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Problem

Although the concept of forgiveness is very old, it has not been systematically studied until fairly recently. As forgiveness therapies and the empirical study of these therapies continue to emerge, the question of the counselor’s own sense of religiosity and forgiveness has not been considered. This study looked at the religiosity of counselors/psychotherapists and how this influences the degree to which they have forgiven an individual who has hurt or offended them, as well as whether a counselor’s religiosity influences their willingness to encourage a client to forgive someone who has hurt or offended them.
Purpose

The purpose of this study was to add to a counselor’s understanding of his or her role in the counseling relationship and how the counselor’s role influences this relationship. It also was designed to enhance the practice of psychotherapy.

Method

Because this study examined the relationship between the independent variable (religiosity of the counselor) and the dependent variable (willingness to encourage forgiveness), a correlational research design was employed. This research looked at the overall concept of religiosity and its relationship to willingness to forgive and encouragement to forgive.

Results

This study looked at the relationship of counselor religiosity and its effect on forgiveness and reconciliation as it relates to the practice of counseling. The quantitative portion found that there was no statistical relationship between a counselor’s religiosity and his or her own willingness to forgive an offender, and that there was no statistical relationship between a counselor’s religiosity and his or her own willingness to reconcile with an offender. Qualitative analysis found that the more religious a counselor believed him or herself to be, the more apt they were to encourage forgiveness of an offender. It was also found that the more religious a counselor believed him or herself to be, the more apt they were to encourage reconciliation with an offender. The qualitative portion also found that counselor willingness to reconcile with an offender did not play a role in encouraging a client to reconcile with an offender, and if a counselor recommended forgiveness he or she was also more likely to recommend reconciliation.
© Copyright by AnnMarie Cutting 2009

All Rights Reserved
COUNSELOR RELIGIOSITY AND ITS RELATIONSHIP TO THE
WILLINGNESS TO ENCOURAGE FORGIVENESS AND
RECONCILIATION IN CLIENTS

A dissertation
presented in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree
Doctor of Philosophy

by
AnnMarie Cutting

APPROVAL BY THE COMMITTEE:

____________________________
Chair: Frederick A. Kosinski, Jr.  Dean, School of Education
                          James Jeffery

____________________________
Member: Jerome Thayer

____________________________
Member: Dennis Waite

____________________________
External: Rebecca Katovsich  Date approved
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES ................................................................. v

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS .......................................................... viii

EPIGRAPH ................................................................. x

Chapter

I. INTRODUCTION ............................................................. 1

  Statement of the Problem .................................................. 2
  Purpose of the Study ......................................................... 3
  Research Questions .......................................................... 3
  Hypotheses ................................................................. 3
  Definition of Terms .......................................................... 5
  Basic Assumptions ........................................................... 5
  Delimitations ............................................................... 6
  Limitations ................................................................. 6
  Organization of the Study ................................................... 6

II. LITERATURE REVIEW ................................................... 8

  Background and Overview ............................................... 8
  Counselor Religiosity and Capacity to Forgive ......................... 17
  Counselor Religiosity and Willingness to Encourage Forgiveness ... 26
  Summary ................................................................. 39

III. METHODOLOGY ......................................................... 43

  Population and Sample .................................................... 43
  Research Instruments ....................................................... 44
  Data Collection Procedures .............................................. 45
  Null Hypotheses .......................................................... 46
  Data Analysis ............................................................ 47
IV. RESULTS ................................................................. 49
    Introduction ......................................................... 49
    Sample ............................................................... 49
    Measurement Results .............................................. 50
    Testing the Hypotheses .......................................... 50
    Interview Results ................................................. 76
    Interview Questions and Responses ............................ 79
    Summary ............................................................ 85

V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS ............ 88
    Findings and Discussion ........................................... 91
    Conclusions ........................................................ 96
    Recommendations for Further Research .......................... 99

Appendix

A. CORRESPONDENCE ................................................. 101
B. DEMOGRAPHICS QUESTIONNAIRE ................................. 110
C. RELIGIOSITY MEASURES QUESTIONNAIRE ........................ 112
D. SAMPLE ENRIGHT FORGIVENESS INVENTORY .................... 115
E. FORGIVENESS ENCOURAGEMENT INTERVIEW QUESTIONS ....... 122
F. AUTHORIZATION TO PERFORM STUDY ............................ 124

REFERENCE LIST ...................................................... 126

VITA ................................................................. 131
LIST OF TABLES

1. Six Forgiveness Dimensions and Religiosity Means and Standard Deviations . . . . 51
2. Inter-correlation Matrix for Religiosity, Forgiveness, and the Six Variables of Forgiveness ................................................................................................................. 54
3. Gender and Age .................................................................................................................. 56
4. Willingness to Forgive by Gender .................................................................................. 56
5. Willingness to Forgive by Age ....................................................................................... 56
6. Willingness to Forgive by Gender and Age .................................................................. 57
7. Gender and Years of Experience .................................................................................... 58
8. Willingness to Forgive by Gender .................................................................................. 58
9. Willingness to Forgive by Years of Experience ............................................................... 58
10. Willingness to Forgive by Gender and Years of Experience ......................................... 59
11. Willingness to Forgive by Gender and Religiosity .......................................................... 60
12. Willingness to Forgive by Religiosity When Considering Gender .................................. 61
13. Willingness to Forgive by Gender When Considering Religiosity .................................. 61
14. Willingness to Forgive by Religiosity and Gender .......................................................... 61
15. Willingness to Forgive by Years of Experience and Religiosity .................................... 62
16. Willingness to Forgive by Religiosity When Considering Years of Experience .................. 62
17. Willingness to Forgive by Years of Experience When Considering Religiosity ............... 63
18. Willingness to Forgive by Religiosity and Years of Experience          63
19. Age and Religiosity                                                                                                      64
20. Willingness to Forgive by Religiosity When Considering Age                64
21. Willingness to Forgive by Age When Considering Religiosity               64
22. Willingness to Forgive by Religiosity and Age                           65
23. Correlation Table for Religiosity and Reconciliation                  66
24. Willingness to Reconcile by Gender and Age                              67
25. Willingness to Reconcile by Gender When Considering Age                 68
26. Willingness to Reconcile by Age When Considering Gender                 68
27. Willingness to Reconcile by Gender and Age                              68
28. Gender and Years of Experience                                           69
29. Willingness to Reconcile by Years of Experience                         70
30. Willingness to Reconcile by Gender When Considering Years of Experience 70
31. Willingness to Reconcile by Gender and Years of Experience              70
32. Willingness to Reconcile by Gender and Religiosity                      72
33. Willingness to Reconcile by Gender When Considering Religiosity         72
34. Willingness to Reconcile by Religiosity When Considering Gender          72
35. Willingness to Reconcile by Gender and Religiosity                      73
36. Willingness to Reconcile by Years of Experience and Religiosity         73
37. Willingness to Reconcile by Years of Experience When Considering Religiosity 73
38. Willingness to Reconcile by Religiosity When Considering Years of Experience 74
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The assistance and understanding that has been given by each member of the doctoral committee of the writer is acknowledged with sincere and deep appreciation. Special gratitude is extended to Dr. Frederick Kosinski. Without his supervision and continued counsel and guidance this work would have been daunting. I am indebted to Dr. Jerome Thayer, for the time he spent helping me analyze the data and his continued encouragement. I am also grateful to Dr. Dennis Waite for his support.

Words are too inadequate to express my gratitude to my friend and mentor, Dr. Larry Teitsma, without whose support and encouragement I would have surely failed. His journey ahead of me in this type of study has made my travel easier.

Friendship cannot be underestimated, and I am truly appreciative of the encouragement I received from my friend, Merrill Graham, who travels with me on the road of doctoral studies. She held the light at the end of the tunnel when it was too dark for me to see.

Family is also very important. I will be forever grateful to my father, Fay Rettinhouse, for teaching me to love learning, to strive to be the best I can be, and most importantly to love the Lord. His early training and affection will be with me always.

Children are a blessing from the Lord and I thank my five children, Jonathan, Janice, Rachel, Rebekah, and Aaron, for their patience with me as I spent much time in
study and writing while they grew up. I thank them for their forgiveness for the dinners missed while I was in class and for the time I was physically present but mentally miles away. I would also like to acknowledge my son-in-law Jeff for encouraging me by accomplishing his goals and being like another son to me, and to my granddaughter, Ellorie, for blessing my heart with her beautiful smiles.

I am indebted to my loving husband, Jack. He has been my compass during this project. He has been my companion, helpmate, and he has journeyed with me through my ups and downs. I especially thank him for his constant encouragement, support, and wisdom, and for doing the dishes.

Lastly, I am eternally indebted to my Heavenly Father who has surrounded me with so many loving, wonderful people. He has lifted me up and given me strength when I grew weary. He has truly blessed my life.
EPIGRAPH

"But those who wait on the Lord shall renew their strength; they shall mount up with wings like eagles, they shall run and not be weary, they shall walk and not faint."

--Isaiah 40:31
CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Within the past decade, a number of scientific studies (Baskin & Enright, 2004; Denton & Martin, 1998; Erikson, Korte, & Marston, 2002) have begun to document what religious leaders, theologians, and philosophers have long speculated: Forgiveness is a potentially significant modality for increasing a sense of well-being and improving interpersonal relations for both clients and counselors alike.

Based on the importance that spirituality and religion have to many people, counselors should be prepared for clients who may want to talk about their faith as it relates to various life issues, forgiveness being one of them. Unfortunately, many counselors may not be ready or able to do so. The very nature of the therapeutic setting requires that counselors recognize what motivates people to act the way they do, and what may have compelled them to seek out treatment in the first place.

Forgiveness as a psychological construct has recently become a topic of increasing interest to researchers. Information about forgiveness is appearing in the psychological literature with greater frequency because of this increased research focus. In addition, it is achieving greater acceptance as a psychological construct. Freedman and Enright (1996) pointed out that although forgiveness was formerly a topic of inquiry for theologians and philosophers, it is now becoming acceptable in counseling and psychology as well.
Despite this growing interest, there has been little consensus reached among investigators concerning the potential positive, negative, or neutral impact of religion on mental and physical health. A number of past studies (Enright, Eastin, Golden, Sarinopoulos, & Freedman, 1992; Glock & Stark, 1965) as well as those more recent have measured religiosity solely in terms of either church attendance or church membership. The multi-dimensional concept has become more popular since Glock and Stark’s description in 1965 of five dimensions of religiosity (Glock & Stark, 1965). Other researchers have subsequently refined these five dimensions by dropping some of the dimensions and adding others through the method of factor analysis (Gonzalez, Koenig, Moberg, & Smiley, 1988). From this background, the research for this dissertation is designed to investigate the relationship between the counselor’s own overall religiosity and his or her attitude toward forgiveness and the effect this has on the issue of forgiveness in the therapeutic process.

Statement of the Problem

Although the concept of forgiveness is truly ancient, it has not been systematically studied until fairly recently. As forgiveness therapies and the empirical study of these therapies continue to emerge, the question of the counselor’s own sense of religiosity and forgiveness has not been considered. This study proposed to look at the religiosity of counselors/psychotherapists and how this influences the degree to which they have forgiven an individual who has hurt or offended them, as well as whether a counselor’s religiosity influences their willingness to encourage a client to forgive someone who has hurt or offended them.
Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to add to a counselor’s understanding of his or her role in the counseling relationship and how the counselor’s role influences this relationship, and to enhance the practice of psychotherapy.

Research Questions

This study proposed to answer the following questions:

1. Does a counselor’s religiosity influence his or her willingness to forgive and reconcile with people who have hurt or offended him or her?

2. Does a counselor’s religiosity influence his or her willingness to encourage a client to forgive and reconcile with someone who has hurt or offended him or her?

3. Does a counselor’s willingness to forgive an offender influence his or her willingness to encourage a client to forgive and reconcile with someone who has hurt or offended him or her?

4. Is there a relationship between gender, age, and years of counseling experience and willingness to forgive or to reconcile with an offender?

5. Is there an interaction between gender, age, and years of counseling experience and religiosity as they relate to willingness to forgive or reconcile with an offender?

Hypotheses

The following hypotheses were formulated for investigation:

1. There is a relationship between counselor religiosity and willingness to forgive an offender as measured by the capacity to:

   a. Overcome negative affect toward an offender.
b. Overcome negative behavior toward an offender.

c. Overcome negative cognition toward an offender.

d. Experience positive affect toward an offender.

e. Experience positive behavior toward an offender.

f. Experience positive cognition toward an offender.

2. There is a relationship between gender, age, and years of counseling experience, and willingness to forgive an offender.

3. There is an interaction between gender, age, years of counseling experience, and religiosity as they relate to willingness to forgive an offender.

4. There is a relationship between counselor religiosity and willingness to reconcile with an offender.

5. There is a relationship between gender, age, and years of counseling experience and willingness to reconcile with an offender.

6. There is an interaction between gender, age, years of counseling experience, and religiosity as they relate to willingness to reconcile with an offender.

7. There is a relationship between counselor religiosity and willingness to encourage clients to forgive offenders.

8. There is a relationship between counselor religiosity and willingness to encourage a client to reconcile with an offender.

9. There is a relationship between counselor willingness to forgive an offender and willingness to reconcile with an offender.

10. There is a relationship between counselor willingness to encourage a client to forgive and willingness to encourage a client to reconcile with an offender.
**Definition of Terms**

*Forgiveness:* An inner process by which the person who has been injured releases himself or herself from the anger, resentment, and fear that is felt and does not wish for revenge. It is conceptualized as a multidimensional construct involving cognitive, affective, and behavioral components.

*Religiosity:* Relating to or manifesting faithful devotion to an acknowledged ultimate deity, a commitment to biblically based religious beliefs and practices.

*Pastoral Counselor:* An individual who is a registered member of the American Association of Pastoral Counselors (AAPC). They practice pastoral counseling at an advanced level, integrating religious resources with insights from behavioral sciences. Requirements for membership are as follows: (a) must be a member of a human service profession which has an interest in the ministry of pastoral counseling, pastoral counselor training, or in pastoral counseling centers, (b) must be duly licensed/certified by a state, or credentialed by a professional human service association, (c) must have an active relationship to a local religious community, and (d) must have 375 hours of pastoral counseling with 125 hours of supervision of that counseling with an AAPC Diplomate or AAPC Fellow.

**Basic Assumptions**

In this study it was assumed that:

1. The responses of the Pastoral Counselors reflect their accurate and honest opinions.

2. Religiosity and willingness to forgive can be measured.
Delimitations

The population of this study was limited to active registered members of the American Association of Pastoral Counselors (AAPC) in the United States. Members of this organization are recognized Pastoral Counselors, and may be licensed in the areas of Counseling, Psychology, Social Work, and/or Marriage and Family counseling.

Limitations

This study was limited to those counselors who responded to the request for participation in this study and returned the questionnaires and measurement instruments. The results may not be generalized to other groups of counselors who may not ascribe to Judeo-Christian beliefs. Judeo-Christian beliefs for the purpose of this study relate to beliefs based on the person and teachings of Jesus Christ and the Bible.

Organization of the Study

Chapter 1 includes the introduction, statement of the problem, purpose of the study, research questions, hypotheses, definitions of terms, delimitations, basic assumptions, and limitations of the study.

Chapter 2 contains a review of related literature that deals with research on forgiveness and religiosity and how this influences a counselor’s willingness to encourage a client to forgive.

Chapter 3 explains the methodology used.

Chapter 4 describes the demographic data, testing of hypotheses, and questionnaire results and presents the findings of the research.
Chapter 5 describes a summary of the findings, conclusions, implications, and recommendations for future research.

Appendices and references complete the report of this research.
CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

Background and Overview

Within the past decade, a number of scientific studies have begun to document what religious leaders, theologians, and philosophers have long speculated: Forgiveness is a potentially significant modality for increasing a sense of well-being and improving interpersonal relations for both clients and counselors alike. Although the scientific literature remains sparse as it applies to specific cases, the studies to date tend to agree that forgiving is effective in resolving feelings of remorse, guilt, anger, anxiety, and fear (Kanz, 2000). The significant benefits of forgiveness have been identified in a wide range of diverse populations such as incest survivors, substance abusers, and cancer patients (Freedman & Enright, 1996). Furthermore, the results of a 1991 Gallup poll showed that 94% of adult Americans believe in God or in a universal spirit. In addition, 68% of American adults are members of a church, synagogue, or place of worship, and 58% of the same population rated religion as being very important in their lives (Stevens & Wolf, 2001). A more recent Gallup poll indicated that 96% of adult Americans believe in God or in a universal spirit (Gallup Organization, 1994). Stevens and Wolf (2001) also point to a recent increase in interest in spiritual and religious issues in the United States, as evidenced by increased coverage of these issues in the national media, newspapers, magazines, books, and television specials. Similarly, in the fields of counseling and
psychology, there has been a growing awareness about the importance of incorporating spirituality and religion into psychotherapy (Stevens & Wolf, 2001). For instance, in the code of ethics, the American Psychological Association (APA) acknowledged religion as being a component of human diversity. In addition, the *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, 4th edition* (APA, 2000), includes spiritual problems as a V-code. Furthermore, both the American Counseling Association and the American Association for Marriage and Family Therapy have identified religion as an element of human diversity. According to the American Association of Pastoral Counselors (1992), 66% of the people surveyed reported that they preferred a professional counselor who represented spiritual values and beliefs, and 81% indicated that they preferred to have their own values and beliefs integrated into the process. In fact, the ability to forgive and the willingness to be forgiven, together with a sense of religiosity in an individual’s life, were both cited among the top 10 reasons why people stay married. The results of a study by Fenell (1993), who used a modified “Delphi method,” a consensus-building technique to narrow down a larger list of marital characteristics, identified the 10 most important ones cited in long-term successful marriages. The researcher used a panel of individuals with expert knowledge of this subject, who engaged in a three-round process of elimination to arrive at the desired consensus (Fenell, 1993).

