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ABSTRACT

An extensive literature review on child well-being has signified a dearth in relevant South African research on the current topic. It has been established that the interplay of hope, life satisfaction and income level exerts a great impact on the well-being of children. Hence, this study aims to investigate the relationship between hope and life satisfaction among children in low and middle income communities in Cape Town. More specifically, the study aims to ascertain the moderating effect of income level on the relationship between hope and life satisfaction. The 3P Model of Subjective Well-Being (SWB) was used as a theoretical position conceptualising this study. The model categorizes the components of subjective well-being under temporal states of the Past, the Present and the Prospect (future), and therefore proposes that we evaluate our lives across these temporal states. The study used secondary data from the Children’s Worlds: International Survey on Children’s Well Being (2012). Data was collected across all 12 year old participants, within each participating school, by means of purposive sampling, with a total of 1004 participants. The questionnaire administered, incorporated Huebner’s (1991) Student Life Satisfaction Scale (SLSS) and Snyder’s et al. (1997) Children’s Hope Scale. Data was analysed by means of correlational analysis and results revealed that there is a significant relationship between hope and life satisfaction for both low and middle income communities. The Process Tool for Moderation Analysis revealed that income level moderates the relationship between hope and life satisfaction. Moreover, this relationship appeared to be stronger for the low income group than for the middle income group. Hence, this finding suggests that hope has a more pronounced impact on life satisfaction for the low income group than for the middle income group.
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BACKGROUND AND RATIONALE

Early emergence of the concept of subjective well-being (SWB) can be located in Wilson’s (1967) Correlates of avowed happiness (as cited in Diener et al., 1999), Bradburn’s (1969) The structure of psychological well-being, and is later evident in the work of Campbell, Converse and Rodgers (1976), as well as, Andrews and Withey (1976). Over the years there has been a progressive increase in studies focussing on subjective well-being (SWB), with the last three decades in particular, showing a dramatic increase (Diener, 2013). Diener et al. (1999) contend that advancement in the field “reflects larger societal trends concerning the value of the individual, the importance of subjective views in evaluating life, and the recognition that well-being necessarily includes positive elements that transcend economic prosperity” (p. 276). Studies in SWB work from the premise that objective indicators only provide a partial explanation of quality of life, and what people think and feel about their lives are of critical importance (Savahl et al., 2014).

Within the child indicator movement the progress has been less pronounced, but has experienced a marked increase in recent years. The increase in children’s SWB can to a large extent be attributed to the near universal adoption of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (UNCRC). Presenting a normative framework for children’s rights, the UNCRC has been significant in driving the notion that children are valid social actors and constructors of knowledge and subsequently propagates for child centred research, where children’s voices and their perceptions of various aspects of well-being are foregrounded. What followed were methodological advancements toward participatory techniques, with a specific focus on obtaining child centred data. Indeed, within contemporary international dialogue, the importance of SWB in assessing overall well-being and quality of life, is well established (Savahl, et al., 2014).

Subjective well-being therefore developed as a complement to objective indicators, with subjective indicators being a reflection of both cognitive judgements, such as life satisfaction and positive feelings, such as hope (Diener & Biswas-Diener, 2002). Our sense of life satisfaction is reflected in how we perceive our current situation and ultimately, our perceived well-being. Life satisfaction, thus refers to a subjective evaluation of the overall quality of one’s life, and is considered to be a key indicator of SWB (Diener & Diener, 1995, as cited in Proctor, Linley & Maltby, 2009). The all-encompassing nature of this concept (SWB) extends
to the experience of pleasant emotions, low levels of negative moods and high life satisfaction (Diener, Lucas & Oishi, 2002).

Another key dimension of well-being identified in recent literature, is hope (Isaacs, 2010; Savahl et al., 2013). The concept of hope denotes a "positive motivational state that is based on an interactively derived sense of successful agency (goal-directed energy), and pathways (planning to meet goals)", (Snyder, 2002, p. 250). Hope, as the provider of agency (Engelbrecht, 2011), can therefore be used to improve one’s current living conditions, via a process named ‘pathways thinking’, which holds that our present and imagined futures are linked by thought.

