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Abstract
Genuine self-forgiveness entails accepting responsibility for wrongdoing while experiencing a continued sense of self-worth (Enright & Human Development Study Group, 1996; Fisher & Exline, 2006; Hall & Fincham, 2005; Martin, 2008; Szablowinski, 2012; Vitz & Meade, 2011; Wenzel, Woodyatt, & Hedrick, 2012; Woodyatt & Wenzel, 2013a; Woodyatt & Wenzel, 2013b). Previous research has demonstrated that a benevolent concept of God and a personal sense of God’s forgiveness facilitate self-forgiveness (Exline, Yali, & Lobel, 1999; Hall & Fincham, 2008; Martin, 2008; McConnell & Dixon, 2012), suggesting that those who accept responsibility for the offense and believe God can forgive that offense will not become stuck in self-condemnation. The theological concept of grace is closely related to self-forgiveness; people must acknowledge that they have sinned while accepting God’s unmerited favor (McMinn, Ruiz, Marx, Wright, & Gilbert, 2006; Sells, Bechenbach, & Patrick, 2009). This study examined the effects of a grace intervention on self-forgiveness within two Friends (Quaker) churches. The grace intervention was developed in collaboration with church leaders and psychological researchers and included a 9-week sermon series, group Bible studies,
weekly grace practices. All church attendees were asked to complete a trait self-forgiveness scale, while a smaller portion of each church completed a more extensive battery of questionnaires, which were completed before and after each church experienced the grace intervention they developed. The study utilized a quasi-experimental crossover design for statistical analyses. Both congregations were assessed again at the conclusion of the second congregation’s grace intervention. Significant changes over time and an interaction effect were found in trait self-forgiveness, intrinsic religiosity, and daily spiritual experiences. Changes over time without interaction effects were found with spiritual wellbeing, grace to self, self-forgiveness feelings and actions, and self-forgiveness beliefs. Group differences were found with daily spiritual experiences, authoritarian God concept, grace to others, and genuine self-forgiveness. This study suggests that an intervention focused on the theological concept of grace may increase people’s ability to forgive themselves for offenses they have committed against other people. Future research should look at the implications this could have for those experiencing psychological distress.
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Chapter 1

Introduction

The concept of interpersonal forgiveness has been one of increasing interest in the positive psychology literature over the past few decades, with well over 1,000 scientific articles published. However, it has not been until recently that the idea of forgiving oneself, or self-forgiveness, has gained traction. Self-forgiveness is the concept that one recognizes that one has hurt another person and accepts responsibility for that wrongdoing, while reconciling that offense with a sense of self-respect and self-worth. Early models of self-forgiveness suggested that it was nearly identical to interpersonal forgiveness (Enright & Human Development Study Group [HDSG], 1996). However, more recent research demonstrates that self-forgiveness is different from interpersonal forgiveness in several ways.

Hall and Fincham (2005) noted that the focus of self-forgiveness is the harm done oneself or another person, and consequently, the victim and the perpetrator can be the same person, although self-forgiveness is most often thought of as forgiving oneself after hurting another person. In interpersonal forgiveness, however, the victim and perpetrator are separate. Another key difference between the two concepts is that reconciliation is required in order for self-forgiveness to take place while it is not obligatory for interpersonal forgiveness. In self-forgiveness individuals must accept that they have hurt another and reconcile that to a sense of continued self-worth despite the transgression. Other researchers have found that self-forgiveness is more closely tied to psychological wellbeing than interpersonal forgiveness (Davis
et al., 2015; Thompson et al., 2005) and that trait anger is linked more heavily to interpersonal forgiveness than self-forgiveness (Macaskill, 2012; Thompson et al., 2005).

**State Versus Trait Forgiveness**

Within the self-forgiveness literature, researchers have either focused on state or trait self-forgiveness. Those who research trait self-forgiveness have examined what factors contribute to a person being more or less forgiving in a general sense (sometimes referred to as *forgivingness*). Researchers have found that people who possess a more forgiving attitude towards themselves tend to have lower levels of mood disturbance (Exline, Yali, & Lobel, 1999; Friedman et al., 2010; Macaskill, 2012; Maltby, Macaskill, & Day, 2001; Thompson et al., 2005), a better quality of life (Friedman et al., 2010; Thompson et al., 2005), better psychological adjustment (Romero et al., 2006), higher levels of narcissism (Strelan, 2007), lower levels of shame (Macaskill, 2012; Ranganadhan & Todorov, 2010; Strelan, 2007), higher life satisfaction (Macaskill, 2012), lower levels of neuroticism (Leach & Lark, 2004; Maltby et al., 2001; Ross, Kendall, Matters, Wrobel, & Rye, 2004; Walker & Gorsuch, 2002), and are less likely to experience personal distress empathy (Ranganadhan & Todorov, 2010). (Personal distress empathy is related to how uncomfortable a person feels when experiencing another person’s distress). In addition, Davis et al. (2015) found that trait self-forgiveness is weakly to moderately predictive of physical health, moderately related to mental health, moderately predictive of relationship satisfaction, and weakly related to relationship commitment. However, results have been mixed concerning guilt and self-esteem. Some researchers have found those who are more likely to forgive themselves are less prone to guilt and have a higher self-esteem
(Strelan, 2007) while other researchers have not found a relationship between self-forgiveness and guilt or self-esteem (Wohl, DeShea, & Wahkinney, 2008).

Other researchers have considered specific instances of self-forgiveness rather than a general proclivity to forgive. The research concerning state self-forgiveness has been much more mixed than that regarding trait self-forgiveness. However, two aspects of state self-forgiveness have been constant throughout the literature: that self-forgiveness increases over time after an individual has hurt another person (Hall & Fincham, 2008; Wenzel, Woodyatt, & Hedrick, 2012; Woodyatt & Wenzel, 2013b) and that self-forgiveness is negatively correlated with the severity of the offense (Hall & Fincham, 2008). Zechmeister and Romero (2002) reported that individuals who forgive themselves after a transgression against another person experience less regret, self-blame, and guilt than those who are less self-forgiving, as well as experiencing an improved relationship with their victim. Self-forgivers engage in more conciliatory behaviors, but they also experience less empathy for their victim and are more likely to blame their victim. This raises the question as to whether self-forgiveness could be easily confused with self-excusing. Thus, most researchers consider acceptance of responsibility and remorse to play a key role self-forgiveness since it is an essential component of many self-forgiveness models and research (Enright & HDSG, 1996; Fisher & Exline, 2006; Hall & Fincham, 2005; Martin, 2008; Szablowinski, 2012; Vitz & Meade, 2011; Wenzel et al., 2012; Woodyatt & Wenzel, 2013a; Woodyatt & Wenzel, 2013b). It seems reasonable to assume that genuine self-forgiveness ought to include acceptance of responsibility for the wrongdoing and concern for the other. If it fails to do so, then it may be a false form of self-forgiveness.
Pseudo Self-Forgiveness

An area of concern when studying self-forgiveness is the concept of pseudo self-forgiveness, which denotes that individuals who have wronged another person have not accepted responsibility for their offense and consequently do not feel shame, guilt, remorse, or any other negative emotion that one would expect them to feel. Pseudo self-forgiveness is challenging in self-forgiveness studies because it can confound the concept of self-forgiveness. Are researchers actually measuring self-forgiveness, or are they capturing pseudo self-forgiveness?

Genuine self-forgiveness might be considered in light of the 2 x 2 grid shown in Table 1. According to this grid, one must both experience an awareness of personal responsibility for the damage done as well as absolving a desire for self-recrimination in order for genuine self-forgiveness to occur. Pseudo self-forgiveness occurs when a person is freed from self-recrimination but without much awareness that their behaviors may have been harmful to self or others.

Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsibility for Harm</th>
<th>Release from Self-Recrimination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Unawareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>Self-condemnation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Two studies have included a measure of acceptance of responsibility into their research of state self-forgiveness, as well as including measures of trait self-forgiveness (Fisher & Exline, 2006; Wenzel et al., 2012). Both studies found that current measures of trait self-forgiveness (e.g., Forgiveness of Self measure, Heartland Forgiveness Inventory, Multidimensional Forgiveness Scale, and Wohl et al.’s Self-Forgiveness Scales) did not account for acceptance of responsibility, repentance, or remorse. In fact, Wenzel et al. (2012) found that self-forgiveness (as measured by Wohl et al.’s Self-Forgiveness Scales) was significantly and negatively related to acceptance of responsibility. Fisher and Exline (2006) found that self-forgiveness (as measured by the Forgiveness of Self measure and Heartland Forgiveness Inventory) was not significantly correlated with acceptance of responsibility, while the Multidimensional Forgiveness Scale was slightly and negatively correlated with acceptance of responsibility. Since these commonly used measures of self-forgiveness show either no relationship with acceptance of responsibility or are correlated negatively, it seems that they may be measuring pseudo self-forgiveness.

Self-Forgiveness and Religion/Spirituality

Forgiveness is an important concept in many of the world’s religions. However, there has been limited research looking at the role of self-forgiveness within religious communities. Several studies have found no differences in self-forgiveness based on religious beliefs and behaviors (Exline et al., 1999; Leach & Lark, 2004; Toussaint & Williams, 2008), but another study found that religiousness negatively correlated with self-forgiveness (Walker & Gorsuch, 2002). If there is a tendency for highly religious individuals to be less self-forgiving, the
relationship between these two constructs is more complex than can be captured in correlational research.

Hall and Fincham (2008) examined the effects of conciliatory behavior toward the victim and toward a higher power and its impact on self-forgiveness. Contrary to their expectations, they found that self-forgiveness decreased as conciliatory behavior toward a higher power increased. Conversely, self-forgiveness positively correlated with conciliatory behavior toward the victim. They speculated that increased conciliatory behavior toward a higher power may be an indication of self-condemnation. Those who keep trying to make amends do not believe that they will ever be forgiven, and as a result, they are unable to forgive themselves. Going along with this idea, they also found that perceived forgiveness from God positively correlated with self-forgiveness, suggesting that willingness to forgive oneself may be related to individuals’ perceptions of how punitive and vengeful God is.

At least to some extent, the relationship between self-forgiveness and religious beliefs appears to be affected by one’s view of God. Exline et al. (1999) found difficulty forgiving God had a more deleterious impact on mental health outcomes than did self-forgiveness. Difficulty forgiving God implies that a person believes God has done something wrong, presumably something mean-spirited, and this perception of God is associated with emotional disturbance. Taken together, it appears that Exline et al. (1999) and Hall and Fincham (2008) are suggesting that if people view God as vengeful and mean-spirited, they will have more difficulty forgiving God and believing that they are worthy of forgiveness, thereby making self-forgiveness more difficult.
Similarly, McConnell and Dixon (2012) found that a personal sense of being forgiven by God significantly correlated with self-forgiveness. These researchers were interested in how a personal belief that God forgives a particular person (rather than a general belief in God’s forgiveness for humanity) affects self-forgiveness. They hypothesized that a belief in a general sense of God’s forgiveness would be less likely to affect self-forgiveness while a belief that God forgives a particular wrongdoing would facilitate self-forgiveness. As expected, they found this personal sense of God’s forgiveness was significantly correlated with self-forgiveness while a general belief in God’s forgiveness was not. Likewise, utilizing a sample of both university students and individuals from the general public, Martin (2008) found that those who felt forgiven by God were more likely to forgive themselves. They also found that those who viewed God as forgiving were more likely to engage in self-forgiveness than those who viewed God as punitive. Similar to other studies, they found that religiousness, per se, did not predict self-forgiveness; however, the experience of being forgiven by God and image of God as forgiving predicted self-forgiveness.

In sum, it appears that religiousness per se has little impact directly on self-forgiveness, but there could potentially be factors related to religious beliefs that affect self-forgiveness, such as perceived forgiveness from God and the view of God as either punitive versus forgiving. Within Christian religious communities, these views of God are closely connected to the theological concept of grace.

**Grace and Self-Forgiveness**

Very little psychological research had been done regarding the theological concept of grace. Sells, Beckenbach, and Patrick (2009) define grace as “an attitude or mental frame of
having received unmerited favor and choosing to respond to others because of a pervading sense of appreciation” (p. 208). They theorized that the use of grace within married couples experiencing conflict could help promote interpersonal healing, forgiveness, and reconciliation. Patrick, Beckenbach, Sells, and Reardon (2013) tested this model and found that interpersonal grace can promote forgiveness and reconciliation among married couples. Interestingly, they also found a positive relationship between grace and pain. Those who were able express their pain to their partner also experienced more grace within the relationship, suggesting that grace may create a space in which relational pain can be safely tolerated and expressed.

If grace is viewed as simply being nice to another person, then Patrick et al.’s (2013) findings would seem puzzling, but the Christian doctrine of grace is actually closely connected to pain and struggle. Grace is God’s merciful kindness to those who cannot earn or deserve it, thereby freeing followers of the Christian faith to honestly express struggle and live with a sense of gratitude for God’s forgiving and merciful kindness. McMinn, Ruiz, Marx, Wright, and Gilbert (2006) noted that Christian leaders desire psychologists to understand this link between grace and pain, describing pain as a result of sin. They observed that Christian leaders indicate a difference between sin as a state and sin as an act. Sin as a state “means every dimension of human experience has been tainted by the effects of sin … every nook and cranny of this good creation has been contaminated” (p. 298). Sin as an act, on the other hand, is the choice to act wrongly and is often associated with feelings of guilt. These Christian leaders go on to describe the consequences of sin, both as a state and an act, as detrimental to all. However, they note that God’s grace and forgiveness are necessary to redeem this sin.
McMinn et al. (2006) described the implications for psychologists working with Christian clients, noting that psychologists should be aware when individuals are taking too much responsibility or when they are taking too little, leading to psychological symptoms. When clients accept too much responsibility for things that they do not in actuality have responsibility for, they could potentially experience symptoms of depression, such as feelings of worthlessness related to self-condemnation. Likewise, failure to accept responsibility for things they have done wrong could lead to narcissism. With regard to the current study, it is important to note that taking too little responsibility for one’s misdeeds may also make one vulnerable to pseudo self-forgiveness.

The purpose of the current study was to consider the extent to which individuals who encounter God’s grace in the context of a Christian community were likely to forgive themselves for past misdeeds. It was hypothesized that a grace intervention in a Christian congregation would affect parishioners’ willingness and ability to forgive themselves without decreasing their sense of personal responsibility for past misdeeds. That is, a church-based grace intervention should enhance genuine self-forgiveness, and not pseudo self-forgiveness.
Chapter 2

Method

Participants

Participants included parishioners from two church congregations from the Northwest Yearly Meeting of Friends (NWYM). These were relatively small congregations with average weekly attendance hovering around 100 parishioners. Collaboration with the superintendent of the NWYM and church leaders of the two congregations helped to identify participants and plan the grace intervention. Before either congregation began this grace intervention, congregants attending a Sunday morning worship service filled out a brief measure of trait self-forgiveness. In addition, I attempted to recruit approximately 30 members from each congregation who were asked to complete a more comprehensive battery of questionnaires, related to state self-forgiveness, God concept, responsibility for the offense, severity of the offense, grace, religious beliefs and behaviors, and attitudes towards positive psychology. The initial sample included 54 participants, with 27 in each congregation. Of these, 16 were male (26%) and 38 female (61%). The majority (77%) identified as European American, with 3 (5%) as Hispanic/Latino, 2 (3%) as African-American, 1 (2%) as American Indian, and 8 (12%) not reporting ethnicity. Regarding highest level of education, 4 (7%) reported high school diplomas, 20 (32%) reported some college courses without a degree, 16 (26%) reported college degrees, and 14 (23%) reported graduate degrees. The average age of the sample was 52.1 years (standard deviation of 18.8). Using a crossover design, I found attrition over time, with only 31 participants providing data at each of the three assessment periods (13 in Congregation 1 and 18 in Congregation 2).
Measures

