

Hope and Academic Success in College

C. R. Snyder, Hal S. Shorey, Jennifer Cheavens, Kimberley Mann Pulvers,
Virgil H. Adams III, and Cynthia Wiklund
University of Kansas

A cognitive, motivational theory is introduced to the educational research community. Hope theory integrates the conceptualization of goals, along with the strategies to achieve those goals (pathways), and the motivation to pursue those goals (agency). In a 6-year longitudinal study, individual differences in hope, as measured by the Hope Scale (C. R. Snyder et al., 1991) scores of entering college freshmen, predicted better overall grade point averages even after controlling for variance related to entrance examination scores. High- relative to the low-hope students also were more likely to have graduated and not to have been dismissed over this 6-year period. Hopeful thinking in college academics is discussed, along with the contributions of hope theory for educational research and practice.

Contrary to popular belief, intelligence and ability are not the only determinants of students' classroom successes (Dweck, 1999). Even talented young people may fail to achieve at levels that are consistent with their academic potentials, they may lower their academic expectations (Diener & Dweck, 1978, 1980), and they may either not go to college or, if they do, drop out prior to graduating (Hanson, 1994). These students come to be what Hanson (1994) has called "lost talent," and they are at a distinct disadvantage in today's difficult job market. Therefore, it is important to understand the factors that keep students on track and in pursuit of their educational goals.

Extensive research has been aimed at finding those factors that promote or inhibit academic achievement. These efforts have targeted motivational constructs such as self-efficacy (Bandura, 1982), optimism (Scheier & Carver, 1985), and goal theory—along with related helpless or mastery orientations (Covington, 2000). Although these constructs have contributed significantly to our understanding of academic performances, each elucidates only a part of the motivation story. In this latter regard, our present purpose is to introduce hope theory (Snyder et al., 1991) as a new motivational model for use in educational research.

Hope is defined as "the process of thinking about one's goals, along with the motivation to move toward those goals (agency), and the ways to achieve those goals (pathways)" (Snyder, 1995, p. 355). As such, hope is not an emotion but rather a dynamic cognitive motivational system (Snyder et al., 1991). In this sense, emotions follow cognitions in the process of goal pursuits (Snyder, 2000). Also, hope can be measured as a cross-situational construct that correlates positively with self-esteem, perceived problem-

solving capabilities, perceptions of control, optimism, positive affectivity, and positive outcome expectancies (Snyder et al., 1991). Accordingly, hope enables students to approach problems with a focus on success, thereby increasing the probability that they will attain their goals (Conti, 2000).

Although the agency and pathways components of hope are reciprocal, additive, and positively related, they are not synonymous (Snyder et al., 1991). Both are necessary for hopeful thinking. Agentic thinking reflects the cognitive momentum that translates into a "can do" attitude relating to people's confidence in their abilities to attain valued goals. Whereas some researchers have found that the motivational component represented by agency is more important to adjustment than is identifying specific pathways to attain goals (Cramer & Dyrkacz, 1998), other researchers argue that "in the absence of the strategies to be implemented, goal-directed motivation is useless" (Irving, Snyder, & Crowson, 1998, p. 197). Success at challenging tasks, particularly in the academic domain, often requires being able to generate multiple pathways to goals. As will be discussed in reference to goal theory, the ability to generate multiple pathways can help students when they encounter impediments in their academic goal pursuits.

Goal theory postulates a causal relationship between a person's goal orientation and behavioral responses in academic settings (Elliott & Dweck, 1988). Accordingly, there are two different types of goals that students typically pursue: learning goals and performance goals. These goals, in turn, set up adaptive or maladaptive achievement patterns reflecting either a mastery or a helpless orientation (Dweck, 1999). Mastery-oriented qualities are proposed to result from learning goals. Learning goals reflect a desire to learn new skills and to master new tasks. Students who choose this type of goal are actively engaged in their own learning, including assessing the demands of various assignments, planning the strategies they will use to meet those demands, and monitoring their progress at staying on track (Covington, 2000).

In contrast to those with mastery orientations, those who exhibit a helpless response when confronted with challenges are interested primarily in performance goals or low-effort goals that enable them to look good and be assured of success (Dweck & Leggett, 1988). Those who choose performance goals are more likely to take easy rather than more difficult classes in which the potential

C. R. Snyder, Hal S. Shorey, Jennifer Cheavens, Kimberley Mann Pulvers, Virgil H. Adams III, and Cynthia Wiklund, Department of Psychology, University of Kansas.

