

**The Role of Hope in the Academic and Sport Achievements of  
Division I College Football Players**

By

Elizabeth A. Boldridge  
B.A., University of Kansas, 2002

Submitted to the Department of Psychology and  
The Faculty of the Graduate School of the  
University of Kansas in partial fulfillment of the requirements  
for the degree of Master of Arts in Clinical Psychology.

---

Stephen Ilardi, Chair

---

Ray Higgins, Committee Member

---

Sarah Kirk, Committee Member

Date Submitted: \_\_\_\_\_

The Thesis Committee for Elizabeth Boldridge certifies  
that this is the approved Version of the following thesis:

THE ROLE OF HOPE IN THE ACADEMIC AND SPORT ACHIEVEMENTS OF  
DIVISION I COLLEGE FOOTBALL PLAYERS

Committee:

\_\_\_\_\_ Stephen Ilardi, Chairperson

\_\_\_\_\_ Ray Higgins, Committee Member

\_\_\_\_\_ Sarah Kirk, Committee Member

Date approved: \_\_\_\_\_

### Abstract

Previous investigations have observed that elevated hope is a significant predictor of both academic and athletic achievement among male and female track and field student athletes, even when controlling statistically for natural athletic ability. Little is known, however, about the influence of hope in other athletic domains. Accordingly, the purpose of the present study was to examine the relationship between hope and academic and athletic performance – operationalized as GPA and playing time, respectively – among 100 Division I football players at a large mid-western university followed over the span of three seasons. Based on past research it was predicted that higher hope would be associated with increased academic and football-related performance. Likewise, it was predicted that *domain-specific hope* (i.e., hope regarding academic and athletic domains of achievement, respectively) would yield more robust prediction than would a general, nonspecific measure of trait hope. As expected, hope was positively associated with academic achievement, both concurrently and prospectively. However, it was *inversely* correlated with athletic achievement (playing time) in a subset of relevant analyses even when controlling statistically for natural physical ability. Domain-specific measures of academic and athletic hope proved to be largely unrelated to performance indices in their respective domains.

## **The Role of Hope in the Academic and Sport Achievements of Division I**

### **College Football Players**

Helping student-athletes succeed in both their athletic and classroom pursuits, is of growing interest in sports psychology. In fact, university student-athletes represent an apparent motivational contradiction (Simons, Rheenen, & Covington, 1999), they have been selected to participate in intercollegiate athletics because of their proven abilities and desires to succeed athletically, but they may lack motivation in the classroom (Simons, Rheenen, & Covington, 1999). This difference in motivation for sports verses academics is complicated further by the fact that college athletics has become a multi-million dollar business that typically thrives in direct proportion to an institution's success on the field. Consequently, time demands have increased for activities related to sports performance, resulting in less time for student-athletes to focus on their academics.

The governing body for collegiate athletics, National Collegiate Athletics Association (NCAA), has wrestled with the issue of academic integrity throughout its almost 100-year history (Blum & Lederman, 2003). As recently as 2003-2004, the NCAA implemented several new academic standards in order to raise team grade-point averages and graduation rates. Beginning in 2003, athletes are required to have finished 40 percent of the courses required for a degree before beginning their third year, 60 percent before beginning their fourth year, and 80 percent before beginning their fifth year (Suggs, 2004). Furthermore, as of 2005, teams are evaluated on the basis of academic progress rates, with a specific focus on the percentage of athletes who comply with the NCAA's year-by-year academic requirements. If a team's academic progress rate falls below a certain standard and an athlete on the team flunks out, the

team's coach will not be allowed to award that athlete's scholarship to anyone else (Suggs, 2004).

Precisely what effects such increased academic standards will have on individual and team performance - both in the realm of sports and academics - is a question of considerable interest. Likewise, it is important to identify the personal attributes that motivate and guide student athletes to achieve both their academic and athletic goals. In response to the apparent inadequacy of merely academic variables as predictors, researchers have attempted to determine what nonacademic motivational variables might help explain the performance of student-athletes (Petrie & Russell, 1995). This study will pursue the latter issue of motivational variables as related both to sports and academic performance.

#### *Current Issues in College Athletics*

The academic standards that should apply to college athletics are a central concern among athletic administrators, coaches, and the NCAA. The student-athletes who are entering college often are not prepared for what they encounter. Such athletes are particularly vulnerable to the year-round, daily grind of practice, travel, competition, and meetings, which can demand several hundreds of hours their non-athlete student counterparts have at their disposal (Suggs 2004). In the United States during the fall of 2003, a new evaluation system went into effect concerning eligibility requirements of college athletes. The new system de-emphasizes standardized tests scores, and substitutes a greater emphasis on grade-point-averages in core higher-school courses. Beginning with the freshman class of 2003-2004, an athlete can conceivably score the bare minimum on the standardized tests and still attain eligibility. In other words, the athlete can merely sign his or her name and turn in a blank test and still qualify for sports participation by virtue of having a high-school grade-point-average of 3.55 or higher in 14

core courses (Suggs 2004). Of course, the fact that an athlete gains eligibility to play at the college level by fulfilling these requirements does not mean that he or she is well-prepared academically. Moreover, even if a student does not meet those requirements, he or she still can be *admitted* to an institution. At half of all Division I-A schools, the basketball and football players who did not achieve minimal university entry requirements were accepted as “special admits” at a rate ten times higher than that permitted for the rest of the freshman class (Peltier, Laden, & Matranga, 1999).

In order to address the frequent academic problems encountered by student athletes, as well as to meet the NCAA’s new rules, athletic departments in the United States have implemented specialized tutoring and mentoring programs (Franey, 2003). Many of these programs have been in place for years, and proven to be quite successful in boosting academic achievement. A related trend has been the growing propensity of athletes, particularly those who are students in football and basketball, to leave school early in order to pursue their professional careers. Critics have argued that because NCAA Division I sports have become training and recruiting agencies for professional sports (Snyder, 1996), athletic programs such as football inadvertently direct the players’ attention more toward their respective sports than academics. Of course, a professional sports career is not an option for the overwhelming majority of student-athletes (Lucas, 2002; Lapchick, 1991), but many nevertheless maintain the illusion that they are going to be among the fortunate few who will go on to have successful professional careers. Unfortunately, such illusions are fostered by the well-publicized accounts of those rare athletes who leave school early to launch successful and lucrative professional careers (Simons, Rheenan, & Covington, 1999).

*Motivation and Sport*

There has been little in the way of in-depth examination of the internal motivations of student-athletes in order to understand their academic and athletic achievements. Accordingly, the present study represents an attempt to address this relative void.

In psychology, the topic of motivation is often linked to the work of Abraham Maslow, who articulated a hierarchy of needs. At the lowest level are needs such as hunger, thirst and safety, which are hypothesized prerequisites to the satisfaction of higher level needs such as love, competence, and worth. Similar to Maslow's theory are drive theories developed by early psychologists such as Clark Hull and Kenneth Spence. Drive theories state that motivation stems from a desire to reduce or satisfy an internal need (Cox, 2002). Motivation to succeed in sport, however, is not simply a function of innate drives such as hunger or thirst. That is, drives can be developed and learned (Cox, 2002). Previous research in sports psychology has either exclusively focused on achievement motivation or achievement strategies (Curry & Snyder, 2000). *Hope theory* (Snyder, 19xx), however, successfully merges these two concepts, and may provide a foundation for further investigation into the academic and athletic achievements of student athletes.

### *Hope Theory*

Increasing attention has been given to the construct of hope within the field of psychology, in part due to the work of C. R. Snyder and colleagues. According to this framework, hope reflects a positive cognitive set that people have about their future life goals (Snyder, 1989, 1994, 2002). Hope theory is comprised of two components related to goal-directed thinking: *pathways* and *agency*. Pathways' thinking is the perceived capacity to formulate one or more behavioral strategies by which to arrive at the desired goals, whereas agency thoughts tap the perceived ability to initiate and sustain movement along selected

pathways toward a desired goal (Curry, Snyder, Cook, Ruby, & Rehm, 1997). According to hope theory, pathways and agency thoughts initiate and propel each goal pursuit sequence. Likewise, the hopeful thinker should add clarity and specificity to his or her desired goals as the desired goal becomes closer in proximity. To provide a measure of such processes, the dispositional Hope Scale for adults was developed (Snyder et al., 1991, 2002), and it has proven to be a reliable and valid brief self-report instrument for measuring a person's enduring level of hope across situations and circumstances. This dispositional Hope Scale has been translated into some 40 languages worldwide, and it has been used in approximately 100 reported articles (C.R. Snyder, Personal Communication, August 1 2004). Additionally, the Children's Hope Scale, a dispositional or trait hope scale for children ages 8 through 14, also has been developed and validated (Snyder, 2002). Likewise, a *state* measure of hope has been developed and validated (Snyder, Sympson, Ybasco, Borders, Babyak, & Higgins, 1996). These three measures have been used extensively throughout the literature, with higher hope generally proving robustly positively related to a variety of variables tapping adaptive behaviors, reports, and outcomes. More specifically, higher hope consistently has been associated with better outcomes in academics, athletics, physical health, psychological adjustment, and psychotherapy (for review, see Snyder, 2002).

#### *Trait versus State Hope*

Hope can be measured as either an enduring or temporal state. Snyder and colleagues developed both a Trait Hope scale which measures one's general level of hope, as well as the State Hope scale, which measures situation-specific levels of hope. Questions on the Dispositional Hope scale include "I energetically pursue my goals" or "There are lots of ways around any problem". For the State Hope scale such questions were changed to "At the present



time, I am energetically pursuing my goals," and "There are lots of ways around any problem that I am facing now" (Snyder et al., 1996). Hence, dispositional hope gives a range within which state hope can vary. Persons who are dispositionally higher in hope should manifest higher ongoing state hope because they place themselves in situations in which they experience successful goal-related outcomes (Snyder et al., 1996).

