

Record: 1

Title: Promoting forgiveness: A comparison of two brief psychoeducational group interventions with a waiting-list control.

Authors: McCullough, Michael E., Louisiana Tech U, Behavioral Sciences Dept, Ruston, US
Worthington, Everett L.

Source: Counseling and Values, Vol 40(1), Oct, 1995. pp. 55-68.

Page Count: 14

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: Compared the effects of interpersonal (INT) and self-enhancement (SFE) psychoeducational group interventions promoting forgiveness for an offender, using 65 participants compared to 21 waiting-list controls that completed a forgiveness scale. Ss in the SFE group justified forgiveness because of its physical and psychological benefits to the forgiver, while Ss in the INT group justified forgiveness because of its utility in restoring interpersonal relationships. Both groups led to decreased feelings of revenge, increased positive feelings toward the offender, and greater reports of conciliatory behavior. The SFE group also increased affirming attributions toward the offender, decreased feelings of revenge, and increased conciliatory behavior more effectively than did the INT group. (PsycINFO Database Record (c) 2012 APA, all rights reserved)

Subjects: *Criminals; *Forgiveness; *Group Psychotherapy; *Psychoeducation

PsycINFO Classification: Group & Family Therapy (3313)

Population: Human

Age Group: Adulthood (18 yrs & older)

Methodology: Empirical Study

Format Covered: Print

Publication Type: Journal; Peer Reviewed Journal

Document Type: Journal Article

Release Date: 19960701

Correction Date: 20120416

Digital Object Identifier: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/j.2161-007X.1995.tb00387.x>

Accession Number: 1996-20730-001

Database: PsycINFO

PROMOTING FORGIVENESS: A COMPARISON OF TWO BRIEF PSYCHOEDUCATIONAL GROUP INTERVENTIONS WITH A WAITING-LIST CONTROL

The authors studied the effects of 2 brief psychoeducational group interventions on participants' forgiveness for an offender and compared them with a waiting-list control. The Self-Enhancement group justified forgiveness because of its physical and psychological benefits to the forgiver. The Interpersonal group justified forgiveness because of its utility in restoring interpersonal relationships. Both groups led to decreased feelings of revenge, increased positive feelings toward the offender, and greater reports of conciliatory behavior. The Self-Enhancement group also increased affirming attributions toward the offender, decreased feelings of revenge, and increased conciliatory behavior more effectively than did the Interpersonal group.

Forgiveness is a complex of affective, cognitive, and behavioral phenomena in which negative affect and judgment toward the offender are reduced, not by denying one's right to such affect and judgment, but by viewing the offender with compassion, benevolence, and love (Enright, Gassin, & Wu, 1992; Enright & Human Development Study Group, 1991). In the Judeo-Christian tradition, forgiveness is valued as a way of ameliorating situations in which one person has deeply and intentionally hurt another person.

Until recently, forgiveness has been ignored in psychology, perhaps because of its traditional connection with religion (Fitzgibbons, 1986; Pingleton, 1989). Ironically, survey research suggests that forgiveness is widely valued by therapists (Cole & Barone, 1992; DiBlasio, 1992; DiBlasio & Benda, 1991; DiBlasio & Proctor, 1993) and the American population at large (Gallup Organization, 1993; Gorsuch & Hao, 1993; Poloma & Gallup, 1991). Furthermore, forgiveness seems to be related to (a) reduction of anger, depression, and anxiety (Droll, 1984; Gassin, 1994; Trainer, 1981); (b) restoration of one's sense of personal power and self-esteem (Rhode, 1990; Trainer, 1981); (c) physical health (Huang, 1990; Strasser, 1984); and (d) improved relationships (Gerber, 1990; Nelson, 1992; Woodman, 1991). In fact, in modern society, with increasing amounts of stress, anger, violence, and relational discord, forgiveness could prove increasingly valuable for preventing problems and promoting well-being. Although forgiveness seems to be valued by and valuable to Americans at large, it remains unclear what intervention modalities would effectively encourage forgiveness and with what range of clients such interventions might be effective. Although many interventions have been proposed to stimulate forgiveness (for review see McCullough & Worthington, 1994), only one empirical evaluation exists (Hebl & Enright, 1993). That intervention involved an eight-session group therapy intervention with a small sample of older women. The

efficacy of forgiveness interventions in modalities other than short-term group therapy, and with more heterogeneous samples, remains unexplored. For instance, the promotion of forgiveness through counseling, educational interventions, or psychoeducational groups has not been investigated.