This article was presented, in part, at the American Psychological Association Convention, Boston, August 1999.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to C. R. Snyder, Department of Psychology, University of Kansas, 1415 Jayhawk Boulevard, 340 Fraser Hall, Lawrence, Kansas 66045-2462. E-mail: crsnyder@ku.edu

for success is greater (Mueller & Dweck, 1997, as cited in Dweck, 1999). These students typically do not increase their efforts following failures (Elliott & Dweck, 1988). When confronting obstacles, they exhibit decreased problem solving and readily disengage from goals even if they were performing adequately previously (Elliott & Dweck, 1988). This helpless response is fostered by perceptions that circumstances are beyond one's control, lowered expectations, negative affect, and deteriorating performance (Diener & Dweck, 1978, 1980).

Although the pursuit of learning or performance goals may lead to mastery or helplessness-oriented responses, respectively, goal theory leaves unanswered the question of why students choose one type of goal (Covington, 2000). Because hope theory (Snyder, in press) also posits a motivational system in which the ways that people appraise and pursue their goals result in helplessness- or mastery-oriented responses, it may be able to answer this question. Hope theory proposes that goals themselves do not produce behavior, but rather, people's views of themselves as being agents capable of initiating (agency) and implementing (pathways) actions to pursue valued personal goals (i.e., going to college) produce the helplessness- or mastery-oriented responses.

We propose that students' levels of hope lead them to choose learning or performance goals. High-hope, and specifically high-pathways, thinkers are able to conceive many strategies to reach goals and plan contingencies in the event that they are faced with impediments along the way. As such, goal blockages, which could be perceived as failures, are viewed as challenges to be overcome and are bypassed by the implementation of alternative pathways (Snyder, in press). Perceiving the likelihood of positive outcomes, these students focus on success and, therefore, experience less distress and greater positive affect (Snyder et al., 1991). Supporting our contention that hope pathways may lead to learning goals, goal theorists propose that learning goals favor deep-level, strategic processing, which leads to increased academic achievement (Covington, 2000). The model elucidated by Covington (2000), however, suggests that goals lead to cognitions, which then lead to achievement. In hope theory, on the other hand, cognitions come first and lead to the goals that people choose, which then lead to achievement.

Goal theorists further propose that performance goals trigger superficial, rote-level processing that suppresses achievement (Covington, 2000). Rote-level processing, however, may just be an indication that people with performance goals are not able to develop workable strategies for learning and hence are low-hope and low-pathways thinkers. Low-hope people may give up when encountering barriers to goals simply because they cannot think of other pathways to surmount the obstacles. This often results in frustration, a loss of confidence, and lowered self-esteem (see Snyder, 1994). This position was partially supported by goal researchers who used the Hope Scale (Snyder et al., 1991) to validate a measure of learning- and performance-goal orientations (Roedel, Schraw, & Plake, 1994). The learning-goal orientation was correlated positively with agency and pathways, indicating that hope is related to what Roedel et al. (1994, p. 1017) termed a "concern for improvement and personal mastery."

The ability to generate multiple pathways to goals and to solve problems relating to academic performance may give students a sense that they have control over their environments. This idea is supported by findings that high-hope people experience less gen-

eral anxiety and less anxiety relating specifically to test-taking situations (Snyder, 1999). In contrast, low-hope people experience more anxiety and are more likely to be sidetracked by self-deprecatory, goal-blocking thoughts when taking tests (Snyder, 1999).

Other positive psychology constructs such as self-efficacy and optimism propose similar patterns of achievement motivation. The agency and pathways components of hope, however, differentiate hope from these other constructs. Each model relates differentially to the typical efficacy and outcome expectancies that are described in the motivational literature (Bandura, 1982). Although hope involves reciprocal action between efficacy expectancies, reflecting personal beliefs that one can achieve goals (agency), and outcome expectancies, reflecting one or more strategies for achieving those goals (pathways), self-efficacy (Bandura, 1982; Sherer et al., 1982) emphasizes efficacy expectancies over outcome expectancies. In addition, according to Bandura's (1982) theory, subjective judgments of self-efficacy are task and situation specific, whereas hope characterizes a more general cognitive set that applies across situations (Snyder et al., 1991). In comparison with self-efficacy (using the scale by Sherer et al., 1982), the Hope Scale items are factorally distinct, and they produce unique variance in predicting well-being (Magaletta & Oliver, 1999).

Although hope and optimism, as contrasted with self-efficacy, are more stable dispositional constructs, they also differ in important ways. Scheier and Carver (1985) defined optimism as a general outcome expectancy that good things will happen and developed the Life Orientation Test to reflect this definition (LOT). Although Scheier and Carver propose that outcome expectancies, corresponding to hope pathways, are the best predictors of behavior, other researchers have proposed that optimism is related specifically to hope agency and that hope pathways was Snyder's unique contribution above and beyond what is offered by optimism (Peterson, 2000). An optimist may believe that things will turn out as he or she wants but does not possess the pathways necessary to pursue and acquire the goals (Snyder, 1995).

