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1.1 Forgiveness

Forgiveness is a process in which one may cope with distress after being harmed by another person (Fincham, 2000). Forgiveness has been defined as the “forswearing of negative affect and judgment by viewing the wrongdoer with compassion and love, in the face of a wrongdoer’s considerable injustice” (Enright & the Human Development Study Group, 1996, p. 123). Thompson and Snyder (2003, pp. 302) define forgiveness as the "framing of a perceived transgression such that one's attachment to the transgressor, transgression and squeal of the transgression is transformed from negative to neutral or positive". Forgiveness is understood as an intra-individual experience that is contextualized in social and societal interactions involving transgressions.

Enright, Gassin and Wu (1992) defined forgiveness as “the overcoming of negative affect and judgment towards the offender, not by denying ourselves the right to such affect and judgment, but by endeavoring to view the offender with compassion, benevolence, and love” (p. 101). Forgiveness can be defined as a freely made choice to give up revenge, resentment, harsh judgments or indifferent behavior toward a person who caused a hurt, and to strive to respond with generosity, compassion, love and kindness toward that person.

Importantly, forgiveness is not excusing, denying, minimizing or forgetting the wrong (Enright, Freedman, and Rique, 1998). It is a process that involves reducing negative responses and increasing positive responses towards the person who caused the hurt, across the realms of affect, cognition, emotion and behavior (Enright & Fitzgibbons, 2000). It can occur without reconciliation, which requires the participation of both parties, if the person who caused the hurt is absent, deceased, or remains unsafe (Enright & Fitzgibbons, 2000). This type of forgiveness can be referred to as offense-specific forgiveness. Dispositional forgiveness, also known as trait forgiveness or forgivingness, can be understood as a general tendency to forgive others or oneself that is stable over time and across offenders or situations (Berry et al., 2001). Exline and Baumeister (2000) defined forgiveness as the “cancellation of a debt” by “the person who has been hurt or wronged” (p. 133).
Forgiveness is a complex psychological phenomenon, which involves affective, cognitive and behavioral process. The emotional components concern the replacement of negative emotions (resentment, hostility, hatred) towards the transgressor by positive emotions (empathy, compassion) (Kadiangandu, Gauche, Vinsonneau, and Mullet, 2007). The cognitive components comprise the positive motivational state towards the harm-doer and the absence of a negative motivational state towards the harm-doer (Fincham, 2000), and this transformation usually occurs through re-elaborate or reappraise of the event and/or the transgressor. Lastly, the behavioral components are manifested in the expression of forgiveness (either verbal or nonverbal) and more conciliating behaviors. Although researchers have distinguished forgiveness from reconciliation (Worthington, 2005), it is no doubt that reconciliation is a behavioural manifestation of forgiveness.

Interpersonal forgiveness is the set of motivational changes where one becomes decreasingly motivated to retaliate against an offending relationship and decreasingly motivated to maintain estrangement from the offender (McCullough, Worthington and Rachal, 1997). McCullough et al., (1998) defined forgiveness as the set of motivational changes whereby one becomes decreasingly motivated to retaliate against an offending relationship partner, decreasingly motivated to maintain estrangement from the offender, and increasingly motivated by conciliation and goodwill for the offender, despite the offender's hurtful actions. When an offended person is unable to forgive, his/her perception of the offense produces two motivational states that is he/she has high motivation to avoid contact with the offending partner (avoidance motivation) and high motivation to seek revenge or see harm come to the offending partner (revenge motivation).

Forgiveness is the juxtaposition or superimposition of strong, positive, other-oriented emotions over the negative emotions of un-forgiveness (Worthington & Wade, 1999). The positive emotions associated with forgiveness might include love, compassion, empathy, or sympathy for the transgressor (Worthington & Wade, 1999). Other positive emotions, such as humility about one's own real or potential culpability (Tangney, 2000) or gratitude for one's own experiences of forgiveness (McCullough, Emmons, & Tsang, 2002; Witvliet, Ludwig, & Vander Laan, 2001), might facilitate reducing or replacing the negative emotions of unforgiveness. In
Worthington's model, forgiveness can occur after unforgiveness has developed, but it can also prevent the development of unforgiveness by replacing immediate negative emotions. Forgivingness can be construed as a human strength or personality trait with positive consequences for individuals and social relationships. Mullet et al., (2003) have defined forgiveness as a personality construct. However, it is possible to use forgiveness for self-serving motives (Baumeister, Exline, & Sommer, 1998), or fail to pursue justice by readily forgiving (Exline, Worthington, Hill, & McCullough, 2003).

Denton and Martin (1998) conducted a survey among clinical social workers in the United States which indicates that forgiveness is often a release of negative feelings; forgiving is not condoning, forgiveness requires two persons, forgiveness is a slow process that does not guarantee forgetting or reconciliation. Kanz (2000) instructed students from a U.S. university to answer conceptual forgiveness questions. Participants agreed with the ideas that it is possible to forgive someone without that person being aware of it, forgiveness is not a weakness, forgiving does not excuse (or justify) the offender's hurtful behavior, forgiveness does not automatically restore truth, anger decreases when forgiveness takes place, forgiveness is more likely when the offender has made a major life change, and people have a moral responsibility to forgive.

While theorists show increasing agreement both on what forgiveness is not and what it is, the singular word forgiveness is increasingly understood to be insufficient to describe the internal experiences of forgiving (Exline, Worthington, Hill, & McCullough, 2003). The internal experiences that is one's commitment to forgive and one's forgiving change of hurt are the two multiple aspects of forgiveness that are to be considered despite of being distinct yet related (Enright & Fitzgibbons, 2000)

Forgiveness is involved in promoting well-being. Various models suggest that forgiveness can offer opportunities for recognizing a deeper meaning in the transgression, developing compassion for others, appreciating social support systems, and discovering a renewed sense of life purpose (Enright, Freedman, & Rique, 1998). It is evident that by forgiveness individuals counteract or modify negative behaviors which can result in restoring benevolent and harmonious interpersonal relations with
persons who offended them. The above mentioned various definitions of forgiveness explain the intra-individual, pro-social change towards a perceived offender within a specific interpersonal context (McCullough, Pargament, and Thorensen, 2000).

For thousands of years, people have practiced and studied forgiveness in the realm of religion and philosophy. However, the scientific study of the forgiveness began only recently. The concept of forgiveness has long been a focus of the world's religions (McCullough & Worthington, 1999; Rye et al., 2000), but only during the last decade did psychologists develop a sustained interest in the topic. Forgiveness is a power to ripen force of purity such as love and it affirms the qualities of patience and compassion. It creates life which frees from bondage to the past. It does not mean condoning a harmful action or denying injustice or suffering. It is an inner relinquishment of guilt or resentment both of which can be devastating to us. Forgiveness is the key to action and freedom. It is the fragrance that the violet sheds on the heel that has crushed it. Forgiveness is considered as one of the positive psychological phenomenon in human being.

1.2 Religious Commitment

Hill et al. (1998) defined religion as (a) the feelings, thoughts, experiences, and behaviors that arise from a search for the sacred and/or (b) a search or quest for a non-sacred goal (such as identity, belongingness, meaning, health, or wellness) in a context that has [as] its primary goal the facilitation of (a), and (c) the means and methods (rituals or prescribed behaviors) of the search that receive validation and support from within an identifiable group of people. (p. 21)

Worthington (1988) suggested a model addressing such questions. He theorized that people who were highly religiously committed tended to evaluate their world on religious dimensions based on their religious values. He hypothesized that because of the history of religious conflicts in doctrine, religious people within a Western religious tradition evaluated their world on three dimensions: authority of scripture or sacred writings, authority of ecclesiastical leaders, and degree of identity with their religious group. He further hypothesized that people in relationships (notably counseling relationships) had zones of toleration for different values on those three dimensions, such that when a client encountered a counselor whose values were perceived to be outside of the client's zone of toleration, the client would be likely to
(a) resist counseling or (b) prematurely exit counseling. Aspects of this model have received empirical support in counseling analogue and survey research (Worthington et al., 1996).

