Hope Theory, Measurements, and Applications to School Psychology

C. R. Snyder, Shane J. Lopez, Hal S. Shorey,
Kevin L. Rand, and David B. Feldman
University of Kansas, Lawrence

The tenets of a cognitive, motivational model called hope theory (Snyder et al., 1991) are reviewed, along with the two accompanying instruments for measuring hope in children and adolescents. More than a decade of research on hope theory as it relates to students, teachers, and schools is summarized. Likewise, the applications of hope theory for school psychologists are reviewed.

School psychologists contribute greatly in helping students, teachers, and schools in general to become more hopeful. As such, we see school psychologists serving in the role of "caring coaches" (Snyder, 1994) who help parents, students, teachers, and staff members to reach their education-related goals. In this article, we provide information so as to expand the already positive influence of school psychologists. To this end, we describe the tenets of hope theory, along with two brief hope scales that can be used with young children and adolescents. Moreover, we summarize the hope research conducted mainly in our laboratory, along with its implications for use by school psychologists.

HOPE THEORY

Snyder and colleagues (Snyder et al., 1991) have introduced a new cognitive, motivational model called hope theory. Having undergone a series of reconceptualizations (Snyder, 1989, 1994, 2000a, 2000b, 2002, hope theory is a strength-based construct that is part of the newly emerging positive psychology field (Snyder & Lopez, 2002). According to hope theory, hope reflects individuals' perceptions regarding their capacities to (1) clearly conceptualize goals, (2) develop the specific strategies to reach those goals (pathways thinking), and (3)

initiate and sustain the motivation for using those strategies (agency thinking). The pathways and agency components are both necessary, but neither by itself is sufficient to sustain successful goal pursuit. As such, pathways and agency thoughts are additive, reciprocal, and positively related, but they are not synonymous.

Whereas other positive psychology constructs such as goal theory (Covington, 2000; see also Dweck, 1999), optimism (Scheier & Carver, 1985), self-efficacy (Bandura, 1982), and problem solving (Heppner & Petersen, 1982) give differentially weighted emphases to the goal itself or to the future-oriented agency or pathways-related processes, hope theory equally emphasizes all of these goal-pursuit components (Snyder, 1994). For detailed comparisons of the similarities and differences between hope theory and other theories (e.g., achievement motivation, flow, goal setting, mindfulness, optimism, optimistic explanatory style, problem solving, resiliency, self-efficacy, self-esteem, Type A behavior pattern, etc.), see Magaletta and Oliver (1999), Peterson (2000), Snyder, (1994, 2002), and Snyder, Rand, and Sigmon (2002).

According to hope theory, a goal can be anything that an individual desires to experience, create, get, do, or become. As such, a goal may be a significant, life-long pursuit (e.g., developing a comprehensive theory of human motivation) or it may be mundane and brief (e.g., getting a ride to school). Goals also may vary in terms of having anywhere from very low to very high perceived probabilities of attainment. On this point, it should be noted that high-hope individuals prefer "stretch goals" that are slightly more difficult than previously attained goals.

High- as compared to low-hope individuals are more likely to develop alternative pathways, especially when the goals are important and when obstacles appear (Snyder et al., 1991; Snyder et al., 1996). No matter how good the cognitive routing, however, the pathways thoughts are useless without the associated agency-inducing cognitions (Snyder, Cheavens, & Michael, 1999; Snyder, Michael, & Cheavens, 1999). These agency thoughts are reflected in the positive self-talk that is exhibited by high-hope individuals (e.g., "I can do this" or "I will not give up"; Snyder, LaPointe, Crowson Jr., & Early, 1998). Likewise, reminiscent of the "When the going gets tough the tough get going" saying, high-hope people are sustained by their agency thinking when confronted with challenging situations or impediments (Snyder, 1994, 1999). Thus, high- more than low-hope people exhort themselves to "take the next step" (i.e., "stepping").

MEASURING HOPE

Hope can exist as a relatively stable personality disposition (i.e., a trait) or as a more temporary frame of mind (i.e., a state). Similarly, hopeful thought can occur at various levels of abstraction. For example, one can be hopeful about achieving (1) goals in general (i.e., a trait); (2) goals in a certain life arena (i.e., domain-specific); or (3) one goal in particular (i.e., goal-specific). (Lopez, Ciarlelli, Coffman, Stone, and Wyatt [2000] provide an in-depth coverage of these

latter approaches, including the development and validation of various self-report, observational, and narrative measures of hope.)

Snyder, Hoza et al. (1997) developed the Children's Hope Scale as a trait hope measure for children ages seven through 14 years (see Appendix A). The Children's Hope Scale is comprised of three agency and three pathways items, and it has demonstrated satisfactory (1) internal consistencies (overall alphas from .72 to .86); (2) test-retest reliabilities of .71 to .73 over one month; and (3) convergent and discriminant validities. Furthermore, this scale has been used with physically and psychologically healthy children from public schools, boys diagnosed with attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder, children with various medical problems, children under treatment for cancer or asthma, child burn victims, adolescents with sickle-cell disease, and early adolescents exposed to violence (Snyder, Hoza et al., 1997).