Hope has predicted problem-focused coping and mental health outcomes after controlling for optimism, whereas optimism failed to predict these same outcomes when controlling for hope (Kashdan et al., 2002; Snyder et al., 1991). Likewise, hope has predicted subjective well-being even after controlling for the variance due to self-efficacy and optimism (Magaletta & Oliver, 1999). In addition, the positive relationship between agency and self-efficacy suggested that both constructs share a common emphasis on persistence (Magaletta & Oliver, 1999), although agency still made an independent contribution to predicting well-being beyond that made by general self-efficacy. Magaletta and Oliver (1999) also used factor analysis to show that pathways and the LOT were independent constructs.

Although optimism has been related to choosing achievement goals, it either predicted very little (Pajares, 2001) or no variance in observed (Stewart, Lam, Betson, Wong, & Wong, 1999) or expected (Stoecker, 1999) college grades. In contrast, Hope Scale scores have related to higher scores on achievement tests for grade school children (McDermott & Snyder, 2000; Snyder et al., 1997), higher overall grade point averages (GPAs) for junior high (Lopez, Bouwkamp, Edwards, & Teramoto Pedotti, 2000) and high school (Snyder et al., 1991) students, and higher semester and overall GPAs for college students (Chang, 1998; Curry, Maniar, Sondag,

& Sandstedt, 1999; Curry, Snyder, Cook, Ruby, & Rehm, 1997). In one study, Hope Scale scores significantly predicted college students' final grades in their introductory psychology courses, and they did so even when removing the variance related to the first of three exams in those courses (Snyder et al., 1991). In these previous studies, it also should be noted that hope's predictive power remained significant when controlling for intelligence (children's studies) and prior grades and self-esteem (high school and college studies). Lastly, Hope Scale scores have correlated positively with perceived scholastic competence (Onwuegbuzie & Daley, 1999) and greater academic satisfaction (Chang, 1998).

Measuring Hope

A useful step in the evolution of a new theory is to develop and validate an individual differences scale reflecting the theory structure. Translated into more than 20 languages to date, the adult dispositional Hope Scale (Snyder et al., 1991) has four agency, four pathways, and four distracter items. Respondents are asked to complete these items on an 8-point Likert-type scale in terms of how they generally perceive themselves in goal pursuits across situational contexts. The dispositional Hope Scale is a stable, trait-like measure that assesses a person's global level of hope, and it is designed for use with older children or adults.

The Hope Scale has received considerable construct, concurrent, and discriminant validation support (see Snyder, Simpson, Michael, & Cheavens, 2000). In terms of construct validity, higher hope people, as measured by the Hope Scale, actually produce more routes to their goals, and they have more mental agency to apply to those routes (Kahle & Snyder, 2001; Snyder et al., 1991). Likewise, in regard to discriminant validity, Hope Scale scores have not correlated reliably with IQ and self-consciousness.

Turning to concurrent validity, the Hope Scale has correlated positively with several scales designed to measure similar concepts, including optimism (LOT; Scheier & Carver, 1985), Generalized Expectancy for Success Scale (Fibell & Hale, 1978), problem solving (Problem Solving Inventory; Heppner & Petersen, 1982), self-efficacy (using the scale of Sherer et al., 1982; Magalatta & Oliver, 1999), and self-esteem scale scores (Rosenberg, 1965). Furthermore, Hope Scale scores have correlated negatively with measures of negative affectivity (Positive and Negative Affect Schedule; PANAS; Watson, Clark, & Tellegen, 1988), anxiety (State-Trait Anxiety Inventory; Spielberger, Gorsuch, & Luchene, 1970), depression (Beck Depression Inventory; Beck, Ward, Mendelsohn, Mock, & Erbaugh, 1961), and hopelessness (Beck Hopelessness Scale; Beck, Weissman, Lester, & Trexler, 1974).

Discriminant utility has been assessed by examining the Hope Scale's unique predictive variance in comparison with theoretically related predictor variables. First, Hope Scale scores significantly augmented the prediction of several criterion variables beyond self-esteem. Second, when both the PANAS (Watson et al., 1988) and the Hope Scale were entered into a regression equation with the planning subscale of the COPE (Carver, Scheier, & Weintraub, 1989) as the criterion variable, the Hope Scale accounted for unique variance (Sigmon & Snyder, 1990). Third, regression analyses were performed with the State-Trait Anxiety Inventory (Trait form; Spielberger et al., 1970), the Taylor Manifest Anxiety Scale (Taylor, 1954), and the Hope Scale as predictor variables, and problem-focused coping from the revised Ways of

Coping (Folkman & Lazarus, 1985) as the criterion variable. The Hope Scale scores significantly augmented the predictions from both anxiety indices (Holleran & Snyder, 1990). Finally, in predicting the probability of attaining 6-month goals, Hope Scale scores have reliably augmented the predictions related to positive and negative affect, positive and negative life stress, optimism, and locus of control (Snyder et al., 1991).