Multiple studies have utilized both the State Hope and Trait Hope scales. Although less commonly used, the State Hope Scale has shown to be a reliable and valid measure that is positively related to both intellectual and motor-skill achievements (Snyder et al., 1996). In Curry et al, 1997, the State Hope scale augmented the prediction of cross-country achievement beyond that of dispositional hope. Additionally, The Trait Hope scale, which measures one's enduring level of hope, has been used in studies concerning academic achievement and sport performance. For instance, Curry and Maniar, 2003, conducted a study on student-athletes who were enrolled in a student-athlete life-skills class. The implementation of goal setting strategies, as measured by the Trait Hope Scale, was shown to be a strong predictor of enhanced sport performance, as documented by the athletes' coaches. .

A more recent study found that a goal-specific measure of hope (the Hope Scale's *agency* subscale) predicated goal attainment better than the full Hope Scale (Snyder et al., 1991), which measures hope regarding goals in general (Feldman, Rand & Kahle-Wroblewski, 2009). It can be inferred that when measuring one's more immediate goals, the State Hope scale is a more powerful predictor, and specifically it is ones perceived level of motivation that plays an increasingly important role in predicting goal attainment.

### *Pathways and Agency*

As noted, pathways and agency thinking comprise the core dimensions of the hope

construct. But how do student-athletes develop and maintain each respective hope dimension? Gould, 2001, postulates that few athletes at the college level have had someone sit down with them to discuss what goal setting is and how it works. Furthermore, it is more plausible that “student-athletes think they know a lot about goal setting but seldom do” (Curry and Maniar, 2004). Within a structured clinical setting researchers have proposed that it is agency, “that is quickly elevated through psychological interventions” and that “it is useful to verify that clients’ pathways are congruent with their value system” (Snyder, Rand, King, Feldman, & Woodward, 2002). It is unclear, however, how pathways and agency are influenced outside of the clinical setting, and more specifically within the context of a football setting. For instance, if agency is easily manipulated by skilled clinicians, can it also be influenced through means of sport participation by a player’s coaches, teammates, and other staff members? Moreover what happens when the athlete’s pathways conflict with those directed by his or her coaches? Researchers have concluded that it is “healthier when one’s goals are congruent with one’s personal value system” (Sheldon & Elliot, 1999; Emmons, 1992) and that goal setting efforts are less effective when directed by others (Sheldon & Elliot, 1998; Csikszentmihalyi, 1993). In the realm of collegiate football, performance is largely manipulated by coaches; specifically, players look to their coaches for both motivation and instruction on appropriate methods of reaching team-related and personal goals. Therefore, it is possible that an athlete’s own agency and pathways may not always accurately predict their sport achievement. In fact, one recent study found that, across myriad achievement domains, “goal-specific pathways generally failed to predict goal attainment” (Feldman, Rand & Kahle-Wroblewski, 2009).

### *Self-Efficacy and Optimism*

Although hope theory will be used as the primary conceptual framework that guides the present study, it is important to briefly consider other similar constructs that are at least somewhat congruent with hope theory. Two of the more prominent are optimism and self-efficacy.

Optimism can be defined as one's expectancies or thoughts about future outcomes. Both hope and optimism are psychological variables which have proven to be stable across time, and include "trait-like beliefs that influence people's thoughts and behaviors during goal pursuits" (Rand, 2009). However, optimism differs from hope in that it reflects *outcome expectancies*, and includes factors both within and outside of one's control (Carver & Scheier, 2002). In addition, although optimists, like individuals with high hope, possess the motivation to achieve a goal, an optimist may "not possess the pathways necessary to pursue and acquire the goals" (Snyder, 1995).

With regard to hope and self-efficacy, the constructs of agency and self-efficacy share a common emphasis on persistence (Magaletta & Oliver, 1999). Unlike trait hope, however, which is a person's enduring sense of hope across time and situations, the tasks associated with "self-efficacy theory are situation specific" (Bandura, 1977). Thus, self-efficacy may be regarded as a manifestation of situation-specific *state hope*.

Although both optimism and self-efficacy have contributed extensively to the field's understanding of academic performance, hope has proven to be a more robust predictor of academic achievement (Reference). For instance, hope has predicted subjective well-being even after controlling for the variance due to self-efficacy and optimism (Magaletta & Oliver, 1999). Although optimism has been related to choosing achievement goals, it either predicted very little (Pajares, 2001) or no variance in college grades (e.g., higher semester and overall GPAs for

college students (Curry, Snyder, Cook, Ruby, & Rehm, 1997; Chang, 1998; Curry, Maniar, Sondag, & Sandstedt, 1999)). Finally, when comparing hope with self-efficacy, the Hope Scale items are factorally distinct, and produce unique variance in predicting well-being (Magaletta & Oliver, 1999).

### *Hope Theory and Sport*

Hope theory and its measures may have particular relevance for college athletics given that initial evidence shows hope to be a reliable predictor of students' athletic and academic performances. For instance, in a study by Curry, Snyder, Cook, Ruby, and Rehm (1997), higher Hope Scale scores predicted better grade point averages, along with predicting superior track achievements. Of special note is the fact that the Hope Scale predicted athletic outcomes beyond natural athletic talent. Moreover, in the same Curry et al. study, the Hope Scale was more robustly predictive than the other psychological variables in this study.

Interestingly, in another more recent study athletes competing as individuals (e.g., in tennis) tended to have higher hope scores than athletes participating as members of teams (Skidmore, 2003). More specifically, the overall hope and the agency subscale scores of hope were significantly higher in individual athletes, whereas the pathways component of hope was not significantly higher in individual as compared to team performers. This latter finding, however, ran contrary to previous research (Skidmore, 2003), in which team performers typically manifested a wide network of support, and the individuals on teams who were high in hope could influence others so as to raise their levels of hope.

It is possible, of course, that the role of hope varies across different domains of athletic performance. To date, however, very few such domains have been assessed. In fact, even the high-profile sport of college football has been almost entirely neglected in this respect, despite

anecdotal evidence that hope may be an important mediator of players' on-the-field and off-the-field success (Gould, 2001). The present study, therefore, represents an attempt to shed some light on the predictive utility of the hope construct with respect to the athletic and academic performance of Division I college football players.

### *Hope Theory and Academic Performance*

As previously stated, hope has shown to be a reliable predictor of academic achievement, especially among college-aged students. For example, hope not only proved to be a reliable predictor of higher cumulative GPAs, but also predicted a higher likelihood of graduating from college, and a lower likelihood of being dismissed because of poor grades (Snyder, Shorey, Cheavens, Mann-Pulvers, Adams, & Wiklund, 2002). This may be because high-hope students establish dependable indicators of progress toward goals and are able to methodically break down goals into more manageable steps. High-hope students 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).

Not only are high-hope students able to effectively establish manageable pathways along intended routes, but they are also able to find multiple pathways to reach their goals, and to willingly try new approaches (Tierney, 1995). This perceived ability is advantageous when a pathway becomes blocked because it allows the person to continue pursuing the goal along an alternate pathway (Rand, 2009). Low-hope students, on the other hand, stick with one approach and do not try other avenues when stymied (Michael, 2000; Snyder, 1999). 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) have been developed. For

instance, implementing goal setting within the context of the classroom for student-athletes can be one beneficial way of enhancing their hope. Curry and Maniar, 2004, outlined several effective goal-setting assignments for student-athletes enrolled in a life skills course at the University of Montana. Within such assignments, they purposely emphasized balance in setting goals for sport and for other life domains (Balague, 1999). This is important because “a student-athlete cannot set a sport goal without having a goal outside of sport in relationships, spirituality, academics, or emotional well-being (Carr & Bauman, 1996).

### *The Present Study*

As described previously, the present study explores the construct of hope in the context of academic and sports achievement among Division I college football team members. Specific study hypotheses are as follows.

### *Hypotheses*

1. Higher hope, as measured by scores on the Hope Scale (Snyder et al., 1991), should be associated with superior academic performances in Division I football players. Academic performance will be measured by each individual football player’s semester grade-point average for the Spring 2004, Fall 2004, and Spring 2005 seasons.
2. Higher hope, as measured by Hope Scale scores, should predict superior outcomes for the Division I football players in measures of their performances in their sports. Sport performance will be measured by each player’s game participation during the Fall 2003-2005 seasons.
3. When the shared variables related to the football players’ natural abilities as tapped by their coaches’ ratings are removed statistically from the relationship between Hope Scale scores and football performances, the predictive capability of Hope Scale scores should

remain significant.

### *Significance*

Coaches and athletic administrators are in need of better approaches for measuring and predicting the successes of their college athletes in both their classrooms and sports arenas. The present study assists in these aims. The results may also assist in the development of future academic and athletic intervention programs for student athletes, especially those who are academically at risk of dropping out of school. As such, athletic departments may want to begin using the Hope Scale with their incoming student athletes in order to gain insights into the needs and strengths of their athletes.

### *Methods*

#### *Team Authorization Process*

Authorization to work with football players as subjects for the present study was granted at the permission of both the head football coach and director of football operations at the participating Division I institution. The lead investigator sent a project description (see Appendix A) to the Director of Football Operations. After reading the document, both the head football coach and director of football operations agreed to sign the team study consent form (refer to Appendix B).

#### *Participants*

The participants were members of a NCAA Division I football team from a large midwestern university ( $N = 100$ ). To participate, each student athlete was enrolled at the university and must have met the NCAA eligibility guidelines for athletic participation during the fall semester.

#### *Procedure*

During the fall semester of 2004, approximately six weeks into the football season, a 15-minute session in main athletic building was conducted with all team members and coaches. Participants were informed as to the goals of the project, as well as the corresponding measurements, and what the measurements intend to examine. All participants were reminded that their completion of various scales would be anonymous, and told they may review the document that results from their responses when it is completed (i.e., in a form of a masters thesis). Participants were asked to sign an individual consent form to participate in the project (refer to Appendix C). An additional consent form was distributed for the release of semester grades (refer to Appendix D). Thereafter, each participant was distributed a folder with a designated number. The experimenter then read the directions for the dispositional Hope Scale (Snyder et al., 1991) and participants were asked to complete the scale (refer to Appendix E). When the participants were finished filling out the dispositional Hope Scale they were asked to answer the questions on the questionnaire (refer to Appendix F), as well as the Domain Hope Scale (refer to Appendix H) and all documents were placed back into the folder with the designated number. During this same session, the position coaches were asked to fill out the Physical Ability Rating Scale (refer to Appendix G) on the natural physical ability of each player in their units, and that rating was placed in the appropriate athletes' files. All documents were kept in a locked file in Fraser Hall. Finally, players' semester grades were released by the team's academic counselor and placed in the appropriate file.