To measure the trait aspect of hope in adolescents (and adults) ages 15 and higher, Snyder et al. (1991) developed the Hope Scale (see Appendix B). This scale consists of four items measuring agency, four items measuring pathways, and four distracter items. Having been used with a wide range of samples, the Hope Scale has exhibited acceptable (1) internal consistency (overall alphas from .74 to .88; agency alphas of .70 to .84; and pathways alphas of .63 to .86); (2) test-retest reliabilities ranging from .85 for three weeks to .82 for ten weeks; and (3) concurrent and discriminant validities (Snyder et al., 1991).

In the remainder of this article, we use "high-hope children" to describe those who have scored in the top third of the Children's Hope Scale or the Hope Scale distributions; conversely, "low-hope children" applies to those who have scored in the bottom third of these scale score distributions. In an absolute sense, however, it should be noted that the children who score around the mean of these self-report instruments are reporting fairly frequent hopeful thinking (e.g., they mark the "a lot of the time" option, which is the fourth point on the six-point response continuum of the Children's Hope Scale).

RESEARCH ON HOPE

With the accumulated research over the last decade, we have gained a clearer picture of the relationships between hope and important aspects of students' lives (for reviews, see Snyder, 2000a, 2002). We address those topics that are most salient to the activities of school psychologists in this section.

Views about the Self and the Future

Correlational findings indicate that a child's higher hopeful thinking is positively associated with perceived competence and self-esteem, and negatively associated with symptoms of depression (Snyder, Hoza et al., 1997). Indeed, researchers have reported that lower hope predicts more depressive symptoms (Kwon, 2000), and it does so independently of appraisals and other coping

strategies (Chang & DeSimone, 2001). Additional evidence suggests that children and adolescents (Snyder, Hoza et al., 1997), as well as young adults (Snyder et al., 1991), view themselves in a favorable light and have slight positive self-referential illusions.

Regarding views about the future, those with high hope typically are more optimistic; they focus on success rather than failure when pursuing goals (Snyder, Hoza et al., 1997); they develop many life goals; and they perceive themselves as being capable of solving problems that may arise (Snyder, Hoza et al., 1997). Likewise, recent research suggests that higher hope is linked closely to having a greater perceived purpose in life (Feldman & Snyder, in press).

Achievements in Academic Arenas

Students with low hope experience high anxiety, especially in competitive, test taking situations. Such anxiety probably reflects the fact that they often do not use feedback from failure experiences in an adaptive manner so as to improve their future performances (Onwuegbuzie, 1998; Onwuegbuzie & Snyder, 2000; Snyder et al., 1996). Instead of using such feedback constructively, low-hope individuals are prone to self-doubt and negative ruminations that interfere with attending to the appropriate cues for both inputting (i.e., studying) and outputting information (i.e., test taking; Michael, 2000; Snyder, 1999).

The high- as compared to the low-hope students, on the other hand, do not denigrate their abilities when they "fail," and they do not let such failures affect their self-worth in the long run. In this regard, the high-hope students make the adaptive attributions that the "failure" feedback merely means that they did not try hard enough in a given instance, or that they did not identify the correct studying or test taking strategies. These emphases on strategies and effort attributions may explain, in part, why hope is not significantly related to native intelligence (Snyder, McDermott, Cook, & Rapoff, 2002), but instead is related consistently to academic achievement (even when correcting for perceived self-worth and ability).

Higher hope is related to greater reported scholastic and social competence, as well as to elevated creativity (Onwuegbuzie, 1999). It also is positively correlated with greater problem solving abilities and actual academic achievements (Chang, 1998; Lopez, Bouwkamp, Edwards, & Teramoto Pedrotti, 2000; McDermott & Snyder, 1999, 2000; Snyder, Hoza et al., 1997). Not surprisingly, therefore, high-hope students have reported significantly greater academic (and interpersonal) satisfactions than their low-hope counterparts (Chang, 1998).

Given hope's relationship with perceived competence and adaptive coping strategies, it follows that higher-hope grade school children have better scores on achievement tests (Snyder, Hoza et al., 1997), and that higher-hope high school (Snyder et al., 1991) and beginning college students (Chang, 1998; Curry, Snyder, Cook, Ruby, & Rehm, 1997; Snyder et al., 2002) have higher overall grade point averages (and fewer dropouts; see also Worrell and Hale [2001] although

these investigators did not use a hope index based on hope theory). In these studies, it should be noted that hope's predictive power has remained significant even when controlling for intelligence (children's studies), prior grades and self-esteem (high school and beginning college student studies), and entrance examination scores (beginning college student study).

In an effort to help students clarify their goals and enhance their hope, Lopez and colleagues (Lopez, Bouwkamp et al., 2000) instituted a five-week classroom intervention (via cognitive and narrative techniques) to elementary, middle school, and high school students. The three versions of this Making Hope Happen Program are developmentally appropriate and are designed to be beneficial for all students, irrespective of whether they have high or low hope at the beginning of the sessions. The short-term findings of this program are encouraging in terms of student achievement markers, and it is being continued in order to ascertain the reliability of the academic gains.

Achievement in Athletic Arenas

Higher hope has been related positively to superior athletic (and academic) performances among student athletes (Curry, Maniar, Sondag, & Sandstedt, 1999; Curry et al., 1997). For example, Curry et al. (1997) reported that high-hope student athletes performed significantly better in their track and field events than their low-hope counterparts, even after statistically controlling for variance related to their natural athletic abilities. In fact, in one study, trait and state hope scale scores together accounted for 56% of the variance in subsequent track performances (Curry et al., 1997).