Durayappah (2011) supports this notion in asserting, that there is a constant interplay between our thoughts of the past, present and future. As such, when we evaluate our lives, we do this by thinking of our past well-being, our present position in life, as well as our imagined futures. Therefore, happiness, our perception of our position in life and eventually our sense of hope, stems from our thoughts. In essence, when more time is spent in the good states (good thoughts) and less time in the bad states (bad thoughts), one’s happiness, satisfaction with life, sense of hope and well-being herewith increases (Durayappah, 2011).

It is imperative to understand how participants locate their happiness and life satisfaction. Do they regard themselves as being happy and satisfied with life when they have achieved their goals? Do they regard themselves as being happy and satisfied with life when being surrounded by their loved ones? Do they regard themselves as being happy and satisfied with life when their basic needs are met? Or do they locate their happiness and sense of life satisfaction in financial affluence?

Inevitably, the diverse entities of communities in South Africa are characterized by socio-economic disparities (Savahl et al., 2013), whereby one’s socio-economic status includes some quantification of one’s family income, parental education, occupational status and the availability of resources (Bradley & Corwyn, 2002). Hence, the disparities between low and middle income communities are those of income, the availability of resources, educational levels, educational opportunities, social support, and the accessibility to information and certain skills (e.g. computer skills) (Neuman & Celano, 2001). From this, we can infer that low and middle income communities vary in terms of average income (Guse & Vermaak, 2011). Hence, inhabitants of these two social groups experience their external (satisfaction
with life) and internal (sense of hope) worlds differently. In this regard, income level assumes
the role of a moderator variable, which is a third variable that affects the direction and/or
strength of the relationship between an independent variable (hope) and a dependent variable
(life satisfaction), (Pretorious, 2007).

It is evident that empirical research is required for the exploration of the role of contextual,
historical and socio-demographic variables in well-being (Bronk et al., 2009; Wissing &
Temane, 2013). Previous research (see Moses, 2008; Savahl et al., 2014; Guse & Vermaak,
2011; Wissing & Temane, 2013) point to a dearth of child specific data in the South African
context. Similarly, Guse and Vermaak (2011) propose that research on hope and well-being
in adolescents be conducted, on a sample which is demographically representative of the
South African population. Few studies have examined hope among children and adolescents
(Isaacs, 2010; Merkaš & Brajša-Žganec, 2011; Snyder, 2003; Valle, Heubner & Suldo, 2006;
Guse & Vermaak, 2011), aside from samples used during the validation of the Children's
Hope Scale (Linley & Maltby, 2009). Most of the quality of life studies are health related
(Ashing-Giwa & Lim, 2009; Tay & Diener, 2011; Yadav, 2010), many of the life satisfaction
studies were conducted on either adults or college students in American samples and a fair
amount of studies have been conducted on socio-economic status (Diener & Biswas-Diener,
2002; de la Sablonniere, Tougas & Lortie-Lussier, 2009; Higgs, 2002; Seekings, 2003;
Taylor & Yu, 2009).

The interplay of hope, life satisfaction and income level exerts a great impact on the well-
being of children (Bronk et al., 2009). Moreover, one's socio-economic background, more
specifically income level should be considered, given the possibility that the availability of
resources is a significant role player for pursuing one’s goals, as this may potentially have an
impact on hope and life satisfaction. Not only will this study contribute to the knowledge
base of children’s lives, specifically with regard to the variables hope, life satisfaction and
income level, but it also recognizes the role of children as social actors (Casas, 2011; Fattore,
Mason & Watson, 2012), able to provide us with an understanding of their well-being.
Hence, this role is acknowledged through the employment of two self-report measures;
Snyder’s et al. (1997) Children’s Hope Scale (CHS) and Huebner’s (1991) Student Life
Satisfaction Scale (SLSS).
Aims and objectives

The primary aim of the study is to ascertain the nature of the relationship between hope and life satisfaction among children in both low and middle income communities in Cape Town. The study further aims to determine the extent to which income level moderates the relationship between hope and life satisfaction. The objectives are as follow:

1. To determine whether a significant relationship exists between hope and life satisfaction in low income communities.
2. To determine whether a significant relationship exists between hope and life satisfaction in middle income communities.
3. To determine the extent that income level moderates the relationship between hope and life satisfaction among children in low and middle income communities in Cape Town.