Furthermore, no research has identified the effective components of forgiveness interventions. One important component might be the rationale that clients are given for the importance of forgiveness. For example, Bergin's (1988) sacrificial figure technique encourages forgiveness as a way of "absorbing the pain that has been handed down across generations," so that the forgiver can become "a generator of positive change in the next generation" (p. 29). Bergin's technique refers to the interpersonal benefits of forgiveness to the forgiver and little to the intrapersonal benefits. In contrast, Hope (1987) and Pettitt (1987) commended forgiveness largely for its personal benefits, such as the reduction of negative emotions and physical symptoms. The efficacy of these methods of encouraging forgiveness is unknown.

To address the foregoing issues empirically, two 1-hour psychoeducational interventions to promote forgiveness were compared with each other and a waiting-list control group. The Interpersonal intervention encouraged participants to forgive because forgiveness was seen as being able to restore participants' relationships with the offenders and significant others, which is similar to the rationale of Bergin's (1988) technique. The Self-Enhancement intervention encouraged participants to forgive because forgiveness was seen as being able to yield physical and emotional benefits for the forgiver, as in the techniques of Hope (1987) and Pettitt (1987).

METHOD Participants

Participants were volunteers (N = 86) from psychology classes at a university in the southeastern United States. The sample (76% female) was polyethnic (i.e., 21% Black, 72% White, 7% other) and had a mean age of 21. Students received a small amount of credit in their courses for participating.

Psychoeducational Group Leaders

The two interventions were conducted in hour-long structured groups (n = 7 to 14 per group). Leaders were two male students in the third year of an American Psychological Association (APA)-approved doctoral program in counseling psychology. Both were trained in leading group therapy and structured groups.

Design

The design was a 3 x 3 [S] (condition x time [S]) repeated measures design. Participants were assigned to one of three conditions: interpersonal, self-enhancement, and waiting-list. Participants completed measures at three points in time: preintervention, postintervention, and at a 6-week follow-up.

Forgiveness Interventions

Interventions were designed in accordance with McCullough and Worthington's (1994) review of published forgiveness interventions. Interventions included didactic material, individual exercises, and discussion to help participants generate empathy for the offender, to develop new perspectives

on having been victimized, to recall their own needs to be forgiven, and to distinguish between forgiveness and reconciliation.

For example, both interventions included personal reflection and discussion designed to encourage concentration on the frailties and weaknesses of the offender that might illuminate the causes of the offender's behavior. This task was used to generate empathy for the offender.

Also, participants wrote letters expressing their feelings about the offenses and their consequences and described how they were working to forgive the offenders. This task was intended to shift participants' attention away from the particular hurts and consequences of the offenses they incurred, and to help them to focus their attention on their healing and eventual triumph over their hurts.

The only difference between the two interventions was the rationale for why forgiveness was a desirable goal. The interpersonal intervention justified forgiveness by emphasizing its beneficial effects on relationships. Group leaders stated that forgiveness is a means of escaping the bitterness, fear, and anger that may impair participants' relationships with the offender and significant others. The self-enhancement intervention justified forgiveness as a means of reducing the negative personal consequences of the offenses incurred, emphasizing the paradox of forgiveness discussed by Hope (1987): although voluntarily "letting go" of the offenses that one has incurred seems contrary to one's self-interest, it is ultimately more costly not to let go of such offenses. Group leaders emphasized that forgiveness could possibly lead to a reduction of obsessive thoughts regarding the offense; of emotions such as anger, fear, and bitterness; and of stress-related symptoms. The waiting-list control group did not participate in a group but expected to do so later in the semester.