Based on their initial findings relating hope to sports, Curry et al. (1999) have begun a class at the University of Wyoming to raise students' levels of hope. After taking this class, students have increased confidence related to their athletic ability, academic achievement, and self-esteem (see positive follow-up reported by Curry & Snyder, 2000).

In the only other reported study on the topic of hope and athletics, high- as compared to low-hope children have reported as being less likely to consider quitting their sports (Brown, Curry, Hagstrom, & Sandstedt, 1999).

Connections with Other People

Higher hope has correlated positively with social competence (Barnum, Snyder, Rapoff, Mani, & Thompson, 1998), pleasure in getting to know others, enjoyment in frequent interpersonal interactions (Snyder, Hoza et al., 1997), and interest in the goal pursuits of others (Snyder, Cheavens, & Sympson, 1997).

When hopeful thinking is stymied, interpersonal struggles may result. For instance, ruminations block adaptive goal-related thinking, and cause increased frustration and aggression against others (Collins & Bell, 1997; Snyder, 1994; Snyder & Feldman, 2000). Also, the interpersonal problems of others can translate into lowered hope for children. On this point, children who have witnessed

family members or friends who have been victims of interpersonal violence have lower levels of hope than children who have not seen such violence (Hinton-Nelson, Roberts, & Snyder, 1996).

Individual Differences Related to Sex and Race

The findings are very consistent in showing no differences in hope between girls and boys, or young women and men. Indeed, there is not one reported study showing any sex differences in level of hope. Turning to the issue of the cross-cultural applicability of the two-factor hope theory, this posited factor structure has been supported in at least ten studies. Moreover, the differences in the hope scores of children and young adults across ethnic groups have been examined, and it appears that Caucasians may have fewer obstacles (e.g., oppression, prejudice) in their lives than their ethnic minority counterparts. These findings should be viewed with caution, however, because results occasionally have shown that a particular minority group has higher average hope scores than do Caucasians (see McDermott et al., 1997; Munoz-Dunbar, 1993). Lastly, we were unable to locate any reported research studies that examine the hopefulness of students with learning disorders, physical disabilities, or giftedness.

ENHANCING HOPE IN STUDENTS

As we have noted previously, even children and youth with average scores on one of our scales have considerable hope in an absolute sense. Thus, based on our sampling, the good news is that American children typically describe their thinking as being filled with considerable hope. Furthermore, even if a student has a less than average amount of hope, it still can be parlayed into a level of hopeful thinking that makes a positive difference in her or his life. Hence, we propose that school psychologists should use and refine techniques for enhancing hope in all children.

While students with the least hope tend to benefit most from hope interventions (Bouwkamp, 2001), our research also shows that virtually all students raise their hope levels when taking part in school hope programs (Lopez, Bouwkamp et al., 2000). Therefore, we suggest the application of both targeted and universal applications of hope-raising techniques (described subsequently). That is to say, school psychologists may want to develop group-based approaches for raising the hopeful thinking of all students, irrespective of their levels of trait or school-related hope. Likewise, for those students who are identified as having obviously low levels of hope, special approaches may be tailored to raise their hopeful thinking.

When working with individual students, school psychologists may use a variety of standard testing instruments aimed at tapping interests and aptitudes. Added to these usual instruments, we suggest that school psychologists consider giving the Children's Hope Scale for the younger children and the Hope Scale

for those who are age 15 and older. Although these scales have been used mostly for research to date, their reliability and validity indicate that they may be used with appropriate precautions to measure the hopeful thinking of students in actual, applied school settings. In this regard, we would suggest that attention be given to the levels of the specific agency and pathways scores. For example, it may be that the student has a full low-hope pattern of low agency *and* low pathways scores; or, more happily, the student may have the full high-hope pattern of high agency *and* high pathways. Additionally, the student may have a mixed pattern of high agency/low pathways or low agency/high pathways. In these mixed patterns, attention needs to turn to raising the particular hope component that is low.

In applying hope theory to the work of school psychologists, we will aggregate our suggestions into three categories—those involving goals, pathways, and agency. These suggestions, which we discuss next, can be applied in individual or group settings. (See McDermott & Snyder [1999, 2000] or Snyder, McDermott et al. [2002] for more detailed information about imparting goal setting, as well as pathways and agency thinking to students.)

Helping Students to Set Goals

The foundation of imparting hope rests on helping students to set goals. The goals, of course, must be calibrated to the student's age and specific circumstances. Grade school students will have different goals than junior high school students, who in turn will have different goals than high school students. Let us begin by considering adolescents, who often need encouragement to set goals in various life domains. Sometimes these goals relate to interpersonal matters such as wanting to feel happier or meeting new people, whereas at other times they may involve selecting a career or deciding whether to go to college. By helping adolescents to select several goals, they can turn to their other important goals when they face a profound blockage in one goal.

