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Abstract

Purpose

This research study presents an instrument to measure the level of hope in employees relative to their belief in the positive outcome of strategy plans. The premise of the research is that people may be unwilling to invest time and effort into the implementation of strategic plans if they do not have hope/faith in the success of the plans. Theoretical support comes from Vroom’s expectancy theory, Means Efficacy Theory, Porter’s Value Chain, and Snyder’s Hope Theory.

Methodology/Approach

A review of the literature on the theoretical constructs resulted in 18-item pool for which data were collected from three samples: a South African sample of leadership seminar attendees, a USA sample of university professors from three universities on Long Island, NY, and a USA sample of Coast Guard Officers.

Findings

The combined data shows a 13-item single factor solution explaining 37.63% of the variance with a Chronbach alpha of .912.

Research limitations/implications

More research should be done to determine test-retest reliability and content validity through mixed methods studies. Case studies may be helpful in gaining deeper understanding about the role of hope in the motivation to implement strategic plans.

Practical implications
The practical application of this study lies in the notion that it may be beneficial for leaders to understand the level of employees’ hope in the success of strategic plans before implementing the plan.

**Originality/value of paper.**

While studies exist relative to hope in emotional well-being and physical well-being, no research exists on the measure of hope in the success of strategic plans.
An Instrument to Measure the Impact of Hope in Strategic Plan Implementation

Luthans and Avolio (2003) make the bold statement that: “the force multiplier throughout history has often been attributed to the leader’s ability to generate hope” (p.253). Building on this comment, Helland and Winston’s (2005) conceptual study of hope as it relates to leadership, imply that more work is needed to fully understand and use the concept of hope in leadership. This current study presents an instrument to measure the level of employees’ hope in strategic plan implementation and posits that leaders may want to spend more time developing the followers’ hope in order to increase the likelihood of success in the implementation of strategic plans. To achieve this purpose, this study investigated the notion of hope in more detail than Helland and Winston’s conceptual article did and developed an instrument that other researchers might find useful in continuing the research of hope as a factor in strategic plan implementation.

During a trip to South Africa and subsequent presentations of seminars on leadership and strategic planning by three of this study’s researchers an interesting phenomena emerged. The three researchers noted during conversations with seminar attendees; and through observation of South African organizations attempting to implement strategic plans that many of the plans seemed to fail. Reviews of the strategic plans seemed to indicate that the failure was not due to poor planning or insufficient resources but to a sense of apathy and lack of hope among the organizational citizens charged with implementing the strategies.

This observation is supported by Tangri (2004) who maintains that one of two reasons why strategic plans fail is that the planners do not take into account the human
element, however, Tangri does not operationally define human element, other than the notion that people don’t mind change – they mind being changed. However, successful strategic plan implementation involves more than overcoming passive resistance to change, it requires active involvement on the part of all organization members. When implementing a strategic plan people are called upon to commit and expend personal energy and effort toward the successful implementation of the plan. Vroom’s Expectancy Theory (1964) has paramount value when used in concert with the more recent concept of the value chain (Porter, 1998) and Snyder’s (1994) concept of hope. This theoretical combination may contribute to the understanding of why people do, or do not, invest the requisite energy and effort into the implementation of a strategic plan.

Vroom’s Expectancy Theory implies that people are motivated to act if the combination of three elements: expectancy, instrumentality, and valence combine together in such a way as to make the goal worth the effort. Tied to Vroom’s notion of expectancy is Snyder’s (1994) belief that hope represents a person’s expectation of goal attainment. Shorey and Snyder (2004) relate high-hope to effective leadership in that people who possess high-hope have clear, well-articulated goals and can envision paths to accomplishing these goals. However, followers do not develop their own goals or envision the paths to accomplish the goals as implied in Vroom’s Expectancy Theory but rather, followers are given the task to implement the strategies derived by the leaders. This means that followers have to adopt the leaders’ goals and rewards. The literature has not addressed this topic and is thus, the focus of this article. This article presents the role of hope in strategic plan implementation and suggests that leaders may want to spend
more time developing the hope of followers in order to increase the likelihood of success in the implementation of strategic plans.