Heartland Forgiveness Scale. Trait self-forgiveness was assessed with a part of the Heartland Forgiveness Scale (Thompson et al., 2005). The full scale assesses 3 components of forgiveness—self-forgiveness, interpersonal forgiveness, and forgiveness of situations, but only the items related to self-forgiveness were utilized in this study ($M$ range = 30.99-31.89, $SD$ range = 5.75-6.17, $\alpha$ range = 72-.76; see Appendix A for the complete subscale). These consisted of six statements rated on a 7-point Likert-type scale, ranging from 1 (almost always false of me) to 7 (almost always true of me). In this study we found an alpha of .83 at Time 1.

Severity of the offense. To assess state self-forgiveness, participants imagined an event occurring within the last six months, in which they committed an offense against another person. Because much of the research has shown that the severity of the offense is a reliable predictor of self-forgiveness, participants were asked to rate the severity of the offense they imagined on a 7-point Likert-type scale, ranging from 1 (not severe at all) to 7 (very severe).

Woodyatt and Wenzel’s State Self-Forgiveness Scale. State self-forgiveness of that event was measured utilizing Woodyatt and Wenzel’s (2013b) scale (see Appendix B for the complete scale). It consisted of 19-items assessing 3 components—self-punitiveness ($\alpha$ range = .79-.86), pseudo self-forgiveness ($\alpha$ range = .74-.79), and genuine self-forgiveness ($\alpha$ range = .82-.93). These statements were rated on a 7-point Likert-type scale, ranging from 1 (do not at all agree) to 7 (strongly agree). At Time 1 we found alpha coefficients of .56 for self-punitiveness, .81 for pseudo self-forgiveness, and .82 for genuine self-forgiveness.

Wohl et al.’s State Self-Forgiveness Scale. State self-forgiveness was also assessed using Wohl et al.’s (2008) scale (see Appendix C for the complete scale). Wohl’s scale consisted
of 17 statements regarding self-forgiving feelings and actions ($M = 1.76$, $SD = 1.28$, $\alpha = .86$) and self-forgiving beliefs ($M = 3.09$, $SD = 1.23$, $\alpha = .91$). Statements were rated on a 4-point rating scale, ranging from 1 (not at all) to 4 (completely). At Time 1 we found alphas of .92 for self-forgiveness feelings and actions and .91 for self-forgiveness beliefs.

**Experiencing God’s Forgiveness Scale.** In addition, because self-forgiveness has been shown to be linked to the experience of God’s forgiveness, Martin’s (2008) Experiencing God’s Forgiveness Scale was used (see Appendix E for the complete scale). This consisted of three statements regarding positively experiencing God’s forgiveness ($M$ range = 5.76-7.32, $SD$ range = 2.92-3.12, $\alpha$ range = .95-.96) and two items regarding a punitive experience of God’s forgiveness ($M$ range = 2.23-2.34, $SD$ range = 1.57-1.73, $\alpha = .75$). Statements were rated on an 11-point Likert-type scale, ranging from 0 (strongly disagree) to 10 (strongly agree). In the present study at Time 1, reliability was only .29 for the two punitive divine forgiveness items, while it was .81 for the three positive forgiveness items.

**Responsibility for Offense Scale.** Given Fisher and Exline’s (2006) finding that acceptance of responsibility is an indicator of genuine self-forgiveness, their scale ($M = 7.4$, $SD = 2.1$, $\alpha = .83$) was used to assess the extent to which participants took responsibility for their offense (see Appendix F for the complete scale). This scale consisted of five statements rated on an 11-point Likert-type scale, ranging from 0 (completely disagree) to 10 (completely agree). At Time 1 in the current study alpha reliability was .76.

**God Concept Scale.** Because self-forgiveness is in part related to whether individuals view God as forgiving or punitive, Okun, Johnson, and Cohen’s (2013) God Concept Scale was used to measure how participants viewed God (see Appendix D for the complete scale). This
consisted of five statements related to God’s benevolence ($M = 5.75$, $SD = 1.20$, $\alpha = .86$) and five statements regarding an authoritarian God concept ($M = 3.99$, $SD = 1.55$, $\alpha = .86$). Statements were rated on a 7-point Likert-type scale, ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). The reliability for God’s benevolence was not strong at Time 1 in the current study (alpha = .38), though the authoritarian view of God subscale showed good reliability (alpha = .84).

**Dimensions of Grace Scale (DoGS).** The DoGS (Bufford, Sisemore, & Blackburn, 2016) was used to measure grace orientation (see Appendix G for the complete scale). Each item is responded to on a 7-point continuum from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). It consisted of five sub-scales: God’s Grace, Costly Grace, Grace to Self, Grace from Others, and Grace to Others. Each sub-scale had seven items, except the God’s Grace subscale, which had eight. Bufford et al. (2016) provided evidence of good internal consistency (alphas ranged from .71 to .98), as well as convergent and discriminant validity, while showing that each of the five subscales contributed unique predictive variance. Internal consistency (coefficient alpha) at Time 1 for the entire scale was .86.

**Daily Spiritual Experiences Scale (DSES).** The DSES (Underwood, 2011) was a scale that was designed to measure how often people experience the Divine (see Appendix J for the complete scale). It contained 15 items that were rated on a 6-point, Likert-type scale, ranging from 1 (many times a day) to 6 (never or almost never). The alpha coefficient in the present study was .95 at Time 1.

**Spiritual Wellbeing Scale (SWB).** This scale (Ellison, 1983) measured participants’ spiritual wellbeing (see Appendix K for the complete scale). It consisted of 20 items, which
were rated on a 6-point, Likert-type scale, ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 6 (*strongly agree*). The scale contained two subscales measuring Religious Wellbeing (RWB) and Existential Wellbeing (EWB). The alpha coefficient in the current study was .90 at Time 1.

**Duke University Religion Index (DUREL).** The DUREL (Koenig & Büssing, 2010) was used to measure religiosity (*α* range = .78-.91; see Appendix H for the complete scale). It contained three subscales, examining frequency of religious service attendance, frequency of private religious activities, and intrinsic religiosity. The first subscale regarding religious service attendance contained one item that was rated on a 6-point rating scale, ranging from 1 (*never*) to 6 (*more than once per week*). The subscale related to private religious activities contained one item that was rated on a 6-point rating scale, ranging from 1 (*rarely or never*) to 6 (*more than once a day*). The subscale regarding intrinsic religiosity contained three items that were rated on a 5-point Likert-type scale, ranging from 1 (*definitely not true of me*) to 5 (*definitely true of me*). Overall internal consistency in this study was .76 at Time 1.

**Positive Psychology Attitude Scale (PPAS).** The PPAS was a scale designed for this study to assess the degree to which participants held favorable attitudes toward psychological science (see Appendix I for the complete questionnaire). It consisted of six items, such as *Positive psychology is a worthwhile endeavor.* Participants responded on a 7-point continuum from 1 (Strongly disagree) to 7 (Strongly agree). The alpha coefficient in the present study was .84 at Time 1.