If the school psychologist first gives instruments tapping values, interests, and abilities, then specific goals can be designed for each given student. Likewise, the student can be asked about recent important goals that were quite meaningful and pleasurable. These recent activities then may be used to generate an appropriate future goal. Once the student has produced a list of goals with the help of the school psychologist, that student then should rank the importance of these goals. In this process, the student learns important skills about how to prioritize goals. Some students, particularly those low in hope, do not prioritize their goals; instead, they have the maladaptive practice of impulsively wanting to go after any or all goals that come to their minds.

Assuming that students have been helped to establish desired goals, the next step is to teach them how to set clear markers for such goals. These markers enable the students to track progress toward the goals. A common goal, but one in our view that is quite counterproductive, is the vague "getting good grades."

This and similar goals are sufficiently lacking in clarity that the student cannot know when they are attained (Pennebaker, 1989); moreover, related research shows that abstract goals actually are more difficult to reach than well-specified goals (Emmons, 1992). Thus, we advocate concrete markers such as, "to study an hour each day in preparation for my next biology exam." With this latter goal, students not only can tell when they have reached it, but they can also experience a sense of success.

Another important aspect of helping students is to encourage them to establish approach goals in which they try to move toward getting something accomplished. This is in contrast to avoidance goals, in which students try to prevent something from happening (Snyder, Feldman, Taylor, Schroeder, & Adams III, 2000). The latter avoidance goals work to maintain the status quo, but they are not very reinforcing to students. We have found that high-hope students are more likely to use approach goals in their lives, whereas low-hope students are attracted to avoidance goals (Snyder, 2002). Thus, students should be helped to abandon avoidance goals and to embrace the more productive approach goals (Snyder, Shorey et al., 2002).

High-hope people also appear to be interested in other people's goals along with their own goals. Accordingly, we see advantages in instructing students to think in terms of "we" goals in addition to their own "me" goals (Snyder, Cheavens et al., 1997). This has the benefit of helping students to get along with their peers, and it makes for easier and more fulfilling interpersonal transactions. There is yet another benefit that students will experience as they begin to think about and help other people with their goals. Specifically, related research by Batson (1991) indicates that people who help others are doing so as a part of their natural human altruism needs, and they thus have the pleasure of feeling good about themselves when thinking about and attending to the welfare of others (Snyder, 1994).

Helping Students to Develop Pathways Thinking

Perhaps the most common strategy for enhancing pathways thinking is to help students to break down large goals into smaller subgoals. The idea of such "stepping" is to take a long-range goal and separate it into steps that are undertaken in a logical, one-at-a-time sequence. In our applied experiences, as well as in our research, it is the low-hope students who have the greatest difficulty in making subgoals. They often hold onto counterproductive and inaccurate beliefs that goals are to be undertaken in an "all at once" manner. Likewise, such low-hope students may not have been given much instruction by their caregivers in the planning process more generally. Such planning can be learned, however, and with practice in "stepping," students can gain confidence in the fact that they can form subgoals to any of the major goals in their lives.

Perhaps a student's deficiency is not in stepping per se, but rather it involves a difficulty in identifying several routes to a desired goal. Blockage to our desired

goals happens frequently in life and, lacking alternative pathways to those goals, a student can become very dejected and give up. This may explain, in part, the previous research findings on low-hope students' high probabilities of dropping out of school. Thus, we advocate teaching students to have several routes to their desired goals—even before they set out to reach their goals. Likewise, students need to learn that if one pathway does not work, they then have other routes to try.

Additionally, it is crucial for the production of future pathways, as well as for the maintenance of agency, that the student learns not to attribute a blockage to his or her lack of talent. Instead, we believe that a more productive attribution when encountering impediments is to think of that information as identifying the path that does not work—thereby helping one to search productively for another route that may work.

Helping Students to Enhance Their Agency

Although it may seem obvious that students would select goals that are important to them, it is important to check for this. This follows because students' goals actually may reflect those imposed by their peers, parents, or teachers. The problem with the latter, "other-selected" goals, is that the student may not fully "own" them. As such, the student does not obtain an accompanying sense of motivation in pursuing these imposed goals. Related to this point, research indicates that the pleasure in meeting externally derived goals is very fleeting (Sheldon & Elliot, 1999). Furthermore, when students lack personal goals that fill their needs, their intrinsic motivations and performances are undermined (Conti, 2000). Thus, goals that are built on internal, personal standards are more energizing than those based on external standards.

Helping students to set "stretch" goals also is invigorating for them. These stretch goals are based on a child's or adolescent's previous performances, so this inherently meets the previously mentioned criterion of owning one's goals. As long as students feel that they have chosen their goals, this promotes a sense of challenge that, in turn, is quite motivating.

Having students keep a diary of their ongoing self-talk (via a small notebook or audio tape recorder) can be helpful in determining if their internal dialogues are high (e.g., "I can . . ." and "I'll keep at it . . .") or low (e.g., "I won't . . ." and "I can't . . .") in agency. Students sometimes are amazed at how negative they are in such self-talk. Students of various ages can be cruel to each other, but they also can be extremely critical of themselves. As such, there are plenty of sources for these negative self-scripts. We would suggest that the students who have low-hope internal dialogues be taught to dispute their negative, hypercritical self-talk. Emphasize to such students how they can replace the ongoing self-criticism with more realistic, positive, and productive thoughts. This approach requires repeated practice before it begins to work, so it is important to inform students of this fact so as to lessen their needless discouragement.

