (Pereyra, 2003) and Mexican (Pereyra, 2009) populations. Thus, submission and denial, the two scales of the passive responses factor, are positively related. Likewise, revenge, hostility and resentment, the three scales of the aggressive responses factor and, finally, explanation and forgiveness, the two scales of the prosocial responses factor. On the other hand, the results indicate that the attitude of explanation (prosocial) is positively related to that of hostility (aggressive), but forgiveness is negatively related to that of revenge and resentment (aggressive attitudes). This result could be interpreted as that in young Spaniards, hostility is related to the explanation required for an offense, but once it is forgiven, aggressive attitudes that make it difficult to restore the relationship no longer arise. However, forgiveness is positively related to the two passive attitudes (submission and denial), which shows how these passive attitudes are often considered socially acceptable, and therefore, are confused with assertive and prosocial responses such as forgiveness. Finally, the negative relationship found between denial and revenge and between denial and resentment can be explained if denial is considered as a mechanism that inhibits the active expression of aggressiveness. Aggressive attitudes no longer arise that make it





difficult to restore the relationship. However, forgiveness is positively related to the two passive attitudes (submission and denial), which shows how these passive attitudes are often considered socially acceptable, and therefore, are confused with assertive and prosocial responses such as forgiveness. Finally, the negative relationship found between denial and revenge and between denial and resentment can be explained if denial is considered as a mechanism that inhibits the active expression of aggressiveness. Aggressive attitudes no longer arise that make it difficult to restore the relationship. However, forgiveness is positively related to the two passive attitudes (submission and denial), which shows how these passive attitudes are often considered socially acceptable, and therefore, are confused with assertive and prosocial responses such as forgiveness. Finally, the negative relationship found between denial and revenge and between denial and resentment can be explained if denial is considered as a mechanism that inhibits the active expression of aggressiveness. They are confused with assertive and prosocial responses such as forgiveness. Finally, the negative relationship found between denial and revenge and between denial and resentment can be explained if denial is considered as a mechanism that inhibits the active expression of aggressiveness. They are confused with assertive and prosocial responses such as forgiveness. Finally, the negative relationship found between denial and revenge and between denial and resentment can be explained if denial is considered as a mechanism that inhibits the active expression of aggressiveness. Secondly, regarding the differences between attitudes towards situations of grievance based on gender, the results show that men tend more to be vengeful and women opt more for explanation, a finding similar to that obtained by Miller et al. (2008) in their meta-analytic study. This result can be explained by



referring to the sociocultural tendency to value aggressive attitudes in men, associated with the maintenance of authority and power, while in women greater emotional expression is enhanced and hence their tendency to ask for explanations when feels offended. In fact, in the regression analyses, gender was a significant predictor of prosocial attitudes, especially the explanation attitude.

In relation to the importance of religious belief, it was found that young people who do not give importance to religious belief tend to have aggressive attitudes (revenge, resentment and hostility) and to a lesser extent prosocial attitudes (explanation and forgiveness). This result confirms what was obtained in previous studies with the Argentine population (Pereyra, 2003; Vargas, 2009). On the other hand, in the regression analyzes it was found that religious belief has predictive power over prosocial attitudes, especially the attitude of forgiveness. From the ethical-moral and theological perspective, it is logical to think that people who behave in a manner consistent with their beliefs may tend to develop to a greater extent prosocial attitudes and skills to forgive such as otherness, tolerance with the other, empathy, etc.,

Finally, with respect to the relationship between attitudes towards offending situations and the family social climate, it was found that expressiveness, cohesion and family conflict are predictors of prosocial attitudes; Specifically, family expressiveness predicts the attitude of forgiveness and explanation and family cohesion predicts the attitude of explanation. Family conflict negatively predicts prosocial attitudes as a whole. Therefore, the predictive capacity of the family social climate on prosocial attitudes in situations of offense is confirmed. Our result confirms what was obtained in the study by Pichardo et al. (2002), in which young people who perceived high family cohesion and



expressiveness showed greater general social adaptation compared to those who perceived low cohesion, low expressiveness and high conflict in his family. Other classic studies, such as that of Roming & Bakken (1992 in Martínez, 1997), found that adolescents who perceived their family relationships with a high degree of cohesion and adaptation showed more responsibility and affection in their interpersonal relationships. Martínez and Fuertes (1999) pointed out that homes that have a better family climate are characterized by support, harmony, affection, cohesion and open communication, an ideal context for interaction with peers. In general, the majority of research carried out on the subject shows that in stable family systems with an affective family climate, in which attention is paid to emotional states and in which security and affection are provided to its members,

It should be noted as the main contributions of this work, on the one hand, the study of validity and reliability of the CASA-F questionnaire in young Spaniards. This questionnaire allows us to evaluate an important attitudinal aspect of emotional relationships associated with the resolution of interpersonal conflicts in the family environment. On the other hand, the results obtained reveal differences in attitudes towards offense between men and women, being a possible reflection of different educational and cultural patterns depending on gender. Finally, another contribution of this work is to highlight the need to promote an appropriate family social climate from childhood. The findings indicate the importance of a family social climate characterized by expressiveness, cohesion and low conflict for the adequate emotional-social development of our young people. This work therefore provides keys to a topic that has recently aroused both the interest of researchers and the concern of

society in general: the growing manifestation of aggressive behavior among young people in the family environment in the face of conflictive situations.