**Demographics.** Participants filled out a demographic questionnaire, answering questions regarding their sex, race/ethnicity, age, and employment status. (See Appendix L for the complete questionnaire.)
Procedure

The researchers collaborated with the Superintendent of the Northwest Yearly Meeting (NWYM) of Friends and the church leaders of the two congregations to develop a healing grace intervention. The intervention was designed to fit the unique needs of each particular church and included activities such as a sermon series, small group studies, and weekly grace practices. Effective collaboration required that the healing grace campaign be developed collaboratively with faith community leaders who brought their pastoral and theological expertise to the planning process (McMinn, Aikins, & Lish, 2003). The collaborative process involved a series of meetings that brought together leaders from the two congregations as well as those involved in this project (i.e., my supervisor, consultants who are part of the grant supporting this research, and me). Both congregations developed a “grace emphasis” campaign, involving a sermon series, a small-group study program utilizing The Good and Beautiful God by James Bryan Smith (2009), and personal weekly grace practices. This study implemented 9-week interventions in both congregations.

Before either congregation began the grace interventions, congregants filled out the Heartland Forgiveness Scale (Thompson et al., 2005), along with an identifying number, which allowed their pre-intervention results to be paired with their post-intervention assessment results. In addition, 27 members of each congregation were asked to complete the more comprehensive battery of questionnaires mentioned above. After the initial assessment, one congregation engaged in the grace campaign while the other congregation did not. Once the first congregation completed the campaign, congregants from both churches again filled out the Heartland Forgiveness Scale (Thompson et al., 2005), and the same 27 members were asked to complete
the more comprehensive set of questionnaires. Then the second congregation participated in
their healing grace campaign. After the second church finished the grace campaign, both
congregations completed the assessment process one final time. This crossover design allowed
for a comparison group during the first congregation’s campaign and also for a follow-up
assessment of the first congregation at the conclusion of the second congregation’s campaign.
Participants were offered a $50 gift certificate if they completed the test packet all three times.
The study was approved by the Human Subjects Research Committee at George Fox University.
Chapter 3

Results

Results were analyzed using mixed measures ANOVAs (see Table 2 for scores on the outcome measures). On the measure of trait self-forgiveness, the Heartland Forgiveness Scale, participants changed over time, $F(2, 58) = 10.19, p < .001$, and an interaction effect was found, $F(2, 58) = 4.63, p = .01$, with participants in Congregation 1 changing between Time 1 and Time 2 more than participants in Congregation 2. A repeated measures effect was found on Wohl, et al.’s (2008) state self-forgiveness scale, with participants reporting greater state self-forgiveness over time for Self-Forgiving Feelings and Actions, $F(2, 52) = 5.89, p = .005$, as well as Self-Forgiving Beliefs, $F(2, 52) = 5.79, p = .005$. However, the expected interaction effects were not found. No repeated measures or interaction effects were found for the other state self-forgiveness measure or the God Concept, Experiencing God’s Forgiveness, or Responsibility scales. The Genuine Self-Forgiveness subscale of Woodyatt and Wenzel’s (2013a) state self-forgiveness scale showed that participants in Congregation 2 reported higher levels of self-forgiveness than those in Congregation 1, $F(1, 26) = 9.40, p = .049$.

Participants changed over time, $F(2, 58) = 4.07, p = .022$, and an interaction effect was found, $F(2, 58) = 5.40, p = .007$, on the DUREL. A significant increase in Spiritual Wellbeing was observed, $F(2, 58) = 9.94, p < .001$, though no interaction effects were found. This was also true for both the Religious Well-being, $F(2, 58) = 17.16, p < .001$, and Existential Well-being, $F(2, 58) = 5.64, p = .006$, subscales of the Spiritual Wellbeing scale. Similarly the Daily Spiritual
Experiences scale revealed increased spiritual experiences over the course of the study, $F_{(2, 58)} = 5.34, p = .007$, but no interaction effects. Changes were not observed on the Dimensions of Grace Scale except that Grace to Self increased over time, $F_{(2, 58)} = 7.37, p = .001$, with no interaction effects, and a group difference was observed on the Grace to Others scale, with those in Congregation 2 reporting more grace toward others than those in Congregation 1, $F_{(1, 29)} = 7.53, p = .010$, with again, no interaction.

Several measures of religion and spirituality at Time 1 were correlated with Time 1 measures of self-forgiveness (See Table 3). Trait self-forgiveness was not significantly correlated with any of the measures of religion or spirituality. Pseudo self-forgiveness (Woodyatt & Wenzel, 2013b) was negatively correlated with both subscales of the SWB scale, while self-forgiving feelings and actions and self-forgiving beliefs (Wohl et al., 2008) were correlated with existential well-being on the SWB scale. Experiencing God’s forgiveness was positively associated with all of the measures of religion and spirituality.

We were unable to analyze the data from the Heartland given to each of the congregations. Only six participants from the first congregation and three from the second congregation completed the scale at all three data collection points. Given this small sample size, we lacked sufficient data to analyze the results.
### Table 2

**Scores on the Outcome Measures**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Time 1</th>
<th>Time 2</th>
<th>Time 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Congregation 1</td>
<td>Congregation 2</td>
<td>Congregation 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heartland</td>
<td>4.97 (.78)</td>
<td>4.64 (1.37)</td>
<td>5.64 (.89)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punitiveness</td>
<td>2.73 (1.24)</td>
<td>2.82 (1.02)</td>
<td>2.76 (.91)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pseudo SF</td>
<td>2.21 (1.33)</td>
<td>2.23 (1.32)</td>
<td>2.11 (1.75)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genuine SF</td>
<td>5.47 (.84)</td>
<td>6.46 (1.65)</td>
<td>5.55 (1.65)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF Feel &amp; Action</td>
<td>2.23 (.36)</td>
<td>2.25 (.22)</td>
<td>2.24 (.36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF Beliefs</td>
<td>2.18 (.31)</td>
<td>2.26 (.50)</td>
<td>2.23 (.34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiencing God’s Forgiveness</td>
<td>9.22 (1.76)</td>
<td>9.64 (2.06)</td>
<td>9.13 (2.71)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>8.98 (1.64)</td>
<td>8.95 (2.24)</td>
<td>7.82 (2.90)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benevolent God Concept</td>
<td>6.14 (.38)</td>
<td>6.47 (.53)</td>
<td>6.32 (.37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authoritarian God Concept</td>
<td>4.48 (1.33)</td>
<td>3.67 (1.77)</td>
<td>4.69 (1.60)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DoGs God’s Grace</td>
<td>5.27 (.67)</td>
<td>5.82 (1.19)</td>
<td>5.79 (.74)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DoGs Costly Grace</td>
<td>5.96 (1.01)</td>
<td>6.06 (1.33)</td>
<td>5.88 (1.13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DoGs Self Grace</td>
<td>3.62 (.88)</td>
<td>2.97 (1.22)</td>
<td>4.10 (1.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DoGs Grace from Others</td>
<td>5.07 (1.11)</td>
<td>4.75 (1.85)</td>
<td>5.07 (1.20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DoGs Grace to Others</td>
<td>4.51 (1.97)</td>
<td>5.50 (.97)</td>
<td>4.80 (1.18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSES</td>
<td>3.84 (.70)</td>
<td>4.72 (1.01)</td>
<td>4.28 (.68)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spiritual Wellbeing</td>
<td>4.41 (.43)</td>
<td>4.94 (.78)</td>
<td>5.01 (.84)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EWB</td>
<td>4.38 (.49)</td>
<td>4.80 (.91)</td>
<td>4.91 (.91)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RWB</td>
<td>4.38 (.52)</td>
<td>4.94 (.70)</td>
<td>5.14 (.74)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUREL Intrinsic</td>
<td>4.18 (.75)</td>
<td>4.56 (.60)</td>
<td>4.67 (.49)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Psych</td>
<td>6.17 (.73)</td>
<td>6.26 (.84)</td>
<td>6.09 (.79)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Desirability</td>
<td>5.46 (1.45)</td>
<td>5.44 (2.36)</td>
<td>4.39 (2.26)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3