Present Study

To expand the literature generated by previous cross-sectional studies relating hope to academic achievement, and to assess hope's ability to predict long-term academic outcomes, the present study focused on students' performances over their college careers. Specifically, we measured students' trait hope levels on entering college, GPA at the end of their first and second semesters, and cumulative GPA and graduation status at the end of a 6-year period. It was predicted that higher Hope Scale scores would relate reliably to (a) higher GPAs, (b) higher likelihood of graduating, and (c) lower dismissal or dropout rates.

Method

Participants

Participants were 213 newly admitted college freshmen with a mean age of 18.17 years ($SD = 0.44$, range of 18 to 21 years). These participants were divided into three groups according to their levels of hope: 70 high-hope participants (33 men, 37 women), with a mean hope score of 58.76 ($SD = 1.83$, range of 56 to 63); 71 medium-hope participants (34 men, 37 women), with a mean hope score of 51.93 ($SD = 1.07$, range of 49 to 53); and 72 low-hope participants (35 men, 37 women), with a mean hope score of 40.76 ($SD = 3.87$, range 27 to 46).

Materials

The Hope Scale. Four items assess agency and four items assess pathways using an 8-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (*definitely false*) to 8 (*definitely true*). There are four filler items. Separate yet related agency and pathways factors consistently emerge (correlations of .40 to .50) along with an overarching hope factor (Babyak, Snyder, & Yoshinobu, 1993). The scale has been found to be both temporally stable (test-retests over several weeks of .85) and internally reliable (alphas of .74 to .88). Alpha reliabilities in the present study were .86 for the overall Hope Scale, .81 for the agency component, and .74 for pathways component.

GPA. GPA was measured on a 4-point scale, with F = 0, D = 1, C = 2, B = 3, and A = 4. The grade and graduation status data were obtained from the registrar's office 6 years after the students entered college.

Graduation status. Graduation status was coded into four categories: dismissed because of poor grades, withdrew in good standing, still enrolled in school, and graduated. Six years was chosen as the cutoff time because we wanted to have a time period during which most of the students could have graduated. The average time to graduation at this educational institution is less than 5 years, with a standard deviation of about 2 years.

American College Testing (ACT) scores. ACT scores were obtained from the registrar.

Procedure

In the mass screening procedures for their introductory psychology courses at a Midwestern state university, 808 students completed the Hope Scale (Snyder et al., 1991) 1 week after the

beginning of the fall semester. Only beginning college freshmen were recruited. Hope Scale scores were separated by gender and arrayed from lowest to highest scores. Participants for the high-hope group were selected starting at the top of the distribution and moving downward until sufficient numbers were obtained. Similarly, participants for the low-hope group were selected going from the bottom of the scores upward. For the medium-hope students, those close to the overall mean (± 1 to 2 points) were recruited. We chose to create groups of hope as opposed to using hope as a continuous variable for the purpose of clarity in presenting our results. Further, because this is a preliminary longitudinal test of hope's predictive power, we viewed this as a more stringent test than the continuous variable approach.

The 213 selected students were contacted by telephone and asked to participate in a study about "academic success in college." They also were informed that they would be asked for permission to access ACT entrance scores and their GPAs for their entire time at the university. Participants who agreed were scheduled for a subsequent meeting in groups of approximately 20 with a 25-year-old female experimenter. At that time, they were given an informed consent sheet that repeated the study purposes.

Results

Descriptive Data

The mean GPA was 2.67 ($SD = 0.74$) or C+, with a range of 0.0 (F) to 4.0 (A). The mean composite ACT score was 22.88 ($SD = 4.12$, range of 12 to 34). At the end of 6 years, 29 students had been dismissed from the university because of poor grades (13.6%), 58 had withdrawn in good academic standing (27.2%), 24 were still enrolled in the university as undergraduates (11.3%), and 102 had graduated (47.9%). There were no significant gender differences in any analyses. Reported GPA of 0.0 corresponded to students who performed very poorly in all of their classes and not to students who enrolled but did not attend classes.

GPA Analyses

A one-way analysis of variance using dispositional hope as the independent variable (three levels) and cumulative GPA as the dependent variable was significant, $F(2, 210) = 5.51, p < .01$, with an eta squared of .05. This effect size translates to a Cohen's d of .23, where .10 reflects a small effect size and .25 represents a medium effect size (Cohen, 1988). The low-, medium-, and high-hope groups' mean GPAs were 2.44 ($SD = 0.81$), 2.72 ($SD = 0.71$), and 2.85 ($SD = 0.65$), respectively; only the high- and low-hope groups were different at .05 (using Tukey's honestly significant difference test).