Instruments

Personal Data Sheet. The Personal Data Sheet elicited participants' age, ethnicity (e.g., Asian, Black, Hispanic, White, other), sex, and a summary of an interpersonal offense they had incurred for which they had wanted, but were unable, to forgive the offender.

Wade's Forgiveness Scale. Forgiveness of the offender was measured with Wade's (1989) Forgiveness Scale. This 83-item scale includes 9 subscales. Woodman (1991) reported the following internal consistencies for each subscale:

- Revenge (.72)
- Freedom From Obsession (.65)
- Affirmation (.79)
- Victimization (.83)
- Feelings (.95)
- Avoidance (.91)
- Toward God (.90)

- Conciliation (.81)
- Holding a Grudge (.79)

Each of the 83 items differentiated persons who rated a significant other whom they had forgiven and those who rated a significant other whom they had not forgiven (Wade, 1989). Wade's measure correlates with measures of dyadic adjustment among spouses (Woodman, 1991). Items are endorsed on a 5-point Likert-type scale (1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree).

Procedure

Solicitation of participants. Participants were solicited in undergraduate psychology classes. People who had incurred an interpersonal hurt that they had wanted, but had been unable, to forgive were eligible to participate in the study. People with serious hurts, such as abuse and incest, required more serious attention than participation in this study would provide, and thus were not included in the study.

Preintervention assessment. Interested individuals (N = 320) received the Personal Data Sheet and Wade's Forgiveness Scale. Students completed the instruments during class or at home and returned them to the researcher. Of the packets distributed, 223 (70%) were returned. For this study, 104 students who correctly completed the instruments and who did not report severe offenses such as incest, sexual abuse, and family strife at early ages were assigned to a session based on participants' preference for times. Of the 104 persons scheduled, 86 (82.6%) arrived at their appointed time for the group sessions. Participation of these 86 persons by group was as follows: interpersonal group, 30; self-enhancement group, 35; and waiting-list control condition, 21.

Conduct of the groups. Both leaders led two groups for both interventions, or four groups total. Group leaders rehearsed scripts before conducting the groups to promote intervention fidelity. During the groups, leaders used cue sheets to remind them of the content of each intervention.

Postintervention assessment. At the end of the groups, leaders offered to answer questions or deal with issues that participants wanted to discuss individually. One person desired such attention and was debriefed individually by the group leader and the senior author. After this debriefing, she was referred to a university counseling center. Her data were not analyzed. In another room, participants completed Wade's Forgiveness Scale, which was administered by a graduate student who did not lead any of the groups.

Follow-up assessment. Six weeks after the groups were conducted, participants attended an assessment session in which they completed Wade's Forgiveness Scale. Follow-up assessment was conducted simultaneously for participants in all three conditions. Participants were debriefed, and interested participants of the control group were scheduled to participate in one of the two active interactions.

RESULTS Manipulation Check

To determine whether the differences in the two interventions were perceptible, students (N = 31) from introductory psychology classes heard an audiotape of the group leader's statements in the interpersonal or self-enhancement groups. Participants responded to an item that identified their

perceptions of the rationale provided for forgiveness. Ten of 14 (71%) students who heard the interpersonal intervention correctly identified the rationale presented for forgiveness. Fourteen of the 17 (82%) students who heard the self-enhancement intervention correctly identified the rationale presented for forgiveness. A one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) with intended rationale (interpersonal, self-enhancement) as an independent variable and perceived rationale (interpersonal, self-enhancement) as a dependent variable was significant, $F(1, 29) = 12.08, p < .01$. We therefore concluded that the interventions adequately manipulated the rationale for forgiveness.

The eight individual sessions were videotaped and reviewed by two independent, masked raters who were trained in the content of the two interventions by the first author. Raters checked each group for deviation from the outlines of the interventions to ensure that the groups were faithfully executed. Neither rater found any deviations from the outlines.