Worthington's (1988) defined religious commitment as the degree to which a person adheres to his or her religious values, beliefs, and practices and uses them in daily living. The supposition is that a highly religious person will evaluate the world through religious schemas and thus will integrate his or her religion into much of his or her life. Religious commitment has been operationalized and measured in several ways, including membership or non-membership in religious organizations, the degree of participation in religious activities (such as frequency of attending church), the attitudes and importance of religious experience, and belief in traditional religious creeds (Hill & Hood, 1999).

1.2.1 Forgiveness and Religion

Forgiveness has been encouraged for thousands of years major world religion. Adherents of these religions have claimed that forgiveness yield numerous emotional and spiritual benefits, and dramatically recently (within the last 15 years) begun to develop theoretical models and conduct empirical studies on forgiveness. Given that the scientific study of forgiveness is relatively new, it seems prudent for scientist to learn about long-standing religious conceptualizations of forgiveness. Examination of religious perspectives on forgiveness can benefit social in several ways.

First, religious perspectives on forgiveness can shed light on how religion influences the psychological process involved in forgiveness. Paragament and Rye (2000) have proposed several ways in which religion can contribute to forgiveness. To begin, forgiveness can be sanctified, or imbued, with divine-like qualities. Thus in these religions, forgiveness becomes a means for imitating God, carrying out God's plan, or enhancing one's relationship with the divine. In addition, religion provides numerous role models of individuals who have forgiven despite profound injustices. Religion also offers worldviews that helps victims to reframe their attitudes towards their offenders. Furthermore, religious faith can help individuals cope with the uncertainty surrounding the choice to forgive. The resources of divine and/or congregational support may be especially helpful to people working through the forgiveness process.
Religions provide their adherents with frameworks of meaning that enable them to interpret most aspects of life, particularly the most challenging ones, such as suffering and damage caused by close others (Park, 2005). As the divine is the ultimate arbiter in these matters, religions may have extremely powerful influences on the way people—even those who do not strongly identify themselves with a particular religion—solve their conflicts. What is right and what is wrong in the way to respond to others’ offenses, namely, by forgiving or by keeping resentful, is usually clearly stated in these religious frameworks of meaning. Most faiths recognize and promote forgiveness (McCullough, Bono & Root, 2006).

### 1.2.2 Forgiveness in Hinduism

In the Hindu tradition, forgiveness has always been considered as a great virtue. The word most commonly used to signify forgiveness is “Ksama” (or “Ksamata”). This word is usually associated with words such as “kripa,” “prasada,” “daya,” “karuna,” which mean compassion or mercy. These words either occur in Sanskrit texts (prayers or stotras) or in vernacular settings in which many of the original Sanskrit words are used, sometimes in slightly modified form. According to Manu, author of the famous Manusmriti and born from Lord Brahma Deva, “dharma” (righteousness) is based on 10 virtues, and forgiveness is considered to be one of them (Rye et al., 2000). The importance of forgiveness has been elaborated in various commentaries, notably in the ShrimadBhagwad Gita (one of the most important Hindu Scriptures) and in the Yoga Sutras of Patanjali.

The number of different traditions and viewpoints found within Hinduism make it difficult to define the theological basis for forgiveness. However, concepts such as forgiveness, duty, righteousness, forbearance, compassion and patience are discussed in the epics and the dharma sastras (treatises on righteousness), it is essential to practice all of these. Also, Karma (the law of cause and effect), which pervades Hindu thought, is relevant here. Through Karma, individuals face the consequences of their actions in subsequent reincarnations. Therefore, one can presume that lack of forgiveness, negative feelings, and unresolved, seething anger can only spill over into future births. There are numerous examples of divine forgiveness in Hindu sacred texts. In the Sri Vaishnava Tradition, Lord Vishnu has all the qualities of grace, mercy and so on, but it is his wife the Goddess Lakshmi/Sri,
who is said to epitomize the quality of forgiveness and grace. It should be noted that there are non-theistic Hindu traditions that, by definition, do not focus on the issue of divine forgiveness. (Rye, Pargament 1998, Ali, Beck, Dorff, Hallisey, Narayanan & Williams, 2000).

Evidence for the divine bestowal of forgiveness (ksamat) on repentant human beings is found much earlier in Hinduism than in the biblical record. In the Rig veda, there are prayers of forgiveness directed towards Lord Varuna, a mighty regent sitting on his throne in the highest heaven. As the Guardian of Rita (cosmic order), Varuna could free humans from the bondage of the sins of lying and drunkenness that were a disturbance to this order. He was very gracious to those who repented, and for them, he removed all sins accruing from several generations. Varuna also had hundreds of remedies for the humbled sinner and could take away or prolong life. The righteous hoped to see him in the next world reigning in bliss.

The Dharma-Sastras, law books governing the four castes and stages of life written during the classical period of Hinduism, dealt with sins (papa) and atonements (prayascitta). The Manu-Samhita (500 B.C.E.-200 C.E), said to be composed by the ancient law giver Manu, describes expiations leading to forgiveness from both the Gods and Society that included acts of charity and purification, vows of fasting and abstinence, and performance of rituals and recitations, with subsequent societal acceptance of such acts. References to Varuna reaffirm continuity with the Vedic Forgiveness. As mentioned earlier, those who wish to follow the path of dharma must practice forgiveness, compassion, forbearance, and so on. Therefore, forgiveness is considered to be important in the Hindu tradition.

The Goddess Sri (more popularly known as Lakshmi) is said to forgive even when there is no repentance on the part of the soul that perpetuates the atrocity. Obviously, this is more than normative and is divine. Her acts of forgiveness are sometimes contrasted rhetorically with the Lord Vishnu, who forgives only when there is repentance (“The Goddess Sri: Blossoming Lotus and Breast Jewel of Vishnu” and “Sri; Giver of Fortune, Bestower of Grace).

There are two paradigmatic cases of forgiveness in the epic Ramayana. Lakshmi/ Sri, in her incarnation as Sita (the wife of Rama in the Ramayana) is said to have forgiven (1) a crow, even as it was harming and (2) the demon- women of
Lanka, even as they were harassing. These instances serve as “proof” for the later devotees to speak about vine grace. In theological terms, therefore, forgiveness is granted be with and without repentance, by the Lord and the Goddess.

In human relations, one can be more realistic, and there are other stories to illustrate these issues. In his earthly incarnation as Rama, Vishnu forgives Surgriva after he has shown repentance. Surgriva offers to help Rama and later forgets about it. Rama waits for a long time, is angered by the delay, then sends his brother Lakshmana to remind Surgriva about his forgotten promise. Surgriva apologizes and is warmly forgiven by Rama. There is complete reconciliation. However, in the epic Mahabharata, when the Kaurava princes dishonor the queen Draupadi in a royal court and exult about it, she does not forgive them. Nor is there expectancy that she would forgive them when there is no repentance on their side.

As mentioned earlier, Hinduism is composed of numerous traditions, many of which would interpret this question differently. Thus, it is impossible to present a “rule of thumb” regarding forgiveness and reconciliation that is practiced and accepted by all of the different tradition. Examples of stories in Hinduism that pertain to forgiveness and reconciliation are generally theological in nature.

Forgiveness is thus a central tenet of Hindu spirituality; it has been defined as mental strength in the face of offenses; it implies lack of emotional upset or impassivity and tolerance under difficult circumstances (Kodandaramayya, 2004, Temoshok & Chandra, 2000). Lack of forgiveness, negative feelings, and unresolved anger can be expected to spill over into future births, as, through Karma (law of cause and effect), individuals face consequences of their actions in subsequent reincarnations. In modern age, people like Mahatma Gandhi, Indian political and spiritual leader, declared forgiveness as a great virtue and stated that the weak can never forgive because forgiveness is the attribute of the strong (Goel et al., 1995).

Scientific interest in forgiveness has rapidly increased in the recent years. Most of the research has been done in Western societies, but whether the conceptualizations and underlying mechanisms of forgiveness are across cultures still remain unclear. Some researchers have argued that there are trends in the globalization of forgiveness (Enright & Fitzgibbons, 2000). For example, Huang and Enright (2000) postulated that the development of moral reasoning about forgiveness
is similar across cultures. Adolescents (ages 20-23) are more intrinsically forgiving than their younger counterparts (ages 12-14), who are hypothesized to be more extrinsically motivated. Moreover, common predictors of forgiveness such as apology, intentionality and offense consequence have been found across cultures (Girard & Mullet, 1997; McCullough & Witvliet, 2002).