To ascertain when the dispositional hope and GPA relationships were established, we examined the GPAs at the end of the first semester. There was a significant dispositional hope effect, $F(2, 210) = 4.75, p = .01$, and mean GPAs for the low-, medium-, and high-hope groups were 2.40 ($SD = 0.81$), 2.71 ($SD = 0.71$), and 2.77 ($SD = 0.65$), respectively, with the low- and high-hope groups being significantly different at .05. Using cumulative GPAs at the end of the second semester, there was a significant effect of dispositional hope, $F(2, 189) = 5.25, p < .01$. Mean GPAs for the low-, medium-, and high-hope groups were 2.37 ($SD = 0.81$), 2.54

($SD = 0.71$), and 2.80 ($SD = 0.65$), respectively, with the low and high groups being different at .05.

Hope Scale scores and cumulative GPA were significantly, positively correlated, $r(211) = .21, p < .01$. A partial correlation between Hope Scale scores and GPA remained significant after removing shared ACT variance, $r(191) = .13, p = .04$.

Graduation Status Analyses

The relationship between Hope Scale scores and graduation status was examined using a two-way contingency table. Dispositional hope had two levels (low or high), and academic status had four levels. The actual numbers in the 2 (hope level: low; high) \times 4 (academic status: dismissed because of poor grades; withdrew in good standing; still in school; and graduated) matrix are shown in Table 1. Dispositional hope and graduation status were significantly related, Pearson $\chi^2(6, N = 213) = 14.92, p = .02$, Cramer's $V = .19$.

Follow-up comparisons were conducted on the differences among these proportions for the low- and high-hope groups. The Holm's sequential Bonferroni method was used to control for Type I error at the .05 level across the comparisons. The only significant (.05) differences between the low- and high-hope groups were on graduation (40.27% vs. 56.52%, respectively) and dismissal rates (25.00% vs. 7.10%, respectively). We also were interested in how these graduation and dismissal rates compared with those of the entire cohort of 3,287 students who entered in the same fall semester as did our research participants. Although the dismissal rates were not available, the overall graduation rate for this cohort after 6 years was 53.80%, which appears to approximate the 56.50% of the high-hope group; moreover, it is 13 percentage points higher than that attained by the low-hope students (40.27%).

Discussion

As expected, Hope Scale scores provided reliable predictions about college students' academic performances over the course of their undergraduate careers. All three hypotheses were supported, with higher Hope Scale scores reliably predicting higher cumulative GPAs, a higher likelihood of graduating from college, and a lower likelihood of being dismissed because of poor grades.

These and other findings indicating that hope is a reliable academic predictor may portend the educational usefulness of this construct. Although similar to other constructs, hope offers advantages over these other methods for conceptualizing academic mo-

Table 1
Number of Persons Per Cell in the 2 (Dispositional Hope Level) \times 4 (Academic Status) Matrix

Academic status	Hope level	
	Low	High
Dismissed because of poor grades	18 _a	5 _b
Withdrew in good standing	17	21
Still enrolled	8	5
Graduated	29 _c	39 _d

Note. Values within a row with different subscripts differ significantly at $p < .05$.

tivation. Because hope offers unique predictive ability beyond optimism and self-efficacy in regard to several criterion relevant to the academic domain, it may offer a more complete explanation of the underlying motivational processes. In addition, the hope construct directly explains the patterns of behavior predicted by goal theory, along with its learning and performance goals, and its mastery-versus-helpless orientations. As such, hope fills a void in the goal theory literature as to why people choose one type of goal over another (Covington, 2000).

High-hope students can conceptualize their goals clearly, whereas low-hope students are more ambiguous and uncertain about their goals (Snyder, 1994, in press). High-hope students, therefore, are likely to establish goals based on their own previous performances; they set "stretch" (or learning) goals wherein they establish slightly more difficult study and performance standards (Snyder, Feldman, Taylor, Schroeder, & Adams, 2000). Because they are attuned to their own goals and are in control of how they will pursue them, these students are intrinsically motivated and perform well academically (Conti, 2000). According to Snyder (in press), this increased performance results because goals built on internal, self-standards are more energizing than those based on external standards. High-hope students also are likely to establish concrete markers on which they can track their progress. Moreover, they are better than their low-hope college counterparts at breaking assignments into small steps that are sequenced toward a larger or long-term goal. The low-hope student, on the other hand, is oblivious to internal goals and is very attuned to what other people are doing academically; hence, the low-hope student adopts performance goals. In addition, the low-hope student establishes "all at once goals" that are too big, overwhelming, and anxiety producing.

High-hope students also benefit by staying very focused on their goals. Their thinking is "on task," and they attend to the appropriate cues in specific learning and testing environments (Snyder, 1994, in press). The high- as compared with low-hope students, therefore, are far less likely to become distracted by self-deprecatory thinking and counterproductive negative emotions. In this regard, we have found that low-hope students have difficulty with the input of information (i.e., studying) because of their distracting, task-irrelevant thoughts and detrimental negative feelings (Onwuegbuzie, 1998; Snyder, 1999). Compounding their problems, even if low-hope students have learned the information, they have difficulty focusing on the test questions and therefore are unable to demonstrate their knowledge. Instead, early in the examination process, low-hope students begin to think of how poorly they are going to do (Michael, 2000). Conversely, the high-hope student sees tests, in general, and specific examinations, in particular, as challenges to be conquered (Anderson, 1988).

