

Record: 1

Title: Models of interpersonal forgiveness and their applications to counseling: Review and critique.

Authors: McCullough, Michael E., Virginia Commonwealth U, Dept of Psychology, Richmond, US
Worthington, Everett L.

Source: Counseling and Values, Vol 39(1), Oct, 1994. pp. 2-14.

Page Count: 13

Publisher: US : Assn for Spiritual Ethical and Religious Values in Counseling

Other Journal Titles: The Catholic Counselor and Readings; The National Catholic Guidance Conference Journal

Other Publishers: United Kingdom : Wiley-Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

ISSN: 0160-7960 (Print)
2161-007X (Electronic)

Language: English

Abstract: There are 4 categories of models of interpersonal forgiveness: models based on established psychological theories; models that describe the tasks involved in the process of forgiveness; models based on a moral development framework; and "typologies" of forgiveness. These models are reviewed, illustrated, and critiqued. Although many models of the psychology of forgiveness exist, their impact on empirical research and practice has been minimal. The current state of model building is evaluated and suggestions are offered for directing future conceptual work. (PsycINFO Database Record (c) 2012 APA, all rights reserved)

Subjects: *Counseling; *Forgiveness; *Models

PsycINFO Classification: Psychotherapy & Psychotherapeutic Counseling (3310)

Population: Human

Format Covered: Print

Publication Type: Journal; Peer Reviewed Journal

Document Type: Journal Article

Release Date: 19950701

Correction Date: 20120416

Digital Object Identifier: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/j.2161-007X.1994.tb01003.x>

Accession Number: 1995-26074-001

Database: PsycINFO

Section: ISSUES

MODELS OF INTERPERSONAL FORGIVENESS AND THEIR APPLICATIONS TO COUNSELING: REVIEW AND CRITIQUE

Models of interpersonal forgiveness and their applications to counseling were reviewed. Although many models of the psychology of forgiveness exist, their impact on empirical research and practice has been minimal. The authors evaluate the current state of model building concerning interpersonal forgiveness and offer suggestions for directing future conceptual work.

Helping professionals and social scientists have shown increasing interest in interpersonal forgiveness during the last decade. This growth is demonstrated by the proliferation of books (Enright, Eastin, Golden, Sarinopoulos, & Freedman, 1992), an expanding empirical and conceptual literature (for a review see McCullough & Worthington, 1994) and the convening of the first national conference (Christian Association for Psychological Studies, April, 1993) on forgiveness.

Despite the recent enthusiasm for forgiveness, researchers and practitioners interested in studying forgiveness are likely to be frustrated by the lack of clarity in the models of forgiveness that are available for directing scientific and applied work. Models of interpersonal forgiveness are dispersed through a variety of professional publications and vary in quality and utility. Furthermore, it is not clear that current models of forgiveness have guided empirical research or clinical practice to any appreciable extent with, perhaps, a single exception (cf. Enright's work). Given that generating models of human behavior is important for developing an understanding of the behavior (Strong, 1991a, 1991b), the maturation of the science and application of interpersonal forgiveness is possibly being hindered by a dearth of adequate models. In this article, we summarize and critique extant models of the psychology of forgiveness, identifying their strengths and limitations for guiding empirical research and practice. We then offer recommendations for building models of forgiveness that may strengthen future scholarship.

FOUR CATEGORIES OF MODELS OF FORGIVENESS

Models of interpersonal forgiveness can be distinguished into four categories:

1. Models based on established psychological theories
2. Models that describe the tasks involved in the process of forgiveness
3. Models based on a moral development framework
4. "Typologies" of forgiveness

Models from each of these categories will be reviewed, illustrated, and critiqued.

Models of Forgiveness Based on Psychological Theories

Models of forgiveness have been based on psychoanalytic or psychodynamic (Brandsma, 1982; Lapsley, 1966; Montville, 1989; Pingleton, 1989, 1993; Wapnick, 1985), Jungian (Todd, 1985), existential (Pattison, 1965, 1989), ego object relations (Gartner, 1988), personal construct (Smith,

1981), and cognitive (Droll, 1984) theories. Also, Bonar (1989) and Shontz and Rosenak (1988) have described briefly how the felt need for forgiveness might be conceptualized from Freudian, Jungian, learning, existential, constructivist, and transpersonal theories. These models rely on concepts from their parent theories to explain the function and value of forgiveness. Following is a summary of two exemplars of models based on established psychological theories.