### *Measures*

*The Dispositional Hope Scale.* The scale is comprised of 12 items, with four agency items (e.g., "I energetically pursue my goals"), four pathways items (e.g., "There are a lot of ways around any problems"), and four distracter items. The agency and pathways subscales are



combined to produce an overall Hope Scale score. The items on the agency subscale tap the degree to which an individual has the perceived motivation to move toward his or her goals. The items on the Pathways Subscale reflect perceived ability to generate workable routes to goals. Each item is responded to on an 8-point Likert scale from 1 = “definitely false” to 8 = “definitely true“. The ranges of scores are between 8 to 64. The Hope Scale has demonstrated high internal consistency and high tests-retest reliability. The Hope Scale can be seen in Appendix E.

*Physical ability rating scale (PARS).* The PARS scale was developed for and first used in a study looking at the role of hope in the academic and sport achievement of female track athletes (Curry et al., 1997). More specifically, it measures individual differences in the natural physical ability in student athletes. The position coaches were asked to assess the natural athletic ability of each football player in his unit. They rated each football player on a 100 point scale (1= The least physically gifted athlete I have ever known, 100 = the most physically gifted athlete I have ever known). The directions asked the coach to answer each question about how physically gifted the particular athlete is and to focus upon the athletes pure natural ability. The PARS can be seen in Appendix G.

*Sport performance analysis.* Each player’s sport performance was evaluated by his year-by-year game participation for the Fall 2003-2005 seasons. This information was collected through the National Collegiate Athletic Association website database which keeps season by season statistics for affiliated sport teams.

*Cumulative Grade Point Average.* Each participant’s semester GPA for the Spring 2004, Fall 2004, and Spring 2005 was released by the Student Support Services division of the Kansas Athletic Corporation.

*Demographic Questionnaire.* A demographic questionnaire was distributed and used to

attain basic background information on each player. This can be viewed in Appendix F.

*Domain Hope Scale.* The Domain Hope Scale (Snyder, Shorey, & Sympson, 2005), which will be used as a secondary measurement to examine particular areas of goal achievement, will measure hope levels in seven specific life areas: social relationships, religion/spiritual life, academics, physical health, romantic relationships, family life, psychological health, work and leisure activity (Snyder, Lehman, Kluck, & Monsson, 2006). For the purposes of this study, an eighth life area was added to tap “football activities”. This can be viewed in Appendix H.

## *Results*

### *Descriptive Analyses*

Based on recommendations by Tabachnick and Fidell (2007), an examination of residual scatterplots tests the assumptions of normality, linearity, and homoscedasticity of residuals between predicted dependent variable scores and errors of prediction. Based upon the scatterplots it was found that the predicted scores were normally distributed and the variance of the residuals around the predicted dependent variable scores was the same for all predicted scores which indicates homoscedasticity. Linear relationships were found between the predictors and the predicted dependent variable scores since the overall shape of the scatterplots were generally rectangular.

Demographic analyses revealed that the majority of students were in their first three years of school and collectively, on average, this team scored high on the overall hope scale, ( $M = 55.18$ ) (see Appendix 9). More specifically, the team collectively scored higher with regard to agentic thinking than pathways thinking. Also, only 11% reported that they were suffering from an injury that significantly decreased their playing time at the time the data was collected (see

Appendix 8). Finally, Hope Domain scores were found to be higher than average, with scores ranging between 40 and 45. Predictably, students scored higher than average in terms of hope in the area of football activities, but scored highest in (44.04), physical health (44.21), leisure activities (44.60), and family life (44.97).

As a first step to conducting regression analysis, Pearson product moment correlation coefficients (Pearson  $r$ ) were calculated to ascertain the degree to which there were significant associations between the predictor and dependent variables (see Table 1). The magnitude of the correlation coefficients was evaluated using Cohen's (1988) guidelines: small ( $r = 0.10$ ), medium ( $r = 0.30$ ), and large ( $r = 0.50$ ). The Hope Scale total score and Subscale scores were found to have positive relationships with academic performance in Fall 2004 and Spring 2004, but not Spring 2005. In addition both the Hope Scale total score and subscales revealed negative correlations with sports performance in Fall 2003. The Hope domain scores revealed several significant findings as well. Not surprisingly, academics had a small positive relationship with GPA in Fall 2004, but failed to show a significant correlation for Spring 2004 grades and Spring 2005 grades. Additionally, domain specific hope regarding football activities revealed a negative relationship with Spring 2004 GPA. Furthermore, Family life relates to higher overall sports performance from 2003 to 2005 as well as domain specific hope in football activities.

Hierarchical Linear Regression Analyses were conducted to test Hypotheses I and II by examining the contributions of the Hope total score, Hope subscales, or Hope domains to the prediction of academic performance, while controlling for the effect of selected demographic variables. For each regression model, demographic variables were entered at Step 1. These variables include year in school, ethnicity, experience of injury, and study hours per week. The ethnicity and injury variables were categorical data. As such, a separate step of recoding the

categorical data into dummy variables was conducted. This step generated three dummy variables for ethnicity and one dummy variable for accreditation status. For ethnicity, the category *other* was used as the reference group. As such, dummy variables were created only for the three other ethnic groups (i.e., White or Caucasian, Black or African American, and Hispanic or Latin American) and subsequently entered into the regression. A total of six demographic variables were entered in the regression equations. Three sets of regressions were conducted that used: (a) Hope Total Score, (b) Hope Subscale Scores, and (c) Hope Domain Scores as predictors. These predictors were entered in Step 2 for each regression model. Similar Hierarchical Linear Regression Analyses were conducted to test Hypothesis III by examining the contributions of the Hope total score, Hope subscales, or Hope domains to the prediction of sports performance, with the addition of controlling for the effects of Natural Physical Ability Rating (NPAR). Hence, NPAR was entered at Step 1, demographic variables in Step 2 and three sets of regressions were used: (a) Hope Total Score, (b) Hope Subscale Scores, and (c) Hope Domain Scores as predictors and were entered in Step 3.

The Hope Scale total score had a significantly medium positive relationship with academic performance in Fall 2004 and Spring 2004 (see Table 2 & 3). The Hope Scale total score also had a significantly moderate negative relationship with sports performance in terms of number of games played in 2003 (see Table 4). Finally, the Hope total score accounted for or explained 9% of unique variance in 2003 sports performance after controlling for the effect of NPAR (see Table 7), thus suggesting that Hope predicts sports performance in 2003 over and above the effect of NPAR. However, the negative regression coefficient indicates that higher hope relates to lower sports performance in Fall 2003, and significant relationships were not found for 2004, 2005 or the 2003 hope subscales.

## Regression Analyses

### *Hypothesis I*

The first hypothesis stated that higher hope should relate to superior academic performances in Division I football players. Academic performance was measured by each individual football players' grade point average (GPA) for the following semesters: Fall 2004, Spring 2004, and Spring 2005. In Step 1, the demographic variables predicted academic performance,  $R = .36$ ,  $F(6, 93) = 2.24$ ,  $p < .05$  accounting for 12% of the variance in Fall 2004 academic performance. However, none of these variables had a significant unique contribution to the prediction of academic performance. In Step 2, the Hope total score was entered into the equation,  $R = .43$ ,  $F(7, 92) = 3.02$ ,  $p < .01$  accounting for 19% of the variance in Fall 2004 academic performance (see Table 2). The addition of the Hope total score in the equation resulted in a significant increment in the prediction,  $\Delta R^2 = .06$ ,  $F(1, 92) = 6.86$ ,  $p < .01$ . Specifically, the total score made a significant independent contribution to predicting Fall 2004 academic performance,  $t = 2.62$ ,  $p < .01$ . The Hope total score significantly accounted for or explained 6% of unique variance in Fall 2004 academic performance after controlling for the effects of the demographic variables. This suggests that Hope predicts academic performance in Fall 2004 over and above the effects of demographic variables.

Similar results were found for the Spring 2004 after the Hope total score was entered into the equation,  $R = .52$ ,  $F(7, 54) = 2.89$ ,  $p < .05$  accounting for 27% of the variance in Spring 2004 academic performance (see Table 3). Once again, the Hope total score resulted in a significant increment in the prediction,  $\Delta R^2 = .13$ ,  $F(1, 54) = 9.29$ ,  $p < .01$ . Follow-up analysis revealed that the Hope total score made a significant independent contribution to predicting

Spring 2004 academic performance,  $t = 3.05$ ,  $p < .01$ , accounting for 13% of unique variance in Spring 2004 academic performance after controlling for the effects of the demographic variables.

When looking at the Hope subscales independently, neither pathways nor agency subscales produced significant findings or made independent contributions when evaluating academic achievement over and above the effects of the demographic variables. This suggests that the Hope subscales jointly, but not independently, predicted academic performance in Fall 2004 and Spring 2004.

Finally, hope domain scores and their relationship to academic performance did not significantly predict academic achievement for the Fall 2004 or Spring 2004. However, they did reveal a significant relationship with academic achievement for the Spring 2005 (see Table 5). For example, entering Hope domain scores in the equation resulted in a significant increment in the prediction,  $\Delta R^2 = .22$ ,  $F(10, 58) = 2.01$ ,  $p < .05$ , of which Leisure Activities made a significant independent contribution to predicting Spring 2005 academic performance,  $t = 2.11$ ,  $p < .05$ . The Leisure activities domain significantly accounted for or explained 5% of unique variance in Spring 2005 academic performance after controlling for the effects of the demographic variables and the other Hope domains. Specifically, higher hope in leisure activities relates to higher academic performance in Spring 2005.