High-hope students also find multiple pathways to reach their goals and willingly try new approaches (Tierney, 1995). Low-hope students, on the other hand, stick with one approach and do not try other avenues when stymied (Michael, 2000; Snyder, 1999). Instead of using problem-focused thought, the low-hope students often use counterproductive avoidance and disengagement thinking (Snyder & Pulvers, 2001). Reinforced in the short term by their avoidance thoughts, low-hope students continue their passivity. Unfortunately, they do not learn from past experiences. High-hope students, however, use information about not reaching their goals

as diagnostic feedback to search for other feasible approaches (Snyder, 1996).

Another asset of high-hope students involves their high levels of motivation. Because of their previous successful educational goal attainments, high-hope students are likely to be filled with a sense of agency and the anticipation of future school successes. Furthermore, when extra effort is needed to accomplish a particular goal in one of their classes, the high-hope students have reservoirs of determination. Likewise, when they encounter educational impediments, they are facile at channeling their energies to their new paths. All of these energy production and sustenance characteristics of high-hope students are reinforced by internal, agentic self-talk statements such as "I will get this done!" and "Keep going!" (Snyder, Lapointe, Crowson, & Early, 1998).

Given that the dispositional hope relationship with GPAs was established by students' very first semester, the collegiate academic advantages of higher hope and disadvantages of lower hope are immediate; moreover, they are maintained at the end of the second semester and consistently thereafter. Also, the low-hope students graduated at an overall 40.27% rate as compared with the 53.80% for their entire class cohort of 3,287 students. The high-hope students, in comparison, graduated at 56.50%. Together, these findings indicate that the low- relative to the high-hope students immediately do more poorly and are far less likely to graduate. Accordingly, low-hope students are prime targets for hope-inducing programs at the start of college.

This latter suggestion leads to the next question: Can we teach hopeful thinking to students? Whereas other interventions aimed at teaching metacognitive skills or self-regulated learning focus specifically on the academic domain, teaching hopeful thinking has the potential to improve the students' goal pursuits in all areas of their lives, thereby leading to more positive emotions, greater psychological adjustment, and more social support. Interventions for successfully raising hope in clinical settings (Klausner et al., 1998; Snyder, Ilardi, et al., 2000; Snyder, Michael, & Cheavens, 1999; Worthington et al., 1997) already have been developed. Likewise, these approaches have been applied in junior high classrooms (Lopez, Floyd, Ulven, & Snyder, 2000) as well as on college campuses (Curry et al., 1999). Future research is warranted on raising the hope levels of academically at-risk low-hope students who are entering college.

One final area for the future application of hope theory involves the "other side" of the academic dyad—the instructor. We (McDermott & Snyder, 2000; Snyder, 1999) have hypothesized that an important part of a teacher's role is to encourage students in the pursuit of classroom goals. This can be accomplished through modeling and direct reinforcement of students' efforts. Related to this hypothesis, Culver (1992) found that teachers' Hope Scale scores correlated reliably ($r = .49$) with their scores on a measure of the degree to which they encourage their students. In this regard, our view is that teachers and students have shared roles in keeping hope alive. Whether it is happening in the theaters of students' minds or the lecture halls of our universities, hope may be a lesson worth learning.

References

- Anderson, J. R. (1988). *The role of hope in appraisal, goal-setting, expectancy, and coping*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Kansas, Lawrence.