Since interpersonal conflicts often occur in social contexts (cultural group, society, social group, family), forgiveness should be contextualized in social and societal interactions involving transgression. Based on sociocultural theory, a person’s development cannot be understood by a study of individual, but instead by examining the external social world in which that individual interact with (Vygotsky, 1986). As individuals are embedded in a larger social world, kinship, structure, social mobility, contacts among in-groups and out-groups, corporate power, class structure and religious practice may affect the processes of social interactions; therefore the processes of forgiveness may be somewhat different across cultures. Researchers also hold different views on the psychological processes involved in forgiveness, suggesting that forgiveness may involve decisional, (DiBlasio, 1998; Worthington, 2006), motivational (McCullough et al., 1998) and emotional (Worthington & Wade, 1999; Worthington, 2006) aspects of the psychological processes.

Forgiveness involves Pro-social change regarding a transgressor on the part of the transgression recipient. Indeed, nearly every theorist appears to conquer that when people forgive, their responses (thoughts, feelings, behavioral inclinations, or actual behaviors) towards at transgressor become more positive and/or less negative. This point of consensus led McCullough, Pargament and Thoresen (2000) to propose that intra-individual pro-social change toward a transgressor is a foundational and uncontroversial feature of forgiveness.

1.2.3 Forgiveness in Islam

The God, Allah, is the ultimate power who can forgive. One of Allah’s 99 attribute is Al-Ghafoor, the Forgiving one. Forgiveness means: Closing an account of offense against God or any of His Creation. However, Forgiveness must meet the criteria of sincerity. God, the All-knowing, has the knowledge of everything, including whatever a person thinks but does not express in words or deeds. An
offense maybe be against a person; a group of persons or society; other creations of
God such as animals, plants, land, atmosphere, bodies of water and life therein. Muslims understand that an offense against the creation of God is an offense against God. (Rye, Pargament, 1998, Ali, Beck, Dorff, Hallisey, Narayanan & Williams, 2000).

The concept of forgiveness in the Quran is expressed in three terms: 1) afw, used 35 times; 2) safhu, used 8 times; and 3) ghafara, used 234 times. Afw means to pardon, to excuse for a fault, an offense, or a discourtesy, waiver of punishment and amnesty. Examples of usage in Quran are verses 42;40, 2;187 and 5;95. Safhu means to turn away from a sin or a misdeed, ignore, etc. Examples of usage in the Quran are verses 2;109, 15;85 and 43;89. Ghafara or maghfira means to cover, to forgive, and to remit. Examples of usage in the Quran are verses 2;263, 42;37, and 43;43.

The theological basis of forgiveness is in the Qur'an and Hadith. A selection of teachings about forgiveness from the Qur'an and Hadith are given below (Ali).

And vie with one another to attain to yours Sustainer's forgiveness and to a paradise as vast as the heavens and the earth, which has been readied for the God-conscious who spend [in His way] in time of plenty and time of hardship, and hold in check their anger, and pardon their fellow men because God loves the doers of good; and the ones who are aware of their acts of committing a shameful deed or have [otherwise] sinned against themselves.

“God and pray that their sins be forgiven for who but God could forgive sins? And do not: knowingly persist in doing whatever [wrong] they may have done. These it is who shall have as their reward forgiveness from their Sustainer, and gardens through which running waters flow, therein to abide; and how excellent a reward for those who labor!” (The Qur'an 6 3:133-136).

Further, the religion also teaches us that those who desire to be forgiven for their offenses must learn to forgive others. Especially, if they seek forgiveness from God, they should learn to forgive others for their offenses. If they desire that God overlook their weaknesses, they should learn to overlook weaknesses of others. Forgiveness is important for two reasons:
1. Very importantly, for the afterlife or the life hereafter. One forgives to seek forgiveness. Seeking forgiveness is a sign of humility, and forgiving others is a sign of magnanimity.

2. Seeking forgiveness and forgiving others brings happiness in the worldly life. In addition, forgiving improves relations with people by bringing good reputation and respect.

In the ancient world, tribes and families carried on blood feuds for generations because they could not forgive. Islam taught a middle path between turning the other check and never ending blood feud, that is, revenge to the extent harm done is allowed but forgiveness is preferred.

Allah said in the Qur’an: The recompense for an injury is an injury equal thereto (in degree); but if a person forgives and makes reconciliation, his reward is due from Allah: for (Allah) loves not those who do wrong. (42:40, A. Yusuf Ali). But [remember that an attempt at] requiting evil may, too, become an evil: hence whoever pardons [his foe] and makes peace, his reward rests with God- for, verily, He does not love evildoers. (42:40, Muhammad Asad)

Both translations of the same verse are correct. One gives more literal meaning (Yusuf Ali) and the other gives more interpretive meaning (Muhammad Asad). To take revenge of an offense is allowed only to the Extent of damage done but not to be exceeded. However, there is a great probability of exceeding the damage; thereby, the victim becomes an offender. Forgiveness is a protection and brings great reward from Allah.

Reconciliation is desirable but not essential to forgiveness. If the victim feels that the offender has serious character flaws and it is not in his or her best interest, he or she does not have to reconcile. Sometimes it is best for one’s own sanity not to carry on normal relationships with certain kinds of characters, but one should not totally dissociate from Muslim brethren (Ali).

1.2.4 Forgiveness in Christianity

In Christianity the most common words denoting forgiveness in the New Testament are 1) eleao (cognate nouns)-show mercy (78 times) and 2) aphiemi-release, discharge, put away (64 times). Another word used infrequently but in a
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striking way is splanchnizomai. Usually understood as “feeling sorry for” or “having compassion on” someone, it is derived from a word for “intestines”. It literally means to pour out one’s insides, one’s intestines.

The God of love, who restores the image of God in man through Christ (Colossians 1:15), enables and inspires human beings to forgive. This power or spirit of forgiveness is mediated through Christ, the church, and potentially anyone who truly acts as a neighbor (Luke 10:25-37). This most important reference is Jesus’ petition for his crucifiers from the cross, “Father, forgive [from aphiemi] them, for they know not what they do” (Luke 23:34). Forgiveness is at the religious, theological, and ethical core of the Christian tradition. It represents the possibility and reality of change and transformation of the individual in relation to others in relation to the individual (Williams, 2000).

Forgiveness is generally understood as an act of pardon or release from an injury, offense, or debt. On the part of the forgiving subject, it entails having compassion, releasing someone from any act or attitude that would impede the relationship of those involved. On the part of the forgiven subject, it usually entails showing signs of repentance for the wrong done and acts of contrition and love, in keeping with the graciousness shown by the forgiver. (Rye, Pargament2000, Ali, Beck, Dorff, Hallisey, Narayanan and Williams, 2000)

According to the model of Christ on the cross (Luke 23:34), forgiveness, or at least the petition for God the Father to forgive, does not depend first of all on repentance by the offender. However, in various concrete situations, there arises the problem that Dietrich Bonhoeffer spoke of a “cheap grace,”14 which here means “cheap forgiveness.” It should not be offered mechanically, or from the motive of becoming a martyr and thus better than some opponent, and so on.

Forgiveness is one of the subjects that have been preached in the pulpit and discussed in the Bible classes countless in a Christian church. Forgiveness involved in humility, love, compassion, and service to others can be found easily in Christianity as well as other major religions. It is sanctified as one of the divine characters. As the God forgives us, we take the responsibility to forgive others. Many Christians find themselves difficult to forgive their offenders. Their natural responses against their offenders include pain, loss, fear, anger, hatred or retaliation. Their inability to forgive
forces them to feel shame. Frequently shame stimulates them to defend themselves with rage, power, and righteousness.

1.3 Collectivism and Individualism

Collectivism can be found easily in the Confucianism that individuals have a moral sense to maintain harmony because they have an innate trait to fit well with the environment as well as the universal order. Mature individuals can maintain harmony with their environment with regulating their inner demands. “At seventy, I followed my heart’s desire without overstepping the line.”