Accordingly, the study aims to test the following hypotheses:

**Hypothesis 1:** There is no significant relationship between hope and life satisfaction in low income communities.

**Hypothesis 2:** There is no significant relationship between hope and life satisfaction in middle income communities.

**Hypothesis 3:** The relationship between hope and life satisfaction is not moderated by income level.

### WELL-BEING

The concept of well-being is a broad, contested concept that is both pervasive and widely criticised (Camfield, Struelli & Woodhead, 2008). Its meaning and content thus fluctuate and are dependent on the purpose of the research (Camfield et al., 2008). The diversity of well-being, ranges from having a good life (material welfare and standards of living), to living a good life (values and ideals) and finally locating one’s life experience (subjectivity), (White, 2007).

The great dispute in how well-being should be defined and measured remains unresolved. As such, well-being is regarded as a multifaceted construct, by most researchers (Forgeard et al., 2011). This would include, emotional, social and functional components, upon which there
are many disagreements related to the inclusion of these components in a valid theory and measure of well-being (Forgeard et al., 2011). As a result of its multifaceted nature, the construct of well-being is used synonymously with ‘happiness’, ‘quality of life’ and ‘life satisfaction’, owing to its blurred and broad definitions (Forgeard et al., 2011). Hence, the definitions of well-being are more often than not, related to the measures employed when assessing a person’s well-being (Camfield et al., 2008). These measures can either be objective or subjective in nature, bringing us closer to the purpose of this study – that is to assess children’s SWB through the construct of life satisfaction. Diener and Chang (2011) refer to SWB as people's evaluations of their lives, which can be judgements such as life satisfaction, evaluations based on feelings, including moods and emotions and they assert that people feel a sad mood or a joyful emotion, as a result of their lives going either badly or well. In essence, the evaluations of their lives are mood congruent.

Well-being is therefore often equated with one construct, namely life satisfaction (Forgeard et al., 2011). Accordingly, life satisfaction appears to be the most widely used type of measure to assess well-being and the items are structured in such a way, requiring a more reflective and evaluative aspect when considering one’s life (Forgeard et al., 2011). It is therefore dependent on the standards that individuals have set for themselves (Forgeard et al., 2011), and as such, individuals from the same income level will experience more or less the same sense of life satisfaction.

**LIFE SATISFACTION**

Life satisfaction, referring to a subjective evaluation of the overall quality of life, is considered a key indicator of well-being (Diener & Diener, 1995), as it is integrally tied to emotional, behavioural, social, environmental and psychological outcomes (Proctor et al., 2009). Feather and O'Brien (1986) conducted a longitudinal research study with adolescents and found that those youths who leave school and do not become employed, report lower levels of self-reported activity, perceived competence, and life satisfaction and an increased depressive affect. Evidently, life satisfaction provides indicators of both well-being and psychopathology (Linley & Maltby, 2009).

Life satisfaction is positively related to academic achievement, interpersonal relations, parental relations, self-esteem and hope (Gilman & Huebner, 2006). Also, it is found to be negatively associated with poor attitudes toward school, teachers, social stress, anxiety,
depression and external locus of control (Gilman & Huebner, 2006). Character strengths of love, hope and zest are positively associated with life satisfaction (Park & Peterson, 2006). A strong correlation was found between life satisfaction, standards of living and financial satisfaction (Heady, Muffels & Wooden, 2008; Peiró, 2006). Empirical studies have found that the strongest correlates of life satisfaction among children aged 10 to 13 were self-esteem, internal locus of control and extraversion (Huebner, 1991), contrary to demographic variables which among others, include socio-economic status (Huebner et al., 2004).