- Babyak, M. A., Snyder, C. R., & Yoshinobu, L. (1993). Psychometric properties of the Hope Scale: A confirmatory factor analysis. *Journal of Research in Personality, 27*, 154–169.
- Bandura, A. (1982). Self-efficacy mechanisms in human agency. *American Psychologist, 37*, 122–147.
- Beck, A. T., Ward, C. H., Mendelsohn, M., Mock, J., & Erbaugh, J. (1961). An inventory for measuring depression. *Archives of General Psychiatry, 4*, 53–63.
- Beck, A. T., Weissman, A., Lester, D., & Trexler, L. (1974). The measurement of pessimism: The Hopelessness Scale. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 42*, 861–865.
- Carver, C. S., Scheier, M. F., & Weintraub, J. K. (1989). Assessing coping strategies: A theoretically based approach. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 56*, 267–283.
- Chang, E. C. (1998). Hope, problem-solving ability, and coping in a college student population: Some implications for theory and practice. *Journal of Clinical Psychology, 54*, 953–962.
- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (Rev. ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Conti, R. (2000). College goals: Do self-determined and carefully considered goals predict intrinsic motivation, academic performance, and adjustment during the first semester? *Social Psychology of Education, 4*, 189–211.
- Covington, M. V. (2000). Goal theory, motivation, and school achievement: An integrative review. *Annual Review of Psychology, 51*, 171–200.
- Cramer, K. M., & Dyrkacz, L. (1998). Differential prediction of maladjustment scores with the Snyder Hope subscales. *Psychological Reports, 83*, 1035–1041.
- Culver, N. F. (1992). *A validation of the Encouragement Scale—Teacher Form*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Georgia, Athens.
- Curry, L. A., Maniar, S. D., Sondag, K. A., & Sandstedt, S. (1999). *An optimal performance academic course for university students and student athletes*. Unpublished manuscript, University of Montana, Missoula.
- Curry, L. A., Snyder, C. R., Cook, D. L., Ruby, B. C., & Rehm, M. (1997). Role of hope in academic and sport achievement. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 73*, 1257–1267.
- Diener, C. I., & Dweck, C. S. (1978). An analysis of learned helplessness: Continuous changes in performance, strategy, and achievement cognitions following failure. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 36*, 451–462.
- Diener, C. I., & Dweck, C. S. (1980). An analysis of learned helplessness: II. The processing of success. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 39*, 940–952.
- Dweck, C. S. (1999). *Self-theories: Their role in motivation, personality, and development*. Philadelphia: Psychology Press.
- Dweck, C. S., & Leggett, E. L. (1988). A social-cognitive approach to motivation and personality. *Psychological Review, 95*, 256–273.
- Elliott, E. S., & Dweck, C. S. (1988). Goals: An approach to motivation and achievement. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 54*, 5–12.
- Fibell, B., & Hale, W. D. (1978). The Generalized Expectancy for Success Scale—A new measure. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 46*, 924–931.
- Folkman, S., & Lazarus, R. S. (1985). If it changes it must be a process: Study of emotion and coping during three stages of college examination. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 48*, 150–170.
- Hanson, S. L. (1994). Lost talent: Unrealized educational aspirations and expectations among U.S. youths. *Sociology of Education, 64*, 263–277.
- Heppner, P. P., & Petersen, C. H. (1982). The development and implications of a personal problem-solving inventory. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 29*, 66–75.
- Holleran, S., & Snyder, C. R. (1990). *Discriminant and convergent validation of the Hope Scale*. Unpublished manuscript, University of Kansas, Lawrence.
- Irving, L. M., Snyder, C. R., & Crowson, J. J., Jr. (1998). Hope and the negotiation of cancer facts by college women. *Journal of Personality, 66*, 195–214.
- Kahle, K., & Snyder, C. R. (2001, October). *Still hopeful after all these years: Charting goal-directed thinking in older adults*. Paper presented at the Festschrift in honor of Rue Cromwell, University of Kansas, Lawrence.
- Kashdan, T. B., Pelham, W. E., Lang, A. R., Hoza, B., Jacob, R. G., Jennings, J. R., et al. (2000). Hope and optimism as human strengths in parents of children with externalizing disorders: Stress is in the eye of the beholder. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 21*, 441–468.
- Klausner, E. J., Clarkin, J. F., Spielman, L., Pupo, C., Abrams, R., & Alexopoulos, G. S. (1998). Late-life depression and functional disability: The role of goal-focused group psychotherapy. *International Journal of Geriatric Psychiatry, 13*, 707–716.
- Lopez, S. J., Bouwkamp, J., Edwards, L. M., & Teramoto Pedioti, J. (2000, October). *Making hope happen via brief interventions*. Paper presented at the Second Positive Psychology Summit, Washington, DC.
- Lopez, S. J., Floyd, R. K., Ulven, J. C., & Snyder, C. R. (2000). Hope therapy: Helping clients build a house of hope. In C. R. Snyder (Ed.), *Handbook of hope: Theory, measures, and applications* (pp. 123–150). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Magaletta, P. R., & Oliver, J. M. (1999). The hope construct, will and ways: Their relative relations with self-efficacy, optimism, and general well-being. *Journal of Clinical Psychology, 55*, 539–551.
- McDermott, D., & Snyder, C. R. (2000). *The great big book of hope*. Oakland, CA: New Harbinger Publications.
- Michael, S. T. (2000). Hope conquers fear: Overcoming anxiety and panic attacks. In C. R. Snyder (Ed.), *Handbook of hope: Theory, measures, and applications* (pp. 355–378). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Onwuegbuzie, A. J. (1998). Role of hope in predicting anxiety about statistics. *Psychological Reports, 82*, 1315–1320.
- Onwuegbuzie, A. J., & Daley, C. E. (1999). Relation of hope to self-perception. *Perceptual and Motor Skill, 88*, 535–540.
- Pajares, F. (2001). Toward a positive psychology of academic motivation. *Journal of Educational Research, 95*, 27–35.
- Peterson, C. (2000). The future of optimism. *American Psychologist, 55*, 44–55.
- Roedel, T. D., Schraw, G., & Plake, B. S. (1994). Validation of a measure of learning and performance goal orientations. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 54*, 1013–1021.
- Rosenberg, M. (1965). *Society and adolescent self-image*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Scheier, M. F., & Carver, C. S. (1985). Optimism, coping, and health: Assessment and implications of generalized outcome expectancies. *Health Psychology, 4*, 219–247.
- Sherer, M., Maddux, J. E., Mercandante, B., Prentice-Dunn, S., Jacobs, B., & Rogers, R. (1982). The Self-Efficacy Scale: Construction and validation. *Psychological Reports, 51*, 663–671.
- Sigmon, S. T., & Snyder, C. R. (1990). *Positive and negative affect as a counter-explanation for the relationship between hope and coping strategies*. Unpublished manuscript, University of Kansas, Lawrence.
- Snyder, C. R. (1994). *The psychology of hope: You can get there from here*. New York: Free Press.
- Snyder, C. R. (1995). Conceptualizing, measuring, and nurturing hope. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 73*, 355–360.
- Snyder, C. R. (1996). To hope, to lose, and hope again. *Journal of Personal and Interpersonal Loss, 1*, 3–16.
- Snyder, C. R. (1999). Hope, goal blocking thoughts, and test-related anxieties. *Psychological Reports, 84*, 206–208.
- Snyder, C. R. (Ed.). (2000). *Handbook of hope: Theory, measures, and applications*. San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