For purposes of this study, Fry’s (2003) definition of hope/faith will be used to operationally define hope: “[h]ope is a desire with expectation of fulfillment. Faith adds certainty to hope. It is a firm belief in something for which there is no proof. Faith is more than merely wishing for something. It is based on values, attitudes, and behaviors that demonstrate absolute certainty and trust that what is desired and expected will come to pass” (p. 713). Fry’s notion of hope/faith incorporates elements of Vroom’s expectancy theory, Porter’s use of ‘unseen’ systems undergirding value generation and Snyder’s implication that hope includes both agency (ability and intention) and pathways (means) of achieving goals.

On a subsequent trip to South Africa three of the researchers collected data from leadership seminar attendees that provided insights about the attendees’ attitudes toward expending energy toward the completion of strategic plans. In addition, the researchers added two additional U.S. samples. The theoretical sections that follow develop and present the items that were included in the survey.

**Vroom’s Expectancy Theory**

Vroom’s Expectancy Theory states that a person’s motivation to expend energy and effort is a product of three elements: (a) expectancy – the link between effort and completion of the task, (b) instrumentality – the link between the accomplishment of the task and the receipt of a reward, and (c) valence – the link between getting the reward and satisfaction from the reward. Snyder, Cheavers and Sympson (1997) posited that hope represents a person’s expectation of goal attainment, which ties to Vroom’s notion of
expectancy. This is supported by Snyder and Shorey’s (2004) belief that high-hope people have clear, well-articulated goals and can envision paths to accomplishing the goal. Hope further plays a role in Vroom’s notion of instrumentality in that the person performing the task has hope that he or she will actually get the reward. While instrumentality is similar to expectancy since both refer to gaining the reward, the notion of instrumentality has to do with the probability of receipt. For example, if two people have the same goal of a promotion but only one can receive the promotion, both may have expectancy that achieving the assigned goals may lead to the promotion but both realize that while both people have to achieve the assigned goals, only one will receive the promotion. Both people have a 50% probability of receiving the reward (instrumentality) even if both achieve the assigned goals (expectancy). Hope plays a role in causing the person to have will power (agency) as well as way power (pathways) as presented by Snyder, Irving and Anderson (1991). Vroom’s concept of valence includes the notion of hope - the person has hope of the personal satisfaction that will be derived from the reward that comes from attaining the goal (expectancy) and receiving the reward (instrumentality).

Since Expectancy Theory focuses on the perceived likelihood of success, reward achievement, and satisfaction with the reward, the following instrument-items emerge:

- What level of hope did you have that the project or idea would be successful?
- What level of hope did you have that when the project was completed that your efforts would be recognized?
• What level of satisfaction did you expect from completing the project/idea?
• What level of satisfaction did you actually get from completing the project?

Means Efficacy and Porter’s Value Chain

Means efficacy, according to Eden (2001), is the person’s self-efficacy moderated by the resources available to the person. For example, an employee may have sufficient self-efficacy to know that he/she can produce a desired outcome in one setting because of the availability of needed resources and/or support but lacks sufficient self-efficacy in a different environment when sufficient resources and/or support is lacking. Hope may include the cognitive evaluation on the part of the employee as to whether or not he/she believes that sufficient resources and support systems will in fact be available for the successful completion of the assigned task. This notion of hope and support systems coupled with the concept of means efficacy may tie to Porter’s (1998) Value Chain concept and provide a link between Hope Theory and strategic planning/implementation.

Value Chain

Porter’s (1998) value chain concept implies that competitive success occurs when the strategic activities of the firm: (a) inbound logistics, (b) operations, (c) outbound logistics, (d) marketing/sales, and (e) service, are supported by the ‘hidden’ support services of (a) procurement, (b) technology development, (c) human resource management, and (d) firm infrastructure. The support services are invisible to many of the front line employees yet the front line employees need to have faith that the support services will be sufficient to insure success of strategic efforts. Porter commented that the
support services may be modified given specific industries, but regardless of modification, the support services have to exist in some form and be sufficient to insure success in the implementation of strategic plans.