Civitci and Civitci (2009) documented the mediator and moderator effect of global self-esteem on the relationship between loneliness and global life satisfaction in adolescents. This study identified global self-esteem as a significant predictor of global life satisfaction. Although self-esteem does not have a moderator effect, due to its mediator effect (established by means of hierarchical regression analysis) it was established that loneliness decreases as global life satisfaction increases, as a result of the mediator variable, self-esteem. The sample consisted of 439 students aged 15-18, attending four different high schools in Turkey. The study is limited in generalizability as the sample was composed of adolescents living in one city in Turkey.

Evidently, papers published in psychology and other disciplines show that life satisfaction is associated with physical health and lower substance abuse, less unemployment and financial strains, better ability to meet personal standards, optimism/hope, self-efficacy, more social support and less behavioural problems, and higher interpersonal and cognitive functioning (Dolan, Peasgood & White, 2008; Proctor et al., 2009, as cited in Lavy & Littman-Ovadia, 2011). Family variables, such as, family structure, parenting style, parental emotional and social support and family conflict rendered important in the attainment of life satisfaction among adolescents (Proctor et al., 2009).

Results from correlations and regressions confirmed that global life satisfaction was negatively related to parental psychological control, both dependency-and achievement-oriented, and positively related to diverse dimensions of family functioning, such as affective responsiveness and involvement, communication, and the general healthy functioning (Cacioppo, Pace & Zappulla, 2013). The family functioning variables, such as general healthy functioning of the family and the affective involvement variables, seemed to play a
significant predicting role in life satisfaction among a sample of 255 adolescents aged between 15 and 17 years in Italy (Cacioppo et al., 2013).

Family structure plays a crucial role in children's life satisfaction, as shown in a cross sectional study across 36 western industrialised countries, with a total sample size of 184 496 participants (aged 11, 13 and 15, with a minimum sample size of 1536 learners per age group in each country), (Bjarnason et al., 2012). This study examined the differences in life satisfaction among children in different family structures and reported the following results: Children living with both biological parents reported higher levels of life satisfaction than children living with a single parent or parent–step-parent. Children in joint physical custody reported significantly higher levels of life satisfaction than their counterparts in other types of non-intact families. Difficulties in communicating with parents were strongly associated with less life satisfaction but did not mediate the relation between family structure and life satisfaction. Children in the Nordic countries characterised by strong welfare systems reported significantly higher levels of life satisfaction in all living arrangements except in single father households. Differences in economic inequality between countries moderated the association between certain family structures, perceived family affluence and life satisfaction. Bjarnason et al. (2012) posit that children who live in less fortunate economic circumstances can be expected to be less satisfied with life and the association between single parenthood and reduced life satisfaction may be partly due to economic hardship.

**HOPE**

The concept of hope has been researched in relation to a variety of variables, such as, adolescent identity (Erickson, 1968); life purpose (Bronk et al., 2009) which is then associated with a greater sense of life satisfaction; hope as a predictor of life satisfaction (Bailey et al., 2006); hope as a predictor of students’ athletic and academic performance (Boldridge, 2002); hope in relation to eustress, self-efficacy and life satisfaction (O’Sullivan, 2011); academic and interpersonal life satisfaction (Chang, 1998); exploring the prevalence and dynamics of hope and psychosocial well-being, across racial groups in a South African sample (Guse & Vermaak, 2011); and finally, the relationship between hope and exposure to community violence (Isaacs & Savahl, 2011; Savahl et al., 2013).