A psychodynamic model. Lapsley (1966) conceptualized difficulty in forgiving as resulting from the violation of intrapsychic "contracts" that develop during infancy and early childhood. Individuals develop internalized rules, called contracts, based on childhood perceptions of parents' norms for good and bad behavior, and the rewards and punishments that follow such behavior. Children's contracts are rigid, legalistic, and are believed by children to be universally binding. Contracts usually change as children mature cognitively. Some contracts do not change, however, and continue to guide individuals' standards for right and wrong behavior well into adulthood. When others fail to live by the contracts, persons become angry, resentful, and self-righteous, and unforgiving cognition, emotion, and behavior occur.

Lapsley argued that forgiveness involves two steps. The first step is the cancellation of the rigid contracts for good and bad behavior that developed in childhood. These contracts, though stored in an unconscious, pre-linguistic form, can be examined consciously in adulthood to assess their utility for guiding interpersonal relationships.

The second step in forgiveness is an intrapsychic process that is analogous to interpersonal forgiveness. When childhood contracts are examined, individuals often feel shame and guilt for having let these contracts determine normative behavior for themselves and others. The mature self must forgive the childlike self for insisting that the contracts be satisfied. Once this self-forgiveness occurs, the forgiver is free to conduct more mature relationships with significant others. Legitimate offenses can be addressed with love, rather than with anger and bitterness.

A personal construct model. Smith (1981) drew from Kelly's (1955) personal construct theory to describe how forgiveness occurs. Kelly postulated that individuals actively interpret their experiences according to a set of constructs abstracted from repeated experiences. These constructs dictate how persons respond to environmental events. Psychological change, according to Kelly, involves changing one's constructs, which allows experiences to be perceived in new ways, or applying new constructs to interpret one's experiences. As new constructs are invoked to interpret one's experience, ideally, one's behavior in response to the experience is also changed.

Using Kelly's concepts, Smith (1981) proposed a cognitive model of forgiveness that involves applying new constructs to hurtful past events so that they acquire new meaning and significance. For example, forgiveness might involve changing one's interpretation of a hurtful interaction with a parent so that, rather than invoking constructs such as "good-evil" to describe the parent, one might invoke constructs such as "wounded-healthy," or "perfect-imperfect." Using alternative constructs to construe the interaction, the hurt person responds to the parent with compassion and benevolence, rather than with revenge or retribution.

Evaluation. In general, models of forgiveness based on established psychological theories are particularly strong in internal consistency: each model's propositions fit meaningfully into the larger whole of the established psychological theory. These models are potentially useful in applied settings, especially by counselors with these particular theoretical orientations.

Models of forgiveness based on established psychological theories have promoted little empirical research. These frameworks are potentially useful for integrating research findings regarding forgiveness, however. Further refinement of these models might illuminate how personality and interpersonal variables influence the cognitive and emotional changes that promote forgiveness. The major hypotheses of these models should be tested empirically.

Models of forgiveness based on established theories of personality and counseling would be more useful if counselors from particular theoretical orientations would demonstrate how their models of forgiveness dovetail with counseling from their espoused theories of personality and counseling.

Besides Pingleton (1989, 1993), few writers have demonstrated how their models can guide counseling to promote forgiveness. Case studies might help to illustrate how forgiveness can be promoted from within particular theoretical frameworks.

Models of the Process of Forgiveness

Process models of forgiveness describe the psychological and interpersonal processes involved in forgiveness. Although process models vary widely in content, sequence, and number of stages, the stages and tasks discussed in process models of forgiveness can be roughly divided into those dealing with recognition of the offense, commitment or decision to forgive, cognitive or emotive activity, and behavioral action. Process models can be subdivided further into models addressing (a) the interpersonal, and (b) the intrapersonal process of forgiveness.

Interpersonal process models. Several theorists have proposed models of the interpersonal forgiveness process that describe the activity of both the for~ giver and the person being forgiven. Martin's (1953) model suggested five stages to forgiveness: (a) refusal to seek revenge or accept the relationship as permanently broken; (b) pardon, or desire to reestablish the relationship; (c) complaint, or explanation to the offender of the causes for the harm to the relationship; (d) repentance by the offender; and (e) the reestablishment of a relationship of mutual confidence and trust based on faith. Augsburger (1981), Loewen (1970), and Nelson (1992) have proposed similar interpersonal process models of forgiveness.

