A Study of Communication Skill Training on Forgiveness Couples Who Live in Ahvaz

M. Rjabi Forootan^{1*}, Y. Attari², S. M. Safi³

MSc of Consulting and Guidance, Ahvaz branch, Islamic Azad University, Iran
Professor of Consulting and Guidance, Shahid Chamran University, Ahvaz, Iran
MSc of computer Engineering, Ahvaz branch, Islamic Azad University, Iran
mrforoutan@yahoo.com

Abstract: This research examined the effect of communication skill training on forgiveness among couples who live in Ahvaz. The sample included 30 couples (15 females and 15 males) who were selected randomly. The instrument used in this research to collect the data was Family Forgiveness Scale (Pallard, 1998). The results of analysis of data showed that Communication Skill Training increased significantly among couples in sub/Scale of Forgiveness such as realization, recognition, reparation, restitution and resolution. The level of significant on this study was α =0.0001. [M. Rjabi Forootan, Y. Attari, S. M. Safi. **A Study of Communication Skill Training on Forgiveness Couples Who Live in Ahvaz.** *Researcher* 2014;6(8):62-66]. (ISSN: 1553-9865). http://www.sciencepub.net/researcher.9

Keyword: Forgiveness, Communication Skill Training

1. Introduction

Domesticity is started by this belief that only death can estrange us, and also couples believe it totally at the start of their life. But the fact is not that, domesticity affect several factors that some of them may make dissonance, clash, parting and even divorce, different study demonstrate that one of the most important awkward factor, is aberration in relationship. Aberration in understanding and agreement process for example in report prepared by family consult agency in 1970 main problem of 87% couple in study is aberration in relationship (Jacobson et al., 1980). Man understand their relationship with each other by comprehension, although relationships also affect our understanding of others and different situation reciprocally. Relationship among people is based on comprehension (Bolton, 2005).

Weak communication decrease comprehension of couples of each other and result in that couples cannot support and satisfy each other. But forgiveness is therapeutic to past radical injuries and forgiveness of torment factor is hard. You can excuse for your frustration definition of your flaw and showing your weakness where you are hurt by doesn't forgiveness. And don't forgiveness isn't forget fullness. By forgiveness people who hurt us, don't eliminate bad memory lane, because that displeasing experiences and their torment are instructive for us. Forgiveness isn't forgetting fullness absolution, and/or sacrifice and/or decision for ever. Forgiveness is away to rescue of the past and pay attention to good life in the past forgiveness is the end of therapeutic process (GharacheDaghi, 2002).

Hence, according to the importance of communication skills and the role of forgiveness on

continuity and pleasing of communication too prevent problems happening; can learn several beneficial and effectual communication methods.

Communication and social method, acquired and purposeful behaviors are that people use them in relation to each other in present situation and successful communication are based on them. According to the importance of this subject, in present study we evaluated efficacy of communication skills education on forgiveness of couples in Ahvaz.

Seyf Bahar (2001) studied Family Forgiveness Scale (FFS) (Pollard, 1998) in Iranian families and found that Forgiveness Scale have a relative real ability, validity and norm according to board range academic and among age (1-45 years old) participants (698) and wide range among number of kids (0-8 kids in family) they showed that there is significant correlation between Forgiveness Scale in many families (first generation) and core families (second generation) (Seyf et al., 2003). In recent decades there are diverse researches on forgiveness and its effect on improvement communication among people mental health and its consequences that we note some of them at below.

Jackson (1998) studied effect of forgiveness on closeness and trust in consummation and found that using of forgiveness in relationship has significant effect on level of trust on communication among people (Jackson, 1998).

Coleman (1998) demonstrated that torment improvement is due to forgiveness (Coleman and North, 1998).

Jacobson et al., (1980) said that making positive changes in couples communication belief is one of the main factors for prevent conflict (Jacobson, 1980).

Witkin (1983) studied quality of couples communication by communication skills workshop and its effect on solution effectual and pleasure in communication. Results showed that couples who educated in quality of couples communication had significant increase in positive inarticulate consequences (Witkin, 1983).