The relevance of Porter’s value chain to this study lies in the individual’s faith in the support systems. If the individual believes that the support systems will work and work as presented to the individual then the individual should have more means efficacy relative to his or her belief that energy and effort expended toward the completion of the task will end with success.

Since the value chain support system concept relative to hope refers to the person’s belief in the successful functioning of behind-the-scenes activities, the following instrument-items emerge:

- What level of faith did you have in the other people in the organization/family doing their share of the work?
- What level of faith did you have in the organization/family providing the necessary resources of time, money, and materials to complete the project or idea?
- Other people in the organization/family did not do what they said they would do.
- The plan to complete the project/idea was clearly presented to me.
- What level of faith did you have in your leader to coordinate and lead you and/or your group to complete the project/idea?
• What level of faith did you have in the organization/family’s systems to provide the resources (the resources were available but you could not get them)?

• I believe that what my leader says will happen just as he/she says it will.

**Hope Theory**

While this article opened with a definition of hope as belief in good things to come; Snyder, Irving and Anderson (1991) defined hope as “a positive motivational state that is based on an interactively derived sense of successful (a) agency (goal-directed energy), and (b) pathways (planning to meet goals,” (p. 287). Agency and pathways later came to be described as willpower and way power. High hope people demonstrate the willpower to accomplish a goal and believe they have the means to determine how to accomplish a goal including identifying alternative courses of action for goal attainment when faced with barriers and obstacles along the way.

According to Snyder (2000), hopeful thinking manifests itself in adulthood as a state as well as a disposition. State hope can be influenced by external factors and either increase or decrease depending upon circumstances. A person with a high dispositional hope level seems to more easily recover from disappointment or failed goal pursuit efforts where the person with low dispositional hope may not. However, dispositional hope levels are learned and therefore can be changed through efforts directed at developing higher agency and pathway thinking.

The central tenet of hope theory is that the catalyst for future action is goal directed thinking. (Snyder, 2002) There are distinct differences in how people approach goal pursuit depending upon their hope orientation. High-hope people pursue goals with
“affective zest” whereas low hope people demonstrate “affective lethargy” as they pursue goals? (Snyder, 2002, p. 252). High-hope people seem more able to employ emotional feedback diagnostically to determine more successful goal attainment strategies in the future. Low-hope people experience greater levels of self doubt that represses future action. (Snyder, 1999; Michael, 2000; Snyder, 2002)

Furthermore, high-hope people seem to establish positive relationships with others and “often work toward common goals,” (Snyder, Cheavens, & Sympson; 1997 p. 114). When engaged in group goal attainment efforts “high-hopers serve to make the group not only more productive but also, perhaps equally important, an interpersonally enjoyable arena” (Snyder, Cheavens, & Sympson p. 115). High-hope individuals focus their efforts not only on individual goal attainment but collective goal attainment. They hope not in isolation but in relation to others as they look toward the future. (Helland & Winston; 2005) Ludema, Wilmot and Srivasta (1997) further explain that

When people hope, their stance is not only that reality is open, but that it is continually becoming. Rather than trying to concretize and force the realization of a preconceived future, by hoping people prepare the way for possible futures to emerge. In this sense, hoping can be seen as a deeply creative process, one which requires steadfast patience and the willingness to accept uncertainty as the open future is explored and molded into a compelling image of possibility (p. 12).