#### *Hypothesis Two Results*

The second hypothesis stated that higher hope should relate to superior outcomes for the Division I football players in measures of their sport performances. Sports performance was measured by each individual football players' number of games played (G) from 2003 to 2005. In Step 1, the demographic variables significantly predicted sports performance,  $R = .52$ ,  $F(6, 41) = 2.52$ ,  $p < .05$ . Over 27% of the variance in sports performance was accounted for by the

demographic variables. Among the demographic variables, being African American had a significant contribution to the prediction of sports performance,  $t = 2.74$ ,  $p < .01$ , accounting for 13% of unique variance in sports performance in Fall 2003 after controlling for the effects of the other demographic variables (see Table 4). In Step 2, the Hope total score was entered into the equation and the regression model was significant,  $R = .60$ ,  $F(7, 40) = 3.14$ ,  $p < .05$ . Over 35% of the variance in 2003 sports performance was accounted for after Step 2. The addition of the Hope total score in the equation resulted in a significant increment in the prediction,  $\Delta R^2 = .09$ ,  $F(1, 40) = 5.26$ ,  $p < .05$ . Analyses revealed that the Hope total score made a significant independent contribution to predicting 2003 sports performance,  $t = -2.29$ ,  $p < .05$ , explaining 8% of unique variance in 2003 sports performance after controlling for the effects of the demographic variables. This suggests that Hope predicts sports performance in 2003 over and above the effects of demographic variables. However, the negative regression coefficient indicates that higher hope relates to lower sports performance in 2003. Interestingly enough, Hope did not significantly predict sports performance in 2004 or 2005.

Hope subscales did not produce significant findings in 2003 or 2005, but they did produce significant findings in 2004 (see Table 6). Specifically, the addition of the Hope subscales in the equation resulted in a significant increment in the prediction of sport performance in 2004,  $\Delta R^2 = .14$ ,  $F(2, 51) = 5.17$ ,  $p < .01$ . The Pathways subscale made a significant independent contribution ( $t = 2.82$ ,  $p < .01$ ) as well as the Agency subscale ( $t = -2.66$ ,  $p < .05$ ). When comparing the two subscales, Pathways accounted for 13% of unique variance in 2004 sports performance beyond that accounted for by the agency subscale and the demographic variables. The positive regression coefficient indicates that a higher pathways score relates to greater 2004 sports performance. On the other hand, Agency accounted for 12% of unique

variance in 2004 sports performance. The negative regression coefficient indicates that a lower agency score relates to greater 2004 sports performance. Thus, it can be concluded that both subscales made almost equal independent contributions to the prediction of sports performance over and above the effects of the demographic variables. Finally, Hope Domains did not significantly predict sports performance in 2003, 2004 or 2005 after controlling for the effects of the demographic variables.

### *Hypothesis Three Results*

The third hypothesis stated that when the shared variables related to the football players' natural abilities as tapped by their coaches' ratings are removed statistically from the relationship between Hope Scale scores and football performances, the predictive capability of Hope Scale scores should remain significant. Sports performance was measured by each individual football players' number of games played (G) from 2003 to 2005. In the 2003 analysis, over 22% of the variance in sports performance was accounted for by NPAR (see Table 7). In Step 2, the demographic variables significantly predicted sports performance,  $R = .59$ ,  $F(7, 46) = 3.03$ ,  $p < .05$ . Over 35% of the variance in sports performance was accounted for after Step 2. Among the demographic variables, being African American had a significant unique contribution to the prediction of sports performance. In Step 3, the Hope total score was entered into the equation and the regression model was significant,  $R = .67$ ,  $F(8, 46) = 3.80$ ,  $p < .01$ . Over 44% of the variance in 2003 sports performance was accounted for after Step 3. Hope did not significantly predict sports performance in 2004 or 2005 after controlling for the effect of NPAR. Furthermore neither of the Hope subscales significantly predicted sports performance in 2003, 2004 or 2005 after controlling for the effect of NPAR. Finally, the Hope domains failed to predict sport performance in 2003, 2004 and 2005.



### Discussion

Consistent with past research, the present study found that higher overall hope was positively related to academic performance. Specifically, an early-semester assessment of hope was significantly predictive of end-of-semester GPA. Past studies have revealed similar findings, wherein “hope predicted semester GPA” in the general student population “even after controlling for variance related to entrance examination scores” (Snyder, Shorey, et al., 2002), as well as “superior classroom achievements” by student-athletes (Curry et al., 1997)

What is interesting, however, is that a significant relationship between hope and academic performance was not found in a longer-term (longitudinal) analysis in the present study. Hope, in other words, was unrelated to academic performance in the semester following its initial assessment. The significant negative correlation between the demographic variable *study hours per week* and *Games Played 2005* may provide some insight into this finding. This small yet important correlation could suggest that grade point averages diminished during the Spring 2005 semester because of players were more focused more on athletic activities than their academic activities (e.g., study hours per week). A significant negative relationship between domain specific hope as it applied to football activities and Spring 2004 GPA gives further credence to this explanation. It is highly possible that an enhanced level of engagement in sport related activities, proves to be detrimental to academic performances, thus making hope a less stable predictor of academic achievements in football student-athletes

Also noteworthy is the fact that the Hope subscales jointly, but not independently, predicated academic performance in the Fall and Spring 2004 semesters. This augments the notion that “agency and pathways components of hope are reciprocal, additive, and positively

related” (Snyder et al., 1991) and that “both are necessary for hopeful thinking” (Snyder, Shorey, et al., 2002).

Contrary to expectations, hope showed a significantly moderate *negative* relationship with each player’s athletic performance, as reflected in the number of games played in the preceding season, but hope was not significantly related to sport performance in the study’s two prospective analyses (i.e., regarding concurrent and future seasons)..This finding stands in opposition to a previously published finding regarding hope and sport performance (e.g., Curry et al., 1997) It should be cautioned however, that only *female* college track athletes were used in the Curry study, and, therefore, one “must not apply the results to male college athletes” (Curry et al., 1997). There are several possible explanations for this finding in the current study. First it could be proposed that those individuals who do not play (e.g., walk-on, red shirt freshman) are more hopeful thinkers because of the possible opportunities to eventually play. This possibility was not tested explicitly within the confines of the present study, but should be followed up in future studies. Secondly, the Curry et al. study used athletes from an individual sport and not a team sport. It is possible that dispositional hope may not be as strong a factor in predicting sport performance for members of team sports because of the overarching concern for team goals rather than personal goals. A third and perhaps more important possibility may have to do with a potentially new concept, which I will term here as “team hope,” or one’s level of hope with regard to team goals. Researchers have concluded that “it is healthier when one’s goals are congruent with one’s personal value system” (Sheldon & Elliot, 1999), and that if “goals are not congruent with the values of the goal seeker, the goal-seeking effort is diminished (Sheldon & Elliot, 1998). Perhaps in this particular population it is the *congruency* between personal and team goals - a construct which was not measured - which leads to increased playing time. Also, it

is entirely possible that although players' individual goals are not met when they fail to earn playing time, they still possess high hope for the team.

Notably, although neither of the two Hope Scale subscales made significant independent contributions to the prediction of performance (playing time) in the preceding season, both subscales did significantly predict playing time for the concurrent season, even when overall hope had no such predictive utility. Specifically, higher pathways thinking led to higher sport performance, whereas agency was found to have a *negative* relationship. Thus pathways may play a more important role in football performance, which would not be surprising given that "high pathways thinkers are able to conceive many strategies to reach goals and contingencies in the event that they are faced with impediments along the way" (Snyder, Shorey, et al., 2002). Possessing such traits would be important in a sport like football, especially when it comes to reading a route for a play or thinking of different offensive and defensive schemes during a game. For example, during the course of a play a receiver may have to adjust his route, or make a side adjustment, in order to maximize the successful completion of the play. Finally, a somewhat more perplexing finding was the negative relationship between agency and sport performance, hence, the lower one's perceived ability to maintain progress along an intended route towards a particular goal, the more likely one was to play. There are two possible explanations for this finding. First, it's possible the more games a player participates in is motivation in itself to continue playing. Moreover, a player who sees less game time may need a larger reservoir of agentic thoughts because of the expectancy that increased game time will eventually occur. A second and more plausible explanation may be that a core scholarship player may receive more attention from his coach, thus more criticism resulting in a decrease of agency.

Lastly, overall hope was associated with poorer sports performance in the preceding season (i.e., less playing time), even when controlling statistically for the effect of natural athletic ability (NPAR). This finding conflicts with Curry et al, 1997 study, in which a positive relationship was found between hope and sport performance. Specifically, it accounted for 44% of the unique variance when NPAR was controlled for. Furthermore, neither a significant relationship was found when looking separately at the hope subscales in 2003, nor when looking at overall hope in 2004 or 2005. Thus it can be implied that to be successful on the playing field, one must possess more than just sheer athletic talent. Genetic endowments obviously play an enormous role in the athlete's achievement, but the present hope results tell us what we suspected— what is going on in the athlete's mind also plays an important part in successful sport outcomes (Curry et al., 1997). However, more research should be conducted on this topic as to find whether similar results would be found.

### Limitations

The failure to find a positive relationship between hope and athletic performance in the present study may be due in part to the rather crude performance metric utilized (e.g., number of games played). Hence, the outcome measure (e.g., number of games played) is limited in its ability to capture whether high hope truly leads to greater sport performances. The difficulty with measuring sport performance when examining football players is the lack of consistent measurement between offense and defense and across positions. For instance, only a limited subset of players have the potential to score a touchdown (e.g., wide receiver, quarterback, etc.), or record a sack (e.g., defensive lineman, linebacker, etc.). The question becomes: how does one quantify achievement (Curry et al., 1997) across football positions? It will be important in future hope research to develop objective markers of performance across a variety of sports (Curry et

al., 1997). Furthermore many of the year-by-year stats decrease the reliability of measuring year-by-year stats due to the fact that players change year to year, (e.g., left the program, graduation, new addition), thus reducing the sample size, and consequently, the validity of the results. Moreover, changes in coaching personnel could make a difference in a player's natural physical ability rating. For instance, it may be beneficial to obtain both the head coaches rating as well as the position coaches.

Another potential limitation of the study was the fact that the participants were only evaluated once, midseason. More specifically, participants had already played four games before the study assessment was conducted. It would have been advantageous had they been evaluated for hope at several points during the season (e.g., before, during, and after), to see how their hope levels fluctuated based upon game by game performance. In addition, participants were informed as to the nature of the study (e.g., why the study was being conducted, a description of the measures, etc.), which could have potentially swayed their answers on the questionnaires. It is plausible that players may have been more cautious as to the way in which they selected the answers to the questions in search of more favorable outcomes. Finally, due to the fact that data were only collected on one Division I football team, it cannot be determined if similar results would have been found when comparing to another football program; therefore results may not be generalizable to other football programs.