According to Fenell’s (1993) study, the 10 most important characteristics, in order from most to least important, were identified as:

1. Lifetime commitment to marriage
2. Loyalty to spouse
3. Strong moral values
4. Respect for spouse as a friend

5. Commitment to sexual fidelity

6. Desire to be a good parent

7. Faith in God and spiritual commitment

8. Desire to please and support spouse

9. Good companion to spouse

10. Willingness to forgive and be forgiven (Fenell, 1993, p. 448).

Similarly, Hattie, Meyers, and Rosen-Grandon (2004) reported that the most important characteristics of loving marriages identified in their investigation were respect, forgiveness, romance, support, and sensitivity (p. 58). Based on the importance that spirituality and religion have to so many people, counselors should be prepared for clients who may want to talk about their faith as it relates to various life issues; unfortunately, many counselors may not be ready or able to do so. While a survey of clinical psychologists determined that almost three-quarters (74%) of them considered religious issues to be relevant in clinical practice, two-thirds of the respondents also agreed with the statement, “Psychologists, in general, do not possess the knowledge or skills to assist individuals in their religious or spiritual development” (Griffith & Griggs, 2001, p. 14). Despite these constraints, the very nature of the therapeutic setting demands that counselors recognize what motivates people to act the way they do, and what may have compelled them to seek out treatment in the first place. According to Helminiak’s (2001) essay, “Treating Spiritual Issues in Secular Psychotherapy,” “Human healing and wholesome growth are concerns in both spirituality and counseling. Traditionally, religiously affiliated spirituality defined wholesome growth even as psychotherapy often
does today. Thus, it seems that spirituality is inherently relevant to psychotherapy, and it has been argued that therapy entails spiritual matters” (p. 163). Based on the complexity and highly individualistic nature of these issues, many counselors may feel ill prepared and, therefore, reluctant to avail themselves of the benefits these domains may possess for the therapeutic community (Griffith & Griggs, 2001). Finally, there have been several publications devoted strictly to religious counseling in recent years (Stevens & Wolf, 2001).

The current interest in forgiveness in terms of precisely what it is, how it works, and whether and how it can be applied in counseling settings is taking place after years of disinterest and actual avoidance of the subject by research scientists (Kanz, 2000). In spite of the fact that, for millennia, the benefits of forgiveness have been cited by most societies and cultures as being valuable and worthy of emulation, there has been a general reluctance to investigate the phenomena; Denton and Martin (1998) suggest the hesitancy is the result of associating forgiving with religion, not science.

Nevertheless, the fact remains that forgiveness, as a psychological construct, has recently become a topic of increasing interest to researchers. Information about forgiveness is appearing in the psychological literature with greater frequency because of this increased research focus. In addition, it is achieving greater acceptance as a psychological construct. Freedman and Enright (1996) pointed out that although forgiveness was formerly a topic of inquiry for theologians and philosophers, it is now becoming acceptable in counseling and psychology as well. The publication of forgiveness-related articles in mainstream journals has also addressed the acceptance of forgiveness in the fields of psychology and counseling (Freedman & Enright, 1996).
Despite this growing interest, there has been little consensus reached among investigators concerning the potential positive, negative, or neutral impact of religion on mental and physical health. This debate may be partially attributable to the great variety of instruments used to measure religiosity, a consequence of the lack of a universally acceptable characterization of the religiosity variable. There is considerable controversy over whether religiosity is a unidimensional or multi-dimensional concept (Gonzalez et al., 1988). A number of past studies as well as more recent studies have measured religiosity solely in terms of either church attendance or church membership; however, the multi-dimensional concept has become more popular since Glock and Stark’s description in 1965 of five dimensions of religiosity: belief, ritual, experience, knowledge, and consequences (Glock & Stark, 1965). Other researchers have subsequently refined these dimensions by dropping some of the dimensions and adding others through the method of factor analysis; unfortunately, there has still been little agreement on which dimensions are most relevant or how these should be measured (Gonzalez et al., 1988).

The subject and benefits of forgiveness have also recently appeared in the popular media, which portrays forgiveness as a simplistic phenomenon; however, according to many psychological researchers, forgiveness tends to be a beneficial process that takes time and effort. In other words, according to forgiveness researchers, forgiveness may be a more difficult process than that displayed in the media (Kanz, 2000).

Research has revealed that forgiveness may be more difficult for certain groups than for others; for example, college students may be less forgiving and have more anxiety than their same-gender parents, specifically when looking at a developmentally
relevant area (Kanz, 2000). Enright, Gassin, and Wu (1992, as cited in Enright & The Human Development Study Group, 1996) state that the development of trust is usually a part of forgiveness; nevertheless, people may forgive without having to trust the offender in a problematic area. Age was not studied as it relates to the ability to forgive an offender. Religious individuals may be more forgiving because, in general, “Christians value forgiveness” (McCullough & Worthington, 1994). According to McCullough and Worthington (1994) certain groups can be distinguished from one another on the basis of their respective valuation of forgiveness; groups identified were “marijuana users and non-users, individuals high and low in Machiavellianism, and females aspiring to traditional and nontraditional occupations” (p. 6). Forgiveness may also be more difficult for victims of incest, rape, or other interpersonal hurts than for non-victims (Kanz, 2000). Kanz suggests that, “essentially, forgiveness may be an important process, although more highly valued by some groups than others” (p. 174). Forgiveness has also been explored in different ways in the few quantitative studies that have been conducted on forgiveness. One common method used is client self-report, a technique used in case studies about forgiveness (Worthington & DiBlasio, 1990). Instruments that are specifically designed to measure forgiveness have also been developed and used; these instruments focus on cognitions, emotions, and behaviors in some fashion or another (Kanz, 2000).

Existing definitions of forgiveness do not generally provide counselors with enough specificity to provide themselves or their clients with an adequate understanding of the underlying concepts to make them effective in a treatment setting. Deveney et al. (2002) point out that this general lack of understanding constrains the ability of developing insightful research as well as hinders clinical applications; however, there
have been some distinct areas of consensus that have emerged from the growing body of
literature on the subject. Deveney and her colleagues (2002) note that Denton and
Martin’s (1998) definition of forgiveness is fairly representative; Denton and Martin
indicate that forgiveness involves

two people, one of whom has received a deep and long-lasting injury that is either
psychological, emotional, physical, or moral in nature. [Forgiveness is] an inner
process by which the person who has been injured releases himself or herself from the
anger, resentment, and fear that are felt and does not wish for revenge. (p. 284)

Likewise, Hargrave and Sells (1997) suggested that forgiveness is a process that
can only take place over time, from which the individual who has been injured becomes
less angry, resentful, fearful, and interested in revenge.

There is an important distinction between forgiving and forgetting, pardoning,
condoning, excusing, or denying the offense. According to Witvliet (2001),

Areas of disagreement that have emerged among practitioners include the relationship
between forgiveness and reconciliation, whether forgiveness is a necessary
component of personal growth, and whether one has to feel love and compassion
toward the offender in order to forgive. (p. 210)

While such religious understandings are general and largely subjective, scientific
definitions by contrast are of necessity circumscribed and concrete. To date, the growing
body of research on forgiveness presents a variety of definitions for forgiveness. Enright,
North, and Worthington (2000) have described the cognitive, emotional, and behavioral
elements of forgiveness from their philosophical and theological perspectives. Witvliet
(2001) believes that it is important to differentiate forgiveness from other similar
concepts:

Forgiveness does not involve forgetting, ignoring, denying, overlooking, excusing,
minimizing, tolerating, exonerating, or condoning. Further, it is distinct from
reconciling, and it does not replace the role of justice. Rather, it involves a two-
pronged response: releasing the negative feelings toward the offender, and enacting merciful responses toward the wrongdoer. (p. 212)

From Enright and colleagues’ (2000) perspective, forgiveness can only take place when the victim can “view the wrongdoer with compassion, benevolence, and love while recognizing that he has willfully abandoned his right to them” (p. 325). As research related to forgiveness continues, it is reasonable to expect that other researchers will operationalize forgiveness based solely on a set of conciliatory behaviors (this approach would allow for primate and cross-species studies). Should such studies take place, we may learn much from animal studies (as we have about the psychophysiology of fear, for example); however, we need human research to understand the involvement and interaction of the spiritual, cognitive, emotional, overt behavioral, social, and physical dimensions of granting and receiving forgiveness. Indeed even when we study humans, we will need multiple studies using multiple methodologies and clear definitions to best understand forgiveness. (Witvliet, 2001, p. 212)

In this regard, Worthington (1998) suggests that the concept of forgiveness is sufficiently complex that it justifies a variety of studies to assess the effects of single and repetitive offenses, the act of forgiveness and the trait of forgivingness, the experience of forgiveness from God, and others and oneself, the psychological and physical correlates of forgiveness, and the ways that forgiving differs from reconciling, exonerating, or condoning (Witvliet, 2001).

To date, the empirical research on forgiveness and health has been focused on broad understandings of forgiveness and its embodiment across people with different faith commitments and experiences; Witvliet (2001) points out that the majority of this research has focused on the perspective of the person granting forgiveness to other people. Similar problems concerning precise definitions and operationalized concepts
exist among clinicians concerning religiosity and the part it can potentially play, if at all, in counseling settings.

Webster (2009) defines “religiosity” as “relating to or manifesting faithful devotion to an acknowledged ultimate reality or deity.” Levin and Schiller (1987) make the further distinction of institutionalized and interiorized religiosity. These authors defined interiorized religiosity as “an individually experienced and subjectively interpreted phenomenon, that can be characterized by cognitive and affective traits, such as . . . ‘faith’ or the particular salient beliefs held by an individual” (p. 11). Religion and spirituality are terms for which there are a wide variety of definitions and contexts; however, the definitions of religion and spirituality provided by Wright, Watson, and Bell (1996) are reflective of definitions presented in numerous other sources. Wright et al. defined religion as being “shared, usually institutionalized, values and beliefs about God [implying] involvement in religious community” (p. 31). By contrast, spirituality refers to a personal belief in and experience of a supreme being or an ultimate human condition, along with an internal set of values and active investment in those values, a sense of connection, a sense of meaning, and a sense of inner wholeness within or outside formal religious structures. (Wright et al., 1996, p. 31)

Therefore, religion and spirituality are interrelated but are not exactly alike; one can be religious and not spiritual, spiritual but not religious, as well as spiritual and religious. It should be noted here that religion is a particular system of faith and worship, while religiosity is the practice of a particular system of faith and worship.

Richards and Bergin (1997) provide a distinction between the two terms; religion tends to be “denominational, external, cognitive, behavioral ritualistic, and public” (p. 31); by contrast, spirituality tends to be “universal, ecumenical, internal, affective,
spontaneous, and private” (p. 31). In addition, in the incorporation of religion and spirituality into the counseling process, the term clinical integration is often used; clinical integration refers to Hall and Hall’s (1997) definition: “The term clinical integration, broadly defined, refers to the incorporation of religious or spiritual beliefs, values, and methods into the process of psychotherapy that results in a different way of being a therapist, understanding the client, or doing therapy” (p. 86). There is much to consider when confronted with the issue of religiosity and forgiveness in general, and the waters become even cloudier when they are applied to clinical settings. According to Griffith and Griggs (2001), “Spirituality and religion are important concerns for many people; consequently, counselors must possess the knowledge and skills required for assisting clients with these issues” (p. 14). Therefore, to help shed some new light on a complex issue, a review of the scholarly and peer-reviewed literature is provided to determine how a counselor’s own religiosity affects the degree to which they have forgiven an individual who hurt or offended them, as well as whether a counselor’s religiosity influences their willingness to encourage a client to forgive someone who has hurt or offended them.

Counselor Religiosity and Capacity to Forgive

Baskin and Enright (2004) reported that the scientific investigation of forgiveness interventions emerged as a promising new field in the last years of the 20th century. While the concept of forgiveness is truly ancient, Baskin and Enright also pointed out that it has not been systematically studied until fairly recently. “Significant to counseling because of its interpersonal nature, forgiveness issues are relevant to the context of marriage and dating relationships, parent-child relationships, friendships, professional relationships, and others. In addition, forgiveness is integral to emotional constructs such
as anger” (Baskin & Enright, 2004, p. 79). As forgiveness therapies and the empirical study of these therapies continue to emerge, the questions as to whether these interventions can consistently provide efficacious results on the various levels of forgiveness and on the mental health of targeted clients have assumed new importance.

In his book, *The Reconciled Life: A Critical Theory of Counseling*, R. Paul Olson (1997) advised that “because any theory of counseling grounded in a faith tradition expresses a particular position on the relation between theology and psychology, it is helpful to be aware of some of the alternatives with respect to the latter as a context for development of the former” (p. 29). Since Sigmund Freud’s (1989) rejection of all religion as a collective neurosis as stated in *The Future of an Illusion*, there has been a strain between psychology and religion. Yet, the debate among psychotherapists concerning the association between personal religion and mental health has increased in recent years. In this regard, Allen Bergin (1980) noted that there was a paucity of attention being paid by psychologists to the potential therapeutic value of religion, and he strongly reiterated his own positive view of religion in clinical applications: “I believe that religion can be powerfully benevolent” (Bergin, 1980, p. 643). In response, Albert Ellis (1980) speculated that devout, orthodox, or dogmatic religion (or what might be called religiosity) is significantly correlated with emotional disturbance. People largely disturb themselves by believing strongly in absolutistic shoulds, oughts, and musts. . . . The devoutly religious person tends to be inflexibly closed, intolerant, and unchanging. Religiosity, therefore, is in many respects equivalent to irrational thinking and emotional disturbance. (p. 637)

Clearly, the views of psychotherapists on the relationship between religion and mental health cover a very wide spectrum (Batson, Schoenrade, & Ventis, 1993).
From its beginnings, psychology has attempted to become a natural science that is modeled after physics; as a result, in some respects, it has assumed many characteristics that make it less of a human science. According to Olson (1997),

with the exception of a small number of psychologists, very few in academic psychology have dared to derive an applied psychology from any of the world’s magnificent religions, despite the fact that nearly every world religion includes not only a metaphysic and an ethic, but an anthropology as well. (p. 28)

Olson suggests that it is the latter that appreciates the spiritual dimension of human experience as the realm of meaning and values, wisdom, courage, and compassion, mystery, and reverent wonder. “To ignore the spiritual dimensions of life is to be less than comprehensive; it is also bad science, for it amounts to a denial of what it means to be fully human. Humans experience life in a spiritual dimension as well as in bio-psychosocial dimensions” (Olson, 1997, p. 29).

The rejection of any religiously based psychology is presumed justified in part because including religious constructs, especially those lacking an operational (measurable) definition, would violate the scientific principles of verifiability or falsifiability. These epistemological principles have been developed based on the tenets of logical positivism, which maintain that only those claims that can be proven true or false according to scientific method can truly be regarded as being legitimate; in other words, by definition, any statement that cannot either be supported or refuted by empirical testing cannot be considered to be a true scientific statement (Olson, 1997). In fact, Olson comments on Sarason’s observation: “This result should not be surprising in light of the observation that the majority of psychologists are either agnostic or atheistic and consider other religious psychologists as a puzzlement if not pathological. Sarason made this observation in August 1992 at the Centennial Address before the American
Psychological Association” (Olson, 1997, p. 47). Indeed, in their book, *Religion and Psychology: Mapping the Terrain; Contemporary Dialogues, Future Prospects*, Jonte-Pace and Parsons (2001) have pointed out that

the long-standing disposition to criticize or promote religion is partly responsible for the field’s precarious status within both religious studies and psychology. Scholars of religion are understandably wary of any disposition to reduce religion to a simple formula and then to explain it away, in effect, in terms of some psychological mechanism. (p. 26)

By contrast, mental health practitioners are frequently critical of religion, and tend to be suspicious of any theory or study that seems to value or encourage its practice.

Despite this ambivalence among the therapeutic community, many clinicians have come to appreciate the value inherent in the forgiveness process by virtue of their own sense of religiosity or otherwise. For example, in their essay, “Hope-focused and Forgiveness-based Group Interventions to Promote Marital Enrichment,” Ripley and Worthington (2002) have pointed out that promoting forgiveness is an essential skill for clinicians searching for ways to cope with what can be powerful emotional issues related to harmful acts or offensive behaviors. Notwithstanding these common values among many people today, in many cases, it becomes exceedingly difficult to separate the professional from the personal, and counselors may tend to “cop an attitude” when confronted with clients who have harmed them or have somehow offended them in future therapy sessions or other professional encounters. Religiosity will, of course, play an important part in how any individual will likely respond to such behaviors, but counselors may experience such harmful acts much more frequently than their counterparts in the general public. Therefore, understanding what part an individual’s sense of religiosity plays in the ability to forgive such acts assumes new levels of importance today.
According to the advocates who understand forgiveness as a “gift” that is offered by a victim to an offender even if the offender does not acknowledge his guilt, the party that feels aggrieved is still capable of forgiving; however, as Schimmel (2002) has pointed out,

If forgiveness is considered to be morally appropriate not as a ‘gift’ to a recalcitrant offender, but either as a ‘gift’ or an ‘obligation’ to a remorseful offender, then until the antagonist admits guilt, the self-perceived victim need not, and maybe should not, forgive. Be that as it may, justifying is different from forgiving and is logically incompatible with it. (p. 51)

Therefore, when counselors exonerate someone they say that the harmful act that initially appears to have been performed out of malicious intent or gross negligence was not really done in that manner. For instance, in the case of a driver who falls asleep at the wheel and crashes into another car, killing its occupants in the process; the driver was exonerated for the offense when it was subsequently determined that he had experienced a rare adverse reaction to a medication that does not usually make people sleepy, and that he had been told by his doctor that there was no danger in driving (Schimmel, 2002).

According to Schimmel (2002), “Once we find this out we will not punish him and will not be angry at him, but for this to happen we did not have to forgive him” (p. 51). In the American legal system, certain officials have the right to pardon an offender. This means that he will not receive the punishment that the court decided he deserves. There are a number of reasons for the legal institution of pardon, including a concern that there may have been a mistake made in the functioning of the legal system, an increasingly significant issue in view of the number of cases that have been overturned as the result of DNA testing of old evidence; likewise, abiding by the strict letter of the law can sometimes violate its spirit. In many cases, pardons are granted for political
considerations, such as when former President Bill Clinton left office, with the reasoning
being that even though the criminal is guilty, it is in the long-term interests of the state to
free him, perhaps in order to curry favor with an otherwise discontented yet significant
constituency. In still other instances, the pardon includes expunging all mention of the
offense from the criminal’s record. “He is to be treated henceforth by the legal system as
if the crime were never committed. When a criminal is pardoned this does not imply, as
forgiveness would, that the person who pardons him no longer resents or is angry at him
for his crimes” (Schimmel, 2002, p. 51).