*Correlations at Time 1 between Measures of Religion/Spirituality and Self-Forgiveness*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Punitiveness</th>
<th>Pseudo SF</th>
<th>Genuine SF</th>
<th>SF Feel &amp; Action</th>
<th>SF Beliefs</th>
<th>Experiencing God’s Forgiveness</th>
<th>Benevolent God Concept</th>
<th>Authoritarian God Concept</th>
<th>DSES</th>
<th>EWB</th>
<th>RWB</th>
<th>Spiritual Wellbeing</th>
<th>DUREL Intrinsic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heartland</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.31*</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>.60*</td>
<td>.45*</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punitiveness</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.35*</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pseudo SF</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.62*</td>
<td>-.59*</td>
<td>-.29*</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.41*</td>
<td>-.29*</td>
<td>-.38*</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genuine SF</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.43*</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF Feel &amp; Actions</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.83*</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.40*</td>
<td>.40*</td>
<td>.31*</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF Beliefs</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.44*</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.36*</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiencing God’s Forgiveness</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.39*</td>
<td>.48*</td>
<td>.63*</td>
<td>.60*</td>
<td>.47*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benevolent God Concept</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.30*</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.39*</td>
<td>.32*</td>
<td>.42*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authoritarian God Concept</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSES</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.54*</td>
<td>.62*</td>
<td>.62*</td>
<td>.70*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EWB</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.71*</td>
<td>.94*</td>
<td>.56*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.67*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RWB</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.91*</td>
<td>.69*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Notes. All correlations are reported as Pearson product-moment correlations. *indicates the correlation is statistically significant (p < .05).*
Chapter 4

Discussion

In this study a significant change over time and an interaction effect were found regarding trait self-forgiveness. Past research hinted that measures of trait self-forgiveness could be confounded with pseudo self-forgiveness (Fisher & Exline, 2006; Wenzel et al., 2012), potentially calling into question the result that was found in this study. However, there were no significant changes in the pseudo self-forgiveness measure, and pseudo self-forgiveness and trait self-forgiveness were significantly inversely correlated. These results suggest that the grace intervention may have increased trait self-forgiveness among the participants.

Additionally, we did not find clear evidence supporting the hypothesis that the grace intervention impacted state self-forgiveness directly, although significant changes over time were demonstrated for both congregations on one state self-forgiveness measure. These results were likely confounded by failing to tell participants to imagine the same offense over all three data collection periods. Since participants were not explicitly told to imagine the same offense, it is likely that they imagined different offenses each time, making it difficult to ascertain the effectiveness of the intervention on the initial offense they imagined. It seems possible that if future studies corrected this by telling participants to imagine the same offense throughout the study, then significant changes in state self-forgiveness might be linked more directly to grace interventions.
Past research suggested that religiousness in and of itself is not directly related to self-forgiveness. Rather, specific religious concepts, such as a person’s concept of God as benevolent versus authoritarian and a person’s ability to experience God’s forgiveness, are more important. In this study these relationships were assessed at Time 1, when the sample sizes were largest, and some modest relationships between religious scales and self-forgiveness were found. No relationships were found between either benevolent or authoritarian views of God and the forgiveness measures, including self-forgiveness. However, existential, religious, and spiritual well-being were significantly related to self-forgiveness beliefs, feelings, and actions; they were inversely related to pseudo self-forgiveness. Experiencing God’s forgiveness was significantly correlated with the well-being measures, daily spiritual experiences, and intrinsic religiousness. Finally, genuine self-forgiveness was significantly correlated with daily spiritual experiences but not the other R/S measures.

With regard to changes over time, intrinsic religiousness, as measured by the DUREL, increased over time and demonstrated a significant interaction effect. Additionally, spiritual wellbeing significantly increased over time. However, no effects for the grace intervention in this study were found for participants’ benevolent God concept or experiences of God’s forgiveness. It is intriguing to see the changes in trait self-forgiveness that correspond to intrinsic religiousness and spiritual well-being in light of previous findings that show religiousness is not closely related to self-forgiveness (Exline et al., 1999; Leach & Lark, 2004; Toussaint & Williams, 2008).

It is possible that partnering with these religious communities and implementing the grace interventions increased the salience of religious beliefs and practices among the
participants, thereby increasing their self-reported religiousness. Given that past research did not look at religiousness or related religious concepts (i.e., experiencing God’s forgiveness) over time but instead measured it at a single point in time, it seems likely that religiousness and self-forgiveness have a more complex relationship. This relationship seems to be best understood, not just by a single measure of religiousness at a single point in time, but rather by the salience of religious beliefs and practices, which can and do change over time. Further research clarifying the roles of time, religiousness, and specific religious ideas (such as God concept and experiencing God’s forgiveness) should be examined to clarify what roles they have on self-forgiveness. Perhaps what is needed here is a model for how these attributes interact with each other and contribute to meaning-making, as suggested by Paloutzian and Park (2013).

It is nonetheless perplexing that there were no significant correlations related to participants’ benevolent God concept and their experience of God’s forgiveness. Past studies, for example, divided their sample into those who experienced a benevolent concept of God and those who experienced a more authoritarian God concept and found that those who experienced God as more benevolent were more likely to be self-forgiving (Exline et al., 1999; Hall & Fincham, 2008; Martin, 2008). However, this study functioned more as a field study and we did not analyze for differences based on these scores. It is possible that those who had an authoritarian God concept obscured the impact that the grace intervention may have produced on those who had a more benevolent God concept.

In regard to the results found on the grace measures, only one significant result was discovered, namely that grace to oneself increased over time. Grace towards others, grace from others, costly grace, and God’s grace did not demonstrate any significant changes. Given that
this study implemented a grace intervention, we expected that participants would experience an
increase in grace in all of these different domains. However, grace toward oneself appears to be
the most similar to self-forgiveness, and so seeing this domain increase over time is consistent
with other findings. It is possible that the forgiveness focus of the study, including the extensive
use of forgiveness measures, may have primed this particular change. Future research should
examine what types of interventions promote the other domains of grace.

Confounding these results, it is possible that elements of the grace intervention began in
Congregation 2 during the initial phase of the study. In addition, group differences between the
two congregations were found regarding daily spiritual experiences, authoritarian God concept,
grace to others, and Woodyatt’s genuine state forgiveness. Given that there were significant
differences between the congregations on several concepts even before the grace intervention
was implemented, it is difficult to discern whether these differences or the intervention
themselves contributed to the results found. However, it seems likely that different churches will
always have differences in important religious ideas, and these results reflect the reality of doing
research in real communities rather than in the laboratory. Having interventions that are
effective in communities seem preferable to ones that only work in artificial environments.

This study has several implications for self-forgiveness research and practice. First, it
suggests that trait self-forgiveness can improve within religious communities who have a strong
focus on grace. Second, this is one of the first studies attempting to improve participants’ ability
to forgive themselves using an intervention, rather than merely describing the characteristics,
qualities, or ideas of those who are able to engage in self-forgiveness (Hall & Fincham, 2008;
Wenzel et al., 2012; Woodyatt & Wenzel, 2013b; Zechmeister & Romero, 2002). This study suggests that self-forgiveness may be enhanced through intervention.

Additionally, there are clinical implications for the findings in this study. Given that people who seek psychotherapy may have difficulty with self-loathing, self-condemnation, and forgiving themselves for offenses they have committed against other people, these findings hint at the possibility of helping them work through their difficulty forgiving themselves and potentially help them reconcile a continued sense of self-worth while acknowledging the hurt they have caused. It is possible that with continued research, utilizing both religious and non-religious samples, a manualized treatment could be developed. It seems likely that such an intervention could be helpful to those suffering from anxiety and depression, as well as couples experiencing conflict. It would be helpful for future research to include clinical samples to determine whether a self-forgiveness intervention could improve psychological problems.