It is this aspect of hope, the ability to perceive a positive future in the face of uncertainty and in spite of these uncertainties construct pathways people can embrace and follow as they work together to bring the future to a present state that seems particularly relevant for leaders engaged in successful strategic plan implementation efforts.
From hope theory as it relates to the implementation of strategic plans the following instrument-items emerge:

- While I worked on the project/idea I felt tired all the time. (Reversed worded)
- While I worked on the project I complained about the project/idea to other people who worked on the project/idea. (reversed worded)
- While I worked on the project/idea I put every bit of my energy into the project – just as if it was my project/idea alone.
- While I worked on the project other people complained to me about the project/idea. (reversed worded)
- Would you want to work on the same project/idea again?
- I want to work on other projects/ideas with my leader.
- I have hope in the future of my organization/family.

**Questions/Comments Derived from the Theoretical Concepts**

Table 1 contains the questions/comments that were derived from the concepts and shows the item numbers and sequence of presentation in the instrument. Four of the items were reverse-worded. The reverse items formed their own factor that resulted in the four questions being dropped from the final factor analysis.

The participants received the following instructions on the instrument and were asked to rate their reaction on a scale from 0 - 10:

Think of a project in the recent past in your work or home in which you were asked to help implement a new idea or strategy – a new project of some sort. For each of the items below circle the number that most closely
indicates your level of agreement, hope, or effort, or commitment to the
project. In the response items “-0-“ means none and “10” means complete
or total. The other numbers are equal measures between “-0-“ and “10.”

Research Studies Testing the Instrument to Measure Hope in the Implementation of
Strategic Plans

In an effort to see if there is merit in the consideration and study of hope as a
factor in the implementation of strategic plans, the authors conducted one research study
in South Africa and two research studies in the US (one study tested the instrument with
faculty at Long Island and Brooklyn, New York campuses of two four-year private higher
education institutions, and the other study tested the instrument with US Coast Guard
Contingency Planners).

Although the official language of South African is English, many of the residents
view English as a second language. Since Afrikaans and Xhosa would be the most likely
‘other’ first language of those South Africans participating in the study, the authors had
independent translations of the English instrument into Afrikaans and Xhosa and back
into South African English. These four translations (a) English to Afrikaans, (b)
Afrikaans to South African English, (c) English to Xhosa, and (d) Xhosa to South African
English are included as Appendices B-E at the end of the article. The reason for the
translations is to show that there is no significant change in meaning by those participants
with Afrikaans or Xhosa as their first language.

Each of the three studies (South African data, US faculty data, and US Coast
Guard data) is presented in sequence followed by a summary of the findings.
**South African Study**

This represented a convenience sample because two of the authors of this present study were involved in the logistics of the seminars; and one author of this present study delivered the content for all three seminars. These frames were deemed appropriate for this study in that: (a) the people attending were followers in organizations and (b) worked for leaders who asked them to participate in the implementation of strategic plans.

**South African Results**

Of the 236 participants who completed the instrument during the seminars in October, 2004, 137 attended the seminar in Johannesburg; 54 attended the first seminar in Cape Town; and 45 attended the second seminar in Cape Town.

Before running a factor analysis the data were checked using ANOVA to confirm that the data on each of the 18 items were similar among the three seminar samples and no significant differences were noted.

Data were manually entered into SPSS and during this process the reversed worded items were reversed scored and substituted for the original data. Table 2 shows the component matrix with a minimum factor loading of .500. Items 1, 2, 3, 4, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 16, 17, and 18 comprise factor 1 and explain 37.6% of the variance. The Chronbach alpha for factor 1 is .909. Factor two and three explain 10.6% and 7.6% of the variance respectively and are deemed insufficient to use in the instrument.

[Take in Table II about here]
US College Faculty Study

As part of a larger study (Garnes, 2005) 284 faculty from Long Island and Brooklyn, New York campuses of two four-year private, higher-educational institutions completed the 18 item hope instrument pool while considering the colleges’ IT efforts to implement computer-mediated teaching support strategies.

Table 3 shows the component matrix with a minimum factor loading of .500. Items 1, 2, 3, 4, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, and 18 load on the first factor and explain 40% of the variance. The Chronbach alpha for factor 1 is .923. Factor 2 explains 12% of the variance and is not considered as sufficiently contributing to the understanding of the variance to include it as a separate factor.