Descriptions of Offenses Reported by Participants

Each participant described the offense for which he or she had wanted, but had been unable, to forgive the offender. Major categories of offenses were (a) betrayal of confidence or insult by a friend (20%), (b) infidelity in a romantic relationship (14%), (c) termination of a romantic relationship or marriage (13%), neglect or insult by a parent (9%), (d) rejection by a friend or termination of a friendship (8%), and (e) argument or fight with a romantic partner or spouse (7%). The following narratives exemplify the offenses for which participants wanted to forgive.

I found out the man I had been seeing had been deceiving me and was sleeping with other women. We had been dating for over a year.

My best friend stabbed me in the back, lying and spreading rumors that made me look like a jerk. I'll always remember how she hurt me.

My mother, who was an alcoholic, would embarrass me in front of my friends when they came over. She liked privacy and resented me for interrupting her.

Efficacy of the Interventions in Promoting Forgiveness

The subscales of Wade's (1989) Forgiveness Scale were substantially intercorrelated at preintervention. Of 36 unique correlations, 22 were significant at $p < .001$ (median $r = .45, p = .001$). Intercorrelations of these subscales appear in Table 1. Means, standard deviations, and average Cronbach alphas appear in Table 2. To ensure the pretest equivalency of the three conditions on the nine forgiveness subscales, a one-way (Condition: Interpersonal, Self-Enhancement, Control) multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) on the nine subscales of forgiveness was conducted. We found no pretest differences, multivariate $F(18, 140) = .74, p = .77$.

To examine the effects of the interventions, we conducted a 3 (Condition: Interpersonal, Self-Enhancement, Control) x 2 (Time: Post, Follow-Up) multivariate analysis of covariance (MANCOVA) with repeated measures in which postintervention and follow-up scores on the nine forgiveness subscales were the repeated measures. The covariates were preintervention scores on the nine forgiveness subscales.

The main effect of condition, multivariate $F(18, 106) = 2.03, p = .01$, and time, multivariate $F(9, 62) = 5.2, p < .001$, were significant, although the interaction of condition and time was not, multivariate $F(18, 124) = 1.20, p = .27$. The loci of the multivariate main effects for condition and time were explored with nine 3 (Condition: Interpersonal, Self-Enhancement, Control) \times 2 (Time: Post, Follow-Up) analyses of covariance (ANCOVAs), using the nine forgiveness subscales as dependent variables. Significant effects were explored with Duncan's Multiple Range Test.

Tests of assumptions for ANCOVA. All nine preintervention measures were related to their respective postintervention and follow-up measures (all $r_s .38, p_s < .001$). Additionally, the nine forgiveness variables did not violate the homogeneity of covariance assumption, which we tested using Box's M statistic (all $p_s > .05$; see Tabachnick & Fidell, 1989).

Revenge. The main effect for condition was significant, $F(2,76) = 5.56, p < .01$. Individuals in the self-enhancement condition reported reduced feelings of revenge compared with individuals in the interpersonal or control conditions. Individuals in the interpersonal condition reported reduced feelings of revenge compared with individuals in the control condition. There was no main effect for time, $F(1, 77) = 3.42, p > .05$.

Freedom From Obsession. The main effect for condition was not significant, $F(2, 76) = 1.02, p > .05$. The main effect for time was significant, $F(1, 77) = 28.67, p < .01$. At follow-up, participants reported more freedom from obsessive thoughts regarding the offense and the offender than at postintervention.

Affirmation. The main effect for condition was significant, $F(2, 76) = 7.50, p < .01$. Participants in the self-enhancement condition reported more affirmation of the offender than did participants in the interpersonal or control conditions, which did not differ. There was no main effect for time, $F(1,77) = .82, p > .05$.

Victimization. The main effect for condition was not significant, $F(2, 76) = 2.01, p > .05$. The main effect for time was significant, $F(1, 77) = 17.23, p < .01$. At follow-up, participants reported feeling less victimized than at postintervention.