The present study utilized collaboration between the researchers and two Christian congregations. This collaboration produced several expected and unexpected consequences. First, given that this collaboration occurred within the contexts of two different churches that likely have different needs among their congregants, each congregation had slightly different grace interventions that were tailored to the specific needs of those congregations. Both congregations read the same book in their small group studies, and both congregations had access to the weekly grace practices. However, the church leaders of each congregation preached different sermons, even though both sermon series focused on grace, and the book discussions in the study groups focused on the aspects of the book that were relevant for those participants.
This ability to tailor the interventions to the specific needs of different groups is both positive and bothersome. On one hand, it is good to know that significant changes can be experienced, even with, or perhaps because of, these differences in interventions. The effects of the intervention apparently do not require rigidity in implementation. Additionally, it seems likely that because each congregation was able to somewhat tailor the intervention to their unique needs, collaboration with the churches was better, and there was more enthusiasm for the project than if they were forced to implement an intervention dictated by the psychological researchers involved in the project. For instance, the congregation who implemented the grace intervention second had their pastor leave the church right before their intervention was set to begin. However, it seems likely that the study was able to continue, even though the church leader left, because of the researchers’ and the churches’ dedication to collaboration (McMinn et al., 2003).

However, this fluidity within the research design also poses several challenges. Given the variability introduced by this style of research, it is difficult to determine what aspects of the study contributed to the changes observed here and which had no impact or even detracted from the results. Was it the grace practices? The book discussion? Also, given the slight differences in the implementation of the grace intervention within each church, it is again difficult to ascertain whether the commonalities or the differences in the implementation had any impact on the results. Finally, it is possible that elements of the grace intervention began in Congregation 2 during the intervention phase for Congregation 1. Future research in more controlled settings might be helpful to clarify what aspects of this study actually contributed to self-forgiveness.
Given that psychological research into the theological concept of grace is in its nascency (Sells et al., 2009), this study represents a meaningful contribution to the field. This is one of the first studies utilizing a grace intervention, and it was challenging to first define grace and also to come up with an intervention that focuses primarily on grace without too many other confounding theological and/or positive psychology concepts, like forgiveness or gratitude. Qualitative research to determine the grace interventions that promote the most change will likely be helpful in promoting the continued growth of grace in the field of positive psychology. In addition, continued research on how grace impacts other psychological ideas, such as psychological diagnoses and psychological wellbeing, would also be useful.

This study has various limitations. First, the congregations participating in this study demonstrated significant differences in a variety of important areas, even before the beginning of this study. Second, given the differences in the grace interventions between each congregation, it is difficult to determine precisely what promoted change within each church. Third, these results are challenging to generalize to those outside of the Friends community since it is likely that the members of this particular Christian denomination have different views of grace and forgiveness than other Christian denominations and those who are not religious. Fourth, there is potential selection bias because the congregants willing to complete questionnaires were volunteers in both congregations.

In conclusion, significant increases in trait self-forgiveness among Friends church members who underwent a grace intervention were found, which represents an important step in both self-forgiveness and grace research. Within the self-forgiveness literature, this study provides support for the hypothesis that an intervention can increase self-forgiveness, while in
the grace research, this project provides a first step in how to approach grace within the field of positive psychology. However, the quasi-experimental design of the study precludes firm causal conclusions. Continued research to further the development of an intervention to help those who struggle with self-forgiveness would be beneficial, as well as continued expansion of how grace fits within the framework of positive psychology.
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Appendix A

Heartland Forgiveness Scale, Self-Forgiveness Subset (Thompson et al., 2005)

Directions: In the course of our lives negative things may occur because of our own actions, the actions of others, or circumstances beyond our control. For some time after these events, we may have negative thoughts or feelings about ourselves, others, or the situation. Think about how you typically respond to such negative events. Below each of the following items circle the number (from the 7-point scale below) that best describes how you typically respond to the type of negative situation described. There are no right or wrong answers. Please be as open as possible in your answers.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Almost always More often More often Almost always false of me false of me true of me true of me

Although I feel bad at first when I mess up, over time I can give myself some slack.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

I hold grudges against myself for negative things I’ve done.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Learning from bad things that I’ve done helps me get over them.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

It is really hard for me to accept myself once I’ve messed up.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

With time I am understanding of myself for mistakes I’ve made.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

I don’t stop criticizing myself for negative things I’ve felt, thought, said, or done.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Appendix B

State Self-Forgiveness Scale (Woodyatt & Wenzel, 2013b)

Based on the offense you described in your narrative, rate how much you agree with the following statements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What I have done is un forgive able.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can’t seem to get over what I have done.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel like I can’t look myself in the eye.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I deserve to suffer for what I have done.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I want to punish myself for what I have done.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I keep going over what I have done in my head.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel the other person got what they deserved.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I wasn’t the only one to blame for what happened.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel that what happened was my fault (R).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think the other person was really to blame for what I did.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel angry about the way I have been treated.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I’m not really sure whether what I did was wrong.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have tried to think through why I did what I did.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am trying to accept myself even with my failures.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Since committing the offense I have tried to change.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am trying to learn from my wrongdoing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have spent time working through my guilt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have put energy into processing my wrongdoing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t take what I have done lightly.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C

State Self-Forgiveness Scale (Wohl et al., 2008)

Based on the offense you described in your narrative, rate how much you agree with the following statements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>A little</td>
<td>Mostly</td>
<td>Completely</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As I consider what I did that was wrong, I . . .

- . . feel compassionate toward myself . . . 1 2 3 4
- . . feel rejecting of myself (R) . . . . . . . . 1 2 3 4
- . . feel accepting of myself . . . . . . . . . 1 2 3 4
- . . feel dislike toward myself (R) . . . . . . . . 1 2 3 4
- . . show myself acceptance . . . . . . . . . . . . 1 2 3 4
- . . show myself compassion . . . . . . . . . . . . 1 2 3 4
- . . punish myself (R) . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 1 2 3 4
- . . put myself down (R) . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 1 2 3 4

As I consider what I did that was wrong, I believe I am . . .

- . . acceptable . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 1 2 3 4
- . . okay . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 1 2 3 4
- . . awful (R) . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 1 2 3 4
- . . terrible (R) . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 1 2 3 4
- . . decent . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 1 2 3 4
- . . rotten (R) . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 1 2 3 4
- . . worthy of love . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 1 2 3 4
- . . a bad person (R) . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 1 2 3 4
- . . horrible (R) . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 1 2 3 4
**Appendix D**

**God Concept Scale (Okun et al., 2013)**

Rate how much you agree with the following statements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>God is lenient</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>God is merciful</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>God is gracious</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>God is helping</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>God is compassionate</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>God is controlling</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>God is commanding</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>God is wrathful</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>God is strict</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>God is punishing</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix E

Experiencing God’s Forgiveness Scale (Martin, 2008)

Based on the offense you described in your narrative, rate how much you agree with the following statements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>God is mad at me (R)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>God has offered forgiveness to me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>God will not forgive offenses such as mine (R)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have received forgiveness from God</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have accepted God’s forgiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

0 = strongly disagree, 10 = strongly agree
Appendix F

Acceptance of Responsibility Scale (Fisher & Exline, 2006)

Based on the offense you described in your narrative, rate how much you agree with the following statements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I feel I was responsible for what happened</td>
<td>0-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I wasn’t really to blame for this (R)</td>
<td>0-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was in the wrong in the situation</td>
<td>0-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This was clearly my fault</td>
<td>0-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I did not really do anything wrong (R)</td>
<td>0-10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix G