Hopeful children often draw upon their own memories of positive experiences to keep them buoyant during difficult times. In this way, they tell themselves their own uplifting stories, or they create their own positive personal narratives (Snyder, McDermott et al., 2002). In contrast to high-hope children, low-hope children may not have a base of positive memories to sustain them. These children, especially when in grade school, can be helped to create their own personal narratives. Telling them stories and providing them with books that portray how other children have succeeded or overcome adversity can give low-hope children a model on which to begin building their own sense of agency. For suggested children's books, listed by specific hope-related topics (e.g., adoption, alcohol, anger, arguing, attachment, communication, confidence, crying, death, etc.), we refer the reader to the appendices in *The Psychology of Hope: You Can Get There from Here* (Snyder, 1994) and *Hope For the Journey: Helping Children through the Good Times and Bad* (Snyder, McDermott et al., 2002). Yet another means of raising hope in children is to see that they become involved in team-related activities. In this regard, engaging children in exciting activities that involve teamwork has been found to be effective in raising their levels of hope (Robitschek, 1996).

ENHANCING HOPE IN TEACHERS

School psychologists typically focus on facilitating students' classroom learning and adjustment. We believe that the role of school psychologists should be expanded to include working with teachers (Snyder & Shorey, in press). Here, we use the term "teacher" to apply to those who provide education in academics and sports. As such, our recommendations should be useful for classroom teachers and coaches. In fact, we view these terms interchangeably in the sense that all teaching involves the coaching of students. Recall also, our opening paragraph depiction of school psychologists as "caring coaches."

Just as young children develop hope through learning to trust in the predictability of cause-and-effect interactions with parents and caregivers, so, too, do school children build hope through learning to trust in the ordered predictability and consistency of their interactions with their teachers. By being firm, fair, and consistent, teachers engender hope among their students. Along with such order, we believe that the teacher needs to establish an atmosphere in which students are responsible for their actions. This is not to suggest that total obedience to authority is necessary or even desirable, but rather that students must be held to reasonably high standards.

With order and responsibility having been established, a teacher can then plant the seeds of trust in the classroom. Learning means taking risks, and students will not do this unless they feel assured that the teacher will respect them and refrain from demeaning them—even if their performance falls short of expectations. Whether it is in grade school or junior and senior high school, trust

opens the doors to the establishment of growth-inducing stretch goals wherein students build upon previous knowledge and insights.

High-hope teachers are very clear about their objectives, both in the sense of how to master the material in each learning unit and how to attain good grades; moreover, these teachers take care to convey these objectives to their students. This may entail having to reinforce any written instructions orally. When goals are made concrete, understandable, and are broken down into subgoals, both the teachers and students will be more likely to see growth. Likewise, we would suggest that school psychologists should work with teachers so as to focus on long-range as opposed to short-term goals (Snyder & Feldman, 2000). Children in 21st-century America are very focused on short-term goals and immediate gratification, but long-term goals are crucial for productive and satisfying lives.

Beyond setting clear and specific educational goals, hopeful teachers emphasize preparation and planning; accordingly, learning tasks should be organized in an easily comprehended format. It also is helpful to devise alternate exercises for use if a primary approach does not work. No matter what the exercise, however, teachers should avoid placing an overemphasis on "winning" (e.g., an exercise where one student is singled out and rewarded for the correct answer). Too many student "losers" result within this latter course format. Instead, attempts should be made to create an atmosphere where students are more concerned with expending effort and mastering the information rather than a sole focus on obtaining good outcomes (e.g., high grades or stellar athletic records; Dweck, 1999).

To raise the motivation of students, it is crucial that teachers remain enthused about that which they teach. Such enthusiasm is contagious. Hopeful teaching is a give-and-take process between teachers and students. Good teachers, although filled with plans and enthusiasm, also need to be good listeners and remain flexible in their interactions with students.

We believe that school psychologists are well positioned in school structures to be vigilant for the signs of teacher burnout and the loss of personal hopes that are all too common for teachers and coaches (Snyder, McDermott et al., 2002). To reach this objective, teachers should be encouraged to remain engaged and invested in pursuing their own important interests and life goals outside of the classroom. It is difficult to model hope for others if you do not have hope yourself.

RIPPLES OF HOPE IN TODAY'S SCHOOLS

Hope can flow from one person to another's life, thereby influencing how the latter person sees the world and pursues goals. School psychologists can maximize the benefits of the ripple effects of hope in students and teachers through consultation and direct interventions (as discussed previously). School psychologists, in collaboration with other professionals in the school, also can raise hope in a school building or a school district by facilitating the hope contagions that occur naturally through individual or group achievements. In this section, we share some ideas about maximizing hopeful thinking in school contexts.

The elimination of various forms of "barriers" is essential for spreading hope in each educational community. That is, through assessment and consultation, school psychologists can identify the impediments that may be hindering students' academic performance and growth (e.g., learning problems, behavioral problems); moreover, they may generate alternate pathways for circumventing such obstacles. Additionally, school psychologists may talk with students, teachers, coaches, and staff members to find any physical or psychological barriers that they may be experiencing. Included in such barriers would be schedule problems, difficulties stemming from the physical layout of the facilities, lack of resources, parental disinterest, stressful societal events (e.g., the terrorist attack tragedy in New York City on September 11, 2001), and health-related epidemics.