Snyder (2003, p.4), author and founder of the Children’s Hope Scale defines hope as a “cognitive set involving the self-perceptions that one can produce routes to desired goals
(pathway component), along with the motivation to use those goals (the agency component). Both pathways and agentic thinking must be assessed together so as to obtain an overall sense of a child's hope” (Snyder, 2003). Valle et al. (2006) posit that hope is a cognitive motivational construct that is now seen as a potential psychological strength that may serve as a protective factor for adolescence in the face of adverse life events. People possess both a trait level of hope and specific agency and pathways thoughts about particular goals (Snyder, 2002). Also, hope forms part of a nomological network which includes other expectancy constructs such as self-efficacy, optimism and locus of control (Tennen, Affleck & Tennen, 2002). However, these other constructs are theoretically distinct, whereby self-efficacy is concerned with one's ability to perform a behaviour, one's locus of control with the perception that reinforcement is contingent upon one's behaviour, and optimism with the expectancy that positive outcomes will occur regardless of one's personal actions (Feldman, Rand & Kahle-Wrobleski, 2009). Hope essentially guides an individual to behave so as to attain personal goals; hence it encompasses both planning (pathways) and motivation (agency).

Erickson (1968) identifies the search for identity as the main task of the adolescent, therefore adolescents are actively involved in searching for a life purpose, which in turn is then associated with higher levels of life satisfaction (Bronk et al., 2009). This, however, requires a sense of agency to pursue one's search for identity and most importantly, knowing 'the way' (drawing on both agency and pathways which are core assumptions of the concept of hope), to attaining one's identity (Snyder, 1995). Having identified a purpose for one's life is not only associated with greater life satisfaction, the feeling of confidence that one possesses and the will to progress toward one's ultimate aim, but it is also associated with greater life satisfaction (Bronk et al., 2009).

Bailey et al. (2006) found that hope is a unique predictor of life satisfaction. Individuals who are satisfied with their lives are also hopeful, as indicated by the correlations between life satisfaction and a person's overall hope (Bailey & Snyder, 2007). Similarly, searching for a purpose was only associated with greater life satisfaction, whereby hope mediated the relationship between purpose and life satisfaction (Bronk et al., 2009). A cross sectional study examining the relationship between purpose, hope and life satisfaction found that one’s purpose in life is significantly associated with greater life satisfaction (Bronk et al., 2009). The sample consisted of 153 adolescents, 237 emerging adults and 416 adults, with a total
(N) of 806 participants, utilising The Revised Youth Purpose Survey, the Trait Hope Scale and the Satisfaction with Life Scale. Bronk et al. (2009) found that purpose is linked to SWB, as it involves aspects of both the good life and the meaningful life. The concept of hope has thus been identified as a character strength (Peterson & Seligman, 2004) and represents a focus on significant future aims (Bronk et al., 2009). Hope in essence involves both the will (agency) to pursue certain ends and the way (pathways) to do so effectively (Snyder, Rand & Sigmon, 2005; Bronk et al., 2009). Hence, the belief that individuals have the means of acting successfully is an element of ‘hope’ (Snyder, 1995). One's sense of hope thus facilitates one's commitment to one's purpose over time, despite setbacks and challenges.

Similarly, in a study by Boldridge (2002), hope shows to be a reliable predictor of students’ athletic and academic performance. The Hope Scale thus predicted athletic outcomes beyond natural athletic ability (Boldridge, 2002). Hope has also shown to be a reliable predictor of academic achievement among college-aged students (Boldridge, 2002). Chang (1998) found similar results in a study conducted among 211 students examining interpersonal and life satisfaction in relation to hope. The results (utilizing hierarchical regression analysis) showed that hope was an important predictor of both academic and interpersonal life satisfaction.

A study conducted by Guse and Vermaak (2011) aimed at exploring the prevalence and dynamics of hope and psychosocial well-being across racial groups, among South African adolescents (N =1069). Socio-economic statuses were treated as a moderator in the relationship between hope (using the Children’s Hope Scale) and psychosocial well-being. The prevalence of hope and psychosocial well-being across racial groups was analysed by means of a one-way between groups analysis of variance (ANOVA). The findings indicated that high levels of hope existed among adolescents across racial groups; high levels of psychosocial well-being were experienced by adolescents with no significant effect for race on emotional well-being. A statistically significant relationship exists between hope and psychosocial well-being. A multiple regression analysis indicated that socio-economic status does not moderate the relationship between hope and psychosocial well-being (Guse & Vermaak, 2011).