Individualism might be misunderstood as egocentrism with which an individual would deceive others without trusting others. In reality, however, an individual cannot live without a social relationship. Social isolation or rejection brings about critical damage because human actions occur in social interactions. Culture encompasses almost all of human activities. In analyzing the attributes of collectivism and individualism Triandis enlists 17 concepts such as self-perception, attributions, identity and emotions, cognitions, motivation, attitudes, norms, values, social behavior, attitudes towards privacy, communication, conflict resolution, morality, responsibility, personality, and professional behavior.

However, Kitayama, Duffy, and Uchida suggest 15 concepts such as prevalence and consequences of influence and adjustment, self-image and dissonance, intrinsic motivation, lay theories of agency, lay theories of happiness, emotional consequences of style of action, motivational consequences, consequences on health and well-being, self-enhancement, symbolic self-inflation, self-uniqueness, cognitive elaboration, reciprocity monitoring, attention and perception, and reasoning and categorization. The 15 concepts are categorized as the three categories such as a style of action; representations of self, social others, and the relationship between the two; and cognition or ways to perceive and find the meanings of the environment. Based on their descriptions of the concepts, collectivism and individualism can be explored further.

In collectivism interpersonal relationships are the basic units of individual’s identity and social perception, but individuals are the basic units in individualism. In individualism an individual’s right or interest cannot be violated for the sake of the
The collectivistic style of action of forgiveness pursues adjustment in order to maintain harmony with in-group members or significant others, whereas the individualistic style of action pursues influence for the private self's sake. A collectivist is concerned with others' expectations and evaluations, but an individualist focuses on her intrapersonal attitude including competence, efficacy, and moral integrity. In collectivism an interpersonal dissonance increases if a behavioral choice does not fit into others' expectations and evaluations. But in individualism personal dissonance grows if a decision poses a threat to the individual's sense of competence and integrity. In collectivism behavioral motivations are derived from feelings of indebtedness to significant others, for high expectations are conveyed by their over involvement in a personal choice or decision. But in individualism autonomous choices and involvements increase personal pursuit to excellence. In collectivism an action is supposed to result from the external events or environment, but in individualism, an individual's intra-personal attitudes such as motivation, capacity, value, and personality are supposed to bring about an action with her environmental factors or interpersonal contexts being ignored.

There are some emotions which are closely associated with social engagement or social identity. Socially engaging emotions or emotions facilitating social cohesion are consist of the positive emotions including sympathy, understanding, friendship, gratitude, and respect, and the negative emotions including guilt, shame, and humility. Socially disengaging emotions or emotions raising a threat to social bonding are composed of the positive emotions including pride and self-confidence, and the negative emotions including anger and frustration. In collectivism the socially engaging emotions are focused on and encouraged regardless of their positivity or negativity with disparaging the socially disengaging emotions.

But in individualism the socially disengaging emotions are experienced and recognized as authentic emotions with ignoring the socially engaging emotions. In collectivism happiness is evoked by a realization of mutual sympathy or harmony, while in individualism it is stimulated by an achievement in personal goals. Consequently a sense of happiness confirms the worth of mutual sympathy and social
harmony in collectivism but reinforces the idea of personal achievement in individualism. Even in achieving well-being and health, a collectivist makes use of promotion of interpersonal harmony and avoidance of interpersonal conflicts, while an individualist employs maintenance or promotion of personal control and autonomy.

A collectivist’s cognition is holistic and in that she is likely to pay attention to many events and objects available in the environment. In contrast, an individualist has a tendency to attend to the most salient objects with ignoring the background or context. A collectivist finds it more difficult to find objects from their context and think abstractly or counterfactually.

In human reasoning there are the logical argument differentiating the more plausible proposal from the less plausible one and the dialectic reasoning moderating disagreement. A collectivists favour the dialectic reasoning while an individualists prefer the logical argument. A collectivist is skilful in applying relational categorization such as duty or obligation, family resemblances, and multiple viewpoints, but an individualist prefers logical argumentation and consistency on the basis of explicit rules.

In interpersonal relationship a collectivist is likely to respond to ingroup others, but an individualist has a tendency to apply her/his competence or value to ingroup others. A collectivist tends to have more and better information about ingroup others than herself/himself for fear of being devaluated, but an individualist rates herself/himself more central and salient than any others. The collectivist’s information of others include her/his careful monitoring of her/his interactions. The collectivist does not only reckon her transactions with her/his ingroup others, but is also aware of her/his ingroup others’ monitoring. In finding absence of her/his ingroup others’ monitoring, the collectivist’s actions are very different from her/his actions under surveillance. And the sharp discontinuity between her/his private self and public self also occurs in her/his relationships with her/his out-group members. But an individualist shows less discrimination against her/his out-group members or her/his own unguarded behaviors because her/his behaviors reflect her/his inner states straightforwardly.
The basic tenet of individualism is that individuals are independent from one another, whereas the basic tenet of collectivism is that groups bind and mutually obligate their members (Oyserman et al., 2002). Cross-cultural research that contrasts societies and individuals based on differences in individualism and collectivism can be traced back to the work of Geert Hofstede (1980), who ranked 39 nations on their level of individualism. Although Hofstede and others (Hui, 1988; Triandis, 1988) conceptualized individualism to be the opposite of collectivism, many researchers now view individualism and collectivism as orthogonal (Coon & Kemmelmeier, 2001). One could thus be high (or low) in both simultaneously.

Triandis (1995) defined individualism and collectivism using four major characteristics. *Individualism* is defined as a social pattern consisting of loosely linked individuals who (a) see themselves as relatively independent from the collectives in which they are members; (b) are motivated primarily by their own preferences, needs, rights, or contracts they have made with others; (c) place more importance on personal than collective goals; and (d) tend to make decisions on whether to associate on an analysis of costs and benefits to the individual. *Collectivism*, in contrast, is defined as a social pattern consisting of closely linked individuals who (a) see themselves as connected with the collective in which they are members, (b) are motivated primarily by the social norms and duties of their collective, (c) place more importance on collective goals than on their own personal goals, and (d) emphasize their connectedness to other members of the collective.

### 1.3.1 Theoretical Model of Forgiveness in Individualism

Individualistic forgiveness focuses on the offendee's internal traits in that voluntarily she abandons her right or duty to retaliate or revenge. Its adherence to her intrapersonal attitudes is in a good consistency to the individualistic absorption into an individual's intrapersonal attributes with ignoring the context or environment. In individualism forgiveness is the emotional attitude. "When people forgive an offender, they come to feel less vengeful and less bitter, and they experience the return of positive motivations and good will perhaps even love towards the offender. Forgiveness, therefore, is a private process of replacing your ill will and negative emotions, hoping for a new and improved relationship."
It might be yet possible to find the proposition that forgiveness should include interpersonal domain as well as intrapersonal domain. However, a careful reading reveals that it actually focuses on the intrapersonal domain without weighing the interpersonal reconciliation. For example, Baumeister, Exline, and Sommer (1998) might seem to emphasize both the intrapersonal domain and the interpersonal reconciliation. They listed hollow forgiveness, silent forgiveness, and total forgiveness, stipulating the two dimensions of forgiveness such as emotional attitude and interpersonal behavior.

Hollow forgiveness is consists of interpersonal forgiving behaviors without intrapersonal feeling of forgiving. In silent forgiveness “the victim may have ceased to feel angry or hostile towards the perpetrator, but neglects to express this. The victim thus allows the perpetrator to continue to act as if the perpetrator is in the wrong.” A missing point in silent forgiveness does not lie in reconciliation but the interpersonal action such as delivering the victim’s intention to the offender.

Total forgiveness might seem to combine the intrapersonal attitude and the reconciliation. In reality, it is not. In total forgiveness “the victim ceases to feel upset or resentful about the transgression, and the perpetrator is released from further obligation and guilt. In this case, the relationship may indeed return fully to its pre-transgression state. The point does not lie in restoration of the interpersonal relationship but the offended’s assistance to release the offender’s guilt by informing the offender of the victim’s goodwill. Individualistic forgiveness does not require reconciliation. Rather it ignores reconciliation.