The findings of research by Deveney et al. (2002) indicated that the issues related
to forgiveness are both highly extant and extremely relevant to the clinical work of
mental health counselors. Eighty-eight percent of the counselors who responded in this
study reported that forgiveness presents as an important issue in their practices. The
authors stated that interesting findings were reported regarding mental health counselors’
attitudes toward raising forgiveness-related issues with their clients; “although 94%
reported that it was appropriate for the counselor to raise forgiveness-related issues in
practice, significantly fewer mental health counselors (51%) reported that it was the
counselor’s responsibility to do so” (Deveney et al., 2002, p. 252). The authors suggested
that additional research is needed to help develop a better understanding of the meaning
that is typically attached to appropriate counselor behavior versus counselor
responsibility.

Beyond these findings, the researchers noted that religious affiliation of
participants was also related to attitudes toward forgiveness. Respondents who
subscribed to a Protestant religious tradition, for instance, reported more positive
attitudes toward forgiveness in comparison to those who subscribed to an “other” religion tradition. According to Deveney and her colleagues (2002), the levels of religious involvement were not assessed in their study, a constraint that may restrict any meaningful comparisons and analyses concerning the level of religious involvement and attitudes towards forgiveness. Moreover, this study’s sample size was relatively small. There were 24 counselors who identified themselves as “other”; Deveney and her colleagues have suggested that further study is warranted in order to develop a better understanding of the role and relationship of religious affiliation and involvement and the use of forgiveness in clinical practice (Deveney et al., 2002). The results of the study by Deveney et al. contrasted with the findings of Denton and Martin (1998) where no significant differences in attitudes between practitioners of different religious orientations were reported. In the Denton and Martin study, the researchers suggested a “universally accepted basic understanding of forgiving across religions” (p. 288).

The results of the Deveney et al. (2002) study also indicated that differing theoretical orientations were related to differing attitudes toward forgiveness, with counselors trained in systems therapy tending to express the most positive attitudes. Those clinicians who demonstrated more positive forgiveness attitudes, regardless of their theoretical orientation, were more likely to raise issues of forgiveness in their practice; however, they were also more likely to include the use of forgiveness activities related to the offender. The researchers suggested that it is likely that more positive attitudes on the part of the counselor result in the integration of specific therapeutic activities that are related to forgiveness and the client/self as well as activities related to the offender. “This finding has implications for training although causality regarding
positive attitudes and use of activities focusing on the offender cannot be determined” (p. 284). While the findings by Deveney and her associates were considered significant, they cautioned that additional research is warranted in the area of understanding the actual implications of these findings in the day-to-day practice of mental health counselors as well as therapeutic outcomes related to forgiveness (Deveney et al., 2002).

Examination of the items based on Enright et al.’s model (2000) endorsed by the participants revealed a difference with respect to therapeutic activities utilized by mental health counselors. While Enright et al. (1992) clearly endorsed activities or “units” which are related to both the self/client and offender, their findings indicated that almost 25% of the study’s respondents did not appear to endorse forgiveness-related activities in a systematic way; moreover, two-thirds of the respondents did not endorse activities that specifically acknowledged and addressed the significance of the offender. Consequently, critical activities to the forgiveness process, such as reframing who the wrongdoer is and exhibiting empathy toward the offender, activities that the researchers suggest would seem to be absolutely integral to the forgiving process, were not endorsed by participants.

The majority of respondents in the Deveney et al. (2002) survey appeared to view forgiving as a process that involves the self and ignores the interpersonal quality of forgiving based on their selection of activities.

Consideration of the offender as well as contextual variables surrounding the nature of the offense appear to be ignored as significant to the forgiving process, and contextual conditions affecting forgiveness (i.e., intent of offender to harm, severity of consequences, apology or repentance from the offender) do not appear to be acknowledged, although these contextual variables have been cited as crucial to the forgiving process. (Deveney et al., 2002, p. 285)

The majority of respondents in the Deveney et al. investigation appeared to consider forgiveness as being a sort of gift that was directed primarily to the self alone, in contrast
to a gift to the offending person as well as the individual self. The study’s participants appeared to take away the construct of forgiveness from the interpersonal and moral qualities of generosity and/or moral love. Moreover, the endorsed clinical activities by the respondent counselors seemed to suggest a lack of knowledge regarding key activities cited in intervention studies with a wide range of clients. Endorsed practices also suggested a lack of understanding regarding activities that were specifically designed to mitigate the relative salience of the offending person’s hurtful actions and reduce the power of the offender’s action to cause the client to seek revenge, which resulted in the continuing estrangement of the parties (Deveney et al., 2002).

A common point that emerges in the studies reviewed was that there appeared to be a gap between current understanding of the forgiving process and counseling practice.

While the ability to forgive was reported to be a highly salient and relevant issue for mental health counselors responding to this survey, there appears to be no systematic approach used by the diverse sample of mental health counselors used that specifically addressed key issues related to forgiveness. (Deveney et al., 2002, p. 285)

To this end, the authors suggested that identified gaps can be effectively addressed with further professional training.

Given the reported incidence and prevalence of forgiveness-related issues in practice, further research is needed to clarify issues such as the religious and theoretical orientation of counselors and their relationship to forgiveness. In addition, further research is needed to improve counselors’ current understanding regarding activities designed to assist clients with issues related to forgiveness (i.e., reducing the silence of the offending person’s hurtful actions and reducing the power of the offender’s action to cause the client to seek revenge).
When a counselor is able to “take the high road” and set aside any personal residual animosity in favor of providing successful treatment outcomes for individuals who may or may not be capable of recognizing the impact of their actions on others, that counselor will also be able to encourage others to do the same. It is helpful to remember that even the Bible does not set out precisely how this is to be accomplished, only that it must be done. For example, “the Bible does not tell me how I can overcome my natural hatred for my enemy and come to his assistance. It simply commands me to do so” (Schimmel, 2002, p. 20). Therefore, therapeutic use of forgiveness in healing intergenerational family pain requires an evaluation of the potential participant’s readiness for seeking forgiveness, granting forgiveness, repentance, and, at times, atonement. In his essay, “The Epidemic of Forgiveness,” Marino (1995) advises:

To be sure, there are circumstances in which letting go of a sense of resentment betrays a lack of self-respect, or at least a sense that here is a person with whom I cannot afford to be angry; so, there is more to forgiveness than releasing resentment. Nevertheless, were my friend to claim that he forgave me but still resented my insensitivity, I would have good reason to conclude that he really hadn’t forgiven me. But to the extent that forgiveness can be described as the release of resentment under appropriate circumstances, how could I possibly forgive myself for hurting my friend, if by that I mean that at the time of my self-absolution I forswear all feelings of resentment toward the person whom I have left in the lurch. It would also be completely benighted of me to think that I could forgive myself in the sense that I could command someone whom I have hurt to smother the justified resentment that was the outcome of the injury I inflicted. (p. 10)

While forgiveness has been shown time and again to be an effective technique for healing, it may not be appropriate for every client. As a result, it is important for counselors who are skilled in the therapeutic use of forgiveness to accurately assess their
clients in terms of both openness and readiness. The following recommendations operationalize these levels of readiness in terms of religion, development, and timing.

Because forgiveness, repentance, and atonement are derived largely from religious traditions, counselors should evaluate the potential usefulness of these processes on the basis of each client’s religious background (DiBlasio, 1993). In this regard, spirituality can potentially enhance the power of forgiveness for some; for others, religious concepts and terminology may have negative meanings, thus impeding or preventing clients’ constructive responses to the forgiveness sessions (DiBlasio, 1993).

Murray suggested that forgiveness, as an act, means the forgiver is forswearing justice. “A forgiver knows that a wrongdoer has no right to compassion, but it is given nonetheless” (Murray, 2002, p. 197). According to the results of a study by Holmes, Konstam, and Levine (2003), the act of forgiveness represents a potentially significant modality for increasing well-being and improving interpersonal relationships. The results of a survey of 381 mental health counselors regarding attitudes and practices related to forgiveness revealed forgiveness issues to be highly salient in clinical practice. Counselors’ religiosity and theoretical orientations were associated with attitudes toward forgiveness (Deveney et al., 2002).

These researchers reported that endorsed intervention activities by mental health counselors appeared to indicate a lack of understanding concerning which key activities were designed to facilitate forgiveness with a wide range of clients. “There appears to be a need to address an existing gap between research advances in the area of forgiveness and current counseling practices” (Deveney et al., 2002, p. 253). Still other developmental studies (DiBlasio, 1993; Murray, 2002; Worthington & DiBlasio, 1990)
have shown a relationship between justice and forgiveness stages because of the common, underlying social perspective-taking skills that are required at each stage. This research has suggested to counselors that forgiveness as a therapeutic intervention assumes developmental readiness in terms of cognitive, affective, and social role-taking abilities. In this regard, the forgiveness session is generally most appropriate when clients already possess a sufficient ego capacity to empathize with their partner or significant other, demonstrate remorseful attitudes, and reverse past instances of hurtful behavior patterns.

While there are significant exceptions, the forgiveness session may be contraindicated during periods when defensive posturing is strong, such as cases with persistent denial, projection, or displacement. In these cases, therapeutic work may be a prerequisite to arriving at a level where genuine forgiveness might take place (Murray, 2002).

Following the initial assessment of the clients’ state of readiness to forgive on the basis of religion and development, it is important for counselors to introduce the importance of forgiveness at an appropriate time in the therapeutic relationship. The model advanced by Worthington and DiBlasio (1990) is representative of a body of thinking that suggests a more structured approach to incorporating forgiveness in therapy, often within a gradual three-stage plan: early preparation, the week before the session, and the forgiveness sessions. “One benefit of such models is their emphasis on setting the stage, that is, preparing the clients for the work of forgiving. . . . Forgiveness is the name given to a shared dynamic that involves insight, understanding, compensation, and possibly, reconciliation” (Murray, 2002, p. 210). The old adage, “forgive and forget,”
may not be as easily accomplished as it is proffered as advice, since counselors are, after all, just people too. In fact, forgetting may not be in the counselor’s best interests if there are issues of potential physical threats, for example; but absent these extreme considerations, there are still instances in which it is just as important to remember what prompted the need for forgiveness in the first place as it is to forgive the individual and move on with the therapy.

In this regard, Wade and Worthington (2003) have reported that many problems in living, both clinically severe and normal ones, have their roots in or are exacerbated by interpersonal offenses. Psycho-educational interventions have been successful in helping people overcome interpersonal transgressions. Although typically implemented in a group format, psycho-educational interventions to promote forgiveness have been effective for an array of problems and in a variety of situations. For example, psycho-educational interventions have promoted forgiveness with adolescents who have felt deprived of their parents’ love, men who were upset by their partners’ choice to have an abortion, partners wishing to enrich their marriage, and older women struggling to overcome hurts in their life. Psycho-educational interventions have also been useful in promoting forgiveness in groups of adults who report a diversity of offenses (Wade & Worthington, 2003).

Although there is an increasing amount of literature on psycho-educational interventions to promote forgiveness, little is known about the characteristics of individuals who volunteer for psycho-educational interventions.

It is not known how disturbed they are by the transgression; whether they hold little or much unforgiveness toward the offender; and whether they have tried previously to forgive, and, if so whether they have been successful and to what degree. (Wade & Worthington, 2003, p. 344)
According to Murray (2002),

Too common is the experience of many counselors who find themselves working with adolescents who are angry and who exhibit volatile behavior. Such behavior is frequently influenced by difficulties surrounding the family of origin. Divorce, betrayal, abuse, deceit, racism, unreliability, neglect, and criticism are common experiences for many children. (p. 188)

Even among families with healthy functioning systems, a child may experience pain that is associated with low income, the death of a loved one, or the chronic illness or disability of a family member, “all of which may predispose children” to re-experience the damaged feelings later in their adult relationships. Unless the pain is addressed, these types of harmful behaviors retain the potential to become a vicious lifelong cycle.

The challenge for counselors, therefore, is to help clients interrupt this cycle and allow time for the forgiving process to take place. Murray has proposed that forgiveness is one means to accomplish this; furthermore, developing the capacity for genuine forgiveness can be central to both spiritual development and psychological healing (Murray, 2002). There is a fundamental ambivalence among many with a highly developed sense of religiosity to seek out treatment in the first place. According to Genia and Shafranski (1998),

traditional psychological services are underutilized by the deeply religious who fear that their beliefs and values will be undermined or ridiculed. The tendency to pathologize faith stems from the fact that clinicians have ample opportunity to observe the high correlation between psychopathology and deranged religiosity. (p. 196).

From these observations theorists erroneously assume that religion is the cause of mental illness. Psychologists of religion today generally believe that it is the nature of the psychic organization that determines the spiritual health of the individual. “Disturbed
religious functioning is the external manifestation of pathological tendencies in individual believers” (Genia & Shafranski, 1998, p. 197).

Notwithstanding the wide range of idiosyncratic variations and individual differences that both clinicians and clients bring to the treatment setting, psycho-spiritual development generally appears to progress through five distinct stages (Genia & Shafranski, 1998). Under ideal circumstances, an individual’s faith evolves from the egocentricity of early childhood toward mature spiritual commitment in adulthood; however, Genia and Shafranski caution that, in some cases, emotional conflicts may cause developmental aberrations that will result in unhealthy and destructive forms of faith. Adults who do not manage to progress beyond the earlier stages are more likely to experience more severe psychological traumas than those who manage to achieve higher stages of development (Genia & Shafranski, 1998).

A brief summary of Genia and Shafranski’s developmental stages of religiosity is provided below.

Stage 1: Egocentric Faith: People in stage one either magically identify with the omnipotent Other or attempt to appease a sadistic God that delights in punishing or abandoning them. Magical thinking, petitionary prayer and comfort seeking pervade the religious expression of religiously egocentric people. These people are highly unstable and use the religious arena to reenact their emotional traumas.

Stage 2: Dogmatic Faith: The religiously dogmatic are oriented toward earning God’s love and approval. Intensely fearful of disappointing other people and God, they are compulsive in their conformance to religious codes. These people feel excessively guilty about their sexual and angry feelings, which they attempt to deny or suppress. Their harsh superegos and obsessive scrupulosity make them rigid and emotionally constricted. The religiosity of these people is characterized by self-denial, submission to authority and intolerance of diversity and ambiguity.

Stage 3: Transitional Faith: People in religious transition critically examine previously held beliefs and begin to reformulate their spiritual values and
ideals. They renounce the tyranny of dogma for greater reliance on personal conscience. Until they become anchored in a self-chosen faith that is congruent with their emerging ideals, people in stage three may feel spiritually groundless and confused. Their religious expression may involve affiliational switching or experimentation with divergent faiths.

Stage 4: Reconstructed Faith: People in stage four are committed to a self-chosen faith that provides meaning, purpose and spiritual fulfillment. Their religious practice is guided by constructive, internalized morals and ideals. Although they are tolerant of religious diversity, residual needs to resolve ambiguities may lead these people toward a religious community that proposes definitive answers to their spiritual uncertainties. If their ideological consolidation becomes impermeable to new spiritual insights, their faith will not undergo further progressive transformations.

Stage 5: Transcendent Faith: Few people reach this level of spiritual evolution. Selfless devotion to goodness and truth enables these extraordinary individuals to experience a sense of community with people of all faiths and with God. They are passionately attuned to universal ideals and strive to fulfill the highest potentials in themselves and humankind. (Genia & Shafranski, 1998, pp. 207-208)

The counselor who employs religious-based approaches to denounce the self-inflated client of committing the “sin of pride” will also tend to incite rage or cause the client to feel degraded and demoralized.

The narcissistic personality cannot tolerate a sense of himself as a sinner in need of forgiveness; however, his self-exaltation and need to be infallible are not willful self-idolatry or disobedience to God, but an unconscious maneuver to compensate for deficits in self-regulation resulting from early empathic failures. The individual equates spiritual humility with the humiliations of childhood. The original narcissistic injury must be healed before he can allow himself to be humble. (Genia & Shafranski, 1998, p. 208)

Therefore, Genia and Shafranski recommend that the counselor begin by acknowledging and appreciating how difficult it is for the client to seek help in the first place as this will help the client feel understood and accepted, thereby mediating the client’s need to appear infallible.

According to Genia and Shafranski (1998),
acknowledging his disillusionment and neediness is the first step toward helping him to tolerate his human longings and vulnerabilities. The relationship with an empathically attuned therapist gradually erodes the compulsion to maintain an aggrandized self. As the client’s individuality is nurtured through the therapeutic partnership he learns that God, too, can endure the hated and unacceptable parts of himself. (p. 213)

Within the therapeutic community, forgiveness has also been used as:

1. An overt action for resolution in wounded relationships
2. A necessary element for healing deep emotional wounds
3. An action that is associated with mercy or with giving a gift to the one who has inflicted deep hurt
4. An opportunity to advance personality development (Murray, 2002). In addition, any existing deficits in forgiveness may also contribute to increased levels of psychopathology and difficulties in maintaining or restoring mental health (Murray, 2002).

Murray has suggested that forgiveness is important in a wide variety of counseling settings; for instance, he has noted that forgiveness has been a part of individual, couple, and family counseling. Murray also has suggested that researchers have also addressed reconciliation and healing regarding painful experiences, such as severe trauma, and debilitating emotions, such as bitterness, anger, and depression.

“While a relatively new body of research, much of the forgiveness literature focuses on the healing of peer relationships” (Murray, 2002, p. 189). Incorporating forgiveness as part of a therapeutic plan requires that both counselor and client distinguish forgiveness from reconciliation and understand that it is possible to forgive without reconciling; it seems impossible to truly reconcile without forgiving. According to Murray, “if there can
be no reconciliation, forgiveness can be the process that enables the forgiver to move on
with his or her life unencumbered by the pain of betrayal” (Murray, 2002, p. 190).

In forgiveness, an individual who is hurt chooses to offer understanding to a
perpetrator. If the goal is to reconcile, then forgiveness can provide a new context within
which to nurture the relationship.