**The Dimensions of Grace Scale (Bufford, Sisemore, & Blackburn, 2016)**

*Rate how much you agree with each statement below.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Moderately disagree</th>
<th>Mildly disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Mildly agree</th>
<th>Moderately agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I don’t get mad at people, I get even.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One of my parents could stay mad at me for days sometimes.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because of God’s work in my life I feel I have more self-control.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My emotions are more likely to be appropriate.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I need to see remorse before I offer forgiveness.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The more obedient I am, the more God loves me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others must earn my forgiveness.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I do something wrong I just can easily forget it.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because of grace bestowed to me, I am able to forgive others.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If someone wrongs me, they need to make it right.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People who do bad things deserve what they get.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because of God’s work in my life I feel I have more self-control.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My actions are more likely to be appropriate.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>Moderately disagree</td>
<td>Mildly disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Mildly agree</td>
<td>Moderately agree</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I find it hard to accept help or gifts from others.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If I work harder, I need less grace.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I must work hard to experience God’s grace and forgiveness.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I seldom feel shame.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am able to forgive others when they hurt me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I accept my shortcomings.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I seldom get very upset with myself when others are angry with me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a child, one of my parents often used the “silent treatment” with me when upset with me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The harder I work, the more I earn God’s favor.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My Dad seldom said thank you.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>God cares more about what I do than who I am.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My behavior does not matter since I’ve been forgiven.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My mother or father keeps bringing up my past failures</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes when I pray for something I really want, I find that I end up with something even better.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I tend to dwell on my faults.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>Moderately disagree</td>
<td>Mildly disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Mildly agree</td>
<td>Moderately agree</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My beliefs about grace encourage me to be forgiving of others.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a child I was confident that at least one of my parents loved me no matter what.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>God is in the process of making me more like Jesus.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My parents always remember my mistakes.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those who sin less than others require less grace.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I generally give people what I get from them.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When offended or harmed by others I generally find it easy to forgive them.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix H

The Duke University Religion Index (Koenig & Büssing, 2010)

How often do you attend church or other religious meetings? (ORA)

1 2 3 4 5 6
Never Once a year A few times a month Once a week More than once a week
or less a year a month a week

How often do you spend time in private religious activities, such as prayer, meditation or Bible study? (NORA)

1 2 3 4 5 6
Rarely A few times Once a Two or more Daily More than
or never a month week times a week weekly

The following section contains 3 statements about religious belief or experience. Please mark the extent to which each statement is true or not true for you.

In my life, I experience the presence of the Divine (i.e., God) - (IR)

1 2 3 4 5
Definitely to be true Unsure Tends to be true Definitely true of me
not true

My religious beliefs are what really lie behind my whole approach to life - (IR)

1 2 3 4 5
Definitely to be true Unsure Tends to be true Definitely true of me
not true

I try hard to carry my religion over into all other dealings in life - (IR)

1 2 3 4 5
Definitely to be true Unsure Tends to be true Definitely true of me
not true
Appendix I

Positive Psychology Attitude Scale

Positive psychology is the science of human flourishing, including topics such as gratitude, happiness, forgiveness, grace, humility, and wisdom. Please indicate your perspectives on positive psychology and the Christian faith by responding to the following items.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Positive psychology is a worthwhile endeavor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Christians have things to learn from positive psychologists</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Positive psychologists have things to learn from Christians</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Positive psychology and Christianity share common values</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Psychological science can contribute to my faith</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. It is important for science and faith to work together</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix J

Daily Spiritual Experiences Scale (DSES)

Instructions: The list that follows includes items you may or may not experience. Please consider how often you directly have this experience, and try to disregard whether you feel you should or should not have these experiences. A number of items use the word “God.” If this word is not a comfortable one for you, please substitute another idea which calls to mind the divine or holy for you.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Many times a day</th>
<th>Every day</th>
<th>Most days</th>
<th>Some days</th>
<th>Once in a while</th>
<th>Never or almost never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I feel God’s presence.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I experience a connection to all life.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During worship, or at other times when connecting with God, I feel joy, which lifts me out of my daily concerns.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I find strength in my religion or spirituality.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I find comfort in my religion or spirituality.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel deep inner peace or harmony.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I ask for God’s help in the midst of daily activities.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel guided by God in the midst of daily activities.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel God’s love for me, directly.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel God’s love for me, through others.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am spiritually touched by the beauty of creation.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel thankful for my blessings.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel a selfless caring for others.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I accept others even when they do things I think are wrong.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I desire to be closer to God or in union with the divine.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix K

Spiritual Wellbeing Scale (SWS)

*Directions: Please circle the choice that best describes how much you agree with each statement. Circle only one answer for each statement. There is no right or wrong answer.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1 Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>2 Moderately Disagree</th>
<th>3 Disagree</th>
<th>4 Agree</th>
<th>5 Moderately Agree</th>
<th>6 Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I don’t find much satisfaction in private prayer with God</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t know who I am, where I came from or where I am going</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe that God loves me and cares about me</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel that life is a positive experience</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe that God is impersonal and not interested in my daily situations</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel unsettled about my future</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have a personally meaningful relationship with God</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel very fulfilled and satisfied with life</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t get much personal strength and support from my God</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel a sense of well-being about the direction of my life</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe that God is concerned about my problems</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t enjoy much about my life</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t have a personally satisfying relationship with God</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel good about my future</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My relationship with God helps me not to feel lonely</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel that life is full of conflict and unhappiness</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel most fulfilled when I’m in close communication with God</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life doesn’t have much meaning</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My relationship with God contributes to my sense of well-being</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe there is some real purpose for my life</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix L

Demographic Form

Sex: _______________________

Age: _______

Race/ethnicity (circle one):

- European American
- Asian American/Pacific Islander
- African American
- Native American/Alaska Native
- Hispanic/Latino/a
- Bi/multiracial, please specify: ________________________________

How many years of formal education have you completed (e.g. 12 for high school graduate, 16 for college graduate)? _______

Marital Status (circle one):

- Single, never married
- Single, previously married
- Married
- Separated

How many servings of fruit do you typically eat each day? _______

How many servings of vegetables do you typically eat each day? _______

During a typical week how many minutes are you physically active? _______

How many hours of sleep do you typically get each night? _______
Appendix M

Curriculum Vitae

Education

Graduate

Doctor of Psychology:
August 2017
George Fox University,
Newberg, OR

Master of Science: July 2012
Oklahoma State University,
Stillwater, OK
Emphasis: Community Counseling

Undergraduate

Master of Arts: May 2014
George Fox University,
Newberg, OR

Bachelor of Arts, Cum Laude: May 2009
St. Olaf College, Northfield, MN
Major: Psychology

Clinical Experiences

Doctoral Intern, Syracuse VAMC, Syracuse, NY

- Dates of Employment: August 2016-present
- Population Served: Male and female Veterans, from young adults to older adults
- Experienced five rotations: outpatient clinic, assessment, neuropsychology, nursing home, and PTSD clinical team
- Outpatient rotation: provided individual therapy for veterans with more serious mental health problems, using a longer-term therapy model
- Assessment rotation: completed a variety of test batteries to assess for psychological problems
- Neuropsychology rotation: completed neuropsychological assessments to gain a better understanding of cognitive difficulties
- Nursing home rotation: provided brief individual therapy and psychoeducation on an inpatient medical unit with a geriatric population.
- PTSD clinical team rotation: provided manualized trauma-focused therapy (namely cognitive processing therapy and prolonged exposure) to veterans diagnosed with PTSD

Practicum Student, George Fox University Health and Counseling Center, Newberg, OR

- Dates of Employment: September 2015-May 2016
- Population Served: Traditional college students
- Provided individual and couples therapy with university students
- Conducted psychodiagnostic assessments
- Conducted standardized intake interviews
- Attended weekly individual and group supervision and clinical trainings
- Provided collaborative case management with prescribers, medical professionals, parents, and psychologists
Practicum Student, Warner Pacific College, Portland, OR
- Dates of Employment: September 2015-November 2015
- Population Served: College students
- Conducted psychodiagnostic assessments; scored and interpreted assessment results
- Wrote comprehensive psychological assessment reports
- Shared assessment results with the client in feedback sessions