In individualism it is not perceived that forgiveness is good but revenge is bad or that revenge is a disease and forgiveness is the cure. Since both of them are the emotional attitudes, their cost and benefit can be assessed from the perspective of the self’s well-being. After assessing the cost and benefit of forgiveness, an individualistic offender may make a decision to forgive. Intrapersonal appraisals and decision-making lie at the core of the individualistic forgiveness. Revenge has the benefit that the offender would be prohibited from inflicting harm again. It may prevent the offender from being bullied or inflicted by the others in the future. Revenge has the cost and its emotional cost is cited frequently.
Substantial cost is the continuation of negative effect, continued suffering is one reason that may cause people to hold a grudge. The relationship is probably reciprocal, however: Holding a grudge, at least in intra-psychic terms, may also perpetuate suffering and distress. This cost pertains to the victim role generally. To privately identify oneself as a victim is to embrace suffering, weakness, and distress as part of one’s identity. Indeed, the phrase “happy victim” is probably an oxymoron. To cling to the victim role, therefore, is to relinquish important possibilities for happiness.

Negative emotions might seem to be the revenge’s cost. A careful examination shows that they are not a consequence of revenge. They are nothing but responses to the unjust injury that the offender inflicted. It is possible to clear them without forgoing the will to revenge. The real cost of the revenge lies in a higher possibility in human violence and destructiveness. The desire for revenge increases interpersonal violence or destructive behaviors, building a vicious cycle of violence or destruction.

The cost and benefit of forgiveness are the opposites of revenge. The cost of forgiveness lies in conveying a wrong message that the offendees is short of capacity and courage. The message may feed the temptation of inflicting the offendees again and entice another offender. The benefit of forgiveness is to break the vicious cycle of violence. The offendees can pursue him/her own well-being without being distracted.

1.3.2 Forgiveness in Individualism and Collectivism:

A collectivist puts the most and the only important significance on ingroup harmony or solidarity. For the sake of the ingroup harmony or solidarity she/he always assumes that forgiveness is good and revenge is bad in the relationships with ingroup others. As forgiveness enhances social cohesion and revenge poses a threat to harmony and solidarity, their values are so clear that no personal calculation or personal choice is tolerated. In collectivism, therefore, forgiveness is enforced but revenge is suppressed all the time.

Collectivism forgiveness also takes place within the person. A collectivistic offendees tends to be forced to feel it is a duty or obligation to forgive the offender even if the offender does not show remorse. The offendees’s sense of peace is interrupted whenever there is a soured relationship around her/him. Happiness in the
collectivistic forgiveness is a consequence and a cause of the self's adjustment to the ingroup others' expectations. Revenge or anger against the ingroup others may be suppressed by the belief that the retributive fairness should come true under the universal order in the long run.

The collectivistic forgiveness involves reconciliation. In maintaining harmony and enhancing cohesion in a group or society, it is necessary to reconcile the offended with the offender. The collectivistic reconciliation is enforced by the social monitoring and sanctioning mechanisms. It is earned through apology, restitution, or mediation. However, it is not rare for the offended to initiate earning the reconciliation or returning to ideal levels of harmony and solidarity. It is different from the individualistic reconciliation, which is "a friendly reaching out to the person who harmed you (or the person whom you've harmed) that's supposed to fix the relationship breach. Or... it's a relationship repaired because the victim forgave and the offender repented." The individualistic reconciliation is earned on the basis of the offended's voluntary decision to forgive and the offender's repentance. The offended's spontaneity and the offender's repentance do not appear in the collectivistic reconciliation. It is an enforced reconciliation in compliance with social norm of harmony and solidarity.

Collectivism is associated with harmony and solidarity while individualism is associated with autonomy and individuality. Individualistic forgiveness focuses on personal appraisals and decision with ignoring interpersonal reconciliation. Individualistic reconciliation may happen only if luckily the offended decides to forgive and the offender repents. Collectivistic forgiveness focuses on suppressing revenge and enforced Reconciliation.

Cross-cultural psychologists have posited that cultural values shape the way people perceive the world. In particular, cultural values on the self, thinking patterns, emotional expression, conflict resolution, social harmony and virtues may influence the processes of social interactions, including forgiveness. The dimension of individualism-collectivism is one of the major cultural variability that has been widely used in behavioral studies (Hofstede, 1980; Triandis, 1995), and it may help us to understand possible cultural differences in the processes of forgiveness. Individualism is a social pattern that involves how individuals perceives themselves as relatively
independent of others; emphasizes individual preferences, needs and right; gives priority to personal goals over group goals; and encourage rational cost-benefit analysis of social relationships and contractual relationships. In contrast, collectivism is a social pattern consisting of closely linked individuals viewing themselves as interdependent with others; emphasizes social norms, obligations, and duties; values social connectedness and social harmony (Triandis, 1995). A review by Hook and colleagues (Hook, Worthington, & Usey, 2009) indicated that several features of collectivistic worldview, such as societal pressure to maintain social harmony and minimize conflict, might influence the conceptualizations of forgiveness.

Empirical research has demonstrated that interpersonal variables relate to forgiveness vary across cultures. First of all, people from different cultures view transgression differently. For example, a study by Takaku and colleagues (Takaku, Weiner, & Ohbuchi, 2001) showed that American paid more attention to the perceived controllability of the transgression while Japanese paid more attention to recidivism and their relationship to the transgressor. Americans viewed forgiveness as violations of justice while most Japanese viewed transgressions as violations of norms and roles. People from different cultures may attune to relationships differently; they might differ in sensitivity to transgression, threshold for defining an act as a transgression, emotional responses to transgression, motivations toward transgressors, strength of arousal of the justice motive.

Compared to individualists, collectivists tend to avoid conflict and seek compromise where the offender can save face and social harmony is preserved (Hook, Worthington, & Utsey, 2009). Researchers have found cultural differences in conflict resolution strategies. For example, Asians were more likely to apologize and request forgiveness than were Americans (Park et al., 2005; Sugimoto, 1997). A study by Leung and colleagues (Leung, Au, Fernandez-Dols, & Iwawaki, 1992) also showed that people from collectivistic cultures more often endorsed harmony-enhancing procedures (negotiating and complying), whereas people from individualistic cultures more often endorsed confrontational procedures (threatening and accusing). In order to fit in social group, individuals from collectivistic cultures strive to maintain interpersonal relationships, they show low tendency to revenge and are more willing to apologize.
The pseudo forgiving offendees cannot help choosing to respond lovingly to their offenders. They cannot find their own spontaneity but communal value driving them to get along with their offenders. The forgiveness seems to show "timidity or moral feebleness". It appears to be short of strength and courage constituting genuine forgiveness. The genuine forgiveness presupposes an autonomous self, who can recognize a painful injustice and show a kindness to the offender.

There are cultural differences in the components of forgiveness. For instance, Researchers argued that there are culturally unique trends in the dimensions and/or components (change of heart and more-than-dyadic process) of forgiveness (Kadiangandu et al., 2007). Specifically, they found that people from collectivistic cultures (Congo) conceived forgiveness as the end of resentment towards the offender and the restoration of sympathy, affection, and trust leading to reconciliation with the offender more than people from individualistic cultures (France). They also found that Congolese conceived forgiveness as extensible to state and religious officials, associations, and even personally unknown people more than French. (Kadiangandu et al., 2007).

Kadiangandu et al. (2007) posited that forgiveness is viewed as an interpersonal construct in collectivistic cultures, whereas it is conceived as an intrapersonal construct in individualistic cultures. Individuals who view forgiveness as an interpersonal construct focus on the relationship with the offender after the transgression. As their goal is to maintain interpersonal harmony, they are more likely to express forgiveness to the transgressor. On the other hand, individuals who view forgiveness as an intrapersonal construct focus on their internal emotion processes after the transgression. Since their goal is to maintain emotional well-being, they are more likely to regulate their emotion and retain emotional balance and health.