Intrapersonal process models. Several models of forgiveness describe a sequence of cognitive, emotive, and behavioral steps that the forgiver must undertake, irrespective of the action of the offender following the offense. For example, Pettitt (1987) proposed a five-stage model: (a) committing to forgiveness as a way to address the offense, (b) adopting five new perspectives (recognizing the unmet need that prompted the offense, adopting a state of calm, opening oneself to one's role in the offense, desiring a fair course of action, and desiring to find the good in others), (c) changing the images one has stored up regarding the offense, (d) accepting the offense and canceling one's high expectations, and (e) restoring the flow of vitality and love. From a Christian religious perspective, Benson (1992) identified four stages: (a) identifying the resentment and anger

that one is experiencing regarding the offense, (b) identifying with the sin of the offender in order to gain compassion, (c) accepting Jesus' forgiveness for the offender, and (d) adopting a willingness to bear the sin of the offender and to behave altruistically toward him or her. Similar models have been proposed by Cunningham (1985, 1992), Enright and colleagues (Enright, Eastin, et al., 1992; Enright, Gassin, & Wu, 1992; Enright & Human Development Study Group, 1991; Human Development Study Group, 1991), Hope (1987), Rosenak and Harnden (1992), Smedes (1984), and Thompson (1983).

Evaluation. Process models of forgiveness are most helpful for educating counselors on how to facilitate the forgiveness process and for guiding laypersons interested in forgiving. Process models might also be useful for teaching clients to view forgiveness as a process instead of a single event and for normalizing the variations in clients' thoughts, feelings, and behavior during forgiveness, because positive and negative affect regarding an offender likely wax and wane through the course of forgiveness.

Process models of forgiveness would be more useful if attention were given to several considerations. Instead of assuming that all people use the same process in forgiving, models should explain individual differences in forgiveness. Particularly, what emotional experiences characterize transitions from one stage or task to another? What are the significance and consequences of skipping or "getting stuck" in particular tasks or stages of forgiveness? What can be done therapeutically to get clients "unstuck"? What roles can counselors play--apart from executing a technique---in promoting forgiveness? What factors help or hinder forgiveness? Addressing these questions will yield more useful process models of forgiveness. To date, no process model has been tested empirically.

Models of Forgiveness Based on Kohlberg's Theory of Moral Development

Enright and colleagues (Enright, Gassin, & Wu, 1992; Enright & Human Development Study Group, 1991; Enright, Santos, & Al-Mabuk, 1989), Nelson (1992), and Spidell and Liberman (1981) have used Kohlberg's (1969, 1973, 1976) moral development theory to describe the acquisition of reasoning about forgiveness. These models suggested that as individuals develop cognitive skills, they become more able to take the perspectives of others, to empathize with their predicaments and frailties, and thus to value and accept them as people despite the hurts they have inflicted in the past. In Table 1, the models of Enright's group (Enright, Gassin, & Wu; Enright and Human Development Study Group, 1991; Enright, et al., 1989), Nelson, and Spidell and Liberman are shown to correspond to Kohlberg's stages of justice reasoning.

Nelson (1992) and Enright's group (Enright, Gassin, & Wu; Enright and Human Development Study Group, 1991; Enright, et al., 1989) considered the earliest period of reasoning concerning forgiveness to occur when cognition is predominantly egocentric and preoccupied with avoiding pain and seeking pleasure. Nelson (1992) called this stage of reasoning about forgiveness preconsonance. Individuals resent authority and have a limited capacity for intimacy with and empathy for others. Forgiveness is motivated out of self-interest and desire for revenge and restitution. Such individuals feel hurt by even minor offenses. Enright's group (Enright, Gassin, & Wu; Enright and Human Development Study Group, 1991; Enright, Santos, & Al-Mabuk, 1989) divided this period into two stages. During the stage of revengeful forgiveness, forgiveness is

motivated by an egocentric desire for revenge. During the stage of restitutive-compensational forgiveness, forgiveness is motivated by a desire to receive compensation and restitution for offenses that one has experienced. This period of forgiveness reasoning coincides with the stages of justice reasoning that Kohlberg (1969, 1973, 1976) called punishment and obedience orientation and relativist justice.