Forgiveness comes first as a decision to understand, despite justification for assigning
blame and guilt. Forgiveness is not a denial of the wrong that was committed or the
hurt experienced. It is a gift that is freely and consciously given by an individual who
has been hurt so that the cycle of pain can be broken and healthy beginnings can be
created. (Murray, 2002, p. 190)

Beyond the need to develop an appropriate context in which forgiveness can take
place is the need to respect the client’s religious values when it comes to the issue of
forgiveness. For example, in her essay, “Forgiveness and Health: Review and
Reflections on a Matter of Faith, Feelings, and Physiology,” Witvliet (2001) reported that
“Christian understanding of forgiveness begins with Scripture. The word forgiveness
brings to mind memorable biblical texts, such as the prodigal son, Jesus’ command to
forgive seventy times seven, and the parable of the unmerciful servant” (p. 212).

Notwithstanding the need to recognize other religious views concerning forgiveness and
its applicability to a specific treatment setting, in a predominately Christian nation such as
the United States, such prevailing attitudes concerning forgiveness help to paint an
overall picture of the attitudinal qualities that exist today, even as they apply to other
religions.

In this regard, Witvliet points out that

Christian understandings of forgiveness are rooted in the transforming
message of the Hebrew Scriptures and the New Testament. Forgiveness is at
the center of the gospel message and shapes Christian identity. It permeates
practices of piety, and is emphasized in the Lord’s Prayer, Christian creeds,
and the sacraments. When efforts to embody forgiveness as Christian communities and individuals fail, we repent and ask for God’s forgiveness. Forgiveness is a gift of God’s grace, even as it simultaneously involves our own choices and responses as granters and receivers of forgiveness. Our choices and responses directly involve the spiritual, social, cognitive, emotional, behavioral, and physiological aspects of our selves (all of which are integrally related). All people bear the Imago Dei and have the capacity to be forgiving. Forgiveness is so necessary because all people are affected by the fall and experience brokenness in their relationships with God and each other. (Witvliet, 2001, p. 212)

According to their essay, “Working With God: Managing Conservative Christian Beliefs That May Interfere With Counseling,” Eriksen et al. (2002) have advised that counselors who work with conservative Christians may ask how to respect a client’s values when ‘God’ seems to be saying something contrary to what the counselor believes is in the client’s best interests. In a managed care era of decreasing choice about one’s counselor, referral of such clients to a conservative Christian counselor is not always an option, however. ‘Working with God’ when counseling conservative Christian clients requires counselors to understand conservative Christian beliefs. (p. 48)

Knowledge about the client’s specific religion is highly useful, of course, but Helminiak (2001) has suggested that it is not the key issue. “More important is a psychological understanding of spirituality within which to situate the specifics of the client’s religion” (p. 163). The results of a recent study by Gorsuch and Walker (2004) found that although models dealing with a wide range of interpersonal forgiveness and reconciliation have emerged in recent years, the number of constructs common to these models and how these constructs interrelate has gone largely untested. To fill this gap in the body of knowledge Gorsuch and Walker examined 16 path models of forgiveness and reconciliation in 180 predominantly Christian college students.

The results of the researchers’ (Gorsuch & Walker, 2004) factor analysis suggested five underlying constructs:

1. Hurt and Anger
2. Receiving God’s Forgiveness

3. Emotional Forgiveness

4. Empathy

5. Reconciliation.

According to Gorsuch and Walker (2004), structural equations modeled supported a model whereby people simultaneously experience Hurt and Anger while Receiving God’s Forgiveness, and which then relate to Emotional Forgiveness, then Empathy, then Reconciliation. These results suggest substantial overlap among models, empirically support a distinction between Emotional Forgiveness and Reconciliation, and suggests that Receiving God’s Forgiveness is an important factor for religious people beginning reconciliation. (p. 12).

Some of the study’s findings ran contrary to the researchers’ expectations; one such finding was that Emotional Forgiveness was predicted by Hurt and Anger but Empathy was not. Another finding that ran contrary to their expectations involved the Receiving God’s Forgiveness factor.

Since the sample consisted of primarily Christian college students, it is impossible to know whether this factor would have emerged in factor analysis of the same data collected on a non-religious population. It would be a mistake to consider Receiving God’s Forgiveness as simply a step in the process of forgiveness or a religious ritual. (p. 13)

Gorsuch and Walker have suggested that it is possible that the model in which Receiving God’s Forgiveness was present but uncorrelated with Hurt and Anger was a reflection of an ongoing awareness among the respondents of the potential for being forgiven by God. According to them:

This experience of being forgiven by God is quite separate from one in which a person turns to God for assistance because of difficulty forgiving someone else. Rather, the experience of Christian forgiveness alluded to earlier reflects a progression of healing where undeserving people are confronted with the grace and mercy of God, and then forgive others because of the great love that is inside them. (Gorsuch & Walker, 2004, p. 14)
Forgiveness interventions with groups of individuals determined that the amount of time spent in the intervention was related to the amount of forgiveness people experienced (McCullough & Worthington, 1994). The study by McCullough and Worthington (1994) involved college students using an 8-hour empathy-centered intervention with a self-enhancement model (i.e., a person induced to forgive because forgiveness was good for her or him) and a wait-list control. These researchers determined that the students in the empathy condition were more likely to forgive than were those in an alternate forgiveness condition or a wait-list control. While a number of studies have been conducted with individuals, forgiveness interventions have not been tested empirically with couples in either conjoint or groups of couples settings.

To fill this gap, Ripley and Worthington (2002) investigated two adaptations of interventions that have begun to accumulate research support. Using a community sample of couples, the researchers compared two marital psycho-educational groups: hope-focused relationship enrichment (Worthington, 1998) and empathy-centered forgiveness-based marital enrichment with a repeated test wait-list control condition. To achieve these study goals, the researchers (Ripley & Worthington, 2002) employed several alternative methods to extend previous investigations of both the hope-focused relationship enrichment and the empathy-based model of forgiveness to the current investigation. According to Ripley and Worthington (2002), the hope-focused marital enrichment used the following modifications:

1. A psycho-educational group format of couples intervention
2. Removal of the personalized assessment interventions used in previous research
3. Use of a structured intervention protocol

4. Use of married participants recruited from the community unrestricted as to age or length of marriage

5. Use of a simple observational coding method to evaluate the couples.

Previous intervention research on forgiveness has involved groups or interventions in which only the aggrieved individual had been a group participant. Having both partners present meant that changes were necessary relative to previous research. Wade and Worthington (2003) focused primarily on the intrapersonal experience of forgiving in contrast to the interpersonal transactions involved in forgiveness. Empathy for the partner was promoted as the basis for granting forgiveness. Interactions that were emotionally “soft” rather than blaming were favored.

Ripley and Worthington (2002) hypothesized that participants in both interventions would experience increased dyadic satisfaction relative to the wait-list control; they further hypothesized that hope-focused marital enrichment would have higher scores on communication than would either the forgiveness intervention or the wait-list, because in the hope-focused intervention explicit training was done in communication and conflict negotiation. Finally, Ripley and Worthington believed that the forgiveness intervention would facilitate more forgiveness of a pre-identified hurt than would either the hope-focused marital enrichment or the wait-list, because in the forgiveness-based intervention, the issue of forgiveness was the focus.

The empathy-centered forgiveness-based intervention employed by the researchers was based on a pyramid model of forgiveness that focuses on the intrapersonal aspect of granting forgiveness. The pyramid model posits that there are five
parts to forgiveness: recall of hurt, empathy, humility, commitment, and maintenance.

The model encourages individuals to empathize with their offender to promote forgiveness. Humility is fostered by having individuals recall incidents when they had inflicted hurt on their partner and other people and received forgiveness. As a result, the victim might shift his or her perception from unmitigated blame to humble willingness to forgive. During the commitment phase, the hurt or offended person commits aloud to forgiveness of the other. Finally, maintenance is the follow-up component of forgiveness, which includes a discussion of how the offender may prove him or herself trustworthy again and how future hurts can be handled (i.e., the interpersonal portion of asking for, granting, and receiving forgiveness) (Ripley & Worthington, 2002). The findings of this study suggested that both the hope-focused marital enrichment and the empathy-centered forgiveness-based interventions facilitated communication among the members in a more positive fashion compared to those in a wait-list control group. The authors concluded that the hope-focused marital enrichment psycho-educational group was particularly effective at enhancing couple interactions.

**Summary**

The research showed that over the past decade or so, social scientists and mental health practitioners have become increasingly interested in forgiveness and its potential for improving personal well-being and improving interpersonal relationships. The growing body of evidence suggests that forgiveness can also be a helpful counseling tool with a wide range of populations, including incest survivors, substance abusers, and cancer patients. To date, the social literature and the clinical psychological literature concerning forgiveness have not been integrated, resulting in a number of questions
remaining unanswered. In addition, there remains a significant degree of ambiguity concerning the various issues related to forgiveness, including definitional issues, measurement issues, how the process of forgiveness takes place, and what optimal intervention regimens are appropriate for different populations.

Concerning the definition of forgiveness, there are some areas of consensus that have emerged including the notion that forgiveness is interpersonal and intra-psychic, as well as it is a rational choice that can be made or not. Forgiveness is not generally likened to forgetting, pardoning, condoning, excusing, conflict resolution, or denying the offense because these are important distinctions in a therapeutic setting. While some consensus has emerged, there remains a number of areas of disagreement, including the relationship between forgiveness and reconciliation, whether forgiveness is a necessary component of personal growth and development, and whether an individual must feel love and compassion toward the offender in order to forgive (Holmes et al., 2003).

As noted above, Wade and Worthington (2003) developed a model that was based on social psychological theory; their approach incorporated personal, relationship, and environmental factors that led individuals toward unforgiveness or forgiveness. Furthermore, Wade and Worthington emphasized the importance of distinguishing between the psychology of unforgiveness and forgiveness, pointing out that other researchers have tended to regard forgiveness as the opposite of unforgiveness, a concept that was typically measured by a reduction in anger, bitterness, avoidance, and a need for revenge rather than those specific processes that facilitate the forgiveness cycle.

Forgiveness counseling represents an important addition to the tools available to the professional counseling community. Research by Baskin and Enright (2004)
established forgiveness counseling as a contribution to that community. While forgiveness counseling should not be considered as a “one size fits all” approach for all psychological issues, there are a number of emotional health issues for which it is particularly well suited, including incest survivors, adolescents harmed by emotionally distant parents, and men hurt by the abortion decision of a partner. Therefore, it is important within the counseling community to possess a wide range of options that have a solid empirical foundation; furthermore, forgiveness therapy reveals the strength of relationship-based versus psychopharmacology-based interventions.

For one incest survivor described by Baskin and Enright (2004), the emotional difficulties had persisted for 50 years. In that case, drug-based treatment may have provided short-term alleviation of symptoms; however, few clinicians or patients would want to maintain such a drug regimen for five decades. According to Baskin and Enright, Fourteen-month process-based individual forgiveness counseling brought about significant change that was maintained 14 months later. It is unclear whether a 14-month drug treatment would yield long-term gains that could be similarly maintained. The findings here suggest that the effects of forgiveness counseling on clients are worthy of further study. (p. 81)

Clearly, forgiveness therapy provides distinct and valuable benefits for both the mental health practitioner and client alike, but it is vitally important to keep in mind that there are very important differences between forgiving and forgetting, just as there are differences between excusing and pardoning an offender. When the concept is used appropriately, forgiveness therapy represents a valuable adjunct to the mental health practitioners’ repertoire of techniques that can help people overcome past resentments and the need for future retribution or vengeance.
Although the concept of forgiveness is truly ancient, it has not been systematically studied until fairly recently. As forgiveness therapies and the empirical study of these therapies continue to emerge, the question of the counselor’s own sense of religiosity and forgiveness has not been considered. There is a need to look at the religiosity of the counselor or psychotherapist to determine how this influences the degree to which they have forgiven an individual who has hurt or offended them, as well as whether a counselor’s religiosity influences their willingness to encourage a client to forgive someone who has hurt or offended them.
Because this study examined the relationship between the independent variable (religiosity of the counselor) and the dependent variable (willingness to encourage forgiveness), a correlational research design was employed. This research looked at the overall concept of religiosity and its relationship to willingness to forgive and encouragement to forgive.

**Population and Sample**

The population for this study was composed of psychotherapists and counselors presently registered as members of the American Association of Pastoral Counselors (AAPC). This membership is comprised of approximately 20,000 to 25,000 psychotherapists and counselors throughout the United States.

The invited sample for this study consisted of approximately 1,200 registered members from throughout the 50 United States and selected randomly by the AAPC. Permission to draw and use names from their membership was requested. (Letters requesting and granting permission are included in Appendix A of the dissertation.)
Research Instruments

The Enright Forgiveness Inventory–U.S. Version (Subkoviak et al., 1995) uses six dimensions of forgiveness to measure the willingness to forgive. The six dimensions assessed are negative affect, negative behavior, negative cognition, positive affect, positive behavior, and positive cognition. This instrument is widely used and appears often in the literature reviewed for this study. For Likert-type items on the Enright Forgiveness Inventory, each answer was assigned a score from 1 to 6 or 6 to 1 depending upon whether the statements were positive or negative.

In constructing this instrument, a panel of psychologists and graduate students generated 25 items to measure the six dimensions of forgiveness. From these, they selected 10 items that covered the six dimensions of forgiveness that they deemed important. To test the reliability and validity of this instrument, it was given to a sample of 204 female and 190 male college students and their same-sex parents. Cronbach’s alpha was used to establish the reliability coefficients of the six dimensions ranging from .93 to .98. The subscales were highly intercorrelated, with correlation coefficients ranging from .80 to .87. Robert D. Enright, Ph.D., was contacted for permission to use his instrument for this study. (Letters requesting and granting permission are included in Appendix A.)

The religiosity variable was measured by the Religiosity Measures Questionnaire (Rohrbaugh & Jessor, 1975). The Religiosity Measure is an eight-item multiple-choice instrument. Each of the multiple choice questions was given a score ranging from 0 to 4. Scores for each scale were computed by totaling the individual items that comprise the scale.
Rohrbaugh and Jessor (1975) carried out their validation study using 949 junior and senior high-school students from the Rocky Mountain region, and 276 freshman college students from a large university in the Rocky Mountain region. This sample was monitored longitudinally throughout their college experience. The Religiosity Scale emerged from this procedure. Reliability of the overall scale measured by Cronbach’s alpha was .93. Overall construct validity had a correlation coefficient value of .69 when compared with concurrent measures.

It was found that there was no instrument to measure the willingness to encourage forgiveness variable involved in this research. Questions were developed by the investigator, and interviews were conducted with a sample of counselors from the selected population who were willing to participate in an attempt to measure this variable.

Three demographic variables were considered in this study. The variables considered were age, gender, and years of counseling experience. Each of these variables was looked at as they related to religiosity of the counselor and their relationship to willingness to forgive.

**Data Collection Procedures**

A list of 1,200 members of the American Association of Pastoral Counselors was randomly selected by computer by the AAPC Membership Services Coordinator from a listing of the entire membership in the United States. Using this list participants were sent a cover letter explaining the research and stating that no form of personal identification should be included with the returned documents (Appendix A), The Demographics Questionnaire (Appendix B), The Religiosity Measures Questionnaire (Appendix C), The Enright Forgiveness Inventory (Appendix D), and a stamped self-
addressed return envelope. A follow-up mailing was sent 2 weeks later to everyone as a thank-you to those who responded and as a friendly reminder to those who had not.

**Null Hypotheses**

The results were tabulated and analyzed to determine whether or not they supported the hypotheses that were stated in chapter 1. These results are presented in chapter 4. In their null form the hypotheses were:

1. There is no relationship between counselor religiosity and his or her willingness to forgive an offender as measured by the capacity to:
   a. Overcome negative affect toward an offender
   b. Overcome negative behavior toward an offender
   c. Overcome negative cognition toward an offender
   d. Experience positive affect toward an offender
   e. Experience positive behavior toward an offender
   f. Experience positive cognition toward an offender.

2. There is no relationship between gender, age, and years of experience and willingness to forgive an offender.

3. There is no interaction between gender, age, years of experience, and counselor religiosity as they relate to willingness to forgive an offender.

4. There is no relationship between counselor religiosity and counselor willingness to reconcile with an offender.

5. There is no relationship between gender, age, and years of experience and willingness to reconcile with an offender.

6. There is no interaction between gender, age, years of experience, and
counselor religiosity as they relate to willingness to reconcile with an offender.

7. There is no relationship between counselor religiosity and his or her willingness to encourage a client to forgive an offender.

8. There is no relationship between counselor religiosity and his or her willingness to encourage a client to reconcile with an offender.

9. There is no relationship between counselor willingness to reconcile with an offender and his or her willingness to encourage a client to reconcile with an offender.

10. There is no relationship between counselor willingness to encourage a client to forgive an offender and his or her willingness to encourage a client to reconcile with an offender.

Data Analysis

As each completed survey was received, the data were entered into a computer file according to a pre-coded number. This created a record for each subject that contains responses to each religiosity and forgiveness item plus the responses to the three demographic items. This file was used in the statistical analysis.

Correlation was used to study the relationship between counselor religiosity and counselor willingness to forgive an offender (Hypothesis #1) and counselor willingness to reconcile with an offender (Hypothesis #4). ANOVA was used for analyzing the data concerning the demographics (age, sex, years of counseling experience), and counselor willingness to forgive an offender (Hypothesis #2) and counselor willingness to reconcile with an offender (Hypothesis #5). ANOVA was used for analyzing the interaction of the data concerning the demographics and the willingness to forgive an offender (Hypothesis #3) and the willingness to reconcile with an offender (Hypothesis #6).
The qualitative portion of this study was done through telephone interviews with counselors from the sample who indicated that they were willing to participate in this portion of the study. These interviews were used to determine (a) the relationship between counselor religiosity and counselor willingness to encourage a client to forgive or to reconcile with an offender (Hypotheses #7 & 8); (b) the relationship between counselor willingness to reconcile with an offender and counselor willingness to encourage a client to reconcile with an offender (Hypothesis #9); and (c) the relationship between counselor willingness to encourage a client to forgive an offender and counselor willingness to encourage a client to reconcile with an offender (Hypothesis #10).
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Introduction

The general purpose of this study was to determine if there was a relationship between counselor religiosity and a counselor’s willingness to encourage forgiveness in clients. More specifically the purpose was to determine if the counselor’s religiosity and willingness to forgive affected his or her willingness to encourage a client to forgive an offender. Chapter 4 presents a description of the sample for this study and the results of the analytical procedures used to test the hypotheses formulated earlier.