Since forgiveness belongs to the victim, cultural differences in the sense of justice and injustice are analyzed. In collectivism revenge is bad and forgiveness is good all the time. In individualism forgiveness and revenge are opposite sides of a coin in that they may have evolved in breaking a vicious cycle of violence. This begins with analysis of collectivism and individualism. Reasons for forgiveness have also been studied, the first being the restoration of social harmony (Hughes, 1975). For some people, forgiveness is necessary because it restores good relations with
others. As a consequence, it should be more important to forgive a member of one's community or a friend than a member of another group or a colleague, because harmony in the community or in the family is considered more important than harmony between communities or at work (Newman, 1987). In Enright's cognitive developmental model of forgiveness (Enright & Fitzgibbons, 2000; pp. 55), forgiveness as social harmony corresponds to one of the highest levels of forgiveness reasoning, one that is usually found among older adolescents and adults. A few studies (Girard & Mullet, 1997; Mullet et al., 1999) have shown that social proximity can be an important factor favoring forgiveness.

The second reason to forgive is religious or philosophical beliefs, or pressure from religious or philosophical authorities (Carter, 1977). Religious people may forgive if their faith or the authorities demand it. From another point of view, ability to forgive can also derive from a personal philosophy or as part of a religious way of life. In Enright's cognitive developmental model of forgiveness (Enright & Fitzgibbons, 2000: pp. 55), lawful expectational forgiveness corresponds to a medium level of forgiveness reasoning, one that can be found among adolescents and young adults. Many studies (Gorsuch & Hao, 1993; Mullet et al., 1999, 2003; Poloma & Gallup, 1991; Shoemaker & Bolt, 1977; Worthington & Scott, 1983) have shown the positive link between religious faith and forgivingness.

1.4 Theories of Forgiveness

1.4.1 McCullough’s theory of forgiveness

McCullough, Worthington and Rachal (1997b) define forgiveness as: “The set of motivational changes whereby one becomes (a) decreasingly motivated to retaliate against an offending relationship partner, (b) decreasingly motivated to maintain estrangement from the offender, and (c) increasingly motivated by conciliation and goodwill for the offender, despite the offender's hurtful actions” (p. 321-322).

The authors suggest that the retaliatory, avoiding and conciliatory motivations may be linked to the basic psychological motivational systems. The negative motivations towards the offender, including the motivation to revenge and the motivation to avoidance, are hypothesized to relate to a fear- and anger related motivational system. Motivation to revenge is hypothesized to parallel an anger-
related motivational system, and may be activated by a set of emotion termed righteous indignation (Gottman, 1993). When individuals experience righteous indignation emotions such as anger and contempt, their anger-related motivation is activated, leading them to seek revenge on the offender.

Motivation to avoidance is hypothesized to parallel a fear-related motivational system, which may be activated by a set of emotions termed hurt-perceived attack (Gottman, 1993). When individuals experience hurt-perceived emotions such as fear and worry, their fear-related motivation is activated, leading them to avoid contact with the offender. The positive motivations towards the transgressor are hypothesized to assimilate psychological concepts of accommodation (Rusbult, Verette, Whitney, Slovik, & Lipkus, 1991) and willingness to sacrifice (Van Lange et al., 1997) in close relationships, of which individuals are willing to restrain from claiming one's own rights or benefits for the good of the relationship.

In McCullough's theory of forgiveness, empathy is hypothesized to play a major role in bringing about decrease of revenge and avoidance motivations and increase of conciliatory motivations. With reference to Batson's empathy-altruism hypothesis (Batson & Oleson, 1991), they hypothesize that forgiveness occur when empathy elicits the transgressed individual's care of (a) the guilt, distress within the transgressor brought by the transgression, (b) isolation and loneliness within the transgressor brought by the estranged relationship, and (c) rebuilding the close relationship. And with the increased caring emotions for the transgressor, the transgression may be perceived as less severe, which in turn decrease the negative revenge and avoidance motivations and increase the positive conciliatory motivations. In sum, McCullough defines intrapersonal forgiveness in terms of its motivational and affective components.

1.4.2 Transgression Related Interpersonal Motivation

Following a transgression, most people will experience some motivation to seek revenge or to avoid the transgressor and some decline in goodwill for the transgressor. However, some people will experience relatively quick returns to baseline in these motivations; others will experience lingering negative motivations for days, weeks, or even months. Forgiveness is conceptualized as pro-social changes in these transgression-related interpersonal motivations, or TRIMs (McCullough,
Bellah, Kilpatrick, & Johnson, 2001; McCullough, Fincham, & Tsang, 2003; McCullough & Hoyt, 2002; McCullough et al., 1998, 1997).

When people forgive, they become less avoidant, less vengeful, and more benevolent toward the people who have hurt them. Although some researchers acknowledge that forgiveness can also be conceptualized as an active, deliberative process (Worthington & Scherer, 2004), the unifying feature of forgiveness on which most scholars seem to agree is that forgiveness is a change process by which an individual becomes more positively disposed and less negatively disposed toward an individual who has harmed him or her at some point in the past (Baumeister, Exline, & Sommer, 1998; Enright & Coyle, 1998; McCullough, Pargament, & Thoresen, 2000; Worthington, 2005), irrespective of whether that process occurs effortful or more passively.

McCullough has emphasized reductions of motivations of revenge and avoidance over time and increase of conciliation over time (McCullough, Fincham, & Tsang, 2003). Snyder has emphasized cognition (Thompson et al., 2005). Worthington has emphasized emotion (Worthington & Wade, 1999). All agree that forgiving is a complex phenomenon.

McCullough, Bono, & Root (2007) have referred forgiveness as a pro-social motivation which is a redirection in negative motivations (revenge and avoidance) and accompanied by more conciliatory motivations toward the transgressor. Yet the mechanism of enhancing motivation/behavioral intention to change (towards the transgressor) is not fully understood. According to McCullough, et al. (2007), the immediate behavioral responses following a transgression are revenge and avoidance. Nevertheless, studies on examining the processes for such motivational change (from negative to positive) are rare. Furthermore, if an individual forgive the transgressor solely because of his or her change in motivation but without experiencing positive affect, this type of forgiveness may not be authentic and sustainable.

McCullough et al. (1998) define interpersonal forgiving as the set of motivational changes whereby one becomes (a) decreasingly motivated to retaliate against an offending relationship partner, (b) decreasingly motivated to maintain estrangement from the offender, and (c) increasingly motivated by conciliation and goodwill for the offender, despite the offender's hurtful actions. When an offended...
person is unable to forgive his/her perception of the offense produces two motivational states; that is, (a) high motivation to avoid contact with the offending partner (avoidance motivation) and (b) high motivation to seek revenge or see harm come to the offending partner (revenge motivation).

When an interpersonal transgression occurs, the victim can perceive the transgression as hurtful, offensive, or some mixture of both. These perceptions are often accompanied by immediate emotional reactions of anger to the extent that the transgression is perceived as an offense (Thoresen et al., 1998) or of fear to the extent that the transgression is perceived as hurtful (Worthington & Wade, 1999). Such immediate and highly charged emotional reactions can occur even when forgiveness is quickly forthcoming. Sometimes, however, these immediate emotions are transformed into a more enduring state of un-forgiveness.

Despite the obvious differences among such definitions, they share an important feature the assumption that forgiveness involves pro-social change regarding a transgressor on the part of the transgression recipient. Indeed, nearly every theorist appears to conquer that when people forgive, their responses (thoughts, feelings, behavioral inclinations, or actual behaviors) toward a transgressor become more positive and/or less negative. This point of consensus led McCullough, Pargament, and Thoresen (2000) to propose that intra-individual pro-social change toward a transgressor is a foundational and uncontroversial feature of forgiveness.

Pro-social psychological change is a hallmark of forgiveness and because change requires the passage of time, time is necessarily an intrinsic aspect of forgiveness. However, the theoretical and methodological implications of a temporal view of forgiveness have been neglected. This neglect is illustrated by the fact that most researchers have measured forgiveness in terms of an individual’s self-reported cognitions, emotions, motivations, or behaviors toward a transgressor at a single point in time. For example, McCullough and colleagues (McCullough et al., 1998; McCullough & Hoyt, 2002) have used cross-sectional or instantaneous measurements of transgression recipients’ vengeful, avoidant, and benevolent feelings toward someone who committed a transgression against them as measures of how much they had forgiven their transgressors. Implicit in such operationalization’s is the assumption that people who report low avoidance motivation, low revenge
motivation, and high benevolence toward a transgressor instantaneously have forgiven to a greater extent than have people with high avoidance and revenge motivation and low benevolence.