Practicum Student, North Clackamas Early Childhood Evaluation Center, Milwaukie, OR
- Dates of Employment: February 2015-August 2015
- Population Served: Children ages birth to 5-years
- Conducted psychological assessment to determine eligibility for early intervention services for the North Clackamas school district
- Scored assessment results and wrote assessment reports
- Worked with both children and their parents to determine eligibility
- Collaborated with the speech/language therapist, occupational therapist, and physical therapist when conducting the assessment and writing the report
- Collaborated with teachers to gain more detailed information about a child’s behavior in the classroom
- Conducted behavioral observations within the child’s classroom and home to determine eligibility for an autism spectrum diagnosis

Practicum Student, VA Medical Center, Portland, OR
- Dates of Employment: June 2014-June 2015
- Population Served: Male and female Veterans, from young adults to older adults
- Experienced four rotations: outpatient clinic, health psychology, primary care/post-deployment clinic, and palliative care
- Outpatient rotation: provided individual and group therapy for veterans with more serious mental health problems, using a longer-term therapy model (10-12 sessions)
- Health psychology rotation: provided individual therapy with veterans with serious medical problems and conducted formal psychodiagnostic assessment batteries.
- Primary care/post-deployment clinic rotation: provided brief individual therapy and triaged new veterans into the VA system, assessing their mental health needs
- Palliative care rotation: provided brief individual therapy and psychoeducation on an inpatient medical unit with a geriatric population.

Practicum Student, Chehalem Youth and Family Services, Newberg, OR
- Dates of Employment: September 2013-August 2014
- Population Served: Uninsured, low SES community members, including a wide age range (5 years old and up) and high comorbidity rates
- Provided individual, family, and couples counseling within the outpatient community mental health center
- Conducted group therapy with adolescents in residential treatment and with residents of a retirement community
Conducted mental health initial intakes and Mental Health Assessments (MHA) for outpatient uninsured and Oregon Health Plan (OHP) clients in accordance with OAR’s and Yamhill County Care Organization (YCCO) guidelines
- Completed MHAs utilizing the bio-psycho-social interview, diagnostic justification, and case conceptualization
- Developed Individual Service and Support Plans (treatment plans) and monitored therapeutic goals and YCCO OHP compliance for authorizations
- Provided collaborative case management with collateral providers, schools, social workers, prescribers, and DHS case managers
- Provided crisis intervention for clients who need crisis management and support

**Practicum Student, VA Medical Center, Oklahoma City**
- Dates of Employment: June 2011-May 2012
- Population Served: Older adult Veterans with serious medical comorbidities on an inpatient medical unit
- Performed brief psychotherapy and psychoeducation
- Conducted formal neuropsychological assessments on an as-needed basis
- Triaged incoming veterans to assess their mental health needs
- Presented cases weekly for the interdisciplinary treatment team meeting
- Collaborated with social workers, physicians, nursing staff, occupational therapists, and physical therapists

**Group Therapy Experiences**

**Coping with Anger, Syracuse VAMC**
- Dates of Group: October 2016-present
- Co-led a 12-week psychoeducation group for veterans
- This CBT group focused on changing the way veterans view anger by recognizing underlying emotions, recognizing unhelpful thought patterns, practicing strategies to decrease physiological arousal, and coming up with different ways to think about anger-eliciting situations.

**Pathways to Recovery, Portland VAMC**
- Dates of Group: July-August 2014
- Co-led a weekly ongoing semi-open support and processing group for about 8 veterans with severe mental health problems.

**Positive Psychology, Chehalem Youth & Family Services**
- Dates of Group: June-July 2014
- Co-led a weekly 8 week group for about 5 female adolescents in residential treatment.
- The group focused on integrating positive psychology concepts, like gratitude and forgiveness, into the adolescents’ lives in order to increase mood.
Transitions, Chehalem Youth & Family Services
- Dates of Group: June-July 2014
- Co-led a weekly 6 week group for about 6 residents of a local retirement community, focusing on areas of transition for older adults, such as family and medical transitions.

Adolescent Identity, Chehalem Youth & Family Services
- Dates of Group: April-May 2014
- Co-led a weekly 8 week group for about 6 male adolescents in residential treatment.
- The group focused on forming a healthy adolescent identity, addressing how issues, such as friendship and body image, inform our identities.

Make Parenting a Pleasure, Chehalem Youth & Family Services
- Dates of Group: April 2014
- Co-led a parenting class for 1 community member.
- The group focused on providing developmental information about children, improving the parent-child relationship, and addressing ways to appropriately discipline children of different developmental levels.

Grief & Loss, Chehalem Youth & Family Services
- Dates of Group: January-March 2014
- Co-led a weekly 10 week group for about 4 female adolescents in residential treatment.
- The group focused on defining loss and coping with grief.

Transitions, Chehalem Youth & Family Services
- Dates of Group: November-December 2013
- Co-led a weekly 6 week group for about 7 residents of a local retirement community, focusing on areas of transition for older adults, such as family and medical transitions.

Professional Skills, Chehalem Youth and Family Services
- Dates of Group: September-October 2013
- Co-led a weekly 8 week group for about 6 male adolescents in residential treatment.
- The group focused on teaching and practicing skills for adolescents who would soon be leaving residential treatment and living in the community.

Cognitive Skills, Oklahoma City VAMC
- Dates of Group: June 2011-May 2012
- Co-led a weekly ongoing open group for about 6 older adult veterans. The group focused on including cognitive tasks for veterans to engage in and to provide social support while in the hospital.
Work Experiences

Qualified Mental Health Professional, Chehalem Counseling Center, Newberg, OR,
- Dates of Employment: June 2015-June 2016
- Population Served: Uninsured, low SES community members, including a wide age range (5 years old and up) and high comorbidity rates
- Provided individual, family, and couples counseling within the outpatient community mental health center
- Conducted mental health initial intakes and Mental Health Assessments (MHA) for outpatient uninsured and Oregon Health Plan (OHP) clients in accordance with OAR’s and Yamhill County Care Organization (YCCO) guidelines
- Developed Individual Service and Support Plans (treatment plans) and monitor therapeutic goals and YCCO OHP compliance for authorizations
- Provided collaborative case management with collateral providers, schools, social workers, prescribers, and DHS case managers
- Provided crisis intervention for clients who need crisis management and support

Supervisory and Teaching Experiences

Supervisory Mentor, George Fox University, Newberg, OR
- Dates of Employment: September 2015-May 2016
- Met with 2nd year clinical psychology doctoral student weekly to facilitate the student’s development and competency as a therapist
- Provided mentoring and training for the supervisee, emphasizing the supervisee’s professional development

Teaching Assistant, Cognitive Behavioral Therapy, George Fox University, Newberg, OR
- Dates of Employment: September 2015-December 2015
- Attended weekly classes to provide feedback to students practicing CBT skills
- Co-led some lectures

Teaching Assistant, Advanced Counseling, George Fox University, Newberg, OR
- Met with undergraduate students weekly to mentor and give feedback regarding counseling skills
- Graded students’ therapy videos and provided students with individual feedback
- Provided continued support after the end of the class, including mentoring about graduate school options
**Professional Presentations**


**Grants**

**ELCA Lutheran Church Oregon Synod**, “Mental Health Awareness within a Mainline Protestant Church”—Principle Investigator, February 2015-December 2015, $1,400


**John Templeton Foundation**, “The Effects of Grace on Self-Forgiveness within a Religious Community”—Principle Investigator, May 2014-May 2017, $20,000