US Coast Guard Study

Table 4 shows the component matrix for the 114 US Coast Guard participants with a minimum factor loading of .500. Items 2, 3, 4, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, and 18 load on the first factor and explain 33.37% of the variance. The Chronbach alpha for factor 1 is .883. Factor 2 explains 9.5% of the variance and is not considered as sufficiently contributing to the understanding of the variance to include it as a separate factor.

Combined Analysis

The authors combined the data from the three samples and ran an ANOVA to see if significant differences existed by item. Although differences did exist, the Bonferroni post-hoc test did not reveal a pattern of differences but rather the samples varied one to
another in different combinations. For example with item 1 the South African sample was different than the US Faculty and the USCG, but with item 2 the US Faculty differed from the other two and with item 4, the USCG differed from the other two.

Factor 1 in table 5 consisting of items 1, 2, 3, 4, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, and 18 explains 37.63% of the variance in the data and has a Chronbach alpha of .912. Factor 2 explains 11.25% of the variance and is not considered as sufficiently contributing to the understanding of the variance to include it as a separate factor.

Conclusion

The similarities between the samples lead to a conclusion that the factor consisting of items 1, 2, 3, 4, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, and 18 could be used to measure the level of hope that a follower/employee may have in the implementation of a strategic plan. More research is necessary from this point forward to test the relationship of hope with successful and failed implementation efforts. Longitudinal studies may be of use to measure the change in hope over time in order to show the state-status of hope as it relates to the willingness of employees to commit energy and effort to the implementation of strategic plans. If the research bears out the relationship there may be reasons to train leaders to spend the requisite time on building hope in followers/employees rather than focusing solely on the strategic plan.

Now that an instrument to measure employees’ hope relative to the implementation of strategic plans future research can occur in which discriminate studies can measure the differences in organizations where plans were successful and not successful. Research can also measure the before and after measures of hope where leaders use rhetoric to build hope.
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Appendix A

Hope Instrument as used with the three samples

Instructions:

Think of a project in the recent past in your work or home in which you were asked to help implement a new idea or strategy – a new project of some sort. For each of the items below circle the number that most closely indicates your level of agreement, hope, or effort, or commitment to the project. In the response items -0- means none and 10 means complete or total. The other numbers are equal measures between -0- and 10.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>None</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>Complete</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>What level of hope did you have that the project or idea would be successful?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>What level of faith did you have in the other people in the organization/family doing their share of the work?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>What level of hope did you have that when the project was completed that your efforts would be recognized?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>What level of faith did you have in the organization/family providing the necessary resources of time, money, and materials to complete the project or idea?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>While I worked on the project/idea I felt tired all the time.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>While I worked on the project I complained about the project/idea to other people who worked on the project/idea.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Other people in the organization/family did not do what they said they would do.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>While I worked on the project/idea I put every bit of my energy into the project – just as if it was my project/idea alone.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>While I worked on the project other people complained to me about the project/idea.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Scale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>The plan to complete the project/idea was clearly presented to me.</td>
<td>0 - 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>What level of faith did you have in your leader to coordinate and lead you and/or your group to complete the project/idea?</td>
<td>0 - 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>What level of satisfaction did you expect from completing the project/idea?</td>
<td>0 - 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>What level of satisfaction did you actually get from completing the project?</td>
<td>0 - 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Would you want to work on the same project/idea again?</td>
<td>0 - 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>What level of faith did you have in the organization/family’s systems to provide the resources (the resources were available but you could not get them)?</td>
<td>0 - 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>I believe that what my leader says will happen just as he/she says it will.</td>
<td>0 - 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>I want to work on other projects/ideas with my leader.</td>
<td>0 - 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>I have hope in the future of my organization/family.</td>
<td>0 - 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B

Translations of the Hope Instrument from American English to Afrikaans.