1.4.3 Talking About Transgressions and Collectivism

Collectivists talk about transgressions in ways that promote social harmony and reconciliation. Accounts refer to the explanations given to a victim about the cause and responsibility for having acted in particular ways. Accounts for negative behavior can deny responsibility or justify the behavior (often by blaming the victim) or can mitigate tension by naming excusing circumstances or confessing responsibility (Takaku, 2000). Four studies (Fukuno & Ohbuchi, 1998; Park, Lee, & Song, 2005; Sugimoto, 1997; Takaku, 2000) examined cultural differences in account styles.

Two studies examined the appropriateness of accounts among Japanese and American participants. Apologies admit to personal responsibility for wrongdoing, usually involve expressive remorse and regret, and usually include the promise to attempt to avoid similar transgressions in the future. Justifications admit to wrongdoing but usually blame the accuser as the cause of one’s acts. Takaku (2000) had Japanese participants and American-born participants read a hypothetical vignette that described a conflict situation at work. Participants then rated the appropriateness of different types of accounts. Takaku found that Japanese participants thought that apology was more appropriate (medium effect) and justification less appropriate (large effect) for wrongdoing than did American-born participants Asking a slightly different question, Fukuno and Ohbuchi (1998) had American participants and Japanese participants read several hypothetical vignettes that described scenarios involving an offense and account and asked participants to indicate the effectiveness of various accounts at improving a victim’s impression of the offender.

Fukuno and Ohbuchi found that American participants thought that justification was more effective than did Japanese participants at improving a victim’s impression of the offender. However, Japanese and American participants thought that apology was equally effective. This finding suggests that collectivistic cultures and individualistic cultures both find apologies to be personally costly. In
collectivistic cultures concerned with maintaining social harmony and justifications are seldom used.

1.4.4 Worthington’s theory of forgiveness

In defining the concept of forgiveness, Worthington (2006) differentiates two types of forgiveness: decisional forgiveness and emotional forgiveness. Decisional forgiveness is defined as “a victim’s behavioral intention statement that one will seek to behave toward the transgressor like one did prior to a transgression” (Worthington, 2006; p.56). Emotional forgiveness is defined as the replacement of negative unforgiving emotions with positive other-oriented emotions, such as empathy, sympathy, compassion, romantic love and altruistic love (Worthington, 2006; see also Wade & Worthington, 1999).

Worthington (2006) suggests that decisional forgiveness and emotional forgiveness are two distinct processes involving different psychological mechanisms. Decisional forgiveness is the transgressed individual’s intention to inhibit negative behaviors and/or to maintain positive behaviors towards the transgressor. It is hypothesized to be arrived at “rationally or by will” (p.59). Emotional forgiveness is an experience of the negative unforgiving emotions being replaced by the positive other-oriented emotions. It is hypothesized to be arrived at through “emotional replacement” (p.59). Worthington hypothesizes the two processes to be different from each other.

Sometimes, individuals who make a decision to forgive may still experience the unforgiving emotions. And in other times, individuals may have experienced emotional forgiveness, even if they did not make any decision to forgive. Although the two processes may be independent, they may also lead to one another. For instance, when a transgressed individual makes a decision to forgive, he or she may behave in a way to maintain positive interactions with transgressor. These positive interactions may improve the victim-transgressor relationship, and in turn improve the transgressed individual’s cognitions and emotions towards the transgressor. Similarly, in the case of emotional forgiveness, changes of emotions may at the same time bring about changes in cognitions and behaviors.
In his stress and coping theory of forgiveness, Worthington (2006) considers decisional forgiveness and emotional forgiveness as two of the many coping mechanisms in the context of interpersonal transgressions. He suggests that individuals experience a transgression when they perceive an injustice gap. An injustice gap is defined as the difference between a desired outcome and a current outcome of an incident. With reference to Lazarus's (1999) stress-and-coping theory of emotion, he argues that when an injustice gap is perceived, individuals would appraise whether the transgression may be a threat or a challenge. If individuals find the situation difficult to cope with, they may appraise it as a threat; and if they find it not difficult to cope with, they may perceive it as a challenge.

When a transgression is appraised as a threat, individuals more likely ruminates, mentally replaying the negative sides of the event repeatedly. Rumination leads to accumulation of unforgiving emotions, defined as a complex of delayed ‘cold’ emotions, including bitterness, resentment, hostility, hatred, anger and fear (Worthington, 2006), and the unforgiving emotions in turn leads to motivations to seek justice, revenge or avoidance. The experience of unforgiving emotions is stressful and individuals seek various strategies to cope with this stress. These coping strategies may include but not restrict to justice seeking, revenge, forgiving, self-smoothing or reappraising the event.

Decisional forgiveness and emotional forgiveness are two of the many strategies to reduce the injustice gap and the unforgiving emotions. Decisional forgiveness contributes to coping with the stress of unforgiveness as individuals may feel more resolved of the internal struggles concerning the transgression. Coping strategies may include but not restrict to justice seeking, revenge, forgiving, self-smoothing or reappraising the event. Decisional forgiveness and emotional forgiveness are two of the many strategies to reduce the injustice gap and the unforgiving emotions. Emotional forgiveness contributes to coping with the stress of unforgiveness as it directly reduces unforgiving emotions towards the transgressor.

The use of the decisional and emotional forgiveness coping strategies may lead to different outcomes. Decisional forgiveness mainly affects relationships, social interactions and social harmony (Hook et al., 2009), while emotional forgiveness mainly affects physical health and mental health (Worthington et al., 2007a; Toussaint
& Webb, 2005). Although Worthington focused his discussion on decisional and emotional forgiveness, he noted that no strategies of coping with the unforgiving stress are definitely better than others. Whether the strategies may be effective depends on the specific transgression context. Worthington defines intrapersonal forgiveness in terms of its decisional and affective-motivational components.

1.5 State Anger

State anger which is defined as the psychobiological emotional state or condition marked by suggestive feelings that vary in intensity from mild irritation or annoyance to intense fury and rage.

Anger is one of our most passionate emotions, and potentially one of the most dangerous. Our scientific understanding of anger has developed over the decades, but behavioral scientists still lack clarity in their conceptions of anger and related emotions, whereas conceptions of some other emotions, such as fear, are better developed. For instance, fear and anxiety have been distinguished, with fear describing a reaction to a specific stimulus and anxiety describing a more generalized reaction. Scientists could, and possibly should, develop more refined concepts of anger and related states.

Kalat and Shiota (2007) describe anger as the emotional state associated with a wish to hurt someone or to push him away. If anger is defined from the point of view of its function, anger is related to self-defense or to the overcoming of obstacles that stand in the way of reaching a goal (Saarni, Campos, Camras, & Witherington, 2006).

Whether anger is defined from a more affective or a more functionalist viewpoint, it is typically a response to a specific stimulus, whether real or imagined a threat, an unpleasant or annoying situation, an unfair situation, and so forth. Most theorists agree that anger is a drive it is associated with a compulsion to respond to whatever caused it. For this reason, anger is often linked with aggression. What exactly elicits an anger reaction can vary from person to person. Scherer and Wallbott (1994) found the most common causes of anger. They found that people most often felt angry in situations that were unpleasant, unfair, and intentionally caused by someone else. This study and others have suggested that in many cases, anger and blame go hand in hand. However, blame is not necessary for anger.
For instance, an individual may become angry when she/he is frustrated, such as when she/he is busy working on her/his computer to meet a deadline and the computer is slow and keeps crashing. She may want to hit the computer. Likely there is no person to blame in this circumstance, but many people would describe their emotional reaction as one of anger.

Anger is an emotion that can motivate constructive behaviors, such as standing up for one’s rights, but it can also prompt destructive displays of verbal aggression, possibly permanently harming relationships, or of physical aggression, potentially leading to serious injury that ruins the lives of both the recipient and the perpetrator of the violence. Given the importance of this emotion, our theoretical understanding and research-based knowledge are relatively unsophisticated. This leaves room for innovative and productive studies that will shed new light on anger and its causes and provide information that will help people to channel anger constructively.