Facilitating goal setting also is part of a school psychologist's acumen. Hope can be promoted by connecting one student's goal (e.g., a child with behavior problems who wants to learn how to play chess) with another student's goal (e.g., a socially awkward student who is good at chess, but likes working one-on-one). We would encourage school psychologists to foster interdependence among diverse sets of students, much in the spirit of Aronson's "jigsaw" approach (Aronson, Bridgeman, & Geffner, 1978; see Internet site at www.jigsaw.org/steps.htm). In this regard, hope appears to be a cooperation-linked concept by its very nature, and efforts repeatedly should be made to facilitate such linkages. School psychologists also can help groups of students or members of an Individual Education Program team set common, attainable goals. The pursuit of shared goals can positively galvanize a group. In this sense, team activities often have inherent hope-inducing repercussions for their participants. Likewise, team activities engendering school pride, when not taken to an extreme, can produce hope.

School psychologists who are facile at eliminating barriers and are committed to helping students and teachers pursue meaningful goals become models of healthy goal pursuit. Often, however, the sheer number of institutional obstacles may limit the time that school psychologists spend in being hopeful models. Everyone's hopes can grow more easily, however, when there are common goals aimed at lessening the number and magnitudes of obstacles in school environments. As key facilitators in this process, we view school psychologists as "barrier beaters" who help to make the attainment of a variety of educational goals more likely in our schools.

CONCLUSION

In this article, we have presented the fundamentals of hope theory to our school psychology colleagues. It is probably accurate to say that engendering hope already is a part of what school psychologists do. As such, the present hope theory ideas may help school psychologists to do an even better job of molding schools into arenas where meaningful goals are set; where the parents, teachers,

and students know how to reach those goals; and where everyone involved has the requisite motivations to try hard. *Hopeful thinking can empower and guide a lifetime of learning,* and school psychologists can help to keep this lesson alive.

REFERENCES

Aronson, E., Bridgeman, D. L., & Geffner, R. (1978). Interdependent interactions and prosocial behavior. *Journal of Research and Development in Education, 12,* 16–27.

Bandura, A. (1982). Self-efficacy mechanism in human agency. *American Psychologist, 37,* 122–147.

Barnum, D. D., Snyder, C. R., Rapoff, M. A., Mani, M. M., & Thompson, R. (1998). Hope and social support in the psychological adjustment of pediatric burn survivors and matched controls. *Children's Health Care, 27,* 15–30.

Batson, C. D. (1991). *The altruism question: Toward a social-psychological answer.* Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Bouwkamp, J. (2001). *Making hope happen: A program for inner-city adolescents.* Master's thesis: University of Kansas, Lawrence, KS.

Brown, M., Curry, L. A., Hagstrom, H., & Sandstedt, S. (1999, August). *Female teenage athletes, sport participation, self-esteem, and hope.* Paper presented at the Association for the Advancement of Applied Sport Psychology, Banff, AB, Canada.

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.

Chang, E. C., & DeSimone, S. L. (2001). The influence of hope on appraisals, coping, and dysphoria: A test of hope theory. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 20,* 117–129.

Collins, K., & Bell, R. (1997). Personality and aggression: The dissipation-rumination scale. *Personality and Individual Differences, 22,* 751–755.

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.

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, MT.

Curry, L., & Snyder, C. R. (2000). Hope takes the field: Mind matters in athletic performances. In C. R. Snyder (Ed.), *Handbook of hope: Theory, measures, and applications* (pp. 243–260). San Diego: Academic Press.

Curry, L. A., Snyder, C. R., Cook, D. L., Ruby, B. C., & Rehm, M. (1997). The role of hope in student-athlete academic and sport achievement. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 73,* 257–1267.

Dweck, C. S. (1999). *Self-theories: Their role in motivation, personality, and development.* Philadelphia: Psychology Press.

Emmons, R. A. (1992). Abstract versus concrete goals: Personal striving level, physical illness, and psychological well-being. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 62,* 292–300.

Feldman, D. B., & Snyder, C. R. (in press). Hope and meaning in life. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology.*

Heppner, P. P., & Petersen, C. H. (1982). The development and implications of a personal problem-solving inventory. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 29,* 66–75.

Hinton-Nelson, M. D., Roberts, M. C., & Snyder, C. R. (1996). Early adolescents exposed to violence: Hope and vulnerability to victimization. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 66,* 346–353.

Kwon, P. (2000). Hope and dysphoria: The moderating role of defense mechanisms. *Journal of Personality, 68,* 199–223.

Lopez, S. J., Bouwkamp, J., Edwards, L. E., & Teramoto Pedrotti, J. (2000). *Making hope happen via brief interventions.* Presented at the 2nd Positive Psychology Summit in Washington, DC.

Lopez, S. J., Ciarlelli, R., Coffman, L., Stone, M., & Wyatt, L. (2000). Diagnosing for strengths: On measuring hope building blocks. In C. R. Snyder (Ed.), *Handbook of hope: Theory, measures, and interventions* (pp. 57–85). San Diego: Academic Press.

Magaletta, P. R., & Oliver, J. M. (1999). The hope construct, will, and ways: Their relations with self-efficacy, optimism, and general well being. *Journal of Clinical Psychology, 55,* 539–551.