Feelings. The main effect for condition was significant, $F(2, 76) = 5.37, p < .01$. Participants in the interpersonal and self-enhancement conditions, who did not differ, reported greater positive feelings toward the offender than did participants in the control condition. The main effect for time was significant, $F(1, 77) = 35.65, p < .01$. Participants reported more positive feelings for the offender at follow-up than at postintervention.

Avoidance. The main effect for condition was not significant, $F(2, 75) = .76, ns$; nor was the main effect for time, $F(1, 76) = 3.60, p > .05$.

Toward God. The main effect for condition was not significant, $F(2, 75) = .00, ns$; nor was the main effect for time, $F(2,76) = 3.43, p > .05$.

Conciliation. The main effect for condition was significant, $F(2,75) = 6.92, p < .01$. Participants in the self-enhancement condition reported greater conciliatory thoughts and behaviors than did

participants in the interpersonal or control conditions. Participants in the interpersonal condition also reported greater conciliatory thoughts and behaviors than did participants in the control condition. The effect for time was not significant, $F(1, 76) = 3.96, p = .05$.

Holding a Grudge. The main effect for condition was not significant, $F(2,75) = 1.52, p > .05$. The effect for time was significant, $F(1, 76) = 10.03, p < .01$. Participants reported holding a grudge less at follow-up than at postintervention.

DISCUSSION Encouraging Forgiveness

Preliminary analyses suggest that groups were (a) delivered in a high-quality manner and (b) that differences among the experimental conditions on forgiveness variables following intervention were caused by the interventions rather than by differences among conditions that were present before intervention. The hypothesis that both interventions would promote forgiveness received some support. Participants in both interventions had less desire for revenge, more positive feelings toward the offender, and more desire for reconciliation than did control group participants. Participants in the self-enhancement condition also had more affirming thoughts and feelings toward the offender than did control group participants. Thus, it seems that intervention components that encourage empathy for one's offender, promote change in one's perspective on having been hurt, promote exploration of one's need to be forgiven, and distinguish forgiveness from reconciliation, along with the curative elements of group participation (Yalom, 1970), effectively promote forgiveness, as suggested in previous theoretical (Enright & Human Development Study Group, 1991; Fitzgibbons, 1986; Hope, 1987) and empirical work (Hebl & Enright, 1993).

The self-enhancement group was more effective than the interpersonal group at reducing feelings of revenge, increasing affirming thoughts regarding the offense, and promoting conciliatory thoughts and behaviors, although both interventions performed better than did the control condition on these dimensions. Participants may have found the discussion in the self-enhancement condition of Hope's (1987) paradox--that "letting go" of the hurts one has incurred is in one's best interest--more persuasive than the promise of interpersonal benefits, such as the restoration of relationships, as discussed in the interpersonal condition. Future research might explore the efficacy of these two rationales in concert, or identify client variables (e.g., religious commitment, severity of hurt, and moral development) that interact with the different rationales to influence intervention outcome.

Five subscales of forgiveness (i.e., Freedom from Obsession, Victimization, Avoidance, Toward God, and Holding a Grudge) were not influenced by either intervention. Although the interventions may simply have failed at encouraging these aspects of forgiveness, other interpretations are available. Because scores on the Feeling subscale and the Freedom From Obsession, Victimization, and Holding a Grudge subscales became more positive over time for the entire sample (including the control group), these subscales may reflect aspects of forgiveness that improve as a result of a natural change process and regardless of intervention. Perhaps, also, the completion of Wade's (1989) scale was itself an "intervention" that promoted forgiveness. Given the questionable construct validity of Wade's measure to date, discussing why the interventions led to changes on some subscales (but not others) and why the mere passage of time led to changes on some subscales (but not others) may be unwarranted. Creative intervention studies and validity studies could address these questions directly.

Limitations of This Research

Several methodological weaknesses limit the validity of this study's findings. Participants (N = 86) represented a small subset of the individuals initially solicited (N = 320). Results may have been influenced by self-selection and systematic drop-out at the time of volunteering, measurement, or group attendance. But this problem may be mitigated by its similarity to the self-selection process that occurs in real-life help seeking.