Dink aan ‘n projek wat jy in die nabye verlede by jou huis of werk gevra was om te help met die implementeering van ‘n nuwe idée of strategie – n nuwe projek van aard. Vir elke van die volgende items hier onder, omsirkel die nommer wat die naaste indikasie is van jou vlak van ondersteuning, hoop of moeite, of toegevydheid teenoor die projek. In die reaksie item toon -0- geen en 10 beteken afgehandel of total. Die ander nommers is ‘n gelykte maatstaf tussen -0- en 10.

Tabel 1: Vrae / Aanmerkings en hulle Toeretiese / Voorstellings steun

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Vraag / Aanmerking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Watter vlak van hoop het jy gehad dat die projek of idée ‘n sukses sou wees?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Watter vlak van geloof het jy in die ander mense in die organisasie / familie gehad wat jou verseker het dat hulle hulle deel van die werk sou doen?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Watter vlak van hoop het jy gehad dat as die projek klaar was dat jou moeite erken sou word?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Watter vlak van geloof het jy gehad in die organisasie / familie as jy gelet het op die nodige hulpmiddels van tyd, geld, en material wat hulle beskikbaar gehad het om die projek of idée te voltooí?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Tydens die tyd wat ek aan die projek / idée gewerk het, het ek die hele tyd moeg gevoel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Terwyl ek aan die projek gewerk het, het ek gekla oor die project / idée teenoor die ander mense wat saam met my op die projek / idée gewerk het.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Van die ander ments in die organisasie / familie het nie gedoen wat hulle gesê het hulle gaan doen nie.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Terwyl ek aan die projek gewerk het, het ek al my energie in die projek / idée in gesit as of dit net my projek / idée was.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Terwyl ek besig was om op die projek te werk was daar ander mense wat teenoor my gekla het oor die projek / idée.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Die plan van hoe om die projek / idée te voltooí was baie duidelik teenoor my aangebied.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Watter vlak van geloof het jy in jou leier gehad day hy deur sy koordinasie en leiding jou en jou groep kon help om die projek / idée te voltooí?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Watter vlak van satsifikasie het jy verwag nadat die projek /idée voltooí was?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Watter vlak van satsifikasie het jy na ware ondervind nadat die projek afgehandel was?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Sou jy weer aan dieselfde projek / idée gewerk het?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Watter vlak van geloof het jy in die organisasie / familie sisteem gehad om die nodige hulpmiddels te verskaf (die hulpmiddels was maklik verkrygbaar maar jy kon dit nie in die hande kry nie)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Ek glo wat ook al my leier se sal gebeur dit net so sal gebeur soos wat jy gesê het dit sal gebeur.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Ek sal graag saam met my leier op ander projekte / idées wil werk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Ek het hoop in die toekoms van my organisasie / familie.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Translation done by Antonie Boshoff.
Appendix C

Translation of the Hope Instrument from Afrikaans to South African English.²

Think of a project that you were recently asked to help with at home or work with the implementation of a new idea or strategy – a new project of kind. For each of the following items below, circle the number which is the closest indication of your level of support, hope, effort or dedication towards the project. In the reaction item, show ‘0’ (none) and ‘10’ means dealt with or total. The other numbers are equal measures between ‘0’ and ‘10’.

Table 1: Questions / comments and their theories / suggestions support.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Questions / Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>What level of hope did you have that the project or idea was going to be a success?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>What level of faith did you have in the other people in the organisation or family that assured you that they would do their share of the work?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>What level of hope did you have that when the project was completed, that your efforts would be acknowledged?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>What level of faith did you have in the organisation or family if you focussed on the necessary aids of time, money and materials that was available to complete the project or idea?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>During the time that I worked on the project, I was feeling tired the whole time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>While I was working on the project, I complained about the project or idea towards the other people that was working with me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Some of the other people in the organisation or family did not do what they said they would.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>While I was working on the project or idea, I put all my energy into the project or idea as if it was solely my project or idea.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>While I was busy working on the project or idea there were other people who were complaining about the project or idea to me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>The plan of how to complete the project or idea was clearly presented to me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>What level of faith did you have in your leader that through his coordination and guidance could help you and your group completed the project or idea?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>What level of satisfaction did you expect after the project or idea was completed?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>What level of satisfaction was found to be true after the project was completed?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Would you ever work on the same project or idea again?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

² Translation done by Ingrid Reyneke.
15. What level of faith did you have in the organisation or family system to supply the necessary aids (the aids were easily available, but you couldn’t get your hands on it)?