Nelson (1992) and Enright's group (Enright, Gassin, & Wu; Enright and Human Development Study Group, 1991; Enright, et al., 1989) considered an intermediate period of reasoning concerning forgiveness to occur when individuals are preoccupied with rule-governed behavior and a desire to look good in the eyes of others. At Nelson's consonance stage, forgiveness is motivated by adherence to rules; a desire to seem to be good and just; and a preoccupation with fairness, law, and propriety. Forgiveness seems like the "right thing to do," because right relationships are socially desirable. Enright and associates (Enright, Gassin, & Wu; Enright and Human Development Study Group, 1991; Enright, et al., 1989) subdivided this period into expectational forgiveness, during which forgiveness results from social pressure; lawful expectational forgiveness, in which forgiveness results from institutional, moral, or religious pressure; and forgiveness as social harmony, in which forgiveness is used to maintain social harmony and good relationships. This period of forgiveness reasoning coincides with Kohlberg's (1969, 1973, 1976) stages of justice reasoning called good boy/good girl justice, law and order justice, and social contract orientation.

The third period of reasoning concerning forgiveness is characterized by genuine interest in the well-being of others and for promoting love and interpersonal harmony. Nelson (1992) identified this stage as postconsonance. Enright and associates (Enright, Gassin, & Wu; Enright and Human Development Study Group, 1991; Enright, et al., 1989) called this stage forgiveness as love. This period of forgiveness reasoning coincides with Kohlberg's (1969, 1973, 1976) universal ethical principle orientation stage of justice reasoning.

Enright et al. (1989), Huang (1990), and Park, Enright, and Gassin (1993) found evidence for a developmental view on reasoning concerning forgiveness in American, Taiwanese, and Korean samples. In these studies, reasoning concerning forgiveness (according to Enright et al.'s [1989] model) was moderately correlated with justice reasoning. Reasoning concerning forgiveness also increased with age.

Evaluation. The Enright group's (Enright, Gassin, & Wu; Enright and Human Development Study Group, 1991; Enright, et al., 1989) developmental theory of forgiveness has stimulated empirical research the results of which suggest that reasoning concerning forgiveness is developmental (Enright et al., 1989; Huang, 1990; Park et al., 1993) Enright and the Human Development Study Group (1991) have discussed how their theory could be applied to interventions to stimulate the development of reasoning concerning forgiveness. Their proposals have not been investigated empirically.

Future theorizing on forgiveness development might compare and contrast forgiveness, justice, and care. Forgiveness seems to capture aspects of justice and care simultaneously. In forgiveness, an immoral interpersonal offense is recognized as such, but the "just" punishment for the offense is foresworn so that the relationship between the offender and the offeree might be healed and the

norms of the relationship might be reestablished. Although theorists have posited that men and women would manifest different levels of justice-based and care-based moral reasoning (cf. Gilligan, 1982), Enright et al. (1989), Huang (1990), and Park et al. (1993) failed to find gender differences in reasoning about forgiveness. Could forgiveness encompass both morality and caring? Enright et al. (1989) argued that a morality of forgiveness, like a morality of care, are aspects of a morality of justice. This line of theorizing should be elaborated elsewhere.

Typologies of Forgiveness

Three researchers (Nelson, 1992; Trainer, 1981; Veenstra, 1992) have proposed typologies of forgiveness. Typologies categorize phenomena, such as forms of forgiveness, based on critical features that differentiate them. Trainer (1981) distinguished among three types of forgiveness. Rote-expected forgiveness is an overt manifestation of forgiveness accompanied by fear, anxiety, and resentment. Expedient forgiveness is performed as a means to another end and is accompanied by condescension and hostility. Intrinsic forgiveness is characterized by a change in attitudes and feelings toward an offender and by behavioral expressions of forgiveness and goodwill.

Nelson (1992) distinguished between detached, limited, and full forgiveness by the degree of behavioral, attitudinal, and emotional change toward the offender that each type of forgiveness involves. Veenstra (1992) proposed a typology based on six ways forgiveness can be used interpersonally following an offense: (a) overlooking the offense, (b) excusing the offense, (c) condoning the offense, (d) pardoning the offense, (e) releasing the offender from blame, and (f) reestablishing trust with the offender.

Trainer (1981) and Nelson (1992) found empirical support for their typologies. Their types of forgiveness were distinguishable from one another based on the degree of internal change toward the offender and by the motivation of the forgiver. Nelson and Trainer found that forgiveness that involved internalized cognitive and affective changes toward the offender was associated with reductions in anger and negative affect and greater relationship adjustment.