Anger in Catholicism is counted as one of the seven deadly sins. While Medieval Christianity vigorously denounced anger as one of the seven cardinal, or deadly sins, some Christian writers at times regarded the anger caused by injustice as having some value. Saint Basil viewed anger as a "reprehensible temporary madness. Joseph F. Delany in the Catholic Encyclopedia (1914) defines anger as "the desire of vengeance" and states that a reasonable vengeance and passion is ethical and praiseworthy. Vengeance is sinful when it exceeds its limits in which case it becomes opposed to justice and charity. For example, "vengeance upon one who has not deserved it, or to a greater extent than it has been deserved, or in conflict with the dispositions of law, or from an improper motive" are all sinful. An unduly vehement vengeance is considered a venial sin unless it seriously goes counter to the love of God or of one's neighbor.

A more positive view of anger is espoused by Roman Catholic pastoral theologian Henri J. M. Nouwen. Father Nouwen points to the spiritual benefits in anger toward God as found in both the Old Testament and New Testament of the Bible. In the Bible, says Father Nouwen, “it is clear that only by expressing our anger and hatred directly to God will we come to know the fullness of both his love and our freedom.”
In protestants, everyone experiences anger, Andrew D. Lester observes, and furthermore anger can serve as "a spiritual friend, a spiritual guide, and a spiritual ally." Denying and suppressing anger is contrary to St. Paul’s admonition in his Epistle to the Ephesians 4:16. When anger toward God is denied and suppressed, it interferes with an individual’s relation with God. However, expressing one’s anger toward God can deepen the relationship. Fitz Simons Allison holds that "we worship God by expressing our honest anger at him.

Biblical scholar Leonard Pine concludes from his studies in the Book of Habakkuk that "far from being a sin, proper remonstration with God is the activity of a healthy faith relationship with Him. Other biblical examples of anger toward God include the following:

- Moses was angry with God for mistreating his people: "Lord, why have you mistreated [lit done evil to] this people?" (Book of Exodus 5:22).
- Naomi was angry with God after the death of her husband and two sons: "The Almighty has dealt bitterly with me. The Almighty has brought calamity upon me" (Book of Ruth 1:20-21 abr).
- Elijah was angry with God after the son of the widow died: "O Lord my God, have you brought calamity even upon the widow with whom I am staying, by killing her son?" (1 Kings 17:20).
- Job was angry with God: "You have turned cruel to me; with the might of your hand you persecute me" (Book of Job 30:21).
- Jeremiah was angry with God for deceiving his people: "Ah, Lord God, how utterly you have deceived this people and Jerusalem." (Book of Jeremiah 4:10).

In Hinduism, anger is equated with sorrow as a form of unrequited desire. The objects of anger are perceived as a hindrance to the gratification of the desires of the angry person. Alternatively if one thinks one is superior, the result is grief. Anger is considered to be packed with more evil power than desire. In the Bhagavad Gita Krishna regards greed, anger, and lust as signs of ignorance and leads to perpetual bondage. As for the agitations of the bickering mind, they are divided into two divisions. The first is called avirodha-prīti, or unrestricted attachment, and the other is called virodha-yukta-krodha, anger arising from frustration. Adherence to the
philosophy of the Māyāvādīs, belief in the fruitive results of the karmāvādīs, and belief in plans based on materialistic desires are called avirodha-prīti. (Reference needed)

Jñānīs, karmīs and materialistic plan makers generally attract the attention of conditioned souls, but when the materialists cannot fulfill their plans and when their devices are frustrated, they become angry. Frustration of material desires produces anger.

Anger (Arabic: غضب, ghadab) in Islam is considered to be instigated by Satan (Shaitan). Factors stated to lead to anger include selfishness, arrogance and excessive ambition. Islamic teachings also state that anger hinders the faith (iman) of a person. The Quran attributes anger to prophets and believers as well as Muhammad’s enemies. It mentions the anger of Moses (Musa) against his people for worshiping a golden calf and at the moment when Moses strikes an Egyptian for fighting against an Israelite. The anger of Jonah (Yunus) is also mentioned in the Quran, which led to his departure from the people of Nineveh and his eventual realization of his error and his repentance. The removal of anger from the hearts of believers by God (Arabic: ﻥٓא‬ ﯽ‬‬‬‬‬‬‬‬‬‬‬‬‬ Allāh) after the fighting against Muhammad’s enemies is over. In general, suppression of anger (Arabic: ﯽ‬‬‬‬‬‬‬‬‬‬‬‬‬ ﯽ‬‬‬‬‬‬‬‬‬‬‬‬‬ ﯽ‬‬‬‬‬‬‬‬‬‬‬‬‬ kazm) is deemed a praiseworthy quality in the hadis. IbnAbdil Barr, the Andalusian Maliki jurist explains that controlling anger is the door way for restraining other blameworthy traits ego and envy, since these two are less powerful than anger. The hadis state various ways to diminish prevent and control anger. One of these methods is to perform a ritual ablution, a different narration states that the angry person should lie down and other narrations instructs the angry person to invoke God and seek refuge from the Devil, by reciting I take refuge with Allah from the accursed Devil.

1.6 Decisional Forgiveness

Decisional Forgiveness is an intention to behave more benevolently toward the transgressor (Exline, Worthington, Hill, & McCullough, 2003) to the extent that it is safe to do so. Decisional forgiveness can involve an intention to eliminate negative behavior in non-continuing relationships (McCullough et al., 2003) and to also restore positive behavior in continuing close relationships (Finkel, Rusbult, Kumashiro, & Harmon, 2002). One’s genuine decision to forgive may be unaccompanied by an
affective transformation in one's response to the offender. One may decide to release the transgressor from the debt (Baumeister et al., 1998; DiBlasio, 1998) and to behave in forgiving ways toward an offender and yet still be emotionally upset, cognitively oriented toward anger or rumination, and motivationally oriented toward revenge or avoidance (Worthington, 2006). Mindful of this discrepancy, Exline, Worthington, Hill, and McCullough (2003) argued that the science of forgiveness would be advanced more rapidly by considering decisional forgiveness as being separate from emotional forgiveness.

1.7 Emotional Forgiveness

Emotional Forgiveness for a transgression involves affective transformation, in which negative, unforgiving emotions are supplanted with positive other-oriented emotions, such as empathy, sympathy, compassion, or love toward the offender (Exline et al., 2003; Worthington, 2006). The process of emotional replacement can be likened to the chemical titration of an acid. The neutralization of the acid can occur drop by drop over time, but it can also occur all at once with a large addition of the positive-pH base. Similarly, positive emotions can supplant negative, unforgiving emotions incrementally (as a victim works to empathically understand the offender in therapy) or more dramatically (when a victim is significantly moved by a genuine apology and offer of full restitution from an offender).

To date, distinctions between decisional and emotional forgiveness have remained theoretical, relying on careful readings of the literature and attention to anecdotes (Exline et al., 2003; Worthington, Witvliet, Pietrini, & Miller, 2007).

Hook et al. (2009) proposed that people within individualistic cultures are more focused on reducing emotional, motivational, and cognitive discomfort; whereas people in collectivistic cultures are more focused on restoring the relationship and not behaving in ways that threaten group solidarity. They suggested that decisional forgiveness is more important than emotional forgiveness in collectivistic cultures. On the one hand, people in collectivistic cultures more readily express decisional forgiveness (intent to behave in ways that do not express negative emotions or motivations and treat the other person as a person of value) rather than emotional forgiveness (restoring inner harmony within an individual). On the other hand, among individualistic cultures, emotional forgiveness will take a higher relative importance.
than will decisional forgiveness because individualistic people are more often more concerned with personal peace than with how they might behave toward the offender. Furthermore, Ho and Fung (2011) postulated that individualists distinguish themselves from others and strive for personal benefits; thus, they may endorse more emotional forgiveness. Conversely, collectivists emphasize collective norms, social harmony, and relationships; thus, they may endorse more decisional forgiveness.

Faith and science have equally yet differently contributed towards the understanding of forgiveness. While faith or religion taught people the importance of forgiveness through various scriptures and epics. Science studied the underlining impact and effect of the practice of forgiveness on the well-being of individuals. Having scriptures that speak about the various episodes of forgiveness that have already taken place centuries back and science is teaching us the impact of the practice of forgiveness, we individuals have a choice to live a healthy or unpleasant life.