Sample

The research utilized a sample of psychotherapists and counselors presently registered as members of the American Association of Pastoral Counselors (AAPC). The membership of the AAPC is composed of approximately 20,000 to 25,000 psychotherapists and counselors throughout the United States. From this membership 1,200 registered members from the 50 United States were selected randomly by the AAPC to participate in this study. Responses were received from 407 psychotherapists and counselors.

Demographic information regarding the sample was as follows:

1. Two hundred sixty males and 147 females responded.

2. Eleven subjects were between the ages of 25 and 30 years of age, 32
were between 31 and 40 years of age, 62 were between 41 and 50 years of age, 153 were between 51 and 60 years of age, and 149 were 61 years of age or above.

3. Twenty-seven subjects had less than 5 years of experience, 41 had 6 to 10 years of experience, 114 had between 11 and 20 years of experience, 141 had 21 to 30 years of experience, and 84 had more than 31 years of experience.

**Measurement Results**

The six different dimensions of the Enright Forgiveness Inventory were used to measure a counselor’s willingness to forgive an offender. The six dimensions assessed were negative affect, negative behavior, negative cognition, positive affect, positive behavior, and positive cognition. The Likert-type items on the EFI were assigned a score from 1 to 6 or 6 to 1 depending upon whether the statements were positive or negative. The means and standard deviations for each of the six dimensions and the overall forgiveness mean and standard deviation are listed in Table 1. The Enright Forgiveness Inventory measured how much they were hurt and how willing they were to forgive and reconcile with an offender.

Religiosity was measured using the Religiosity Measures Questionnaire. The Religiosity Measures Questionnaire is an eight-item multiple-choice instrument. Religiosity mean and standard deviation are also listed in Table 1.

**Testing the Hypotheses**

Each of the 10 hypotheses was stated in the null form and tested by the methods outlined in chapter 3 of this dissertation. Since all of the hypotheses involved The Enright Forgiveness Inventory, The Religiosity Measures Questionnaire, or both, a
review of their characteristics is considered important for understanding the testing of the hypotheses.

Table 1

*Six Forgiveness Dimensions and Religiosity Means and Standard Deviations*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive affect</td>
<td>35.5135</td>
<td>14.15708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative affect</td>
<td>40.9312</td>
<td>13.28765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive behavior</td>
<td>43.0516</td>
<td>23.26406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative behavior</td>
<td>44.7789</td>
<td>11.47991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive cognition</td>
<td>43.3366</td>
<td>12.07885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative cognition</td>
<td>48.3170</td>
<td>12.01376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forgiveness</td>
<td>254.6413</td>
<td>66.14057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religiosity</td>
<td>23.8157</td>
<td>6.56554</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. N = 407.*

The Enright Forgiveness Inventory–U.S. Version (Subkoviak et al., 1995) uses six dimensions of forgiveness to measure the willingness to forgive and a single question to determine the willingness to reconcile. The six dimensions of forgiveness are negative affect, negative behavior, negative cognition, positive affect, positive behavior, and positive cognition. For Likert-type items on the EFI, each answer was assigned a score from 1 to 6 or 6 to 1 depending upon whether the statements were positive or negative. Each of the six dimensions had the possibility of a maximum score of 60. The total
forgiveness score was determined by totaling the score of each of the six dimensions. The maximum possible score was 360. Reconciliation was determined by a yes or no answer to one question.

The religiosity variable was measured by the Religiosity Measures Questionnaire (Rohrbaugh & Jessor, 1975). The Religiosity Measure is an eight-item multiple-choice instrument. Each item had a possible score of 0 to 4. The maximum possible score was 32. Total Scores were computed by totaling the individual items.

In this chapter tables are included for hypotheses 1 through 6. These tables report correlations used to test hypotheses 1 and 4. Tables for hypotheses 2, 3, 5, and 6 report ANOVA results (sum of squares, degrees of freedom, mean square, probabilities for F-tests, means, and standard deviations). Because unweighted means were used, there will be some variation in the reported means.

Hypotheses 7 through 10 were tested using data from telephone interviews conducted with respondents who indicated they were willing to participate in a follow-up interview using two questions designed to solicit responses to determine a counselor’s willingness to encourage a client to forgive an offender. These questions were restricted to two areas of concern: (a) sexual abuse of an individual under 18 years of age, and (b) marital infidelity.

Hypothesis #1: *There is no relationship between counselor religiosity and his or her willingness to forgive an offender as measured by the capacity to:*

a. Overcome negative affect toward an offender

b. Overcome negative behavior toward an offender

c. Overcome negative cognition toward an offender
d. Experience positive affect toward an offender

e. Experience positive behavior toward an offender

f. Experience positive cognition toward an offender.

Of importance to this research is the examination of the relationship between the
independent variable (religiosity) and the dependent variable (forgiveness) and the six
aspects of forgiveness. Table 2 presents the correlation matrix for the religiosity,
forgiveness, and the six forgiveness scales.

Of major interest is the column that indicates the Pearson product-moment
coefficient of correlation between religiosity and each of the other variables. These are
the coefficients used to test the hypothesis. The inter-correlation between any other two
variables can also be readily located on this table.

Five of the seven variables correlated significantly with religiosity at the .05 level;
forgiveness, negative affect, negative behavior, positive cognition, and negative
cognition. These correlations ranged between .099 and .120.

The correlations between religiosity and two of the aspects of forgiveness were
not statistically significant. There was no statistical significance between religiosity and
positive affect or positive behavior. The correlations were .059 and -.081 respectively.

Although five of the variables correlated significantly with religiosity and two did
not, the correlations were all low. Hypothesis #1 was rejected. There was a relationship
between counselor religiosity and his or her willingness to forgive an offender as
measured by the six variables of forgiveness on the Enright Forgiveness Inventory.

Hypothesis #2: There is no relationship between willingness to forgive an
offender and gender, age, and years of experience.
Table 2  

*Inter-Correlation Matrix for Religiosity, Forgiveness, and the Six Variables of Forgiveness*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Religiosity</th>
<th>Forgiveness</th>
<th>Positive Affect</th>
<th>Negative Affect</th>
<th>Positive Behavior</th>
<th>Negative Behavior</th>
<th>Positive Cognition</th>
<th>Negative Cognition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Religiosity</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forgiveness</td>
<td>.099*</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Affect</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>.848</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Affect</td>
<td>.100*</td>
<td>.881</td>
<td>.749</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Behavior</td>
<td>-.081</td>
<td>.464</td>
<td>.446</td>
<td>.375</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Behavior</td>
<td>.116*</td>
<td>.875</td>
<td>.654</td>
<td>.792</td>
<td>.380</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Cognition</td>
<td>.120*</td>
<td>.897</td>
<td>.746</td>
<td>.707</td>
<td>.428</td>
<td>.721</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Cognition</td>
<td>.110*</td>
<td>.826</td>
<td>.510</td>
<td>.720</td>
<td>.323</td>
<td>.758</td>
<td>.790</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .05 level.*
Two two-way analyses of variance were performed to compare the difference between genders and the difference between age groups in the willingness to forgive an offender, and the difference between genders and the difference between years of experience groups in the willingness to forgive an offender. Since years of experience is highly dependent upon age there was no two-way analysis conducted to test the relationship between age, and years of experience.

No significant differences were found between males and females in willingness to forgive an offender when males and females were compared at the .05 level of significance, \( p = .234 \) (Table 3). The overall mean score for males was 253.192 with a standard deviation of 5.054 (Table 4) and the overall mean score for females was 262.491 with a standard deviation of 5.935 (Table 4).

No significant differences were found between age groups in willingness to forgive an offender when age groups were compared at the .05 level of significance, \( p = .468 \) (Table 3). The age group with the highest mean score on the Enright Forgiveness Inventory was the 25-40 age group with a mean score of 270.213 and a standard deviation of 10.254 (Table 5). The group with the lowest mean score was the 41-50 age group with a mean score of 251.200 and a standard deviation of 8.430 (Table 5). Since the means for the older three age groups were rather close (Table 5), another analysis was done combining these three groups into one age group. No significant difference was found.

When testing for the interaction between gender and age, at the .05 level of significance, no significant interaction was found, \( p = .939 \) (Table 3). In Table 6 are the means for interaction.
Thus, it was concluded that there was no difference between genders and between ages as they relate to willingness to forgive an offender. It was also concluded that there was no interaction between gender and age as they relate to the willingness to forgive an offender.

Table 3

*Gender and Age*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>6263.443</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6263.443</td>
<td>1.423</td>
<td>.234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>11206.689</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3735.563</td>
<td>.849</td>
<td>.468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender X Age</td>
<td>1783.480</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>594.493</td>
<td>.135</td>
<td>.939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>1754068.850</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>4418.309</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>28166845.000</td>
<td>407</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4

*Willingness to Forgive by Gender*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>253.192</td>
<td>5.054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>262.491</td>
<td>5.935</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5

*Willingness to Forgive by Age*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25 - 40</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>270.213</td>
<td>10.254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 - 50</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>251.200</td>
<td>8.430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 - 60</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>252.993</td>
<td>5.748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61 - above</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>256.959</td>
<td>5.816</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6

Willingness to Forgive by Gender and Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>25 - 40</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>262.760</td>
<td>13.269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41 - 50</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>249.400</td>
<td>12.113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51 - 60</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>250.231</td>
<td>6.506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>61 - above</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>250.376</td>
<td>6.602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>25 - 40</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>277.667</td>
<td>15.638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41 - 50</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>253.000</td>
<td>11.728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51 - 60</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>255.755</td>
<td>9.478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>61 - above</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>263.542</td>
<td>9.576</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A two-way analysis of variance was performed to compare the difference between genders and difference between years of experience groups in the willingness to forgive an offender. No significant difference was found between years of experience in willingness to forgive an offender when years of experience were compared at the .05 level of significance, $p = .113$ (Table 7). The years of experience group with the highest mean score on the Enright Forgiveness Inventory was the 0-5 years of experience group with a mean score of 282.408 and a standard deviation of 12.739 (Table 9). The group with the lowest mean score was the 31 or more years of experience group with a mean score of 242.426 and a standard deviation of 9.923 (Table 9).

No significant differences were found between males and females in willingness to forgive an offender when compared at the .05 level of significance. Since the test for gender was reported previously, it will not be discussed again here. (See Table 8.)
Table 7

*Gender and Years of Experience*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Years of Experience</td>
<td>32571.016</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8142.754</td>
<td>1.882</td>
<td>.113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>4934.749</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4934.749</td>
<td>1.140</td>
<td>.286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of Experience X Gender</td>
<td>8574.980</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2143.745</td>
<td>.495</td>
<td>.739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>1717969.034</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>4327.378</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>28166845.000</td>
<td>407</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8

*Willingness to Forgive by Gender*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>252.461</td>
<td>5.337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>261.451</td>
<td>6.511</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9

*Willingness to Forgive by Years of Experience*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of Experience</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 - 5</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>282.408</td>
<td>12.739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 10</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>244.505</td>
<td>10.530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 20</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>257.572</td>
<td>6.196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - 30</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>257.869</td>
<td>5.741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 or more</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>242.426</td>
<td>9.923</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When testing for the interaction between years of experience and gender, at the .05 level of significance, no significant interaction was found, $p = .739$ (Table 7). In Table 10 are the means for interaction.
Thus it was concluded that there was no difference between genders and between years of experience as they relate to willingness to forgive an offender. It was also concluded that there was no interaction between gender and years of experience as they relate to the willingness to forgive an offender.

Table 10

Willingness to Forgive by Gender and Years of Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Years of Experience</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>0 - 5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>268.083</td>
<td>18.990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 - 10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>241.760</td>
<td>13.157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11 - 20</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>251.968</td>
<td>8.288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21 - 30</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>260.719</td>
<td>6.973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31 or more</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>239.775</td>
<td>7.807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0 - 5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>296.733</td>
<td>16.985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 - 10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>247.250</td>
<td>16.446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11 - 20</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>263.176</td>
<td>9.211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21 - 30</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>255.019</td>
<td>9.122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31 or more</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>245.077</td>
<td>18.245</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hypothesis #3: There is no interaction between gender, age, years of experience, and religiosity as they relate to willingness to forgive an offender.

Three two-way analyses of variance were performed to compare the interaction of religiosity and gender, religiosity and age, and religiosity and years of experience in the willingness to forgive an offender. The scores on the Religiosity Measures Questionnaire were divided into three groups: low (scores from 0 - 8), medium (scores from 9 - 24), and high (scores from 25 - 32). Since the relationships between gender, age, years of experience, and religiosity as they relate to the willingness to forgive an offender were
discussed previously, they will be discussed only in their interaction with religiosity here if the results are inconsistent with previous results (Table 12).

When considering Hypothesis #1, religiosity was considered alone and a significant difference between the religiosity groups in the willingness to forgive an offender was found. However, when considering religiosity and gender together, a significant difference was not found between the three religiosity groups, \( p = .271 \) (Table 11).

When testing Hypothesis #2, gender was considered alone and there was no significant difference between males and females in the willingness to forgive an offender. However, when considering gender and religiosity together, a significant difference was found between males and females, \( p = .044 \) (Table 11). Females scored higher (mean = 262.159, Table 13) than males (mean = 245.469, Table 13), but the difference was small.

There was no significant interaction between religiosity and gender in the willingness to forgive an offender, \( p = .183 \) (Table 11). The means are reported in Table 14.

Table 11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Religiosity</td>
<td>11296.164</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5648.082</td>
<td>1.311</td>
<td>.271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>17621.037</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17621.037</td>
<td>4.091</td>
<td>.044*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relig X Gen</td>
<td>14694.667</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7347.333</td>
<td>1.706</td>
<td>.183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>1727381.940</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>4307.686</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>28166845.000</td>
<td>407</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .05 level.
Table 12

Willingness to Forgive by Religiosity When Considering Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religiosity</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>242.877</td>
<td>75.330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>261.486</td>
<td>67.325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>257.079</td>
<td>62.307</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13

Willingness to Forgive by Gender When Considering Religiosity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>245.469</td>
<td>66.661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>262.159</td>
<td>65.038</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14

Willingness to Forgive by Religiosity and Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Religiosity</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>223.317</td>
<td>72.983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>256.096</td>
<td>69.998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>256.993</td>
<td>60.716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>262.438</td>
<td>76.204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>266.875</td>
<td>61.616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>257.165</td>
<td>64.953</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There was no significant interaction between years of experience and religiosity in the willingness to forgive an offender, $p = .274$ (Table 15). These means are reported in Table 18. Table 16 reports the means for religiosity when considering years of
experience. The means for years of experience when considering religiosity are reported in Table 17.

There was no significant interaction between religiosity and age in the willingness to forgive an offender, $p = .282$ (Table 19). These means are reported in Table 22.

Table 15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Religiosity</td>
<td>26912.333</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13456.167</td>
<td>3.172</td>
<td>.043*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yrs. Exp.</td>
<td>18878.340</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4719.585</td>
<td>1.113</td>
<td>.350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relig X Yrs Exp.</td>
<td>42110.852</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5263.856</td>
<td>1.241</td>
<td>.274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>1662706.010</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>4241.597</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>28166845.000</td>
<td>407</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .05 level.

Table 16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religiosity</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>221.313</td>
<td>75.330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>262.395</td>
<td>67.325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>258.106</td>
<td>62.307</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 17

Willingness to Forgive by Years of Experience When Considering Religiosity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of Experience</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 - 5</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>247.712</td>
<td>43.851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 10</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>246.744</td>
<td>67.808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 20</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>247.670</td>
<td>68.306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - 30</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>258.099</td>
<td>66.931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 or more</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>236.133</td>
<td>64.035</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 18

Willingness to Forgive by Religiosity and Years of Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religiosity</th>
<th>Years Exp.</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>0 - 5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>164.000</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 - 10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>252.222</td>
<td>54.097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11 - 20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>212.563</td>
<td>87.238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21 - 30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>251.600</td>
<td>77.231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31 or more</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>226.182</td>
<td>66.921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>0 - 5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>292.667</td>
<td>47.178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 - 10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>251.818</td>
<td>87.496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11 - 20</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>268.686</td>
<td>56.846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21 - 30</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>265.769</td>
<td>66.382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31 or more</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>233.035</td>
<td>72.198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>0 - 5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>286.471</td>
<td>32.606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 - 10</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>236.191</td>
<td>63.792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11 - 20</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>261.762</td>
<td>65.427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21 - 30</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>256.927</td>
<td>65.090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31 or more</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>249.181</td>
<td>57.550</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 20 reports the means for the three religiosity groups when considering age.
The means for age groups when considering religiosity are reported in Table 21.
Table 19

*Age and Religiosity*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Religiosity</td>
<td>42587.280</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21293.640</td>
<td>4.935</td>
<td>.008*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>6580.512</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2193.504</td>
<td>.508</td>
<td>.677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relig X Age</td>
<td>32265.237</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5377.539</td>
<td>1.246</td>
<td>.282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>1704397.293</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>4314.930</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>28166845.000</td>
<td>407</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .05 level.

Table 20

*Willingness to Forgive by Religiosity When Considering Age*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religiosity</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>230.525</td>
<td>75.330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>266.998</td>
<td>67.325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>259.154</td>
<td>62.307</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 21

*Willingness to Forgive by Age When Considering Religiosity*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25 - 40</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>261.792</td>
<td>63.335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 - 50</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>244.579</td>
<td>70.871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 - 60</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>252.971</td>
<td>67.529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61 - above</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>249.562</td>
<td>63.535</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 22

Willingness to Forgive by Religiosity and Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religiosity</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>25 - 40</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>223.000</td>
<td>75.761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41 - 50</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>210.273</td>
<td>78.903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51 - 60</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>254.647</td>
<td>67.554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>61 - above</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>234.182</td>
<td>79.818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>25 - 40</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>295.786</td>
<td>51.069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41 - 50</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>265.357</td>
<td>58.579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51 - 60</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>253.565</td>
<td>74.456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>61 - above</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>253.286</td>
<td>64.964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>25 - 40</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>266.590</td>
<td>59.822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41 - 50</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>258.108</td>
<td>70.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51 - 60</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>250.700</td>
<td>64.502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>61 - above</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>261.218</td>
<td>56.796</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Therefore, Hypothesis #3 was retained. There was no interaction between gender, age, years of experience, and religiosity as they relate to the willingness to forgive an offender.