Evaluation. Typologies are particularly useful for illustrating that forgiveness can occur for a variety of motives and with a variety of consequences. They may be useful in counseling settings, although it is not clear that their concepts have enough theoretical value to stimulate or support a program of research. Typologies would be more useful for counselors if techniques were developed for encouraging the emotional and cognitive changes that characterize full forgiveness and intrinsic forgiveness. Counselors may find a description of the behavioral and affective signs that characterize the different types of forgiveness helpful. For example, intrinsic forgiveness may be associated with humility and calm, whereas role-expected or expedient forgiveness are associated with smugness, self-righteousness, and the absence of desire for reconciliation with the offender.

PROPOSALS FOR ADVANCING SCHOLARSHIP ON FORGIVENESS

Theorizing about forgiveness, like the empirical literature on forgiveness (McCullough & Worthington, 1994), is in an early phase of scientific and applied sophistication. Most models of forgiveness are of limited clinical utility. The dearth of appropriate models for encouraging forgiveness in counseling is demonstrated by survey research showing that the development of

counseling techniques to encourage forgiveness has been slow, especially among younger clinicians (DiBlasio, 1992; DiBlasio & Proctor, 1993). Also, although counselors view forgiveness as useful and relevant to counseling (Cole & Barone, 1992), few professional programs offer training in the use of forgiveness (for a survey of explicitly Christian programs see Moon, Bailey, Kwasny, & Willis, 1991). The lack of adequate models of forgiveness may be at least partially responsible for the lack of training that counselors receive on encouraging forgiveness.

Extant models of interpersonal forgiveness have inspired little empirical work. Empirical and conceptual work regarding forgiveness exist, for the most part, as two separate literatures. As the study of forgiveness matures, we hope that additional research will be theory-driven. Theory-driven research will flourish, of course, only if models of forgiveness are proposed and refined within the literature.

Another criticism of models of forgiveness is the notable absence of models for several important psychological theories. Where are the models of forgiveness based on interpersonal theory? Cognitive-behavioral theory? Family systems theory? Theorists espousing these theoretical perspectives could contribute to scholarship on forgiveness.

To direct future model building, we offer six substantive recommendations that improve model building. First, models of forgiveness should be based on clear definitions of forgiveness. For example, Enright and colleagues (Human Development Study Group, 1991) define forgiveness as a complex of cognitive, affective, and behavioral elements in which negative affect and judgment toward an offender are reduced, not by denying one's right to such affect and judgment, but by viewing the offender with compassion, benevolence, and love, while realizing that the offender has no right to them. That definition has guided their research. Other models require clearly articulated definitions.

Second, attention should be paid to whether models and theories of are descriptive or prescriptive. Descriptive models and theories hypothesize the events that occur when people forgive; prescriptive models and theories hypothesize how forgiveness should occur in order to be most effective. The untangling of how forgiveness is and how forgiveness should be is inevitably value-laden, but making this distinction would add conceptual clarity that is currently not present in the literature.

Third, the antecedents of forgiveness should be distinguished from the causes of forgiveness. It is likely that forgiveness is facilitated by certain features of the offender, the offended person, the offense, the history of the relationship between the offender and the offended person. These antecedents should be separated from the causal mechanisms of forgiveness.

Fourth, forgiveness should be distinguished from its consequences. Forgiveness is related to changes in affect, cognition, and behavior regarding an offender, but it is unclear which among these changes forgiveness comprises per se and which ones are the consequences of forgiveness. Distinctions between content and consequences of forgiveness should follow logically from a definition of forgiveness.

Fifth, models of forgiveness should offer testable hypotheses. By offering hypotheses about the antecedents, causes, mechanisms, and consequences of forgiveness, as well as about the boundary conditions in which successful forgiveness occurs, researchers will be encouraged to submit theories of forgiveness to empirical study and counselors will be encouraged to "test" these models in their own counseling.

Sixth, models of forgiveness should be developed to direct counselors' efforts to encourage forgiveness in counseling. The literature on forgiveness contains models of the psychology of forgiveness and techniques for encouraging forgiveness, but not intermediate models to link the psychology of forgiveness with counseling techniques designed to encourage forgiveness. Along with continued elaboration of extant models of forgiveness, the development of congruent counseling models will facilitate the integration of theory, research, and practice and lead to a more comprehensive and applicable understanding of interpersonal forgiveness.