- Snyder, C. R. (in press). Hope theory: Rainbows in the mind. *Psychological Inquiry*.
- Snyder, C. R., Feldman, D. B., Taylor, J. D., Schroeder, L. L., & Adams, V., III. (2000). The roles of hopeful thinking in preventing problems and enhancing strengths. *Applied and Preventive Psychology, 15*, 262–295.
- Snyder, C. R., Harris, C., Anderson, J. R., Holleran, S. A., Irving, L. M., Sigmon, S. T., et al. (1991). The will and the ways: Development and validation of an individual-differences measure of hope. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 60*, 570–585.
- Snyder, C. R., Hoza, B., Pelham, W. E., Rapoff, M., Ware, L., Danovsky, M., et al. (1997). The development and validation of the Children's Hope Scale. *Journal of Pediatric Psychology, 22*, 399–421.
- Snyder, C. R., Haridi, S. S., Cheavens, J., Michael, S. T., Yamhure, L., & Sympton, S. (2000). The role of hope in cognitive behavior therapies. *Cognitive Therapy and Research, 24*, 747–762.
- Snyder, C. R., Lapointe, A. B., Crowson, J. J., Jr., & Early, S. (1998). Preferences of high- and low-hope people for self-referential input. *Cognition & Emotion, 12*, 807–823.
- Snyder, C. R., Michael, S., & Cheavens, J. (1999). Hope as a psychotherapeutic foundation for nonspecific factors, placebos, and expectancies. In M. A. Hubble, B. Duncan, & S. Miller (Eds.), *Heart and soul of change* (pp. 179–200). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Snyder, C. R., & Pulvers, K. (2001). Dr. Seuss, the coping machine, and "Oh, the places you will go." In C. R. Snyder (Ed.), *Coping and copers: Adaptive processes and people* (pp. 3–29). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Snyder, C. R., Sympton, S. C., Michael, S. T., & Cheavens, J. (2000). The optimism and hope constructs: Variants on a positive expectancy theme. In E. C. Chang (Ed.), *Optimism and pessimism* (pp. 103–124). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Spielberger, C. D., Gorsuch, R. L., & Luchene, R. E. (1970). *The State-Trait Anxiety Inventory*. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Stewart, S. M., Lam, T. H., Betson, C. L., Wong, C. M., & Wong, A. M. P. (1999). A prospective analysis of stress and academic performance in the first two years of medical school. *Medical Education, 33*, 243–250.
- Stoecker, J. A. (1999). Optimism and grade expectancies. *Psychological Reports, 84*, 873–879.
- Taylor, J. A. (1954). A personality scale of manifest anxiety. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 48*, 285–290.
- Tierney, A. M. (1995). Analysis of a new theory of hope and personality as measured by the California Psychological Inventory. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 55*(10-B), 4616.
- Watson, D., Clark, L. A., & Tellegen, A. (1988). Development and validation of brief measures of positive and negative affect: The PANAS scales. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 54*, 1063–1070.
- Worthington, E. L., Jr., Hight, T. L., Ripley, J. S., Perrone, K. M., Kurusu, T. A., & Jones, D. R. (1997). Strategic hope-focused relationship-enrichment counseling with individuals. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 44*, 381–389.

Received March 16, 2001

Revision received January 4, 2002

Accepted January 17, 2002 ■