Finally, the study was limited with regard to sample size. The lack of a substantial sample measuring sport performance (e.g., games played) was due in part to the fact that only statistics are collected and entered on those players who played at least one game during the season. Hence, a significant percentage of non-scholarship players, as well as players who redshirted during their freshmen year could not be sampled. In addition, players listed on the team roster for

the 2003-2005 seasons differed quite substantially from year to year. For example, players may not be listed on the roster all 3 years due to graduation, transferring to a different institution, or quitting the team. Therefore, a large proportion of sport performance, and a small yet significant amount of academic performance data went unaccounted for, thus resulting in different sample sizes.

### *Future Directions*

There are several suggestions that need further exploration as they cannot be determined based on the present study. First, clearly more research is needed studying the concept of hope in student-athletes. Although the hope construct has been researched extensively with student populations, the student-athlete population has been largely untapped. Moreover, we presently do not know the extent to which hope in football student-athletes differs across football populations (e.g., division level, programs, athletic conference). Arguably, level of competition and performance expectations differ based on division, and as such one should question the degree with which may impact hope levels in players. Additionally, future studies should consider looking at differences in hope in team versus individual sports. Specifically, more discussion is needed regarding the concept of “team hope”.

Undoubtedly, the use of different demographic variables in future studies must be considered. In the present study the only demographic variable which proved to be significant was ethnicity. For instance, being African American accounted for 13% of the unique difference the predicting sport performance in 2003. Future studies may consider evaluating hope based on racial differences.

As stated in the limitations section, the difficulty with using football participants lies in finding an accurate measure of sport performance. Future studies may chose to explore various

ways to measure football sport performance by position or between offense and defense. Using such measures may produce different findings than the present study.

In terms of the Hope domains, there were several small yet significant correlations that warrant further evaluation. First domain specific hope as it relates to the area of *Family Life* had a significantly medium positive relationship with total number of games played ( $r = .30$ ). This means that higher hope in family life relates to higher overall sports performance from 2003 to 2005. If family is found to be a significant predictor in athletic performance, coaches could use this as an evaluation method for assessing incoming recruits. Secondly, domain specific hope in the area related to *Football Activities* had a significantly medium negative relationship with GPA in Spring 2004 ( $r = -.33$ ). Thus suggesting higher hope in football activities relates to lower academic performance in Spring 2004.

One unique feature of this study is the use of longitudinal data. A limited group of longitudinal studies on the topic of hope have been conducted. For instance, in a 6-year longitudinal study, individual differences in hope, as measured by the Hope Scale (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 (Snyder, Shorey, et al., 2002). Moreover, the study found that high- relative to the low-hope students were more likely to have graduated and not to have been dismissed over this 6-year period.(Snyder, Shorey, et al., 2002). There is great utility of such studies especially for coaches and other athletic department officials in the recruitment of student-athletes.

In a different longitudinal study, Feldman, Rand, and Kahle-Wroblewski (2009) measured hope in regards to actual goal attainment among 162 college students and found that a goal-specific measure of hope (particularly the agency subscale) predicted goal attainment better than

the Hope Scale (Snyder et al., 1991). The use of longitudinal data could be beneficial in future studies as to examine the academic and sport achievement of a specific cohort of student-athletes during their 4-year tenure. Furthermore, sport performance measures could be enhanced to track state levels of hope and how it influences goal-specific sport performances.

Finally, studies similar to the one previously mentioned could be especially useful in terms of setting team or individual goals for a particular season. It would be intriguing to see whether high hope student-athletes are successful in achieving the goals they set for themselves both academically as well as the sports arena. Research regarding hope and goal attainment would be especially helpful for coaches who would benefit from objective ways of measuring their student-athletes sport performances.



## References

- Balague, G. (1999). Understanding identity, value, and meaning when working with elite athletes. *The Sport Psychologist*, 13, 89-98.
- Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review*, 84, 191-215.
- Blum, D.E., & Lederman, D. (2003, November 19). NCAA plans new way to keep score. *USA Today*. Retrieved November 19, 2003, from [http://www.usatoday.com/sports/college/2003-11-19-new-ncaa-rules\\_x.htm](http://www.usatoday.com/sports/college/2003-11-19-new-ncaa-rules_x.htm).
- Carr, C. & Bauman, N J. (1996). Life skills for collegiate student-athletes. In E.F Etzel, A.R Ferrante, & J. W. Pinkney (Eds.), *Counseling college student-athletes: Issues and interventions* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed., pp. 281-308). Morgantown, WV: Fitness Information Technology.
- Carver, C. S., & Scheier, M. F. (2002). Optimism. In C. R. Snyder & S. J. Lopez (Eds.), *Handbook of positive psychology* (pp. 231-243). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Cox, R.H. (2002). *Sport psychology: Concepts and applications* (5th ed.). Boston: McGraw-Hill.
- Curry, L.A. & Maniar, S.D. (2004). Academic course for enhancing student-athlete performance in sport. *The Sport Psychologist*, 18, 297-316.
- Curry, L.A. & Maniar, S.D. (2003). Academic course combining psychological skills training and life skills education for university students and student-athletes. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*, 15, 270-277.
- Curry, L.A., & 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.243-259). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Curry, LA., 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.
- Feldman, D.B., Rand, K.L., Kahl-Wroblewski, K. (2009). Hope and goal attainment: Testing a basic prediction of hope theory. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 28, 479-497.
- Franey, L. (2003, September 4). Universities boast impressive academic centers for athletes. *The Kansas City Star*. Retrieved September 4, 2003, from <http://www.kansascity.com/mld/kansascity/news/local/6684869.htm>.
- Gould, D. (2001). Goal setting for peak performance. In J.M. Williams (Ed.). *Applied sport psychology: Personal growth to peak performance* (4th ed., pp. 190-205). Mountain View, CA: Mayfield.
- 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.
- Lucas, J. (2002). Athletes' expectations for success in athletics compared to academic competition. *The Sport Journal*, 5. Retrieved May 26, 2004, from <http://www.thesportjournal.org/2002Journal/Vol5-No2/expectations.asp>.
- Magaletta, P. R., & Oliver, J. M. (1999). The hope construct, will and ways: Their relationship with self-efficacy, optimism, and general well-being. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 55, 539-551.
- 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.
- Pajares, F. (2001). Toward a positive psychology of academic motivation. *Journal of*

- Educational Research*, 95, 27–35.
- Peltier, G.L., Laden, R., & Matranga, M. (1999). Do high school athletes succeed in college: A review of research. *The High School Journal*, 234-238.
- Petrie, T.A., & Russell, R.K. (1995). Academic and psychosocial antecedents of Academic performance for minority and nonminority college football players. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, 73, 615-620.
- Rand, K.L. (2008). Hope and optimism: Latent structures and influences on grade expectancy and academic performance. *Journal of Personality*, 77, 231-260.
- Sheldon, K.M., & Elliot, A.J. (1998). Not all personal goals are personal: Comparing autonomous and controlled reasons as predictors of effort and attainment. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 24, 546–557.
- 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.
- Simons, H.D., Rheen, D.V., & Covington, M.V. (1999). Academic motivation and the student athlete. *Journal of College Student Development*, 40, 151-162.
- Skidmore, R. (2003). *Hope theory in sport, an investigation into the hope levels of team performers compared with individual performers*. Chester College of Higher Education.
- Snyder, C.R. (2002). Hope theory: Rainbows in the mind. *Psychological Inquiry*, 13, 249-275.
- Snyder, C.R. (1998). Hope. *Encyclopedia of Mental Health*, 2, 421-431.
- Snyder, C.R. (1995). Conceptualizing, measuring, and nurturing hope. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 73, 355-360.
- Snyder, C.R., Harris, C., Anderson, J. R., Holleran, S. A., Irving, L. M., Sigmon, S. T.,

- Yoshinobu, L., Gibb, J., Langel, C., & Harney, P. (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., Lehman, K.A., Kluck, B., & Monsson, Y. (2006). Hope for rehabilitation and vice versa. *Rehabilitation Psychology*, 51, 89-112.
- Snyder, C.R., Rand, K.L., King, E.A., Feldman, D.B., & Woodward, J.T. (2002). False hope. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 58, 1003-1022.
- Snyder, C.R., Shorey, H.S., Cheavens, J. Mann-Pulvers, K., Adams, V.H. & Wiklund, C. (2002). Hope and academic success in college. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 94, 820-826,
- Snyder, C. R., Shorey, H. S., & Sympson, S. (2005). *Development and validation of the Domain Hope Scale—Revised*. Unpublished manuscript, University of Kansas, Lawrence.
- 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.
- Snyder, P. (1996) Comparative levels of expressed academic motivation among anglo and african american university student-athletes. *Journal of Black Studies*, 26, 641-667.
- Suggs, W. (2004). NCAA weighs new penalties for academic laggards. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, p. A42.
- Tabachnik, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2007). *Using multivariate statistics* (5th ed.). New York, NY: Pearson Education, Inc.
- 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.