Hypothesis #4: There is no relationship between religiosity and counselor willingness to reconcile with an offender.

The relationship between religiosity and willingness to reconcile with an offender was examined using correlation. Table 23 presents the correlation matrix between religiosity and willingness to reconcile with an offender.

The correlation was calculated using both the individual scores for religiosity and the low, medium, and high grouping. Since the results were similar, the individual scores correlation is reported here.

The correlation between religiosity and the willingness to reconcile was not significant. The correlation was -.087. Therefore, Hypothesis #4 was retained. There
was no relationship between religiosity and counselor willingness to reconcile with an offender.

Table 23

Correlation Table for Religiosity and Reconciliation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Religiosity</th>
<th>Reconciliation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Religiosity</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-.087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reconciliation</td>
<td>-.087</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hypothesis #5: There is no relationship between willingness to reconcile with an offender and gender, age, and years of experience.

Two two-way analyses of variance were performed to compare the difference between genders and the difference between age groups in the willingness to reconcile with an offender, and the difference between genders and years of experience in the willingness to reconcile with an offender. Since years of experience is highly dependent upon age, there was no two-way analysis conducted to test the relationship between age and years of experience.

No significant differences were found between males and females in willingness to reconcile with an offender when males and females were compared at the .05 level of significance, \( p = .083 \) (Table 24). The overall mean score for males was 1.482 with a standard deviation of .501 (Table 25), and the overall mean score for females was 1.584 with a standard deviation of .496 (Table 25).
No significant differences were found between age groups in willingness to reconcile with an offender when age groups were compared at the .05 level of significance, $p = .264$ (Table 24). The age group with the highest mean score for reconciliation on the Enright Forgiveness Inventory was the 51-60 age group with a mean score of 1.586 and a standard deviation of .497 (Table 26). The group with the lowest mean score was the 61 and above age group with a mean score of 1.467 and a standard deviation of .501 (Table 26).

When testing for the interaction between gender and age at the .05 level of significance, no significant interaction was found, $p = .371$ (Table 24). In Table 27 are the means for interaction.

Thus it was concluded that there was no difference between genders and between ages as they relate to willingness to reconcile with an offender. It was also concluded that there was no interaction between gender and age as they relate to the willingness to reconcile with an offender.

Table 24

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.994</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.331</td>
<td>1.332</td>
<td>.264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.750</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.750</td>
<td>3.014</td>
<td>.083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender X Age</td>
<td>.782</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.261</td>
<td>1.048</td>
<td>.371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>99.265</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>.249</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1049.000</td>
<td>407</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A two-way analysis of variance was performed to compare the difference between genders and the difference between years of experience groups in the willingness to reconcile with an offender. No significant difference was found between years of
experience in willingness to reconcile with an offender when years of experience was compared at the .05 level of significance, \( p = .346 \) (Table 28). The years of experience group with the highest mean score was the 11-20 years of experience group with a mean score of 1.580 and a standard deviation of .496 (Table 29). The group with the lowest mean score was the 0-5 years of experience group with a mean score of 1.417 and a standard deviation of .506 (Table 29).

When considering years of experience, a significant difference was found between males and females at the .05 level of significance, \( p = .016 \) (Table 28). Males were less likely to reconcile with an offender with a mean score of 1.443 and a standard deviation of .501 (Table 30). Females were more likely to reconcile with an offender with a mean score of 1.597 and a standard deviation of .496 (Table 30).

When testing for the interaction between years of experience and gender, at the .05 level of significance, no significant interaction was found, \( p = .239 \) (Table 28). In Table 31 are the means for interaction.

Table 28

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Years of Experience</td>
<td>1.113</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.278</td>
<td>1.122</td>
<td>.346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>1.454</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.454</td>
<td>5.863</td>
<td>.016*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender X Years of Experience</td>
<td>1.373</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.343</td>
<td>1.383</td>
<td>.239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>98.488</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>.248</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1049.000</td>
<td>407</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .05 level.
Table 29

Willingness to Reconcile by Years of Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of Experience</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 - 5</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1.417</td>
<td>.506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 10</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1.490</td>
<td>.506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 20</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>1.580</td>
<td>.496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - 30</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>1.500</td>
<td>.502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 or more</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>1.614</td>
<td>.499</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 30

Willingness to Reconcile by Gender When Considering Years of Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>1.443</td>
<td>.501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>1.597</td>
<td>.496</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 31

Willingness to Reconcile by Gender and Years of Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Years of Experience</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>0 - 5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.167</td>
<td>.398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 - 10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1.480</td>
<td>.100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11 - 20</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>1.571</td>
<td>.499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21 - 30</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>1.461</td>
<td>.501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31 or more</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>1.535</td>
<td>.502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0 - 5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.667</td>
<td>.488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 - 10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.500</td>
<td>.516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11 - 20</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>1.588</td>
<td>.497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21 - 30</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>1.538</td>
<td>.503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31 or more</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.692</td>
<td>.480</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Therefore, Hypothesis 5 was rejected. There was a significant difference between males and females in the willingness to reconcile with an offender when considering years of experience.

Hypothesis #6: *There is no interaction between gender, age, years of experience, and religiosity as they relate to willingness to reconcile with an offender.*

Three two-way analyses of variance were performed to compare the interaction of religiosity and gender, religiosity and age, and religiosity and years of experience in the willingness to reconcile with an offender. The scores on the Religiosity Measures Questionnaire were divided into three groups: low, medium, and high. Since the relationships between gender, age, years of experience, and religiosity as they relate to the willingness to reconcile with an offender were discussed previously, they will be discussed only in their interaction with religiosity here unless the results are inconsistent with previous results.

There was no significant interaction between religiosity and gender in the willingness to reconcile with an offender, $p = .362$ (Table 32). The means are reported in Table 35. Table 33 reports the means for gender when considering religiosity. The means for religiosity when considering gender are reported in Table 34.

There was no significant interaction between years of experience and religiosity in the willingness to reconcile with an offender, $p = .921$ (Table 36). The means are reported in Table 39. Table 37 reports the means for years of experience when considering religiosity. The means for religiosity when considering years of experience are reported in Table 38.
### Table 32

**Willingness to Reconcile by Gender and Religiosity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Religiosity</td>
<td>.956</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.478</td>
<td>1.929</td>
<td>.147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.826</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.826</td>
<td>3.334</td>
<td>.069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religiosity X</td>
<td>.504</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.252</td>
<td>1.018</td>
<td>.362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>99.317</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>.248</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1049.000</td>
<td>407</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 33

**Willingness to Reconcile by Gender When Considering Religiosity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>1.511</td>
<td>.501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>1.625</td>
<td>.496</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 34

**Willingness to Reconcile by Religiosity When Considering Gender**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religiosity</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>1.631</td>
<td>.498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>1.577</td>
<td>.496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>1.495</td>
<td>.501</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 35

Willingness to Reconcile by Gender and Religiosity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Religiosity</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>.506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>.497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>.498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>.447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>.501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>.500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 36

Willingness to Reconcile by Years of Experience and Religiosity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Religiosity</td>
<td>.330</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.165</td>
<td>.653</td>
<td>.521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of Experience</td>
<td>.860</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.215</td>
<td>.851</td>
<td>.493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religiosity X Years of Experience</td>
<td>.806</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.101</td>
<td>.399</td>
<td>.921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>99.016</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>.253</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1049.000</td>
<td>407</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 37

Willingness to Reconcile by Years of Experience When Considering Religiosity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years Of Experience</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 - 5</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1.305</td>
<td>.506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 10</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1.489</td>
<td>.506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 20</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>1.602</td>
<td>.496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - 30</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>1.534</td>
<td>.502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 or more</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>1.563</td>
<td>.499</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 38

Willingness to Reconcile by Religiosity When Considering Years of Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religiosity</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>1.453</td>
<td>.498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>1.556</td>
<td>.496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>1.486</td>
<td>.501</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 39

Willingness to Reconcile by Religiosity and Years of Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religiosity</th>
<th>Years of Experience</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>0 - 5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 - 10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>.527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11 - 20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21 - 30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>.489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31 or more</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>.522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>0 - 5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>.527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 - 10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>.522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11 - 20</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>.482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21 - 30</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>.506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31 or more</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>.494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>0 - 5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>.514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 - 10</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>.512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11 - 20</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>.503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21 - 30</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>.499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31 or more</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>.505</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There was no significant interaction between religiosity and age in the willingness to reconcile with an offender, $p = .265$ (Table 40). Means are reported in Table 43. Table 41 reports the means for religiosity when considering age. The means for age when considering religiosity are reported in Table 42.
Therefore, Hypothesis #6 was retained. There was no interaction between gender, age, years of experience, and religiosity as they relate to the willingness to reconcile with an offender.

Table 40

**Willingness to Reconcile by Religiosity and Age**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Religiosity</td>
<td>.605</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.302</td>
<td>1.222</td>
<td>.296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>1.332</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.444</td>
<td>1.794</td>
<td>.148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religiosity X Age</td>
<td>1.900</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.317</td>
<td>1.280</td>
<td>.265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>97.736</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>.247</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1049.000</td>
<td>407</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 41

**Willingness to Reconcile by Religiosity When Considering Age**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religiosity</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>1.595</td>
<td>.498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>1.564</td>
<td>.496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>1.487</td>
<td>.501</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 42

**Willingness to Reconcile by Age When Considering Religiosity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25 - 40</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>1.500</td>
<td>.506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 - 50</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>1.632</td>
<td>.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 - 60</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>1.595</td>
<td>.497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61 - above</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>1.469</td>
<td>.501</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 43

Willingness to Reconcile by Religiosity and Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religiosity</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>25 - 40</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>.535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41 - 50</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>.302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51 - 60</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>.507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>61 - above</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>.510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>25 - 40</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>.514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41 - 50</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>.519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51 - 60</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>.465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>61 - above</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>.505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>25 - 40</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>.512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41 - 50</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>.507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51 - 60</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>.503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>61 - above</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>.502</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interview Results

Data for hypotheses 7, 8, 9, and 10 are the result of telephone interviews conducted with the 20 respondents who indicated they were willing to participate in a follow-up interview. These respondents were asked two questions that were restricted to two areas of concern: (a) sexual abuse of an individual under 18 years of age, and (b) marital infidelity.

The structured interview provided opportunity to understand the reasoning for each respondent encouraging a client to forgive, or not encouraging a client to forgive, while relating it to the counselor’s own willingness to forgive and reconcile with an offender. The results give additional insight into areas that may have affected the earlier retention or rejection of hypotheses.

Tables 44, 45, and 46 indicate the demographics of the 20 who participated in the follow-up interview and give the data for age, gender, and years of experience.
Tables 47 and 48 give data regarding religiosity and reconciliation.

Table 44

*Number in Each Age Group*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25 - 40</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 - 50</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 - 60</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61 and above</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 45

*Number in Each Gender Group*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 46

*Number in Each Years-of-Experience Group*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of Experience</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 - 5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 20</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - 30</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 or more</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 47

Number in each Religiosity Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religiosity</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 48

Number in Each Reconciliation Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reconciliate</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Forgiveness scores ranged between 150 and 330 out of a possible 360 for those participating in the follow-up interview, with an average score of 254. Results for the 20 willing to participate in the follow-up interviews indicated that 15 were willing to forgive an offender and reconcile, while 5 indicated they were not willing to forgive and reconcile with an offender. Seventeen of the 20 willing to participate in the follow-up interview reported feeling much hurt by an offender, whereas 3 reported some or little hurt. Religiosity scores ranged between 13 and 32 out of a possible 32 for those participating in the follow-up interview, with an average score of 25.

Forgiveness scores for the general sample ranged between 55 and 360 with an average score of 254.64. Results for the general sample indicated that 214 were willing to forgive and reconcile with an offender, whereas 193 indicated they were not willing to forgive and reconcile with an offender. Two hundred and eight-two of the general sample
indicated that they had experienced much hurt, whereas 126 indicated some or little hurt by an offender.

**Interview Questions and Responses**

**Question #1:** *Under what conditions would you encourage a client to forgive someone who had sexually abused him or her before the age of 18? (What would be your rationale if you would not encourage a client to forgive someone who had sexually abused him or her?) Would you ever encourage them to reconcile? Under what conditions would you encourage reconciliation?*

Responses were classified into the following categories for encouragement to forgive: (a) *Yes* (frequency = 6); (b) *No* (frequency = 12); (c) *Maybe* (frequency = 2).

Responses were classified into the following three categories for encouragement to reconcile: (a) *Yes* (frequency = 0); (b) *No* (frequency = 18); (c) *Maybe* (frequency = 2).

The respondents who said they would encourage the client to forgive made statements such as “It would help the client heal,” or “Forgiveness is really for the client not the offender.” Of those who indicated they would not encourage forgiveness, responses such as “It makes the client more vulnerable,” “This behavior is unforgivable,” or “The client would be set-up for more abuse” were made. The two respondents who said *Maybe* stated that “It depends upon what the client wants to do.” Statements such as these showed that the best interest or wishes of the client were uppermost when encouraging a client to forgive.

Eighteen of the participants would not recommend that the client reconcile with an offender, making statements such as “The client would be putting themselves in a vulnerable position making it likely that they would be abused again” or “Because of the
abuse the client may believe that they must forgive because it was their own fault the abuse occurred in the first place.” Thus, those who responded No indicated that it would be harmful to the client to do so. The two who responded Maybe to this question felt that if the client indicated he/she would like to reconcile they should be helped to reconcile.

Question #2: Under what conditions would you encourage a client to forgive a partner for having an affair? (What would be your rationale if you would not encourage a client to forgive his/her partner?) Would you ever encourage them to reconcile? Under what conditions would you encourage reconciliation?

Responses were classified into the following categories for encouragement to forgive: (a) Yes (frequency = 9); (b) No (frequency = 7); (c) Maybe (frequency = 4).

Responses were classified into the following three categories for encouragement to reconcile: (a) Yes (frequency = 7); (b) No (frequency = 8); (c) Maybe (frequency = 5).

The majority of respondents indicated they would encourage a client to forgive an unfaithful partner. The rationale included statements such as “Relationships are two-way,” “If the partner is repentant then forgiveness is acceptable,” “Affairs are rarely the fault of just one partner.” Statements such as these indicate that in this type of relationship the client is a part of the solution and a part of the problem. Those who said they would not encourage forgiveness gave responses that indicated that forgiveness could never really be given: “Forgiveness never really occurs,” “If a partner cheats once and thinks they will be forgiven, they will cheat again.” When Maybe was the response, participants make remarks such as, “If the client is not ready to accept that the relationship is broken then they should be encouraged to forgive,” or “Sometimes the client believes that if they forgive the partner and try harder to repair the relationship
there is a chance that things will be different.” Therefore, forgiveness was based upon the counselor’s perception of what the client truly desired.

When it came to encouraging a client to reconcile, respondents were more evenly divided between Yes, No, and Maybe, with the majority indicating No to reconciliation. Of those who responded Yes, the rationale can be summarized in the statement of one respondent: “Marriage is for a lifetime, there are always big and small things that partners must forgive each other in order for the relationship to survive.” Those who said they would not encourage reconciling made statements like “They could never really trust the other partner again.” So the belief was that trust could not be reestablished. When Maybe was given as a response, the statement most often given was, “If the client indicates they desire reconciliation, it should be done with the realization that the partner would most likely cheat again.”

The above information was used when considering hypotheses 7, 8, 9, and 10.

Hypothesis #7: There is no relationship between counselor religiosity and his or her willingness to encourage a client to forgive an offender.

In considering Question #1, when interviewees were asked if they would encourage forgiveness of an offender when the offense was sexual abuse of someone under the age of 18 years, 6 stated they would encourage forgiveness, 12 indicated they would not encourage forgiveness, and 2 said maybe they would encourage forgiveness. Of those who responded Maybe, one fell in the High religiosity group and one in the Low religiosity group. Of those who responded No, seven fell in the Medium religiosity group and five in the High religiosity group. Of those who responded Yes, all fell in the High religiosity group. Examining the responses in each of the Yes and No response groups, I
found that 100% of the Yes responses were in the High religiosity group, whereas 41% of the No group responses were in the High religiosity group. It would appear that religiosity does play a role when encouraging forgiveness of an offender when considering sexual abuse of someone under the age of 18 years.

When participants were asked if they would encourage forgiveness of a partner for having an affair, nine responded Yes, seven responded No, and four responded Maybe. Of those who responded Yes, eight fell in the High religiosity group and one fell in the Medium religiosity group. Of those who responded No, three fell in the High religiosity group, and four fell in the Medium religiosity group. Of those who responded Maybe, three fell in the High religiosity group and one fell in the Low religiosity group. Since a much higher percentage of those responding Yes and Maybe were in the High religiosity group, it would appear that religiosity plays a role in forgiving an offender, or in at least considering the possibility of forgiveness.

During the telephone interviews, initially it appeared that counselor religiosity played a lesser role in deciding whether or not to encourage a client to forgive than did the situation. However, a closer examination of these responses indicated otherwise. It would appear that the higher a counselor’s religiosity score, the more apt they were to encourage forgiveness of an offender.

Therefore, Hypothesis #7 was not supported. There was a relationship between counselor religiosity and his or her willingness to encourage a client to forgive an offender.

Hypothesis #8: There is no relationship between counselor religiosity and his or her willingness to encourage a client to reconcile with an offender.
In considering question #1, because no one participating in the interview process indicated that they would encourage a client to reconcile with an offender, I will not discuss reconciliation further in relationship to sexual abuse of someone under the age of 18 years.

When interviewees were asked if they would encourage reconciliation with a partner for having an affair, seven responded Yes, eight responded No, and five responded Maybe. Of those who responded Yes, six fell in the High religiosity group and one fell in the Medium religiosity group. Of those who responded No, three fell in the High religiosity group, four in the Medium religiosity group, and one in the Low religiosity group. Of those who responded Maybe, all five fell in the High religiosity group. When we look more closely at the responses, it was found that 37% of those responding No were in the High religiosity group. Of those who responded Yes, 86% were in the High religiosity group, and of those who responded Maybe, 100% were in the High religiosity group. It would appear that religiosity does play a role in encouraging a client to reconcile with an offender. The higher a counselor’s religiosity score, the more apt they were to encourage reconciliation with an offender.