16. I believe that whatever my leader says will happen, will happen just as he said.

17. I would like to work on other projects or ideas with my leader.

18. I have hope in the future of my organisation or family.
Appendix D

Translations of the Hope Instrument from American English to Xhosa.³

Cinga ngephulo kwixesha elingephi elidlulileyo emsebenzini wakho okange apho wawuceliwe ukuba uncede ekumiliseleni le mbono okanye lendlela ethile yokwenza iphulo elitsha loholo o lunthile.


Eyokuqala: Imibuzo/iziphawulo kunye me nenxaso eyilayo/cengaphunyezwanga.

Isihloko# Umbuzo/ukuphawula

1. Leliphi ibakala lethembu owawunalo elokuba iphulo lokuphumele lela?
2. Leliphi ibakala lokholo owawunalo kubanye ubantu enkampanini/kubantu bakokwenu ekunckolenele ngomsebenzi?
3. Leliphu ibakala lethembu owawunalo xaphulo laligqitybula ukuba ezakho imzame zakukuqwalaselela zaziwe uvuzwe?
4. Leliphi ibakala lokholo owawunalo ekhampanini/kubantu bakokwenu ekubeni bancedise ngexeslha, imali, kunye nezinto ezifunekayo ukuze iphulo ligqitywe?
5. Ngeli lixa ndisebenza kulo iphulo eli ndandiziva ndi dziko lonke ixesla.
6. Ngeli lixa ndisebenza kulo iphulo ndandikabaza ngao iphulo kubanye ubantu ababe-sebenza kulo?
7. Abanye ubantu ekhanipanini/abantu bakolwethu zange benze izinta babythe bazakuzenza.
8. Xa ndandisebenza kwiphulo ndawusebenzisa onke amandla wam-ndisenza ngathi eli pfulo lelam ndoduva.
9. Xa ndindisebenza kwiphulo abanye abantu babeklalaza ngam.
10. Umgamo owawuza kulandelwa ukuze libre nokugqitywa iphulo yacaciswa kum.
11. Leliphu ibakulu lokholo owawunalo kwinkokhehiyako ekukuncedni ekukhokhela wena nabanye ekugqibeni eliphulo?
12. Leliphi ebakala lokwenhesisela owawulili ndele xa sele iphulo ligqibekile?
13. Leliphi ebakala lokweleniseka owalifumanayo ekugqibeni eliphulo?
14. Ungathanda ukuselenza kweliphulo linye kwakhona?

³ Translation done by Nomfundo Madikizela.
15. Leliphi ibakala lokholo owawunalo ekhanimpanini/ kozalena nabo ngendlela yokuncedisa ngezinto ezifunekayo (zazikhona ezizinto zazifuneka kodiwa wawungenako ukuzifumuna)?

16. Ndiyakholwa ukuba inkohele yam ethe kuzakunemzeka kwinkuhusonbo ngengoko etswinlo?

17. Ndifuna ukusebenza kumanye aphulo nenkokheli yam.

Appendix E

Translations of the Hope Instrument from Xhosa to South African English. 4

Think about an initiative/programme in a more recent past/not so distant past at your work or at home where you were asked to help in the establishment of a view or a certain way of initiative/programme.

In each of the below-mentioned ascribe the number that best describes the extent to which you agree, hope in or have strength in the initiative/programme. In the answers that follow a zero stands for non-existent and ten means complete. Other numbers represent varying opinions expressed between zero and ten.