1.1 Hypothesis

Communication skills education is due to increasing in couples forgiveness (H_{1-1}) realization, (H_{1-2}) recognition, (H_{1-3}) reparation, (H_{1-4}) restitution, (H_{1-5}) resolution in Ahvaz.

1.2 Statistical sample and sampling method

In this research for sample volume selection used voluntary sampling that this sampling is based on test and interested people was used according to rules. Researcher should gain people agreement who participate in study before start (Delavar, 2006). In this research was asked in announcement interested people to participate in classes, then 30 couples were registries and divided them in control and treatment groups, randomly.

2. Instrument

In present study below instrument were used for variable measuring.

2.1 Forgiveness Scale

FFS was made by Pollard, Anderson, Anderson and Jennings (1998). This scale has 40 parts and divides into 2 sections. The first and second part is related to main family communication and present relationship, respectively.

5 corporate concepts including: realization, recognition, reparation, restitution and resolution among 3 patterns were used to make this scale.

Concept of realization is injurer and injured internal mental awareness that made torment. Concept of recognition referred to the level of hurt to injured and injurer persons. Reparation indicates 3 elements include 1) encounter with understanding event, 2) acceptance responsibility by injurer and 3) injurer ask injured to forgiveness and forgiveness injured. Restitution means make injured satisfy and resolution means and injured from hurts forgiveness. This form has 5 sub/scales and each of them has & questions injurer high score in this form show that person has high forgiveness and when her/his spouse make her/him sad, he/she can forgive her/his. How score in this form show that person has low forgiveness in her/his relationship.

2.2 Real ability

Pollard et al., 1998 in their research used FFS and tested it on 229 women and 118 men. Cronbach's aindex obtained for entire form was 93%

and for all sub/scales was ranged 55%-86% that was good.

SeyfandBahari (2001) evaluated psychoanalyst characteristics of FFS by using of one sample include 756 present of couples in Tehran city. By using Cronbach's aindex, real ability related to main and present families and entire form obtained 84%, 85% and 84%, respectively. However restitution and reparation in Main family and realization subscale hadn't satisfactory real ability, but another subscales had satisfactory real ability (Seyf et al., 2003) (table 1).

2.3 Reliability

Pollard et al., 1998 to evaluate the level of FFS, used a sample include 342 persons, correlated this scale with autonomy scale Worthington (WAS) and Ethics Relational Scale (RES) (Pollard, 1998). Results showed that subscales of this scale have good convergence reliability. Also results demonstrated that FFS had acceptable validation. Research findings present in 2 parts, a) dereliabilityscriptures findings and b) findings related to research hypothesis.

a) Descriptive Findings

Descriptive findings of this research include statistical indexes like mean, standard deviation, maximum, minimum and number of sample variables that for all studied variables of this research tabulated in table 2. As you see in table 2 n pre-test level forgiveness mean and standard deviation in each group for all treatment group are 49.40 and 2.69, for control group are 47.90 and 4.03, and in post-test mean and standard deviation for treatment group are 59.43 and 1.77, for control group are 47.70 and 2.92, and difference of mean and standard deviation (pre-test-post-test) for all treatment group -20.03 and 3.47 and for control group are 0.20 and 3.75, respectively.

a) Findings Related to Research Hypothesis

This research include hypothesizes at below and each hypothesis with its results obtained from analysis it present in this section. Communication skills education H₁ results in increasing forgiveness among treatment couples compared by control group.

As you see in table 3 there is significant difference between treatment and control groups for forgiveness. So H₁ is accepted. In other hand, according to forgiveness mean between treatment groups related to its mean among control group communication skills education makes increasing forgiveness among treatment group. It should be noted that low difference score in treatment group related to the scoring way FFS showed an increasing noted variable. As you see in table 4 between 2 groups there is difference significant for realization, recognition, restitution and resolution. In other hand, communication skills education on treatment couples according to forgiveness mean in treatment group

related to control couples result in forgiveness improvement in treatment group for noted variables. So 1-1 to 1-5 hypothesizes are accepted. It should be noted that according to forgiveness scale scoring way, low difference score in treatment group related to control group make it increased.