Table 1

*Correlation Matrix between Predictor and Criterion Variables (N = 100).*

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1. Year in School		-.19	.19	.06	-.06	.02	-.05	.04	.08	-.03
2. White or Caucasian			<b>-.86**</b>	<b>-.20*</b>	<b>-.20*</b>	.13	-.16	.17	<b>.21*</b>	.05
3. Black/African American				-.17	-.17	-.13	.15	<b>-.20*</b>	<b>-.25**</b>	-.06
4. Latino American					-.04	-.07	.03	.05	.08	-.01
5. Mixed Race/Other						.09	-.01	.03	.02	.04
6. Injury Experience							-.08	.01	-.02	.05
7. Study Hours per Week								-.04	.03	-.14
8. Hope Scale Total									<b>.91**</b>	<b>.78**</b>
9. Pathways Subscale										<b>.44**</b>
10. Agency Subscale										
11. Social Relationships										
12. Religion/Spiritual Life										
13. Academics										
14. Physical Health										
15. Romantic Relationships										
16. Family Life										
17. Psychological Health										
18. Work										
19. Leisure Activities										
20. Football Activities										
21. NPAR										
22. GPA Fall 2004										
23. GPA Spring 2004										
24. GPA Spring 2005										
25. G 2003										
26. G 2004										
27. G 2005										
28. G Total										

(table continued)

Variable	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
1. Year in School	-.05	-.03	-.16	-.13	-.12	-.01	.11	<b>.29**</b>	-.03	-.17
2. White or Caucasian	<b>.29**</b>	<b>-.21*</b>	-.02	.03	-.01	<b>-.27**</b>	-.08	.01	.11	-.08
3. Black/African American	<b>-.24*</b>	<b>.32**</b>	.10	.04	.02	<b>.34**</b>	.08	-.07	-.03	.14
4. Latino American	-.04	.00	-.09	-.12	.01	-.17	-.02	.09	-.13	<b>-.26**</b>
5. Mixed Race/Other	-.10	<b>-.29**</b>	-.11	-.05	-.04	-.02	.01	.08	-.08	.10
6. Injury Experience	-.06	-.05	.06	-.02	.08	-.12	.06	.08	-.16	-.07
7. Study Hours per Week	<b>-.28**</b>	.06	.02	.12	-.06	.02	-.15	-.06	<b>-.23*</b>	-.13
8. Hope Scale Total	<b>.47**</b>	.14	<b>.44**</b>	<b>.29**</b>	<b>.34**</b>	.12	<b>.41**</b>	<b>.35**</b>	.16	.08
9. Pathways Subscale	<b>.42**</b>	.09	<b>.33**</b>	<b>.24*</b>	<b>.25**</b>	.08	<b>.32**</b>	<b>.28**</b>	.17	.03
10. Agency Subscale	<b>.36**</b>	.16	<b>.44**</b>	<b>.27**</b>	<b>.36**</b>	.13	<b>.39**</b>	<b>.33**</b>	.10	.12
11. Social Relationships		.15	<b>.23*</b>	<b>.29**</b>	<b>.52**</b>	.10	<b>.26**</b>	.15	<b>.22*</b>	.11
12. Religion/Spiritual Life			<b>.27**</b>	<b>.23*</b>	.19	<b>.31**</b>	<b>.28**</b>	.08	.12	.17
13. Academics				<b>.42**</b>	<b>.29**</b>	<b>.31**</b>	<b>.41**</b>	<b>.40**</b>	<b>.20*</b>	<b>.22*</b>
14. Physical Health					.18	<b>.25*</b>	<b>.35**</b>	<b>.28**</b>	<b>.26**</b>	<b>.21*</b>
15. Romantic Relationships						.09	<b>.29**</b>	<b>.25**</b>	<b>.39**</b>	.11
16. Family Life							<b>.28**</b>	.17	<b>.26**</b>	<b>.35**</b>
17. Psychological Health								<b>.30**</b>	<b>.32**</b>	.11
18. Work									<b>.29**</b>	<b>.32**</b>
19. Leisure Activities										<b>.28**</b>
20. Football Activities										
21. NPAR										
22. GPA Fall 2004										
23. GPA Spring 2004										
24. GPA Spring 2005										
25. G 2003										
26. G 2004										
27. G 2005										
28. G Total										

(table continued)

Variable	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28
1. Year in School	.16	.09	.15	-.06	.09	<b>.25*</b>	.15	.23
2. White or Caucasian	<b>-.44**</b>	<b>.24*</b>	<b>.25*</b>	.12	-.15	.11	-.17	-.17
3. Black/African American	<b>.44**</b>	<b>-.25**</b>	<b>-.24*</b>	-.17	<b>.36*</b>	.12	.05	<b>.26*</b>
4. Latino American	-.02	.11	.06	.13	-.23	-.12	.11	-.11
5. Mixed Race/Other	.02	-.09	-.09	.00	<b>-.30*</b>	<b>-.34**</b>	.17	-.12
6. Injury Experience	.11	.05	.21	.10	-.01	-.09	-.06	-.05
7. Study Hours per Week	-.13	-.01	.04	.16	-.15	-.15	<b>-.27*</b>	-.12
8. Hope Scale Total	-.15	<b>.30**</b>	<b>.39**</b>	.19	<b>-.37**</b>	.04	-.05	-.03
9. Pathways Subscale	-.13	<b>.27**</b>	<b>.36**</b>	.19	<b>-.34*</b>	.18	-.10	.03
10. Agency Subscale	-.13	<b>.24*</b>	<b>.30*</b>	.14	<b>-.30*</b>	-.20	.05	-.10
11. Social Relationships	-.16	.18	.22	.05	-.10	.14	.22	.09
12. Religion/Spiritual Life	-.10	.05	-.03	.00	-.18	.03	-.06	-.05
13. Academics	-.05	<b>.19*</b>	.25	.17	.05	.11	-.15	.00
14. Physical Health	-.13	.08	.11	-.10	.01	-.04	-.04	.02
15. Romantic Relationships	-.03	.19	.15	<b>.25*</b>	.00	-.01	<b>.33*</b>	.08
16. Family Life	-.04	-.05	-.04	.05	.20	.20	.09	<b>.30**</b>
17. Psychological Health	-.02	.09	.15	.06	-.01	-.01	-.01	.07
18. Work	-.10	.10	.22	.07	-.08	.14	.12	.11
19. Leisure Activities	-.01	.15	.02	.16	.21	.16	.16	.16
20. Football Activities	-.06	-.07	<b>-.33**</b>	-.20	.00	.02	.15	.15
21. NPAR		-.12	.03	-.03	<b>.49**</b>	.21	.02	<b>.26*</b>
22. GPA Fall 2004			<b>.59**</b>	<b>.57**</b>	-.10	.12	.10	.03
23. GPA Spring 2004				<b>.52**</b>	-.14	.07	.05	-.01
24. GPA Spring 2005					-.03	.16	.04	.03
25. G 2003						<b>.40**</b>	.24	<b>.71**</b>
26. G 2004							.19	<b>.67**</b>
27. G 2005								<b>.70**</b>
28. G Total								

Note. \* $p < .05$ . \*\* $p < .01$ . Significant correlations are in **boldface**. NPAR = Natural Physical Ability Rating. GPA = Grade Point Average. G = Number of Games Played.

Table 2

*Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analyses for the Prediction of Fall 2004 GPA by the Hope Scale Total Score controlling for the Demographic Variables (N = 100).*

Predictor	B	SE B	$\beta$	<i>p</i>
Step 1: Demographic Variables				
Year in School	0.10	0.07	0.15	.145
White or Caucasian	0.59	0.42	0.35	.170
Black or African American	0.03	0.43	0.02	.948
Hispanic or Latin American	0.76	0.58	0.18	.192
Injury Experience	0.12	0.27	0.04	.664
Study Hours per Week	0.01	0.01	0.05	.642
Step 2: Hope Scale Total				
	0.05	0.02	0.25	.010

*Note.*  $R^2 = 0.13$  for Step 1;  $\Delta R^2 = 0.06$  for Step 2. GPA = Grade Point Average. B = unstandardized coefficient. SE B = standard error.  $\beta$  = standardized coefficient.

Table 3

*Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analyses for the Prediction of Spring 2004 GPA by the Hope Scale Total Score controlling for the Demographic Variables (N = 62).*

Predictor	B	SE B	$\beta$	<i>p</i>
Step 1: Demographic Variables				
Year in School	0.11	0.07	0.20	.134
White or Caucasian	0.48	0.41	0.43	.243
Black or African American	0.19	0.40	0.17	.635
Hispanic or Latin American	0.46	0.47	0.20	.339
Injury Experience	0.24	0.23	0.14	.313
Study Hours per Week	0.02	0.02	0.14	.291
Step 2: Hope Scale Total				
	0.04	0.01	0.37	.004

*Note.*  $R^2 = 0.15$  for Step 1;  $\Delta R^2 = 0.13$  for Step 2. GPA = Grade Point Average. B = unstandardized coefficient. SE B = standard error.  $\beta$  = standardized coefficient.



Table 4

*Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analyses for the Prediction of Games Played (G) in 2003 by the Hope Scale Total Score controlling for the Demographic Variables (N = 48).*

Predictor	B	SE B	$\beta$	<i>p</i>
Step 1: Demographic Variables				
Year in School	0.54	0.68	0.11	.432
White or Caucasian	5.893	3.08	0.66	.062
Black or African American	8.20	3.00	0.93	.009
Hispanic or Latin American	0.97	4.09	0.04	.814
Injury Experience	-0.18	1.93	-0.01	.925
Study Hours per Week	-0.13	0.07	-0.25	.083
Step 2: Hope Scale Total				
	-0.29	0.13	-0.30	.027

*Note.*  $R^2 = 0.27$  for Step 1;  $\Delta R^2 = 0.09$  for Step 2. B = unstandardized coefficient. SE B = standard error.  $\beta$  = standardized coefficient.

Table 5

*Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analyses for the Prediction of Spring 2005 GPA by the Hope Domains controlling for the Demographic Variables (N = 75).*

Predictor	B	SE B	$\beta$	<i>p</i>
Step 1: Demographic Variables				
Year in School	-0.00	0.07	-0.00	.980
White or Caucasian	0.21	0.37	0.15	.573
Black or African American	-0.12	0.38	-0.08	.763
Hispanic or Latin American	0.54	0.55	0.15	.327
Injury Experience	0.53	0.31	0.20	.092
Study Hours per Week	0.04	0.02	0.21	.072
Step 2: Hope Domains				
Social Relationships	-0.01	0.02	-0.05	.761
Religion or Spiritual Life	0.00	0.01	0.04	.755
Academics	0.04	0.02	0.28	.054
Physical Health	-0.05	0.03	-0.26	.062
Romantic Relationships	0.03	0.02	0.23	.130
Family Life	0.04	0.03	0.16	.209
Psychological Health	-0.01	0.01	-0.11	.423
Work	-0.01	0.02	-0.05	.715
Leisure Activities	0.05	0.03	0.26	.039
Football Activities	-0.03	0.02	-0.15	.264

*Note.*  $R^2 = 0.15$  for Step 1;  $\Delta R^2 = 0.22$  for Step 2. GPA = Grade Point Average. B = unstandardized coefficient. SE B = standard error.  $\beta$  = standardized coefficient.