Table One: Questions/indications and the opinions that support them:

1. To which degree of expectation did you have hope regarding the success of the initiative?
2. Which degree of confidence, did you have in other people in your company/in the people of same cultural background as yourself with regards to helping with the work?
3. Which degree of expectation did you have when it was conducted that your efforts would be considered and rewarded?
4. To which extent were you confident in your company and the people with the same cultural background as yourself in helping at the time when finance and other necessities for the success of the programme or the initiative?
5. During the time of the initiative I felt tired at all times.
6. During my involvement in this programme I did complain to others where involved.
7. Some of my colleagues/ my fellow people did not deliver on their promises.
8. During my involvement in this project I put my all into it as though it was entirely my project.
9. During my involvement in this programme my colleagues complained about me.
10. The procedure to be followed for the completion of the project was explained to me.
11. To what extend were your confident in your leader in helping you in leading you and others to the completion of the project?
12. To what extend were you satisfied on the completion of the project?
13. How much satisfaction did you experience in completing this programme?
14. Would you like to work in the same programme again?
15. How much confidence did you have in your company/in your people regarding helping with requirements (the requirements were available whoever you were unable to obtain them).
16. I believe that what my leader said will be done or promised will be fulfilled.
17. I would like to with the same leader in other projects.
18. I am confident in the future of my company and in my own people.

4 Translation done by Constance Monametsi.
Table I: Questions/Comments and their Theoretical/Conceptual support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Question/Comment</th>
<th>Theory/Concept</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>What level of hope did you have that the project or idea would be successful?</td>
<td>Expectancy theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>What level of faith did you have in the other people in the organization/family doing their share of the work?</td>
<td>Value Chain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>What level of hope did you have that when the project was completed that your efforts would be recognized?</td>
<td>Expectancy theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>What level of faith did you have in the organization/family providing the necessary resources of time, money, and materials to complete the project or idea?</td>
<td>Value Chain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>While I worked on the project/idea I felt tired all the time.</td>
<td>Hope (reversed worded) relates to dispositional scale-item 3-distractor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>While I worked on the project I complained about the project/idea to other people who worked on the project/idea.</td>
<td>Hope (reversed worded)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Other people in the organization/family did not do what they said they would do.</td>
<td>Value Chain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>While I worked on the project/idea I put every bit of my energy into the project – just as if it was my project/idea alone.</td>
<td>Hope Theory agency-state hope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>While I worked on the project other people complained to me about the project/idea.</td>
<td>Hope Theory (reversed worded)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>The plan to complete the project/idea was clearly presented to me.</td>
<td>Value Chain – infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>What level of faith did you have in your leader to coordinate and lead you and/or your group to complete the project/idea?</td>
<td>Value Chain – infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>What level of satisfaction did you expect from completing the project/idea?</td>
<td>Expectancy theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>What level of satisfaction did you actually get from completing the project?</td>
<td>Expectancy theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Would you want to work on the same project/idea again?</td>
<td>Hope theory</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
15 What level of faith did you have in the organization/family’s systems to provide the resources (the resources were available but you could not get them)?

16 I believe that what my leader says will happen just as he/she says it will.

17 I want to work on other projects/ideas with my leader.

18 I have hope in the future of my organization/family.

Table II: South African Sample Component Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.658</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.617</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.682</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.666</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5r</td>
<td>0.706</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6r</td>
<td>0.664</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7r</td>
<td>0.607</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.641</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9r</td>
<td>-0.661</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.665</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.781</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.698</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.701</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.725</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.719</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.751</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.767</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table III: US Faculty Sample Component Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Component</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.706</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.723</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.711</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.803</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.703</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.735</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.768</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.690</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.697</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table IV: US Coast Guard Sample Component Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Component</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.516</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.584</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.644</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.586</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.735</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.610</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.781</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.631</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.634</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.774</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.768</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.579</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table V: Combined Sample Component Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Component</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.640</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.662</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.676</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.733</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.663</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.772</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.731</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.721</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.632</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.647</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.737</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.752</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.721</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>