3. Results

In this section obtained results, scientific reasons for each hypothesis rejection or acceptance and their analysis are discussed.

4. Discussion

4.1 Findings definition of main and secondary research hypothesizes

 H_1 : communication skills education cause increasing treatment couples forgiveness related to control group.

According to findings from independent test in table 4, H₁ based on difference significant between treatment and control group is accepted. Otherwise, according to treatment couples group's forgiveness related control mean to couples communication skills education make increasing forgiveness among treatment families. These results agree to Enright and Fizgibbons (2000) research (Enright and Fizgibbons, 2000). In this research participant were educated for 12 sections (each section was 90 minutes). Subject's education was forgiveness. Results of this study showed that rage, stress and unhappy feeling in these people was decreased and people were enthusiastic for spouse forgiveness. This finding agrees to Ripley and Worthington (2002) results (Ripley and Worthington, 2002), they put 2 couples groups under communication intervention for upgrading relationship and educated them forgiveness based on empathy. Results of this study showed that treatment group related to control group had difference significant in positive communication behavior (Gilbert, 2004).

In definition of this hypothesis can say marriage is a collection of closeness, emotionally, socially and mental relationship that each of them may hurt (GharacheDaghi, 2002). As in this relationship would made hurt and resentment inescapably, forgiveness ability and preventing of sequential conflicts can result in relationship continuity. When forgiveness exists in relationship, aggression is reduced and couples solve their problem by conversation instead of dispute, and couples have more acceptances, and talk about their emotion easily. So, couples focus on their ability and fitness instead of rough edges, and make constructive and positive communication together.

4.2 Communication skills education cause increasing forgiveness among treatment couples related to control group by realization.

According to the results on ANOVA (table 4) (F=67.2, p < 0.0001) can understand that there is difference significant between treatment and control groups for realization. So H_{1-1} is accepted. Otherwise, educated couples have more realization to hurts and communicate better relationship with her/his spouse. Glading (2003) believes that injured couples with low forgiveness in their relationship have low sureness for problem solution. So, they want to escape and have weak strategic for behavior control.

4.3 Communication skills education cause increasing treatment couples forgiveness by recognition related to control group.

According to obtained results of ANOVA (table 4) (F=13.66, p < 0.0001) can understand that there is difference significant between control and treatment groups for recognition. So, H₁₋₂ is accepted. In other hand, couples who recognized hurt in their relationship, have good relationship. Goldenboughr (2000) believes that the best effective way to changing in marriage is that couple positive behavior exchange rate increase (Goldenberg and Goldenberg, 1934). In definition of this hypothesis can say forgiveness is one of relationship facilitators that can be starter of couple's communication and keep it. When couples have an exact and insightful evaluation, try to follow reason of problem and solve it instead of avenge and giveback their right. So, couples communication can have better structure. Couples can follow positive communication and conversation by discuss about harm behavior and make rules.

4.4 Communication skills education cause increasing treatment couples forgiveness by reparation related to control group.

According to the results of ANOVA (table 4) (F= 43.08, p < 0.0001) can find that there is difference significant between treatment and control groups for reparation. So, H_{1-3} is accepted. Otherwise, couples who repair hurts in relationship, have better communication in their relationship (Abbas Pour, 2007).

4.5 Communication skills education cause increasing treatment couples forgiveness by restitution related to control group.

According to the results of ANOVA (table 4) (F= 66.215, p < 0.0001) can find that there is difference significant between treatment and control groups for restitution. So, H_{1-3} is accepted. Otherwise, couples who restitute of her/his spouse after doing bad action, have better communication in

their relationship, in definition of this hypothesis can say when injurer couple restitute of her/his spouse and ask her/his forgiveness instead of avoidance or rage, communication is started again and couples can apologize and put forgiveness as a relationship pattern.

4.6 Communication skills education cause increasing treatment couples forgiveness by resolution related to control group.

According to the results of ANOVA (Table 4) (F= 54.63, p < 0.0001) can find that there is difference significant between treatment and control groups for resolution. So, H_{1-3} is accepted. Otherwise, couples who feel resolution after his/her spouse hurt, finally forgive him/her communication in relationship.