McDermott, D., Hastings, S. L., Gariglietti, K. P., Gingerich, K., Callahan, B., & Diamond, K. (1997). A cross-cultural investigation of hope in children and adolescents. *Resources in Education, CG028078.*

McDermott, D., & Snyder, C. R. (1999). *Making hope happen.* Oakland, CA: New Harbinger Publications.

McDermott, D., & Snyder, C. R. (2000). *The great big book of hope: Help your children achieve their dreams.* 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: Academic Press.

Munoz-Dunbar, R. (1993). *Hope: A cross-cultural assessment of American college students.* Master's thesis. University of Kansas, Lawrence, KS.

Onwuegbuzie, A. J. (1998). Role of hope in predicting anxiety about statistics. *Psychological Reports, 82,* 1315–1320.

Onwuegbuzie, A. J. (1999). Relation of hope to self-perception. *Perceptual and Motor Skills, 88,* 535–540.

Onwuegbuzie, A. J., & Snyder, C. R. (2000). Relations between hope and graduate students' studying and test-taking strategies. *Psychological Reports, 86,* 803–806.

Pennebaker, J. W. (1989). Stream of consciousness and stress: Levels of thinking. In J. S. Uleman & J. A. Bargh (Eds.), *Unintended thought* (pp. 327–349). New York: Guilford Press.

Peterson, C. (2000). The future of optimism. *American Psychologist, 55*(1), 44–55.

Robitschek, C. (1996). At-risk youth and hope: Incorporating a ropes course into a summer jobs program. *The Career Development Quarterly, 45,* 163–169.

Scheier, M. F., & Carver, C. S. (1985). Optimisim, coping, and health: Assessment and implications of generalized outcome expectations. *Health Psychology, 4*(3), 219–247.

Sheldon, K. M., & Elliot, A. J. (1999). Goal striving, need satisfaction, and longitudinal well-being: The self-concordance model. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 76,* 482–497.

Snyder, C. R. (1989). Reality negotiation: From excuses to hope and beyond. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 8,* 130–157.

Snyder, C. R. (1994). *The psychology of hope: You can get there from here.* New York: Free Press.

Snyder, C. R. (1999). Hope, goal blocking thoughts, and test-related anxieties. *Psychological Reports, 84,* 206–208.

Snyder, C. R. (Ed.). (2000a). *Handbook of hope: Theory, measures, and applications.* San Diego: Academic Press.

Snyder, C. R. (2000b). The past and future of hope. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 19,* 11–28.

Snyder, C. R. (2002). Hope theory: Rainbows in the mind. *Psychological Inquiry, 13,* 249–275.

Snyder, C. R., Cheavens, J., & Michael, S. T. (1999). Hoping. In C. R Snyder (Ed.), *Coping: The psychology of what works* (pp. 205–231). New York: Oxford.

Snyder, C. R., Cheavens, J., & Sympson, S. C. (1997). Hope: An individual motive for social commerce. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice, 1,* 107–118.

Snyder, C. R., & Feldman, D. B. (2000). Hope for the many: An empowering social agenda. In C. R. Snyder (Ed.), *Handbook of hope: Theory, measures, and applications* (pp. 402–415). San Diego: Academic Press.

Snyder, C. R., Feldman, D. B., Taylor, J. D., Schroeder, L. L., & Adams III, V. (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., LaPointe, A. B., Crowson Jr., J. J., & Early, S. (1998). Preferences of high- and low-hope people for self-referential input. *Cognition & Emotion, 12,* 807–823.

Snyder, C. R., & Lopez, S. (2002). *Handbook of positive psychology.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Snyder, C. R., McDermott, D., Cook, W., & Rapoff, M. (2002). *Hope for the journey: Helping children through the good times and xx* (revised edition). Clinton Corners, NY: Percheron Press.

Snyder, C. R., Michael, S. T., & Cheavens, J. S. (1999). Hope as a psychotherapeutic foundation of nonspecific factors, placebos, and expectancies. In M. A. Huble, B. Duncan, & S. Miller (Eds.), *Heart and soul of change* (pp. 205–230). Washington, DC: APA.

Snyder, C. R., Rand, K. L., & Sigmon, D. R. (2002). Hope theory: A member of the positive psychology family. In C. R. Snyder & S. Lopez (Eds.), *Handbook of positive psychology* (pp. 257–266) New York: Oxford University Press.

Snyder, C. R., & Shorey, H. (2002). Hope in the classroom: The role of positive psychology in academic achievement and psychology curriculum. *Psychology Teacher Network, 12,* 1–9.

Snyder, C. R., Shorey, H., Cheavens, J., Pulvers, K. M., Adams III, V., & Wiklund, C. (2002). Hope and academic success in college. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 94,* 820–826.

Snyder, C. R., Sympson, S. C., Ybasco, F. C., Borders, T. F., Babyak, M. A., & Higgins, R. L. (1996). Development and validation of the State Hope Scale. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 70,* 321–335.

Worrell, F. C., & Hale, R. L. (2001). The relationship of hope in the future and perceived school climate to school completion. *School Psychology Quarterly, 16,* 370–388.