In a qualitative study, conducted by Isaacs and Savahl (2011), utilising 14 participants aged 14-15 residing in an impoverished community in Cape Town, hope in the context of community violence, was discussed in three themes, namely; the religiosity of hope, the
future and the future of the community. Participants linked hope to values and self-esteem and associated the concept of hope with future-directed behaviour/thinking. In the context of religiosity, hope is viewed as a protective factor (providing resiliency to get through difficult times) and a loss of hope is associated with violence causation, even suicide. However, participants realised that having hope is an important factor, even more so than dwelling on the thought of how bad the community is in terms of violence. Participants also expressed their hopes and dreams for the future with optimism, all of which recognizes education as a gateway out of their current situation. Their exposure to violence thus serves as motivation for them to escape the situation. Also, social support is considered an important factor in the attainment of one’s goals. This study revealed that social support and a person’s sense of hope seemed to be positively correlated and individual hope seemed higher than community hope (Savahl et al., 2013).

The Meaning in Life Questionnaire administered among 731 adult respondents in the United States indicated that the presence of meaning was positively associated with life satisfaction, happiness and positive affect and negatively associated with depression and negative affect (Park, Park & Peterson, 2010). Vacek, Coyle and Vera (2010) found that hope, optimism and self-esteem were significant predictors of subjective well-being among a sample of 137 low-income, urban, ethnic minority adolescents. The sample used was homogenous in terms of socio-economic status and age, thus results are not generalizable to adolescents residing in other areas from a different socio-economic background (Vacek et al., 2010).

Merkaš and Brajša-Žganec (2011) in their study, compared children with different levels of hope, on measures of life satisfaction, self-esteem, family cohesion and social support, among a sample of 298 children aged between 10 and 15 years. Children were placed in either a low- or high-hope group, using a hierarchical cluster analysis on the Children’s Hope Scale scores. Most children in the sample lived with both parents (87%) and about 10% of the children lived in single-parent families. Results revealed that children with high hope were more satisfied with their life and had higher self-esteem when compared to children with low hope. The reason why children with high hope do better than their low hope counterparts brings us back to Snyder’s definition of hope (Snyder, 2002), whereby he holds that high hope children have an advantage in that they find multiple pathways to their goals, as well as the motivation to pursue those goals. Furthermore, children with high hope reported greater support from others with high levels of family cohesion. In this study, hope significantly and positively
relates to life satisfaction, self-esteem, perceived social support and family cohesion (Merkaš & Brajša-Žganec, 2011).

**SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS AND INCOME**

The relationship between SWB and income is a complex one. Although this relationship remains a positive one, it does not necessarily mean that individuals from the highest income levels will in fact report greater levels of SWB (Pavot & Diener, 2013). Diener, Horowitz and Emmons (1985) found that more than one-third of wealthy individuals reported below average SWB. This finding can be attributed to the argument that a rise in income is accompanied by a rise in material living standards (Pavot & Diener, 2013). This proposes that SWB only increases slightly above the average reported SWB, by means of a considerable rise in income, where it will then decrease as income levels further increase. This remains somewhat true to the Easterlin (1974) paradox, which essentially holds that income differences are generally positively correlated with SWB, with little or no corresponding increases in SWB when national income levels increase (Pavot & Diener, 2013). Further evidence suggests that although SWB levels decreases as income levels increase above the average set point, the correlation between income and SWB remains strongest for individuals living in poverty or near-poverty (that is for individuals living on and below the average income level), (Diener, Ng & Tov, 2008).