Table 6

*Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analyses for the Prediction of Games Played (G) in 2004 by the Hope Subscales controlling for the Demographic Variables (N = 60).*

Predictor	B	SE B	$\beta$	<i>p</i>
Step 1: Demographic Variables				
Year in School	0.62	0.41	0.19	.132
White or Caucasian	4.63	1.97	0.59	.022
Black or African American	4.33	1.92	0.58	.028
Hispanic or Latin American	1.80	2.75	0.11	.516
Injury Experience	-0.86	1.40	-0.08	.539
Study Hours per Week	-0.09	0.06	-0.18	.161
Step 2: Hope Subscales				
Pathways	0.42	0.15	0.38	.007
Agency	-0.60	0.22	-0.35	.011

*Note.*  $R^2 = 0.20$  for Step 1;  $\Delta R^2 = 0.14$  for Step 2. B = unstandardized coefficient. SE B = standard error.  $\beta$  = standardized coefficient.

Table 7

*Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analyses for the Prediction of Games Played (G) in 2003 by the Hope Scale Total Score controlling for the NPAR (N = 48).*

Predictor	B	SE B	$\beta$	<i>p</i>
Step 1: NPAR	0.10	0.03	0.47	.001
Step 2: Demographic Variables				
Year in School	0.38	0.66	0.08	.566
White or Caucasian	4.89	2.99	0.54	.110
Black or African American	6.20	3.02	0.70	.047
Hispanic or Latin American	0.48	3.92	0.02	.903
Injury Experience	0.70	1.97	0.05	.723
Study Hours per Week	-0.09	0.07	-0.17	.217
Step 3: Hope Scale Total	-0.30	0.12	-0.31	.016

*Note.*  $R^2 = 0.22$  for Step 1;  $\Delta R^2 = 0.13$  for Step 2;  $\Delta R^2 = 0.09$  for Step 3. NPAR = Natural Physical Ability Rating. B = unstandardized coefficient. SE B = standard error.  $\beta$  = standardized coefficient.

Table 8

*Frequencies and Percents of Demographic Variables (N = 107).*

Variable	Frequency	%
Year in School		
1	26	24.5
2	23	21.7
3	30	28.3
4	20	18.9
5	7	6.6
Ethnicity		
White or Caucasian	53	49.5
Black or African American	46	43.0
Hispanic or Latino American	4	3.7
Mixed Race and Other	4	3.7
Injury History		
Yes	12	11.2
No	95	88.8

Table 9

*Descriptive Statistics of Demographic, Independent, and Dependent Variables (N = 107)*

Variable	Range		<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
	Minimum	Maximum		
Age	18	24	20.20	1.57
Study Hours per Week	0	60	7.39	6.45
Hope Scale Total	40	64	55.18	4.80
Pathways Subscale	17	32	26.61	3.36
Agency Subscale	18	32	28.57	2.26
Social Relationships	22	48	40.10	4.81
Religion/Spiritual Life	9	48	35.33	9.26
Academics	27	48	39.46	4.72
Physical Health	33	48	44.21	3.60
Romantic Relationships	26	48	40.89	5.17
Family Life	32	48	44.97	3.70
Psychological Health	17	48	39.07	6.80
Work	19	48	41.43	5.78
Leisure Activities	33	48	44.60	4.06
Football Activities	0	48	44.04	5.97
NPAR	1	90	42.69	21.69
GPA Fall 2004	0.33	4.00	2.37	0.83
GPA Spring 2004	1.64	4.00	2.67	0.56
GPA Spring 2005	0.33	4.00	2.62	0.78
G 2003	1	13	9.06	4.51
G 2004	0	11	7.98	3.67
G 2005	0	12	8.32	4.67
G Total	0	36	18.61	11.35

*Note.* *M* = Mean. *SD* = Standard Deviation.

## Appendix A: Project Description

### Hope and Athletes

Much has been written about the construct of hope and its relationship to academic and sport achievement in student athletes. However, a study has yet to be conducted on a Division I football team. It has been hypothesized that Division I athletes, particularly within revenue sports, encounter more applied pressure to win in order to support athletic programs. Therefore, they tend to focus more attention on their athletic achievements than their academic achievements. It has also been theorized that Division I athletes in revenue sports typically have more of an opportunity to continue their athletic careers at a professional level. The previous issues are of substantial importance when evaluating athletes goals both athletically and academically.

The hope construct, as it applies in Clinical Psychology, is defined as the sum of goal thoughts as tapped by pathways and agency (Curry, Snyder, Cook, Ruby, and Rehm, 1997). Pathways thinking reflects the person's capacity to conceptualize one or more avenues by which to arrive at the desired goal, and agentic thinking taps thoughts aimed at initiating and sustaining movement along one's chosen pathways towards a desired goal (Curry, Snyder, Cook, Ruby, and Rehm, 1997). Consider a football player who wants to be the starting quarterback for his Division I team. He must be able to formulate ways in which to get free from opposing players so as to effectively launch his passes. Likewise, he constantly must be able to muster the requisite a motivation so as to overcome any obstacles that he may encounter.

### *Hypotheses*

1. Higher hope, as measured by scores on the Hope Scale (Snyder et al., 1991), should relate to superior academic performances in Division I football players. Academic performance will be measured by each individual football players semester grade-point average during the spring 2004, fall 2004, and spring 2005.
2. Higher hope as measured by Hope Scale scores should relate to superior outcomes for the Division I football players in measures of their performances in their sports. The measures of their football performances will include the number of times a player participated in a game during the fall 2003-2005 seasons.
3. When the shared variables related to the football players' natural abilities as tapped by their coaches ratings are removed statistically from the relationship between Hope Scale scores and football performances, the predictive capability of Hope Scale scores should remain significant.

### Significance

Coaches and athletic administrators are in need of better approaches for measuring and predicting the success of college athletes in both the classroom and sports arena. The present study may assist in these aims. Additionally, present research results may assist

in the development of future academic and athletic intervention programs for student athletes, especially those who are academically at risk of dropping out. As such, coaches may want to begin using the Hope Scale with their incoming student athletes in order to gain insights into the needs and strengths of their athletes.

#### Background and Experience of Experimenter

For the past 6 years I have worked as a student assistant in the Student Support Services Division of the Kansas Athletic Corporation, and I have worked in several capacities that are relevant to this project.

First, I have gained substantial experience in the evaluation of incoming student athletes academic transcripts, and the evaluation of all students semester grades.

Second, for the past two semesters I have worked closely with the academic counselors for football, and assisted in organizing a directed study program for several academically at risk football players. My duties included outlining the student athletes study schedules, and tracking their class progress.

Third, I have been actively involved in the Character First seminar designed for the Kansas Football program.

#### Requirements for the Present Study

##### *Participants*

Division I football players that are enrolled at the university, and have met the NCAA eligibility guidelines for athletic participation in both the fall and spring.

##### *Measures*

##### The Dispositional Hope Scale

The scale is comprised of four agency items, four pathways items, and four distracter items (e.g., "I energetically pursue my goals"), (e.g., "There are a lot of ways around any problems"). Each item is measured on a 8-point Likert scale from 1 = "definitely false" to 8 = "definitely true". The Hope Scale has demonstrated high tests-retest reliability and internal reliability.

##### Physical ability rating scale (PARS).

The position coaches will be asked to assess the natural athletic ability of each player within their position unit.

##### Game by game performance analysis.

Players sport performance will be evaluated by the number of times they participate in a game during the fall 2003-2005 seasons. This information will be collected through the National Collegiate Athletic Association website database which keeps season by season statistics for affiliated sport teams.



### Cumulative Grade Point Average

Each participant's semester GPA will be collected for the spring 2004, fall 2004, and spring 2005 semesters as released by the Student Support Services division of the Kansas Athletic Corporation.

### Demographic Questionnaire

A demographic questionnaire will be distributed that will be used to attain basic background information on each player.

### *Time Commitment*

This study will be completed with the following time constraints:

1. Coaches and players will only be required to meet with the principal investigator (Elizabeth Boldridge) once, wherein the Physical Ability Rating Scores, Hope Scale Scores, and demographic questionnaire will be distributed and completed by coaches and players.
2. The Physical Ability Rating Scores, Hope Scale Scores, and demographic questionnaire must be completed before December 1, 2004.
3. All materials must be collected by January 1, 2005

### Total Time Commitment

Position Coach: 15 minutes

Players: 15 minutes

[**Note:** All materials will be kept in a locked file in the office of Dr. Rick Snyder, Clinical Psychologist, Department of Clinical Psychology, and my thesis advisor. Only the principal investigator will have use of that locked file. **Coaches' assessments on the physical ability rating scale will remain confidential and will not be shown to individual players. Participants will not be identified in the study, nor will their individual GPA's.** Furthermore, the name of the team used for the study will not be identified in the final document. At the end of the study all materials will be destroyed, and coaches/ players will be allowed to review the final document. Finally, this is not a deception study, as is the case in some studies, and all participants will be briefed about the nature of the study before they consent.]

Appendix B: Team Study Consent Form

The Role of Hope in the Academic and Sport Achievements  
of Division I Football Players

The following document gives consent for the University of Kansas Football Program to be used as a research subject in the above study. This certifies that permission has been granted by the following personnel:

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Head Coach**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Date**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Director of Football Operations**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Date**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Principal Investigator**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Date**

Appendix C: Individual Study Consent Form

The Role of Hope in the Academic and Sport Achievements  
of Division I College Football Players

I, (student name), agree to be in the above study, conducted by Elizabeth Boldridge, a candidate for a Master of Arts Degree in Clinical Psychology, and the principle investigator.

I agree to answer the questions on the enclosed forms honestly. I further understand that my name and other personal information will not be disclosed to any person, or in the final document (in the form of a masters thesis).

If I have any questions about this project, I can ask the principal investigator.  
By signing below I am indicating that I understand all of the previous terms.

Signed: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

\*With my signature I affirm that I have received a copy of this consent form.