Therefore, Hypothesis #8 was not supported. There was a relationship between counselor religiosity and his or her willingness to encourage reconciliation with an offender.

Hypothesis #9: There is no relationship between counselor willingness to reconcile with an offender and his or her willingness to encourage a client to reconcile with an offender.
In considering question #1, because no one participating in the interview process indicated that they would encourage a client to reconcile with an offender, I will not discuss reconciliation further in relationship to sexual abuse of someone under the age of 18 years.

When interviewees were asked if they could encourage reconciliation with a partner for having an affair, six responded Yes, nine responded No, and five responded Maybe. Of those who responded Yes, five (83%) indicated they would be willing to reconcile, and one (17%) indicated they would not be willing to reconcile with an offender themselves. Of those who responded No, eight (89%) indicated they themselves would be willing to reconcile with an offender, and one (11%) indicated they would not be willing to reconcile. Of those who responded Maybe, two (40%) indicated they would be willing to reconcile with an offender, and two (40%) indicated they would not be willing to reconcile, while one (20%) indicated they might or might not reconcile with an offender. Because more than 80% of both those indicating a willingness to reconcile with an offender and those indicating they would not be willing to reconcile with an offender would not recommend a client to reconcile with an offender, it would appear that counselor willingness to reconcile or not reconcile with an offender does not play a role in encouraging a client to reconcile with an offender.

Therefore, Hypothesis #9 was supported. There was no relationship between counselor willingness to reconcile with an offender and his or her willingness to encourage a client to reconcile with an offender.
Hypothesis #10: There is no relationship between counselor willingness to encourage a client to forgive an offender and his or her willingness to encourage a client to reconcile with an offender.

In considering question #1, because no one participating in the interview process indicated that they would encourage a client to reconcile with an offender, I will not discuss reconciliation further in relationship to sexual abuse of someone under the age of 18 years.

When interviewees were asked if they would encourage forgiveness of a partner for having an affair, nine responded Yes, seven responded No, and four responded Maybe. Of those who responded Yes, seven (77%) indicated they would also encourage a client to reconcile, and two (23%) indicated they would not encourage a client to reconcile. Of those who responded No, none (0%) indicated they would encourage a client to reconcile. Of those who responded Maybe, all (100%) indicated they might or might not encourage a client to reconcile with an offender. It appears that if a counselor encouraged forgiveness of an offender, they were also apt to encourage reconciliation with an offender. If a counselor does not encourage forgiveness of an offender, they will not encourage reconciliation with an offender.

Therefore, Hypothesis #10 was not supported. There was a relationship between counselor willingness to encourage a client to forgive an offender and his or her willingness to encourage a client to reconcile with an offender.

Summary

Chapter 4 has presented the findings of a study on counselor religiosity and its effect on forgiveness and reconciliation as it relates to the practice of counseling.
Hypotheses 1 through 6 dealt with a counselor’s general demographics of age, gender, and years of experience in relationship to counselor forgiveness and reconciliation. They also explored the counselor’s own religiosity, willingness to forgive an offender, and willingness to reconcile with an offender. Hypothesis #1 was rejected, showing that there was a relationship between counselor religiosity and his or her willingness to forgive an offender. The higher the religiosity score, the more apt a counselor was willing to forgive an offender as measured by the variables of affect, behavior, and cognition on the Enright Forgiveness Inventory. Hypothesis #4 was retained, finding no relationship between counselor religiosity and counselor willingness to reconcile with an offender. Hypothesis #2 was retained, showing that there was no relationship between the demographic variables of age, gender, and years of experience as they pertain to counselor willingness to forgive an offender. Hypothesis #5 was rejected. There was no difference in males or females, or in different age groups in the willingness to reconcile with an offender. Neither was there an interaction between gender and age in the willingness to reconcile with an offender. There was no difference in years of experience in reconciling with an offender; however, when considering years of experience and gender, it was found that males were less likely to reconcile with an offender than their female counterparts. The more years of experience a male had, the more likely they were to reconcile with an offender. There was no difference in the number of years of experience for females and willingness to reconcile. Both Hypothesis #3 and Hypothesis #6 were retained, showing no interaction between gender, age, years of experience, and religiosity in counselor willingness to forgive an offender or in counselor willingness to reconcile with an offender.
Telephone interviews were conducted with those respondents who indicated that they would be willing to participate in a follow-up interview. The interview was used to determine if there was a relationship between counselor religiosity and the willingness to encourage a client to forgive and reconcile with an offender. The interview process was also used to determine if there was a relationship between a counselor’s willingness to encourage a client to forgive an offender and a counselor’s willingness to encourage a client to reconcile with an offender. Hypotheses #7 and #8 were not supported, indicating that there was a relationship between counselor religiosity and his or her willingness to encourage a client to forgive an offender, and his or her willingness to encourage a client to reconcile with an offender. The higher a counselor’s religiosity score, the more they were apt to encourage forgiveness of an offender and reconciliation with an offender.

Hypothesis #10 was also not supported. A counselor’s willingness to encourage a client to forgive an offender was related to a counselor’s willingness to encourage a client to reconcile with an offender. If a counselor encouraged forgiveness of an offender, they were also apt to encourage reconciliation with an offender. Hypothesis #9 was supported, indicating that there was no relationship between a counselor’s own willingness to reconcile with an offender and his or her willingness to encourage a client to reconcile with an offender.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Although the concept of forgiveness is age old, it has not been systematically studied until fairly recently. As forgiveness therapies and the empirical study of these therapies continue to emerge, the question of the counselor's own sense of religiosity and forgiveness has not been considered. The overall purpose of this study was to add to a counselor’s understanding of his or her role in the counseling relationship and how they influence this relationship, and to enhance the practice of psychotherapy. The study was designed to answer the following questions:

1. Does a counselor’s religiosity influence his or her willingness to forgive and reconcile with people who have hurt or offended him or her?

2. Does a counselor’s religiosity influence his or her willingness to encourage a client to forgive and reconcile with someone who has hurt or offended him or her?

3. Does a counselor’s willingness to forgive an offender influence his or her willingness to encourage a client to forgive and reconcile with someone who has hurt or offended him or her?

4. Is there a relationship between gender, age, and years of counseling experience and willingness to forgive or to reconcile with an offender?
5. Is there an interaction between gender, age, and years of counseling experience and religiosity as they relate to willingness to forgive or reconcile with an offender?

The population of this study was limited to active registered members of the American Association of Pastoral Counselors (AAPC) in the United States. Members of this organization are recognized Pastoral Counselors, and may be licensed in the areas of Counseling, Psychology, Social Work, and/or Marriage and Family counseling. This study was also limited to those counselors and psychologists who responded to the request for participation in the study and returned the questionnaires and measurement instruments. A list of 1,200 members of the American Association of Pastoral Counselors was randomly selected by computer by the AAPC Membership Services Coordinator from a listing of the entire membership in the United States. Using this list, participants were sent a cover letter explaining the research and stating that no form of personal identification should be included with the returned documents, the willingness to forgive questionnaire, the two inventories, a demographics questionnaire, and a stamped self-addressed return envelope. A follow-up mailing was sent to everyone as a thank-you to those who responded and as a friendly reminder to those who had not. Responses were received from 407 psychotherapists and counselors.

The instruments used were the Enright Forgiveness Inventory–U.S. Version (Subkoviak et al., 1995) using six dimensions of forgiveness to measure the willingness to forgive. The six dimensions assessed were negative affect, negative behavior, negative cognition, positive affect, positive behavior, and positive cognition. For Likert-type items on the Enright Forgiveness Inventory, each answer was assigned a score from 1 to 6 or 6 to 1 depending upon whether the statements were positive or negative.
The religiosity variable was measured by the Religiosity Measures Questionnaire (Rohrbaugh & Jessor, 1975). The Religiosity Measure is an eight-item multiple-choice instrument. Each item had a possible score of 0 to 4. Scores for each scale were computed by totaling the individual items that comprise the scale. The maximum possible score was 32.

Since an appropriate instrument was not found to measure the willingness to encourage forgiveness variable involved in this proposed research, it was necessary to construct an instrument. The investigator conducted interviews with a sample of counselors from the selected population who were willing to participate in an attempt to measure this variable.

The three demographic variables considered in this study were age, gender, and years of counseling experience. Each of these variables was looked at as they relate to religiosity of the counselor and their relationship to willingness to forgive.

Correlation was used to study the relationship between counselor religiosity and counselor willingness to forgive an offender and counselor willingness to reconcile with an offender. ANOVA was used for analyzing the data concerning the demographics (age, gender, years of counseling experience), counselor willingness to forgive an offender, and counselor willingness to reconcile with an offender. ANOVA was also used for analyzing the interaction of the data concerning the demographics and the willingness to forgive an offender and the willingness to reconcile with an offender.

The qualitative portion of this study was done through telephone interviews with counselors from the sample indicating that they were willing to participate in this portion of the study. These interviews were used to determine: (a) the relationship between
counselor religiosity and counselor willingness to encourage a client to forgive or to reconcile with an offender; (b) the relationship between counselor willingness to reconcile with an offender and counselor willingness to encourage a client to reconcile with an offender; and (c) the relationship between counselor willingness to encourage a client to forgive an offender and counselor willingness to encourage a client to reconcile with an offender.

**Findings and Discussion**

The findings of this study are summarized by considering each of the 10 null hypotheses.

**Hypothesis #1:** There is no relationship between counselor religiosity and his or her willingness to forgive an offender as measured by the capacity to:

a. Overcome negative affect toward an offender

b. Overcome negative behavior toward an offender

c. Overcome negative cognition toward an offender

d. Experience positive affect toward an offender

e. Experience positive behavior toward an offender

f. Experience positive cognition toward an offender.

There was no significant relationship found between counselor religiosity and his or her willingness to forgive an offender. Of importance was the relationship between the independent variable (religiosity) and the dependent variable (forgiveness) and the six aspects of forgiveness. Five of the seven variables correlated significantly with religiosity at the .05 level: forgiveness, overcoming negative affect, overcoming negative behavior, overcoming negative cognition, and experiencing positive cognition.
correlation between religiosity and two aspects of forgiveness were not statistically significant: experiencing positive affect and experiencing positive behavior. Since both the significant and non-significant correlations were low, they will not be discussed further.

**Hypothesis #2: There is no relationship between willingness to forgive an offender and gender, age, and years of experience.**

There was no difference between gender groups, age groups, and years-of-experience groups in their willingness to forgive an offender. It was also concluded that there was no interaction between gender and age, and no interaction between gender and years of experience as they relate to willingness to forgive an offender. Since years of experience can be highly dependent upon age, no analysis was done to test for interaction between age and years of experience.

Because it is commonly believed that females are more forgiving than males, this lack of difference might be due to the androgynous nature of counselors. Perhaps it could be a function of the counselor training, or the characteristics of the individual who leads him or her into the field of counseling.

**Hypothesis #3: There is no interaction between gender, age, years of experience, and religiosity as they relate to willingness to forgive an offender.**

There was no significant interaction between gender and religiosity, between age and religiosity, and between years of experience and religiosity as they relate to willingness to forgive an offender.

**Hypothesis #4: There is no relationship between religiosity and counselor willingness to reconcile with an offender.**
The relationship between religiosity and willingness to reconcile was calculated using individual scores for religiosity and willingness to reconcile. There was no relationship between religiosity and counselor willingness to reconcile with an offender. The lack of difference may be a function of counselor training or judgment that comes with experience or age.

Hypothesis #5: There is no relationship between willingness to reconcile with an offender and gender, age, and years of experience.

There was no significant difference found between age groups, gender groups, and between years-of-experience groups as they relate to willingness to reconcile with an offender. It was concluded that there was no interaction between gender and age as they relate to willingness to forgive an offender. Since years of experience can be highly dependent upon age no analysis was done to test for a relationship between age and years of experience.

When considering years of experience and gender together, a significant difference was found between males and females in their willingness to reconcile with an offender. Males were less likely to reconcile with an offender than were females. It was expected that there would be no difference between males and female in their willingness to reconcile with an offender. This could be due to the more nurturing nature of females especially as they begin to get older. Females may have a sense of “life is too short” to maintain hurts and grievances, whereas males may not have that inclination, believing instead that others should come to them for forgiveness. When testing for the interaction between years of experience and gender, no significant interaction was found in the willingness to reconcile with an offender. This might be influenced by a counselor’s
experience and clinical judgment. The more experience a counselor has, the more males and females may become alike in their thinking concerning reconciliation with an offender.

Hypothesis #6: There is no interaction between gender, age, years of experience and religiosity in the willingness to reconcile with an offender.

There was no significant interaction between religiosity and gender, age, or years of experience as they relate to willingness to reconcile with an offender.

Data for hypotheses 7, 8, 9, and 10 were the result of telephone interviews conducted with respondents who had indicated that they were willing to participate in a follow-up interview. These respondents were asked two questions that were restricted to two areas of concern: (a) sexual abuse of an individual under 18 years of age, and (b) marital infidelity.

Hypothesis #7: There is no relationship between counselor religiosity and his or her willingness to encourage a client to forgive an offender.

Hypothesis #7 was not supported. During the telephone interview, initially it appeared that counselor religiosity played a lesser role in deciding whether or not to encourage a client to forgive than the situation did. In other words, the situation seemed to play a larger role in deciding whether or not to encourage a client to forgive an offender than did the religiosity of the counselor. However, a closer examination of the responses indicated otherwise. The higher a counselor’s religiosity score, which was an indicator of how religious the counselor believed him or herself to be, the more apt they were to encourage forgiveness of an offender. Therefore, it was concluded that there was
a relationship between counselor religiosity and his or her willingness to encourage a client to forgive an offender.

Hypothesis #8: *There is no relationship between counselor religiosity and his or her willingness to encourage a client to reconcile with an offender.*

Hypothesis #8 was not supported. When considering the sexual abuse of someone under the age of 18 years, no one participating in the interview process indicated that they would encourage a client to reconcile with an offender. Therefore, it was necessary to focus on marital infidelity alone when considering Hypothesis #8. During the interview process and upon closer examination it became evident that religiosity does play a role in encouraging a client to reconcile with an offender. The higher a counselor’s religiosity score, the more apt they were to encourage reconciliation with an offender. Therefore, it was concluded that there was a relationship between counselor religiosity and his or her willingness to encourage reconciliation with an offender.

Hypothesis #9: *There is no relationship between counselor willingness to reconcile with an offender and his or her willingness to encourage a client to reconcile with an offender.*

Hypothesis #9 was supported. No one participating in the interview process indicated that they would encourage a client to reconcile with an offender when considering sexual abuse of someone under the age of 18 years. Therefore, it was necessary to focus on marital infidelity when considering Hypothesis #9. Since those counselors indicating a willingness to reconcile with an offender and those indicating they would not be willing to reconcile with an offender would not recommend a client
reconcile with an offender, it would appear that counselor willingness to reconcile or not with an offender does not play a role in encouraging a client to reconcile with an offender. Therefore, Hypothesis #9 was supported. There was no relationship between counselor willingness to reconcile with an offender and his or her willingness to encourage a client to reconcile with an offender.

Hypothesis #10: *There is no relationship between counselor willingness to encourage a client to forgive an offender and his or her willingness to encourage a client to reconcile with an offender.*

Hypothesis #10 was not supported. No one participating in the interview process indicated that they would encourage a client to reconcile with an offender when considering sexual abuse of someone under 18 years of age. This made it necessary to focus on marital infidelity. During the interview process it became apparent that if a counselor encouraged forgiveness of an offender, they were also apt to encourage reconciliation with an offender. If a counselor did not encourage forgiveness of an offender, they did not encourage reconciliation with an offender. Thus, Hypothesis #10 was not supported. There was a relationship between counselor willingness to encourage a client to forgive an offender and his or her willingness to encourage a client to reconcile with an offender.

Conclusions

This study investigated the relationship of counselor religiosity and its effect on forgiveness and reconciliation as it relates to the practice of counseling. Hypotheses 1 through 6 dealt with a counselor’s general demographics of age, gender, and years of experience in relationship to counselor forgiveness and reconciliation. These hypotheses
were also used to explore the counselor’s own religiosity, willingness to forgive an offender, and willingness to reconcile with an offender. Hypotheses 7 through 10 dealt with the relationship between counselor religiosity and the willingness to encourage a client to forgive and reconcile with an offender. These hypotheses also were used to explore the relationship between a counselor’s willingness to encourage a client to forgive an offender and a counselor’s willingness to encourage a client to reconcile with an offender.

While it was found that there was no statistical relationship between a counselor’s religiosity and his or her own willingness to forgive an offender, the qualitative interviews lent support to the notion that a counselor’s religiosity may influence the willingness of a counselor to encourage a client to forgive an offender. During the interview process it was found that the higher the counselor’s religiosity score, the more apt they were to encourage a client to forgive an offender.

Furthermore, it was also found that there was no statistical relationship between a counselor’s religiosity and his or her own willingness to reconcile with an offender. However, the qualitative interviews lent support to the notion that a counselor’s religiosity may influence the willingness of a counselor to encourage a client to reconcile with an offender. The more religious a counselor indicated they were, the more apt they were to encourage a client to reconcile with an offender.

These findings would seem to be contradictory. The first six hypotheses indicated that religiosity did not play a role in forgiveness whereas the last four hypotheses resulted in religiosity being a factor in encouraging forgiveness. However, we must bear in mind that the first six hypotheses indicate a counselor’s own willingness to forgive and
reconcile, whereas the last four are in relation to the counselor’s willingness to encourage a client to forgive an offender. Responses to the Enright Forgiveness Inventory and The Religiosity Measure were analyzed to investigate hypotheses 1 through 6. Twenty subjects agreed to participate in qualitative interviews. They were asked the following questions: Question #1: Under what conditions would you encourage a client to forgive someone who had sexually abused him or her before the age of 18? Question #2: Under what conditions would you encourage a client to forgive a partner for having an affair? Analyses of their responses to these questions were used to investigate hypotheses 7 through 10.

Qualitative analysis supported four major findings. First, the more religious a counselor believed him or herself to be, the more apt they were to encourage forgiveness of an offender.