TABLE 1
 Developmental Models of Forgiveness and Their
 Relationship to Kohlberg's Theory

Kohlberg's Theory	Enright Model
Stage 1. Punishment and obedience orientation. Justice should be decided by an authority or one who punishes.	Stage 1. Revengeful forgiveness. Forgiveness is not possible without punishment to a degree of pain similar to the pain of the offense.
Stage 2. Relativist justice. A sense of reciprocity defines justice. ("If you help me, I will help you.")	Stage 2. Restitutional/compensational forgiveness. Forgiveness can occur out of guilt or if the offender offers some form of restitution.
Stage 3. Good boy/good girl justice. Group consensus determines what is right and wrong. The morality of behavior is based on the approval of others.	Stage 3. Expectational forgiveness. Forgiveness is a response to social pressure.
Stage 4. Law and order justice. Societal laws determine conceptions of justice. Laws are	Stage 4. Lawful expectational forgiveness. Forgiveness occurs in response to societal, moral,

upheld to maintain an orderly society.

Stage 5. Social contract orientation. Interest in maintaining the social fabric, with the realization unjust laws exist.

It is just and fair to work in the system for change.

Stage 6. Universal ethical principle orientation. Sense of justice is based on maintaining the individual rights of all persons. Conscience rather than laws or norms determines moral behavior.

Stage 7. Life is valued from a cosmic perspective.

Kohlberg's Theory

Stage 1. Punishment and obedience orientation. Justice should be decided by an authority or one who punishes.

Stage 2. Relativist justice. A sense of reciprocity defines justice. ("If you help me, I will help you.")

Stage 3. Good boy/good girl justice. Group consensus determines what is right and wrong. The morality of behavior

or religious pressure.

Stage 5. Forgiveness as social harmony. Forgiveness restores social harmony and right relationships.

Stage 6. Forgiveness as love. Forgiveness promotes love. The offense does not jeopardize love. Forgiveness increases the likelihood of reconciliation between the offender and the forgiver.

Nelson's Model

Stage 1. Preconsonance. Authority is resented. Forgiveness is motivated out of self-interest. Estrangement from others leads to exaggerated feelings of victimization. Primary response to offense is the desire for restitution and revenge. Individuals try to manipulate others for personal gain. Difficulty overlooking minor offenses.

Stage 2. Consonance. Adherence to rules for deciding when forgiveness is appropriate. Forgiver desires to appear as a

is based on the approval of others

Stage 4. Law and order justice. Societal laws determine conceptions of justice. Laws are upheld to maintain an orderly society.

Stage 5. Social contract orientation. Interest in maintaining the social fabric, with the realization unjust laws exist. It is just and fair to work in the system for change.

State 6. Universal ethical principle orientation. Sense of justice is based on maintaining the individual rights of all persons. Conscience rather than laws or norms determines moral behavior.

Stage 7. Life is valued from a cosmic perspective.

Kohlberg's Theory

Stage 1. Punishment and obedience orientation. Justice should be decided by an authority or one who punishes.

Stage 2. Relativist justice. A sense of reciprocity defines justice. ("If you help me, I will help you.")

Stage 3. Good boy/good girl justice. Group consensus

good person. Motivated by conceptions of fairness, justice, propriety. Forgiveness seems like the "right thing to do."

Forgiver wants to forgive because good interpersonal relationships are socially desirable.

Stage 3. Postconsonance.

Forgiver recognizes the innate value of others. Forgiver is more concerned with the value of others than with adherence to rules. Relationships themselves motivate forgiveness rather than self-interest or social pressures.

Spidell & Liberman's Model

Stage 1. Need for forgiveness is not felt. Guilt feelings do not exist. Person desires to maximize pleasure and to minimize pain.

Stage 2. Need for forgiveness is not felt. Interaction with others to satisfy personal needs with awareness that the needs of others may have to be met in order to meet one's own needs.

Stage 3. Guilt emerges out of internalized expectations. Guilt

determines what is right and wrong. The morality of behavior is based on the approval of others.

Stage 4. Law and order justice. Societal laws determine conceptions of justice. Laws are upheld to maintain an orderly society.

Stage 5. Social contract orientation. Interest in maintaining the social fabric, with the realization unjust laws exist. It is just and fair to work in the system for change.