Generalization to clinical samples is unwarranted. For ethical reasons, the 37 individuals with the most severe hurts (i.e., incest, abuse, early family strife) were not included in the study. Such hurts are probably more representative of the clinical population than are those treated in this study. Also, participants were volunteers, not clients. Motivation, attention, and desire to change may have been different from those of actual clients.

The groups were not compared with an attention-only control group or with an established psychoeducational intervention. But this limitation may be mitigated by the superiority of the self-enhancement group over the interpersonal group, because the weaker group functionally serves as an attention control. Furthermore, although results were statistically significant, the lack of normative data for Wade's (1989) scale prohibits conclusions regarding practical significance.

These validity limitations notwithstanding, the interventions were at least modestly effective. Given the possibilities that forgiveness might hold for the primary and secondary prevention of psychological symptoms, relational strife, and physical violence, short-term psychoeducation to encourage forgiveness may be a cost-effective tool for primary and secondary prevention. For example, forgiveness-promoting groups could be used to (a) prevent violence in the public schools and among juvenile offenders, (b) promote adjustment to the hurts and discouragements of college life (e.g., through brief interventions in dormitories and counseling centers); (c) deal with the hostility and unforgiveness that characterize the Type A behavior pattern; and (d) promote the resolution of marital and family disharmony.

Directions for Future Research

There are several directions that research could take. First, brief psychoeducational groups that promote forgiveness should be field tested in a variety of applied settings. Interventions aimed at particular problems (e.g., romantic and marital discord, hurtful childhood memories, violent crime) might increase the efficacy of such brief interventions.

Second, longer forgiveness interventions should be designed and evaluated for clinical use. It is unlikely that durable change in a clinical population could be effected in less than six or eight sessions. Longer interventions would also allow the comparison of forgiveness interventions with established interventions for anger, anxiety, and interpersonal difficulties.

Third, field studies involving participants with more severe hurts would extend counselors' understanding of the clinical utility of forgiveness interventions. The relative efficacy of forgiveness interventions for individuals with different degrees of hurt could be addressed in attribute-treatment interaction studies.

Fourth, psychometric development should continue. Good measurement of forgiveness is indispensable for meaningful evaluation of techniques for encouraging forgiveness.

Fifth, in the study of the benefits of forgiveness, well-established indices should be used: (a) relationship quality, such as dyadic adjustment, trust, and commitment; (b) subjective well-being; and (c) mental and physical health, such as depression, anger, and blood pressure. Such measurement would be helpful in demonstrating the purported benefits of forgiveness that commend its use in counseling and psychoeducation.

TABLE 1. Intercorrelations of Forgiveness Scales at Preintervention

Legend for Chart:

- A - Variable
- B - Revenge
- C - Freedom From Obsession
- D - Affirmation
- E - Victimization
- F - Feelings
- G - Avoidance
- H - Toward God
- I - Conciliation
- J - Holding a Grudge

A	B	C	D
	E	F	G
	H	I	J
Revenge	--	--	--
	--	--	--
	--	--	--
Freedom From Obsession	-.337	--	--
	--	--	--
	--	--	--
	(.002)	--	--
	--	--	--
	--	--	--
Affirmation	-.597	.092	--
	--	--	--
	--	--	--
	(.000)	(.400)	--

	--	--	--
	--	--	--
Victimization	.561	-.403	-.242
	--	--	--
	--	--	--
	(.000)	(.000)	(.026)
	--	--	--
	--	--	--
Feelings	-.650	.612	.425
	-.457	--	--
	--	--	--
	(.000)	(.000)	(.000)
	(.000)	--	--
	--	--	--
Avoidance	.718	-.341	-.684
	.445	-.652	--
	--	--	--
	(.000)	(.001)	(.000)
	(.000)	(.000)	--
	--	--	--
Toward God	-.042	-.056	.251
	-.072	.183	-.057
	--	--	--
	(.702)	(.616)	(.021)
	(.515)	(.096)	(.604)
	--	--	--
Conciliation	-.503	-.145	.706
	-.162	.584	-.616
	.338	--	--
	(.000)	(.187)	(.000)
	(.139)	(.000)	(.000)
	(.002)	--	--
Holding a Grudge	.629	-.640	-.310

.573	-.789	.607
-.046	-.409	--
(.000)	(.000)	(.004)
(.000)	(.000)	(.000)
(.679)	(.000)	--

Note. Pearson product-moment correlations. Probability values appear in parentheses.