Second, the more religious a counselor believed him or herself to be, the more apt they were to encourage reconciliation with an offender. It is important to note that these findings were based solely on marital infidelity since all participants in the interview process indicated they would not recommend reconciliation in the case of sexual abuse of someone under 18 years of age.

Third, counselor willingness to reconcile with an offender does not play a role in encouraging a client to reconcile with an offender. It is important to note that these findings were based solely on marital infidelity since all participants in the interview process indicated they would not recommend reconciliation in the case of sexual abuse of someone under 18 years of age.
Fourth, if a counselor recommended forgiveness they were more likely to recommend reconciliation. It is important here to note that this finding was based solely on marital infidelity since all participants in the interview process indicated they would not recommend reconciliation in the case of sexual abuse of someone under 18 years of age.

**Recommendations for Further Research**

The following recommendations for further study are based on the reported results and related conclusions of this research:

1. A qualitative study should be conducted that would look more carefully at the rationale for both marital infidelity and sexual abuse. One suggestion might be to use scenarios.

2. Additional research should be conducted with a sample drawn from the general population of counselors and psychologists. For purposes of further examination of these variables, this sample should include an equal proportion of male and female counselors and psychologists. This would help to confirm whether the results of this study regarding counselor religiosity and forgiveness were in part due to the homogeneous sample.

3. Additional research should focus on the identification of the variables that might explain gender differences noted in this study. This study could evaluate the differences between male and female counselors pertaining to willingness to forgive an offender.

4. A study should be conducted that focuses on the moral development of the counselor, using some form of moral development test, and willingness to forgive.
APPENDIX
Hi, AnnMarie. Thanks for the note. The Enright Forgiveness Inventory is published by Mind Garden in California. Here is a link: http://www.mindgarden.com/. I recommend that you visit that site to see about the fees for use. If they are prohibitive, we should talk and see if Mind Garden can help you get started with this interesting research. Take care.

Bob Enright

Annmarie Cutting wrote:

Dear Dr. Enright,

I am a doctoral student at Andrews University in Berrien Springs, Michigan. I have reached the point in my studies where I am ready for my dissertation research. I am interested in doing a study on forgiveness and religiosity and how they interact in the practice of psychotherapy and counseling. I am particularly interested in how these factors influence a counselor’s practice of forgiveness counseling. After reviewing several different measurement instruments, I chose the Enright Forgiveness Inventory as one of my instruments. I would like very much to use this instrument. Could you direct me to a location where I can obtain it. Since I am on a limited budget with a family, would you give me permission to copy your instrument to submit to a portion of my population? My sample size is approximate 600 counselors throughout the United States. If you would like a copy of the research results I would be more than willing to send it to you at the conclusion of my study. If you have any questions you can contact me through e-mail or by telephone at (616) 892-5369.

Thank you for your help and consideration.

Sincerely,

AnnMarie Cutting
From: "Rev. Dr. Anne Ross Stewart" <reydranne@comcast.net>
Date: June 6, 2005 2:32:00 PM EDT
To: "'AnnMarie Cutting'" <mommom@chartermi.net>
Subject: RE: Doctoral dissertation permission

June 5, 2005

Dear AnnMarie,

You may have called the AAPC office when you did not hear back from me. I've not kept up with email recently. In any case, until AAPC has a section for members only on its website, the information you obtain from it is open to the public. You may call Ann Martin at the AAPC office at 703-385-6967 if you have any additional questions.

Best wishes on your dissertation!

Anne

Rev. Dr. Anne Ross Stewart
InterFaith Counseling Services
119 N. Frederick Ave.
Gaithersburg, MD  20877
301-869-8428  Ext. 2

-----Original Message-----
From: AnnMarie Cutting [mailto:mommom@chartermi.net]
Sent: Monday, May 16, 2005 10:22 AM
To: RevDrAnne@comcast.net
Subject: Doctoral dissertation permission

Dear Rev. Dr. Stewart,

I am currently a doctoral student at Andrews University in Berrien Springs, Michigan and am working on my dissertation. The subject of interest is forgiveness from the counselors perspective. I am seeking permission to use the address information on-line to mail questionnaires
and information to your membership so that they may participate if they desire.

Please notify me as to the possibility of using this list for my research. Thank you for your cooperation and participation in this study. If permission from another source is necessary please inform me of the proper channels through which to proceed. Thank you.

AnnMarie Cutting
mommom@chartermi.net
LETTER REQUESTING USE OF MEMBER LIST

June 6, 2005

Linda M. Crede
Membership Services Coordinator
AAPC
950A Lee Highway
Fairfax, VA 22031

Dear Ms. Crede,

My name is AnnMarie Cutting and I am a doctoral student at Andrews University in Berrien Springs, Michigan. I have completed all of the class-work required to obtain a Ph.D. in Counseling Psychology, and I am currently working on a dissertation.

I want to research a topic that has some practical value and I believe this research meets that criterion. The relationship between religiosity and forgiveness has increased the research literature in the past decade. The majority of research has focused on the value of forgiveness to the physical, spiritual, and mental well-being of the client. This study will take a look at the religiosity of the counselor and how this impacts their capacity to do forgiveness counseling. The results obtained will be beneficial not only to the counselor, but also to the clients with whom they work.

I have limited my study to Pastoral Counselors registered with the American Association of Pastoral Counselors for practical reasons.

I am requesting in this letter your written permission to use a list of registered members in the AAPC that you will provide upon request.

I will gladly provide you a summary of the results of this study if you should so desire. Results will be reported in group form and will not reflect individual counselor responses, thereby protecting their anonymity.

If you need further information you can reach me by writing or by telephone at (616) 892-5369. Thank you for your help in this matter.

Sincerely,

AnnMarie Cutting
MAILING LABEL REQUEST

From: "Linda Crede" <linda@aapc.org>
Subject: AAPC mailing label request
Date: June 1, 2005 1:20:00 PM EDT
To: <mommom@charteri.net>

Ann Marie, attached is the form to request mailing labels which you can use to contact the AAPC members. If you have any further questions feel free to contact me.

Linda M. Crede
Membership Services Coordinator
AAPC
9504A Lee Highway
Fairfax, VA 22031
703-385-6967
fax: 703-352-7725
www.aapc.org
linda@aapc.org

labelterm.doc (30.5 KB)
Dear Colleague,

I am writing a dissertation on religiosity and forgiveness as it relates to the practice of counseling. A recent review of the relevant literature suggests that very little has been done in relationship to the counselor’s religiosity and his/her practice of counseling.

You have been selected to participate in a study that will be of value to psychotherapists and counselors. A sample of Pastoral Counselors and Psychologists from the American Association of Pastoral Counselors throughout the United States is being asked to participate in this study. The central purpose of this study is to determine if a counselor’s religiosity and attitudes toward forgiveness influence his/her practice of forgiveness counseling. The results of this study will aid psychotherapists and counselors in understanding how their religiosity and attitudes influence their capacity to do forgiveness counseling.

I am asking you to complete the enclosed Demographic Sheet, Religiosity Measures Questionnaire, and Enright Forgiveness Inventory. These will take about thirty minutes to complete.

Since forgiveness is an abstract and illusive concept I am asking if you would be willing to participate in a follow up phone call concerning encouraging a client to forgive. You will only be identified as a number. If you would be willing to participate in this follow up please
provide a phone number where you can be reached and a time that is convenient to call on the enclosed form.

Please note the following items in regard to this study:

1. The Demographic Sheet, Religiosity Measures Questionnaire, and the Enright Forgiveness Inventory must all be completed and returned in the enclosed Self-addressed envelope.

2. Do Not include any identification on the testing materials or on the return envelope.

3. This study is concerned with the results of the entire sample and not the information provided by particular individuals.

Please return the completed materials as quickly as possible. I urge you to take the few minutes necessary to complete the enclosed materials. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me by letter, 10950 56th Ave., Allendale, MI 49401; telephone, (616) 892-5369; or e-mail, mommom@chartermi.net. You could also contact my advisor, Dr. Frederick Kosinski, at 1-800-253-2874 or kosinskf@andrews.edu.

By completing and returning Demographic Sheet, the Religiosity Measures Questionnaire, and the Enright Forgiveness Inventory, you are giving voluntary consent to participate in this research project.

Thank you very much for your time and participation.

Sincerely,

AnnMarie Cutting
Two weeks ago a packet containing a questionnaire and an inventory seeking the relationship between religiosity and forgiveness was sent to you. If you have already completed and returned it to me, please accept my sincere thanks. If not, I would request that you please do so today. This has been sent to a relatively small, but representative, sample of pastoral counselors. It is extremely important that yours be included in this study if the results are to accurately represent pastoral counselors.

Thank you again for your participation in this study.

Sincerely,

AnnMarie Cutting
Project Researcher
APPENDIX B

DEMOGRAPHICS QUESTIONNAIRE
General Demographic Information

Please check the appropriate area in each category.

Age:  
25-30  _________
30-40  _________
40-50  _________
50-60  _________
60-above _________

Gender:  
Male:  ________ Female:  ________

Number of years experience in counseling:

0-5  _________
6-10  _________
11-20 _________
20-30 _________
30 or more _________

By providing the following information you are consenting to follow up study participation. Please return the questionnaire even if you do not wish to participate in follow up. Thank you.

You are number ____________.

Phone #: _______________________________

Best time to call: _____ AM _____PM

Day: _________________________________
APPENDIX C

RELIGIOSITY MEASURES QUESTIONNAIRE
Religiosity Measures Questionnaire

Instructions: The following questionnaire consists of seven multiple-choice items with one fill-in-the-blank item. Please answer the following questions by *circling* the appropriate letter for the multiple-choice items and providing the most accurate number for the fill-in-the-blank question.

Ritual Religiosity

1. How many times have you attended religious services during the past year? 
   ____ times.

2. Which of the following best describes your practice of prayer or religious meditation?
   a. Prayer is a regular part of my daily life.
   b. I usually pray in times of stress or need but rarely at any other time.
   c. I pray only during formal ceremonies.
   d. I never pray.

Consequential Religiosity

3. When you have a serious personal problem, how often do you take religious advice or teaching into consideration?
   a. Almost always
   b. Usually
   c. Sometimes
   d. Never

4. How much influence would you say that religion has on the way that you choose to act and the way that you choose to spend your time each day?
   a. No influence
   b. A small influence
   c. Some influence
   d. A fair amount of influence
   e. A large influence
Theological Religiosity

5. Which of the following statements comes closest to your belief about God?
   a. I am sure that God really exists and that He is active in my life.
   b. Although I sometimes question His existence, I do believe in God and believe He knows of me as a person.
   c. I don’t know if there is a personal God, but I do believe in a higher power of some kind.
   d. I don’t know if there is a personal God or a higher power of some kind, and I don’t know if I ever will.
   e. I don’t believe in a personal God or a higher power.

6. Which one of the following statements comes closest to your belief about life after death (immortality)?
   a. I believe in a personal life after death, a soul existing as a specific individual spirit.
   b. I believe in a soul existing after death as part of a universal spirit.
   c. I believe in a life after death of some kind, but I really don’t know what it would be like.
   d. I don’t know whether there is any kind of life after death, and I don’t know if I will ever know.
   e. I don’t believe in any kind of life after death.

Experiential Religiosity

7. During the past year, how often have you experienced a feeling of religious reverence or devotion?
   a. Almost daily
   b. Frequently
   c. Sometimes
   d. Rarely
   e. Never

8. Do you agree with the following statement? “Religion gives me a great amount of comfort and security in life.”
   a. Strongly disagree
   b. Disagree
   c. Uncertain
   d. Agree
   e. Strongly Agree
APPENDIX D

SAMPLE ENRIGHT FORGIVENESS INVENTORY
Attitude Scale

Name: ________________________________ Date: ______________

We are sometimes unfairly hurt by people, whether in family, friendship, school, work, or other situations. We ask you now to think of the most recent experience of someone hurting you unfairly and deeply. For a few moments, visualize in your mind the events of that interaction. Try to see the person and try to experience what happened.

1. How deeply were you hurt when the incident occurred?
(circle one)

No hurt  A little hurt  Some hurt  Much hurt  A great deal of hurt

2. Who hurt you?

Child  Spouse  Relative  Friend of the Same Gender  Friend of the Opposite Gender  Employer

Other (specify)__________________________

3. Is the person living?

Yes  No

4. How long ago was the offense?
(Please write in the number of days, weeks, etc.)

__________ days ago  __________ months ago  __________ weeks ago  __________ years ago

5. Please briefly describe what happened when this person hurt you:

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________

Now, please answer a series of questions about your current attitude toward this person. We do not want your rating of past attitudes, but your ratings of attitudes right now. All responses are confidential so please answer honestly.

Thank you.

This set of items deals with your current feelings or emotions right now toward the person. Try to assess your actual feeling for the person on each item. For each item please check the appropriate number matching your level of agreement that best describes your current feeling. Please do not skip any item.

Thank you.

I feel _____________ toward him/her. (Place each word in the blank when answering each item.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I feel...</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 warm</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 negative</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 kindness</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 happy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 hostile</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 positive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 tender</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 unloving</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 repulsed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 resentment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 goodwill</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 angry</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 cold</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 dislike</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 caring</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 bitter</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 good</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 affection</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 friendly</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 disgust</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This set of items deals with your current behavior toward the person. Consider how you do act or would act toward the person in answering the questions. For each item, please check the appropriate number matching your level of agreement that best describes your current behavior or probable behavior. Please do not skip any items.

Thank you.

Regarding this person, I do or would _____________. (Place each word or phrase in the blank when answering each item.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I do or would</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21 show friendship</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 avoid</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 ignore</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 neglect</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 help</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 put him/her down</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 treat gently</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 be considerate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 speak ill of him/her</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 reach out to him/her</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 not attend to him/her</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 lend him/her a hand</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 not speak to him/her</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 act negatively</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 establish good relations with him/her</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 stay away</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 do a favor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 aid him/her when in trouble</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39 be biting when talking with him/her</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 attend his/her party</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This set of items deals with how you currently think about the person. Think about the kinds of thoughts that occupy your mind right now regarding this particular person. For each item please check the appropriate number matching your level of agreement that best describes your current thinking. Please do not skip any item.

Thank you.

I think he or she is _________________. (Place each word or phrase in the blank when answering each item).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I think he or she is...</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>41 wretched</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 evil</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43 horrible</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44 of good quality</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 worthy of respect</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 dreadful</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47 loving</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48 worthless</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49 immoral</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 a good person</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 nice</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52 corrupt</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53 a bad person</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regarding this person, I _________________. (Place each word or phrase in the blank when answering each item).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regarding this person, I</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>54 wish him/her well</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 disapprove of him/her</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56 think favorably of him/her</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57 hope he/she does well in life</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58 condemn the person</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59 hope he/she succeeds</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 hope he/she finds happiness</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In thinking through the person and event you just rated, please consider the following final questions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>There really was no problem now that I think about it.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>I was never bothered by what happened</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>The person was not wrong in what he or she did to me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>My feelings were never hurt.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>What the person did was fair.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We have one final question.

To what extent have you forgiven the person you rated on this Attitude Scale?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>In progress</th>
<th>Complete forgiveness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sample
APPENDIX E
FORGIVENESS ENCOURAGEMENT INTERVIEW QUESTIONS
Forgiveness Encouragement Interview

Consider each of the following. If you are counseling someone in each situation what would you do?

1. Under what conditions would you encourage a client to forgive someone who had sexually abused him/her before the age of 18? (What would be your rationale if you would not encourage a client to forgive someone who had sexually abused him/her?) Would you ever encourage them to reconcile? Under what conditions?

2. Under what conditions would you encourage a client to forgive a partner for having an affair? (What would be your rationale if you would not encourage a client to forgive his/her partner?) Would you ever encourage them to reconcile? Under what conditions?
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AUTHORIZATION TO PERFORM STUDY
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Allendale, MI 49401

Ms. Cutting,
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Protocol Title: Counselor Religiosity and Its Relationship to the Willingness to Encourage Forgiveness In Clients

This letter is to advise you that the Institutional Review Board (IRB) has reviewed and approved your proposal for research. You have been given clearance to proceed with your research plans.

All changes made to the study design and/or consent form, after initiation of the project, require prior approval from the IRB before such changes can be implemented. Feel free to contact our office if you have any questions.

The duration of the present approval is for one year. If your research is going to take more than one year, you must apply for an extension of your approval in order to be authorized to continue with this project.

Some proposal and research design designs may be of such a nature that participation in the project may involve certain risks to human subjects. If your project is one of this nature and in the implementation of your project an incidence occurs which results in a research-related adverse reaction and/or physical injury, such an occurrence must be reported immediately in writing to the Institutional Review Board. Any project-related physical injury must also be reported immediately to the University physician, Dr. Loren Hamel, by calling (269) 473-2222.

We wish you success as you implement the research project as outlined in the approved protocol.

Sincerely,

Samuel Millen
Graduate Assistant
Institutional Review Board
Cc: Dr. Frederick Kosinski

Office of Scholarly Research
(269) 471-6360 Fax: (269) 471-6246 E-mail: irb@andrews.edu
Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI 49104
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- **Ph.D.**  
  Counseling Psychology  
  December 2009  
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  Berrien Springs, MI

**Related Experience**

- **Andrews University Counseling Center**  
  Berrien Springs, MI  
  Student Counselor  
  - Practicum - marriage, personal, and academic counseling

- **Ottawa Area Intermediate School district**  
  Holland, MI  
  Sept. 1996 - June 2003  
  Teacher/Counselor  
  - Counseled and taught Teen Parents and Pregnant Teens

- **Workers Compensation Board**  
  Edmonton, Alberta, Canada  
  Psychologist  
  - Team Leader for patient rehabilitation  
  - Counseled injured workers and family members in life adjustment difficulties  
  - Training and academic counseling for patients needing retraining

- **LeDuc Community and Family Services**  
  LeDuc, Alberta, Canada  
  Psychologist  
  - Counseled families, individuals, and children in a variety of life adjustment issues

- **University of Alberta Counseling Clinic**  
  Edmonton, Alberta, Canada  
  Student Psychologist  
  - Counseled students in academic planning, family counseling, and personal counseling  
  - Provided family and personal counseling to community members  
  - Student Supervisor of University Counseling Clinic