Stage 6. Universal ethical justice is based on maintaining forgiveness rise out of failure the individual rights of all persons. Conscience rather than laws or norms determines moral behavior.

Stage 7. Life is valued from a cosmic perspective.

and need for forgiveness are responses to role failure and the withdrawal of approval and affection from significant others.

Stage 4. Guilt is an objective judgment of the religious community. Guilt is experienced when its laws are violated. Guilt

can only be alleviated by obedience to rules and loyalty to the established order.

Stage 5. A personal decision has been made to accept the principles of one's religious community and to make them one's own. Adherence to those principles that guarantee the greatest good for the greatest number of people.

Stage 6. Guilt and need for principle orientation. Sense of adhere to internalized standards that are considered valid in both religious and personal terms.

Stage 7. Realization that acceptance of God's grace is the only way to deal completely with guilt and the need for forgiveness

Note. See References for works cited for Kohlberg's theory and for the models of Enright et al., Nelson, and Spidell and Liberman.

REFERENCES

Augsburger, D. (1981). *Caring enough to forgive*. Ventura, CA: Regal.

Benson, C. K. (1992). Forgiveness and the psychotherapeutic process. *Journal of Psychology and Christianity*, 11, 76-81.

- Bonar, C. A. (1989). Personality theories and asking forgiveness. *Journal of Psychology and Christianity*, 8, 45-51.
- Brandsma, J. M. (1982). Forgiveness: A dynamic, theological, and therapeutic analysis. *Pastoral Psychology*, 31, 41-50.
- Cole, B., & Barone D. (August, 1992). Psychologists' attitudes toward the use of forgiveness. Paper presented at the 100th annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, Washington, DC.
- Cunningham, B. B. (1985). The will to forgive: A pastoral theological view of forgiving. *Journal of Pastoral Care*, 39, 141-149.
- Cunningham, B. B. (1992). The healing work of forgiving: A pastoral care response to alienation and abandonment. *Review and Expositor*, 89, 373-386.
- DiBlasio, F. A. (1992). Forgiveness in psychotherapy: A comparison of younger and older therapists. *Journal of Psychology and Christianity*, 11, 181-187.
- DiBlasio, F. A., & Proctor, J. H. (1993). Therapists and the clinical use of forgiveness. *American Journal of Family Therapy*, 21, 175-184.
- Droll, D. M. (1984). Forgiveness: Theory and research. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Nevada, Reno.
- Enright, R. D., Eastin, D. L., Golden, S., Sarinopoulos, I., & Freedman, S. (1992). Interpersonal forgiveness within the helping professions: An attempt to resolve differences of opinion. *Counseling and Values*, 36, 84-103.
- Enright, R. D., Gassin, E. A., & Wu, C. (1992). Forgiveness: A developmental view. *Journal of Moral Education*, 2, 99-114.
- Enright, R. D., & Human Development Study Group. (1991). The moral development of forgiveness. In W. Kurtines & J. Gewirtz (Eds.), *Handbook of moral behavior and development*, (Vol. 1; pp. 123-152). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Enright, R. D., Santos, M. J. D., & A1-Mabuk, R. (1989). The adolescent as forgiver. *Journal of Adolescence*, 12, 95-110.
- Gartner, J. (1988). The capacity to forgive: An object relations perspective. *Journal of Religion and Health*, 27, 313-320.
- Gilligan, C. (1982). *In a different voice*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Hope, D. (1987). The healing paradox of forgiveness. *Psychotherapy*, 24, 240-244.
- Huang, S. T. (1990). Cross-cultural and real-life validations of the theory of forgiveness in Taiwan, The Republic of China. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Human Development Study Group. (1991). Five points on the construct of forgiveness within psychotherapy. *Psychotherapy*, 28, 493-496.

Kelly, G. A. (1955). *A theory of personality*. New York: Norton.

Kohlberg, L. (1969). Stage and sequence: The cognitive-developmental approach to socialization. In D. A. Goslin (Ed.), *Handbook of socialization theory and research* (pp. 347-480). Chicago, IL: Rand McNally.

Kohlberg, L. (1973). Stages and aging in moral development--Some speculations. *The Gerontologist*, 13, 497-502.

Kohlberg, L. (1976). Moral stages and moralization: The cognitive-developmental approach. In T. Lickona (Ed.), *Moral development and behavior: Theory, research, and social issues* (pp. 31-53). New York: Holt.