TABLE 2. Preintervention Means, Adjusted Postintervention and Follow-Up Means, Standard Deviations, Univariate Analyses, and Cronbach's Alphas for Forgiveness Subscales

Legend for Chart:

- A - Subscale
- B - Interpersonal, M
- C - Interpersonal, SD
- D - Self-Enhance, M
- E - Self-Enhance, SD
- F - Control, M
- G - Control, SD
- H - Univariate F, Treat
- I - Univariate F, Time
- J - Cronbach's alpha

A	B	C	D
	E	F	G
	H	I	J
Revenge [a]			
Pre	23.1	9.4	23.2
	7.7	20.2	9.8
	5.6[*]	3.4	.91
Post	22.0	8.1	20.0
	7.1	23.0	8.7
	--	--	--
Follow-up	20.1	8.6	18.4
	6.6	23.6	6.7
	--	--	--

Freedom From Obsession [b]

Pre	11.3	3.4	11.4
	3.1	11.3	3.3
	1.0	28.7[*]	.68
Post	11.6	2.6	11.6
	3.0	11.2	3.7
	--	--	--
Follow-up	14.1	3.2	12.7
	3.7	12.7	3.0
	--	--	--
Affirmation[c]			
Pre	28.6	7.6	28.1
	5.5	27.1	8.8
	7.5[*]	0.8	.87
Post	27.6	8.2	30.1
	5.9	27.4	7.4
	--	--	--
Follow-up	29.1	9.8	31.6
	5.7	25.9	7.3
	--	--	--
Victimization[d]			
Pre	19.2	3.0	18.8
	3.2	17.8	3.7
	2.0	17.2[*]	.75
Post	18.1	2.8	18.3
	3.7	18.5	3.9
	--	--	--
Follow-up	15.9	4.4	16.4
	4.0	18.9	4.2
	--	--	--
Feelings[e]			
Pre	71.5	17.8	71.7
	12.8	73.8	17.7

	5.4[*]	35.7[*]	.92
Post	74.5	16.2	80.6
	16.1	70.5	16.4
	--	--	--
Follow-up	85.5	20.8	88.9
	17.3	75.8	20.6
	--	--	--
Avoidance[f]			
Pre	23.4	8.3	22.8
	6.7	24.3	8.8
	0.8	3.6	.92
Post	23.2	7.8	22.3
	7.9	23.4	8.3
	--	--	--
Follow-up	22.0	9.5	20.7
	8.1	24.1	7.2
	--	--	--
Toward God[g]			
Pre	12.6	5.3	11.9
	4.1	11.8	5.4
	0.0	3.4	.91
Post	13.7	6.0	13.7
	4.8	14.0	5.7
	--	--	--
Follow-up	14.7	6.0	14.9
	4.3	14.6	5.4
	--	--	--
Conciliation[h]			
Pre	38.6	7.3	38.5
	6.4	37.0	9.0
	6.9[*]	4.0	.85

Post	38.7	7.3	43.4
	6.0	36.2	8.8
	--	--	--
Follow-up	40.6	8.6	43.4
	6.6	36.2	9.3
	--	--	--
Holding a Grudge[i]			
Pre	13.1	3.1	12.8
	3.7	12.5	3.2
	1.5	10.0[*]	.76
Post	12.3	3.4	11.6
	3.4	12.2	2.6
	--	--	--
Follow-up	10.2	3.9	10.2
	4.0	12.2	3.8
	--	--	--

Note. Subscales are based on Wade's Forgiveness Scale (1989). Item scores range from 1 = Strongly disagree to 5 = Strongly agree.

a Scale scores range from 10 to 50. b Scale scores range from 4 to 20. c Scale scores range from 9 to 45. d Scale scores range from 5 to 25, e Scale scores range from 26 to 130. f Scale scores range from 8 to 40. g Scale scores range from 5 to 25. h Scale scores range from 12 to 60. i Scale scores range from 4 to 20. j Scale scores range from 78 to 390.