As a limitation of the study, it should be noted that the low variance explained in the regression analyzes highlights the need to incorporate other variables in the explanation of attitudes towards the offense: the quality of adult attachment, emotional intelligence and skills. of communication that may be associated with the management of conflict situations, in the various areas of interpersonal relationships.

---

## References

- Bilbao, G., Etxeberria, X., Echano, J., & Aguirre, R. (1999). *Forgiveness in public life*. Bilbao, Spain: University of Deusto, Ethics Classroom. [ ]
- Canales, CI (2011). *Profile of the victim of marital violence regarding family functioning, marital satisfaction and attitudes towards the offense* (Unpublished doctoral thesis). University of Montemorelos, Mexico. [ ]
- Cattell, R. B. (1966). The Scree Test for the number of factors. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, 1 (2), 245-276. [ ]
- Enright, R. D. (1994). Piaget on the moral development of forgiveness: Identity or Reciprocity? *Human Development*, 37(2), 63-80. [ ]
- Fehr, R., Gelfand, M.J., & Nag, M. (2010). The road to forgiveness: A meta-analytic synthesis of its situational and dispositional correlates. *Psychological Bulletin*, 136(5), 894-914. doi: 10.1037/a0019993 [ ]
- García-Alandete, J., & Pérez-Delgado, E. (2005). Religious attitudes and values in a group of young Spanish university students. *Annals of Psychology*, 21 (1), 149-169. [ ]



- Jiménez, MI, & López-Zafra, E. (2011). Social attitudes and social adaptation in Spanish adolescents: the role of perceived emotional intelligence. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 26(1), 105-117. [ ]
- Lafuente, J., & Cantero, MJ (2010). *emotional ties. Attachment, friendship and love*. Madrid: Pyramid. [ ]
- Martínez, JL (1997). Personal development, family environment and couple relationships in adolescence. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 12 (1), 59-78. [ ]
- Martínez, JL, & Fuertes, A. (1999). Importance of the family climate and the couple's experience in adolescent friendship relationships. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 14(2-3), 235-250. [ ]
- Masip, J., Garrido, E., & Herrero, C. (2004). Definition of deception. *Annals of Psychology*, 20(1), 147-171. [ ]
- Mikulincer, M., & Shaver, P.R. (2005). Attachment theory and emotions in close relationships: Exploring the attachment-related dynamics of emotional reactions to relational events. *Personal Relationships*, 12(2), 149-168. [ ]
- Miller, A.J., Worthington, E.L., & McDaniel, M.A. (2008). Gender and forgiveness: A meta-analytic review and research agenda. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 27(8), 843-876. [ ]
- Moos, R.H., Moos, B.S., & Trickett, E. (1995). *Social-Family Climate Scale (FES)*. Madrid: TEA. [ ]
- Moreno, JE, & Pereyra, M. (2000). *Questionnaire on Attitudes towards Situations of Grievance*. Entre Ríos, Argentina: La Plata Adventist University. [ ]
- Moreno, JE, & Pereyra, M. (2001). Attitude toward Offenders Scale: Assessment, validation and research. In M. Martínez (Ed.), *Prevention and*

*control of aggression and the impact on its victims* (pp. 377-384). New York: Kluwer Academic/Plerum Publishers. [ ]

Pereyra, M. (2003). *Reconciliation, how to repair damaged* . Montemorelos, Mexico: Publications Universidad de Montemorelos. [ ]

Pereyra, M. (June, 2009). *The CASA-F in young Mexicans*. Communication presented at the XXXII Inter-American Congress of Psychology, Guatemala. [ ]

Pereyra, M., & Agüero de Kerbs, M. (1998). Personality, hope-hopelessness, control of aggression and mental health in Adventists and non-Adventists. *Theologika*, 13(2), 330-355. [ ]

Pichardo, MC, Fernández, E., & Amezcua, JA (2002). Importance of the family social climate in the personal and social adaptation of adolescents. *Journal of General and Applied Psychology*, 55(4), 575-590. [ ]

Pietromonaco, P.R., Greenwood, D., & Feldman, L. (2004). Conflict in adult close relationships: An attachment perspective. In WS Rholes & JA Simpson (Eds.), *Adult attachment: New directions and emerging issues* (pp. 267-299). New York: Guilford. [ ]

Rijavec, M., Jurcec, L., & Mijocevic, I. (2010). Gender differences in the relationship between forgiveness and depression/happiness. *Psihologijske Teme*, 19(1), 189-202. [ ]

Rodríguez, ES, & Moreno, JE (2011). Attitudes in situations of grievance. A comparative study between security force officers and university students. *Universitas Psychologica*, 10(2), 371-380. [ ]

Rokeach, M. (1968). *Beliefs, attitudes, and values: A theory of organization and change*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass. [ ]



Sheldon, P., & Honeycutt, J. (2011). Impact of gender and religiosity on forgiving communication. *Journal of Communication and Religion*, 34(1), 59-75. [ ]

Toussaint, L., & Webb, JR (2005). Gender differences in the relationship between empathy and forgiveness. *Journal Social Psychology*, 145 (6), 673-685. [ ]