Lapsley, J. N. (1966). Reconciliation, forgiveness, lost contracts. *Theology Today*, 22, 44-59.

Loewen, J. A. (1970). The social context of guilt and forgiveness. *Practical Anthropology*, 17, 80-96.

Martin, J. A. (1953). A realistic theory of forgiveness. In J. Wild (Ed.), *Return to reason* (pp. 313-332). Chicago, IL: Henry Regenry.

McCullough, M. E., & Worthington, E. L., Jr. (1994). Encouraging clients to forgive people who have hurt them: Review, critique, and research prospectus. *Journal of Psychology and Theology*, 22, 3-20.

Montville, J. V. (1989). Psychoanalytic enlightenment and the greening of diplomacy. *Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association*, 37, 297-318.

Moon, G. W., Bailey, J. W., Kwasny, J. C., & Willis, D. E. (1991). Training in the use of Christian disciplines as counseling techniques within explicitly Christian graduate training programs. *Journal of Psychology and Christianity*, 10, 154-165.

Nelson, M. K. (1992). *A new theory of forgiveness*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Purdue University, West LaFayette, IN.

Park, Y. O., Enright, R. D., & Gassin, E. A. (April, 1993). The development of forgiveness in the context of friendship conflict in Korea. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Christian Association of Psychological Studies (CAPS), Kansas City, MO.

Pattison, E. M. (1965). On the failure to forgive or to be forgiven. *American Journal of Psychotherapy*, 19, 106-115.

Pattison, E. M. (1989). Punitive and reconciliation models of forgiveness. In L. Aden and D.G. Benner (Eds.), *Counseling and the human predicament* (pp. 162-176). Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House.

- Pettitt, G. A. (1987). Forgiveness: A teachable skill for creating and maintaining mental health. *New Zealand Medical Journal*, 100,180-182.
- Pingleton, J.P. (1989). The role and function of forgiveness in the psychotherapeutic process. *Journal of Psychology and Theology*, 17, 27-35.
- Pingleton, J.P. (April, 1993). Why we don't forgive: Diagnosis and treatment of failures in the forgiveness process. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Christian Association of Psychological Studies (CAPS), Kansas City, MO.
- Rosenak, C. M., & Hamden, G. M. (1992). Forgiveness in the psychotherapeutic process: Clinical applications. *Journal of Psychology and Christianity*, 11,188--197.
- Shontz, F. C., & Rosenak, C. (1988). Psychological theories and the need for forgiveness: Assessment and critique. *Journal of Psychology and Christianity*, 7, 23--31.
- Smedes, L. B. (1984). *Forgive and forget: Healing the hurts we don't deserve*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Smith, M. (1981). The psychology of forgiveness. *Month*, 14, 301-307.
- Spidell, S., & Liberman, D. (1981). Moral development and the forgiveness of sin. *Journal of Psychology and Theology*, 9, 159-163.
- Strong, S. R. (1991a). Science in counseling psychology: Reply to Gelso (1991) and Patton and Jackson (1991). *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 38, 217-218.
- Strong, S. R. (1991b). Theory-driven science and naive empiricism in counseling psychology. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 38, 204-210.
- Thompson, R. D. (1983). The Wesleyan and the struggle to forgive. *Wesleyan Theological Journal*, 18, 81-92.
- Trainer, M. F. (1981). *Forgiveness: Intrinsic, role-expected, expedient, in the context of divorce*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Boston University, Boston, MA.
- Todd, E. (1985). The value of confession and forgiveness according to Jung. *Journal of Religion and Health*, 24, 39-48.
- Veenstra, G. (1992). Psychological concepts of forgiveness. *Journal of Psychology and Christianity*, 11,160-169.
- Wapnick, K. (1985). Forgiveness: A spiritual psychotherapy In E. M. Stem (Ed.), *Psychotherapy and the religiously committed patient* (pp. 47-53). New York: Hawthorne Press.

~~~~~  
By MICHAEL E. MCCULLOUGH, EVERETT L. WORTHINGTON, JR.

Michael E. McCullough is a doctoral candidate and Everett L. Worthington, Jr. is a professor of psychology, both at Virginia Commonwealth University, Department of Psychology, Box 2018, Richmond, VA 23284-2018. The authors wish to thank Judy M. Chartrand and Steven J. Sandage for insightful comments on earlier drafts of this article.

---

Copyright of Counseling & Values is the property of Wiley-Blackwell and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.