Appendix D: Grade Release Consent Form

The Role of Hope in the Academic and Sport Achievements  
of Division I College Football Players

I, (name of student), agree for Elizabeth Boldridge to use my spring 2004, fall 2004, and spring 2005 semester grade point average (G.P.A), as released by the Student Support Services division of the Kansas Athletic Corporation.

I understand that my grade point average will not be released to anyone. I also understand that my individual GPA and name will not be denoted in the final document (in the form of a masters thesis).

By signing below I am indicating that I understand all of the previous terms.

Signed: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

\*With my signature I affirm that I have received a copy of this consent form.

### Appendix E: The 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 most 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 my goals that I set for myself.

Notes: When administered, we have called this the “Goals Scale” rather than the “Hope Scale” because on some initial occasions when giving the scale, people become sufficiently interested in the fact that hope could be measured that they wanted to discuss this rather than taking the scale. No such problems have been encountered with the rather

mundane “Goals Scale”. Items 3,5,7, & 11 are distracters, and are not used for scoring. The Pathways subscale score is the sum of items 1,4,6, & 8: the agency subscale is the sum of items 2,9,10, & 12. Hope is the sum of the 4 Pathways and 4 Agency items. Scores range from a low of 8 to a high of 64.

#### Appendix F: Demographic Questionnaire

Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Year in school: \_\_\_\_\_

Ethnicity: \_\_\_\_\_ Position: \_\_\_\_\_

Age: \_\_\_\_\_ Years of participation in current sport: \_\_\_\_\_

Are you suffering from any recent injuries that have significantly reduced your playing time: \_\_\_\_\_

Number of credit hours being taken this semester: \_\_\_\_\_

Hours spent studying each week: \_\_\_\_\_

Number of hours dedicated to given sport each week (during the season)

\_\_\_\_\_ (when not in season) \_\_\_\_\_

Do you have aspirations of continuing your sport once you leave college? Yes \_\_\_ No \_\_\_

If not, then what are your plans? Please describe your goals after college in the blank below.

\_\_\_\_\_

Please list the factors that motivate you in your academics.

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Please list the factors that motivate you in football.

---

---

### Appendix G: Natural Physical Ability Rating Scale

Please think about \_\_\_\_\_ (name of athlete). In regard to this athlete, we are interested in your rating of his or her natural physical talents. We are not interested in your assessment of how good this athlete is at a sport, but rather your judgment about that athlete's basic athletic capabilities. Please use a number anywhere from 1 (lowest) to 100 (highest) to assess each athlete. Here are some markers to help you use the 1 to 100 scale:

1 = poor, lacking in talent

10 = slight, some talent

30 = moderate, with intermediate talent

50 = good, with obvious talent

70 = outstanding, with strong talent

90 = extremely talented, equal to the best I have coached

100 = unique, or the best talent I have ever seen at the college level

You can use any number from 1 to 100, and the more distinctions you make between players, the better.

Number: \_\_\_\_\_

## Appendix H: Domain Hope Scale

**Instructions:** Please think carefully about each of the following life areas before you respond to the items in each section. If a particular question does not apply to you right now, try to respond as you would if the question did fit your situation (e.g., you don't have a job right now so you think of your last job). Using the 8-point scale below, place the appropriate number in the blank before each item. Insert the number that best describes your response to each item.

<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>8</b>
Definitely False	Mostly False	Somewhat False	Slightly False	Slightly True	Somewhat True	Mostly True	Definitely True

**SOCIAL RELATIONSHIPS**

Please take a moment to think about your social life--your friendships and acquaintances. Once you have this area of your life in mind, read each item and insert the number from 1 to 8 that best fits for you.

- \_\_\_ 1. I can think of many ways to make friends.
- \_\_\_ 2. I actively pursue friendships.
- \_\_\_ 3. There are several ways to meet new people.
- \_\_\_ 4. I'm motivated to make and maintain friendships.
- \_\_\_ 5. I can think of ways to be included in the groups that are important to me.
- \_\_\_ 6. I am energized to make friends in the future.

**RELIGION/SPIRITUAL LIFE**

Please take a moment to think about your religious or spiritual life. Once you have this area of life in mind, read each item and insert the number (from 1 to 8) that best fits you.

- \_\_\_ 1. I can think of many ways to reach my spiritual goals.
- \_\_\_ 2. I actively pursue my religious activities.
- \_\_\_ 3. There are several ways to meet the challenges of my religion.
- \_\_\_ 4. I am motivated to practice my religion.
- \_\_\_ 5. I can think of ways to fulfill my important spiritual needs.
- \_\_\_ 6. I am energized when it comes to my religion.
- \_\_\_ 7. If you read this question, place an x on the line.

<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>8</b>
Definitely False	Mostly False	Somewhat False	Slightly False	Slightly True	Somewhat True	Mostly True	Definitely True



## ACADEMICS

Please take a moment to think about your school or education--your classes and your coursework. Once you have this area of life in mind, read each item and insert the number (from 1 to 8) that best fits you.

- \_\_\_ 1. I can think of many ways to make good grades.  
 \_\_\_ 2. I actively pursue my school work.  
 \_\_\_ 3. There are several ways to meet the challenges of any class.  
 \_\_\_ 4. I am motivated to do well in school.  
 \_\_\_ 5. I can think of ways to do well in classes that are important to me.  
 \_\_\_ 6. I am energized when it comes to my school work.

## PHYSICAL HEALTH

Please take a moment to think about your physical health. Once you have this area of life in mind, read each item and insert the number (from 1 to 8) that best fits you.

- \_\_\_ 1. I can think of many ways to have good physical health.  
 \_\_\_ 2. I actively pursue my having good physical health.  
 \_\_\_ 3. There are several ways to meet the challenges to staying physically healthy.  
 \_\_\_ 4. I am motivated to be physically healthy.  
 \_\_\_ 5. I can think of ways to maintain the aspects of physical health that are important to me.  
 \_\_\_ 6. I am energized when it comes to my physical health.

<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>8</b>
Definitely False	Mostly False	Somewhat False	Slightly False	Slightly True	Somewhat True	Mostly True	Definitely True

## ROMANTIC RELATIONSHIPS

Please take a moment to think about your love life--your romantic relationships. Once you have this area of life in mind, read each item and insert the number (from 1 to 8) that best fits you.

- \_\_\_ 1. I can think of many ways to get to know someone I'm attracted to.  
 \_\_\_ 2. I actively pursue someone in whom I am romantically interested.  
 \_\_\_ 3. There are several ways to get a personal relationship started.  
 \_\_\_ 4. I am motivated to pursue romantic relationships.  
 \_\_\_ 5. I can think of ways to keep someone interested in me is the relationship is important.  
 \_\_\_ 6. I am energized when it comes to getting a date.

## FAMILY LIFE

Please take a moment to think about your family life--your family members. Once you have this area of life in mind, read each item and insert the number (from 1 to 8) that best fits you.

- \_\_\_ 1. I can think of many ways to have fun with my family.  
 \_\_\_ 2. I actively work on maintaining my family relationships.  
 \_\_\_ 3. There are several ways to include my family in things that are important to me.  
 \_\_\_ 4. I am motivated to keep my relationships with family members.  
 \_\_\_ 5. I can think of ways to keep my family life going.  
 \_\_\_ 6. I am energized when dealing with my family.  
 \_\_\_ 7. If you read this question, place an x on the line.

<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>8</b>
Definitely False	Mostly False	Somewhat False	Slightly False	Slightly True	Somewhat True	Mostly True	Definitely True

## PSYCHOLOGICAL HEALTH

Please take a moment to think about your psychological health. Once you have this area of life in mind, read each item and insert the number (from 1 to 8) that best fits you.

- |     |    |   |
|-----|----|---|
| ___ | 1. | I can think of many ways to have good psychological health.                                   |
| ___ | 2. | I actively pursue my having good psychological health.  |
| ___ | 3. | There are several ways to meet the challenges to staying psychologically healthy.             |
| ___ | 4. | I am motivated to be psychologically healthy.   |
| ___ | 5. | I can think of ways to maintain the aspects of psychological health that are important to me. |
| ___ | 6. | I am energized when it comes to my psychological health.                                      |

#### WORK

**Please take a moment to think about your work or career--your job and job history. Once you have this area of life in mind, read each item and insert the number (from 1 to 8) that best fits you.**

- |     |    |  |
|-----|----|--|
| ___ | 1. | I can think of many ways to find a job.    |
| ___ | 2. | I actively expend effort on the job.       |
| ___ | 3. | There are several ways to succeed at work. |
| ___ | 4. | I am motivated at work.                    |
| ___ | 5. | I think of ways to keep my job.            |
| ___ | 6. | I am energized when working.               |

#### LEISURE ACTIVITIES

**Please take a moment to think about your leisure time--the activities that you enjoy doing in your spare time. Once you have this area of life in mind, read each item and insert the number (from 1 to 8) that best fits you.**

- |     |    |   |
|-----|----|---|
| ___ | 1. | I can think of many ways to find leisure activities.        |
| ___ | 2. | I actively pursue my leisure time activities.               |
| ___ | 3. | There are several ways to have fun.                         |
| ___ | 4. | I am motivated during my leisure time activities..          |
| ___ | 5. | I can think of ways to use my leisure time.                 |
| ___ | 6. | I am energized when it comes to my leisure time activities. |

#### FOOTBALL ACTIVITIES

**Please take a moment to think about your time in football. Once you have this area of life in mind, read each item and insert the number (from 1 to 8) that best fits you.**

- |     |    |  |
|-----|----|--|
| ___ | 1. | I can think of many ways to succeed in my football activities. |
| ___ | 2. | I actively pursue my football activities.                      |
| ___ | 3. | There are several ways to reach my goals in football.          |
| ___ | 4. | I am motivated during my football activities..                 |
| ___ | 5. | I can think of ways to best use by time playing football.      |
| ___ | 6. | I am energized when it comes to my football activities.        |

From Snyder, C. R. (2002). Development and Validation of the Domain Hope Scale-Revised. Unpublished manuscript, University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas. Total scores for each section reflect the sum of the items for the 6 Domain Hope Scale items. For the pathways and agency subscale scores, sum the three odd- and the three even-numbered items, respectively.