Table 1.Cronbach'sα index in FFS sub scale in main and present families*

Subscale α	Realization	Recognition	Reparation	Restitution	Resolution
Main family	76%	82%	60%	75%	71%
Present family	55%	73%	72%	81%	86%

^{*}From Pollard et al., 1998

Table 2. Mean, standard deviation, maximum, minimum and number of forgiveness grade in treatment and control groups in pre-test, post-test and difference (pre-test- post-test) levels

Variable	Level	Index Group	Mean	Standard Deviation	Minimum Grade	Maximum Grade	Number
Couples Forgiveness	Pre-test	control	49.40	2.69	43	52	15
	1 IC-test	treatment	47.90	4.03	42	52	15
	Post-test	control	59.43	1.77	66	72	15
		treatment	47.70	2.94	44	53	15
	Difference (pre-test-	control	-20.03	3.47	-27	-14	15
	post-test)	treatment	0.20	3.75	-6	6	15

Table 3.t test results for mean difference (pre-test- post-test) forgiveness grade in treatment and control groups

Variable	group	Difference	Standard Deviation	df	t	р
Couples forgiveness	treatment	-20.03	3.47	28	15 22	0.0001
	control	0.20	3.75	20	-13.32	0.0001

Table 4. Results of ANOVA for mean difference of forgiveness grade between treatment and control couples

Group	Difference	Variable	SS	df	MS	F	p
treatment	-3.87	Couples forgiveness for realization	106.40 1	1	106.40	67.20	0.0001
control	-0.1	Couples for giveness for realization		1			
treatment	-2.13	Couples forgiveness for recognition	38.53	1	38.53	13.66	0.0001
control	0.13	Couples lorgiveness for recognition		1			
treatment	-3.60	Couples forgiveness for reparation	100.83	1	100.83	43.08	0.0001
control	0.07	Couples lorgiveness for reparation					
treatment	-6.10	Couples forgiveness for restitution	291.40	1	291.40	215.66	0.0001
control	0.13	Couples forgiveness for restitution					
treatment	-4.33	Couples forgiveness for resolution	138.67	1	138.67	54.63	0.0001
control	0.03	Couples forgiveness for resolution					

References

- 1. Jacobson, N.S, Waldron, H. & Moore, D. Toward a behavioral profile of marital distress. Journals of counseling and clinical Psychology1980, 4: 269-277.
- 2. Bolton. Robert.,(2005), Psychological human relationship. Roshd. Tehran. 3rd edition
- 3. GharacheDaghi, Mehdi., you don't understand me, you don't understand me too, Khatoon, second edition. 2002.
- 4. Pollard, M. Anderson, R. Anderson, W., And Jennings, G. The Development of family forgiveness scale. Journal of family therapy. 1998, 20, 95-109.
- Seyf, Soosan., Bahari, Farshad. Forgiveness and Couples Mental Health Relationship, Psychological studies. 20031(9-17).
- 6. Jackson, S.M. The influence of forgiveness on intimacy and trust in marital and committed relationships. Disseration Abstracts international: section B: The sciences & Engineering, 199858-69.

- 7. Coleman, R.D., North, J. Exploring forgiveness, Madion: university of Wisconsin press. 1998.
- 8. Witkin, Journal of Marriage and The family. 1983. 45.
- 9. Delavar, Ali. Theoretical and practical research Principles in Humanities, Roshd, Tehran. 2006.
- 10. Enright, R. D. & Fitzgibbons, R. Helping client forgive Washington. D.C: APA Books. 2000.
- 11. Ripley, J.S. and Worthington, E.L. Hope-Focused forgiveness based group interventions to promote marital enrichment. Journal of counseling and development. 2002. 80, 452-463
- 12. Gilbert, P.B. Analysis of the function of system variable within forgiving and unforgiving families. 2004.
- 13. Goldenberg, Erne., Goldenberg, Herbert. Family Therapy, Ravan, Tehran. 1934.
- 14. Abbas Pour, Zabihollah., Comparison of unity, Adaptability, communication level in couples satisfactory among marriage Kind and unkind staffs who work at public offices in Ahvaz. 2007.

8/8/2014