* $p < .01$.

REFERENCES

- Bergin, A. E. (1988). Three contributions of a spiritual perspective to counseling, psychotherapy, and behavior change. *Counseling and Values*, 33, 21-31.
- Cole, B., & Barone, D. (1991, August). Psychologists' attitudes toward the use of forgiveness. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, Washington, DC.
- DiBlasio, F. A. (1992). Forgiveness in psychotherapy: A comparison of older and younger therapists. *Journal of Psychology and Christianity*, 11, 181-187.
- DiBlasio, F. A., & Benda, B. B. (1991). Practitioners, religion, and the use of forgiveness in the clinical setting. *Journal of Psychology and Christianity*, 10, 166-172.

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., 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.

Fitzgibbons, R. P. (1986). The cognitive and emotive uses of forgiveness in the treatment of anger. *Psychotherapy*, 23, 629-633.

Gallup Organization. (1993). *Life survey on prayer*. Princeton, NJ: Author.

Gassin, E. A. (1994, March). Forgiveness and psychological wholeness: A review of the empirical literature. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Christian Association for Psychological Studies, San Antonio, TX.

Gerber, L. (1990). Transformations in self-understanding in surgeons whose treatment efforts were not successful. *American Journal of Psychotherapy*, 44, 75-84.

Gorsuch, R. L., & Hao, J. Y. (1993). Forgiveness: An exploratory factor analysis and its relationship to religious variables. *Review of Religious Research*, 34, 333-347.

Hebl, J. H., & Enright, R. D. (1993). Forgiveness as a psychotherapeutic goal with elderly females. *Psychotherapy*, 30, 658-667.

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, Madison, WI.

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.

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

Pettitt, G. A. (1987). Forgiveness: A teachable skill for creating and maintaining 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.

Poloma, M. M., & Gallup, G. H., Jr. (1991). *Varieties of prayer: A survey report*. Philadelphia, PA: Trinity Press International.

Rhode, M. G. (1990). *Forgiveness, power, and empathy*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Fuller Graduate School of Psychology, Pasadena, CA.

Strasser, J. A. (1984). *The relation of general forgiveness and forgiveness type to reported health in the elderly*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Catholic University of America, Washington, DC.

Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (1989). *Using multivariate statistics* (2nd ed.). New York: Harper & Row.

Trainer, M. F. (1981). *Forgiveness: Intrinsic, role-expected, expedient, in the context of divorce*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Boston University, Boston, MA.

Wade, S. H. (1989). *The development of a scale to measure forgiveness*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Fuller Theological Seminary, Pasadena, CA.

Woodman, T. (1991). *The role of forgiveness in marital adjustment*. Unpublished dissertation, Fuller Theological Seminary, Pasadena, CA.

Yalom, I. D. (1970). *The theory and practice of group psychotherapy*. New York: Basic Books.

~~~~~

By MICHAEL E. McCULLOUGH and EVERETT L. WORTHINGTON, JR.

Michael E. McCullough is an assistant professor of psychology at Louisiana Tech University, Ruston, Louisiana. Everett L. Worthington, Jr., is a professor of psychology at Virginia Commonwealth University, Richmond, Virginia. The authors wish to thank Timothy R. Elliott, Robert G. Green, Donelson R. Forsyth, and Steven J. Sandage, for their comments on earlier drafts of this article. Special thanks is given to Paula Woehlke for lending her statistical expertise to the article. Correspondence regarding this article should be sent to Michael E. McCullough, Behavioral Sciences Department, P.O. Box 10048, Ruston, LA 71272.

---

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.