Since individuals have a tendency to compare themselves to smaller reference groups, the relative rank of an individual's income predicts the individual's general life satisfaction (Boyce, Brown & Moore, 2010). Therefore, individuals will score themselves as more happy to the extent that they perceive themselves as ranking higher in income than others. Thus, money and happiness are assumed to be causally linked, and higher incomes should lead to greater happiness (Boyce et al., 2010). Contrary to these findings, Kahneman and Deaton (2010) posit that high income buys life satisfaction but not happiness and that low income is associated with both low life evaluation and low emotional well-being. Consequently, life satisfaction is more sensitive to socio-economic status, whereas emotional well-being is more sensitive to circumstances that evoke positive and negative emotions. Therefore, income is more strongly related to life satisfaction than to happiness (Kahneman & Deaton, 2010).

When evaluating their lives, people use different judgement standards to do so, some of which may be related to the fulfilment of basic needs which predicts SWB and the other
being better off materially, than their neighbours, friends or co-workers (Diener, 2012). In addition, satisfaction with the standard of living was found to mediate the relationship between income and life satisfaction. Hence, the stronger relationship for the low income group could be attributed to the importance of the fulfilment of basic needs, over learned desires for material goods, (Diener et al., 2010).

The results of a study conducted by Sacks, Stevenson and Wolfers (2010) suggest that measured subjective well-being complements material living standards. It further reveals that richer individuals in a given country are more satisfied with their lives than are poorer individuals, across countries (Sacks et al., 2010). Additional evidence supports these findings in a study conducted by Diener and Biswas-Diener (2002), who found small correlations between income and SWB, with this correlation being larger in poor nations and the risk of unhappiness being greater for poor people.

According to the findings of Diener, Tay and Oishi (2013), a significant relationship between household income and SWB is more likely to occur if optimism, financial satisfaction and household material prosperity accompany rising income. This finding suggests that the relationship between income and SWB is mediated by these factors. Therefore, this relationship is dependent on whether people are optimistic about their futures and satisfied with the improvement of their material conditions. As is evident, the interplay of hope, life satisfaction and income level exerts a great impact on the well-being of people (Bronk et al., 2009).

**SUMMARY OF LITERATURE**

Despite there being much controversy around the concept of SWB and what it constitutes, it is generally accepted that it is a multifaceted construct (Forgeard et al., 2011). As a result of its multifaceted nature, life satisfaction appears to be the more widely used measure of SWB.

Although Camfield et al. (2008) discovered that the increase in material resources does not directly lead to improvements in SWB, many studies found that a higher socio-economic status, more specifically income level, is associated with greater life satisfaction and SWB (Boyce et al., 2010). Hence, this study looks at income level as moderating the relationship between hope and life satisfaction within a South African context, for both low and middle income communities.
Literature indicates a lack in knowledge with reference to child well-being, specifically in various social and cultural contexts. Also there appears to be a lack of large samples and cross national comparisons, which this study will attend to. Literature also points to the importance of child participation with reference to matters which affect them, hence this study uses data obtained from children as the primary informers to their well-being, by means of using two self-report measures namely; the Snyder’s et al. (1997) Children’s Hope Scale and Huebner’s (1991) Student Life Satisfaction Scale. Although Camfield and Skevington (2008) conclude that SWB (as defined by Diener, 2006) and QoL (as defined by WHOQoL, 2005) are synonymous terms, this study will refer to SWB as defined by Huebner (2004), more specifically assessing life satisfaction. Merkaš and Brajša-Žganec (2011) affirm that current literature on hope, lacks studies that address the relationship between hope and positive expectancies, such as life satisfaction.

Many of the studies on hope were conducted internationally with small sample sizes, except for two South African studies, one being a quantitative study exploring the prevalence and dynamics of hope and psychosocial well-being across racial groups, among an adolescent sample (N=1069) and the other being a qualitative study conducted in Cape Town, utilising 14 participants aged 14-15 in assessing hope in the context of community violence. A limitation from a study conducted by Guse and Vermaak (2011) indicated that the sample was not representative of the population, even with a large sample size of 1069 participants, the majority of participants were white, with other racial groups not represented equally, and hence generalizations could not be extended to the larger population of Gauteng nor South Africa. Majority of the participants indicated their socio-economic status as above average with a minority indicating below average socio-economic status. Accordingly, Guse and Vermaak (2011) recommend that future research should incorporate a sample that is demographically representative of the South African population.