C. R. (Rick) Snyder, Ph.D., is the Wright Distinguished Professor of Clinical Psychology in the Psychology Department at the University of Kansas. His theories have involved how people react to personal feedback, the human need for uniqueness, the ubiquitous drive to excuse transgressions, and the hope motive. Dr. Snyder has been recognized with Fellow status in nine psychological societies and has received numerous awards for his teaching and research at the university, state, national, and international levels.

Shane J. Lopez, Ph.D., received his Ph.D. in counseling psychology in 1998 from the University of Kansas, where he now serves as an Assistant Professor of Psychology and Research in Education. Lopez is junior editor of the *Handbook of Positive Psychology* (Oxford University Press) and Co-editor of *Positive Psychological Assessment* (APA). Research foci include examining the effectiveness of hope training programs in the schools and refining his model of and measure of psychological courage. The School Psychology Program at the University of Kansas is accredited by the APA.

Hal S. Shorey received his B.A. in psychology in 2001 from California State University, San Bernardino. As a Self Graduate Fellow at the University of Kansas, he is working toward his Ph.D. in clinical psychology. His research focus is the development of hope. He is also investigating hope as an active mechanism through which attachment processes influence mental health and other important life outcomes.

Kevin Rand, M.A., is a graduate student in the Clinical Psychology Program at the University of Kansas. His current research interests include the role of hope in the pursuit of nonconscious goals and the potential consequences of "false" hope.

David Feldman is a clinical psychology doctoral student at the University of Kansas. His published writings, research, and therapeutic interests involve positive psychology topics such as hope, life meaning, and posttraumatic growth. He served as editor of the student section of the APA Division 12 Newsletter (*the Clinical Psychologist*). In 2002, he was the first recipient of the University of Kansas' Irving-Handelsman Teaching Award for the Instruction of Undergraduate Psychology.

APPENDIX A: THE CHILDREN'S HOPE SCALE

Directions: The six sentences below describe how children think about themselves and how they do things in general. Read each sentence carefully. For each sentence, please think about how you are in most situations. Place a check inside the circle that describes YOU the best. For example, place a check (✓) in the circle (◯) above "None of the time," if this describes you. Or, if you are this way "All of the time," check this circle. Please answer every question by putting a check in one of the circles. There are no right or wrong answers.

1. I think I am doing pretty well.

◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
None of the time	A little of the time	Some of the time	A lot of the time	Most of the time	All of the time

2. I can think of many ways to get the things in life that are most important to me.

◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
None of the time	A little of the time	Some of the time	A lot of the time	Most of the time	All of the time

3. I am doing just as well as other kids my age.

◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
None of the time	A little of the time	Some of the time	A lot of the time	Most of the time	All of the time

4. When I have a problem, I can come up with lots of ways to solve it.

◯	◯	◯	◯	◯	◯
None of the time	A little of the time	Some of the time	A lot of the time	Most of the time	All of the time

5. I think the things I have done in the past will help me in the future.

○	○	○	○	○	○
None of the time	A little of the time	Some of the time	A lot of the time	Most of the time	All of the time

6. Even when others want to quit, I know that I can find ways to solve the problem.

○	○	○	○	○	○
None of the time	A little of the time	Some of the time	A lot of the time	Most of the time	All of the time

Notes. When administered to children, this scale is not labeled "The Children's Hope Scale," but is called "Questions about Your Goals." To calculate the total Children's Hope Scale score, add the responses to all six items, with "None of the time" = 1; "A little of the time" = 2; "Some of the time" = 3; "A lot of the time" = 4; "Most of the time" = 5; and, "All of the time" = 6. The three odd-numbered items tap agency, and the three even-numbered items tap pathways. From C. R. Snyder, B. Hoza, et al. The development and validation of the Children's Hope Scale, *Journal of Pediatric Psychology*© (1997), *Vol. 22*(3), p. 421. Reprinted with the permission of the *Journal* and the senior author.

APPENDIX B: THE ADULT HOPE SCALE

Directions: Read each item carefully. Using the scale shown below, please select the number that best describes YOU and put that number in the blank provided.

1 = Definitely False
2 = Mostly False
3 = Somewhat False
4 = Slightly False
5 = Slightly True
6 = Somewhat True
7 = Mostly True
8 = Definitely True

_____ 1. I can think of many ways to get out of a jam.
_____ 2. I energetically pursue my goals.
_____ 3. I feel tired most of the time.
_____ 4. There are lots of ways around any problem.
_____ 5. I am easily downed in an argument.
_____ 6. I can think of many ways to get the things in life that are important to me.
_____ 7. I worry about my health.
_____ 8. Even when others get discouraged, I know I can find a way to solve the problem.
_____ 9. My past experiences have prepared me well for my future.
_____ 10. I've been pretty successful in life.
_____ 11. I usually find myself worrying about something.
_____ 12. I meet the goals that I set for myself.

Notes. When administering the scale, it is called "The Future Scale." The Agency subscale score is derived by summing items # 2, 9, 10, and 12; the Pathway subscale score is derived by adding items # 1, 4, 6, and 8. The total Hope Scale score is derived by summing the four Agency and the four Pathway items. From C. R. Snyder, C. Harris et al., The will and the ways: Development and validation of an individual differences measure of hope, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology,*© (1991), *Vol. 60,* p. 585. Reprinted with the permission of the American Psychological Association and the senior author.