Another limitation for a study conducted by Isaacs (2010) indicated a lack of studies focusing on hope and how hope is contextualised in the context of community violence. Hope is thus viewed as a protective factor and positive indicator of well-being, keeping in mind that exposure to community violence places one’s well-being, sense of self and opportunities to play safely, under threat (Savahl et al., 2013).
3P MODEL OF SUBJECTIVE WELL-BEING

Current thinking in literature about children’s development is firmly based on an ecological perspective, whereby we think about children in the context of their families and the communities in which they live (McAuley & Layte, 2012). However, for this study, the 3P Model of SWB was used as a theoretical framework conceptualising this study.

Durayappah (2011) proposes a temporal model of subjective well-being, called the 3P Model. This model draws on existing theories and current research which allows an extensive platform for its comprehensiveness. It proposes that a network of well-being must grow within and through temporal states (past, present and future), in order to sustain and amplify well-being. This model uses time (past, present and future) as the basic component of subjective well-being. Hence our past well-being, present position in life and imagined futures are linked by thought, as encompassed in Snyder’s concept of hope. Durayappah (2011), posits that “the 3P Model evidences the notion that subjective well-being is a temporal component, for we not only desire to pursue happiness (Prospect), but also to experience it (Present), as well as protect our previously acquired happiness (Past)”.

This model shows how objective (hope and socio-economic status) and subjective factors (satisfaction with life) account for the evaluation of subjective well-being. It thus incorporates personal preferences towards components of subjective well-being, as well as temporal preferences, to create individually meaningful well-being, which remains relevant as the individual’s preferences evolve and change. It also includes clear implications for the theoretical definition of adaptation (the shift of events from our cognitive present to our cognitive past) and recommendations for curbing it in order to sustain and even amplify subjective well-being. This model implies that a happy event in one’s life is meaningful, when it is meaningful, not just to our current self, but also has meaning for our past self and future self. Snyder’s concept of hope welcomes this idea whereby he posits that we are individuals with agency eager to reach our goals and that our present and imagined futures are linked by thought (Snyder, 2002). This model also explains how measures of subjective well-being are affected by cognitive biases which factor into evaluations of the temporal states, and meta-biases which factor into global evaluations of life satisfaction. In essence this model maintains that subjective well-being can be evaluated temporally, since human lives
are evaluated in this way, constantly answering, who I was, who I am and who I will be. Hence, children’s evaluations of their lives are not permanent and are subject to change.

Our thoughts about our experiences, whether conscious or not, influence our happiness. Although we live in the present, our thoughts often concern other temporal states (future and past) and the present thoughts alone cannot equate to global evaluations of life satisfaction (Durayappah, 2011). In addition, one form of happiness in the present leads to a greater satisfaction with life over pleasure, in the present. The future component of subjective well-being contains forms of subjective well-being ranging from anticipation, to goals and eventually to purpose whereby commitment to ones goals benefits the individual through personal agency and a sense of structure and meaning to daily life (Diener et al., 1999). Experience measures subjective well-being in the present, evaluation measures subjective well-being in the past and expectation measures subjective well-being in the prospect state (Durayappah, 2011).

This model posits that cognitive biases explain the discrepancy which exists between thoughts of momentary experiences and our past evaluations, as momentary experiences and past evaluations cannot be equated (Durayappah, 2011). These cognitive biases (patterns of errors in judgements occurring in particular situations) are said to exist between all temporal states and thus factor into our evaluations of our subjective well-being (Durayappah, 2011). This model distinguishes between biases occurring between temporal states and meta-biases. Biases occurring between temporal states account for the change in information being transferred, and the manipulation of information which passes between temporal states. People tend to favour a long unpleasant period if the episode in their lives ended on a milder note and this is accounted for by the bias ‘duration neglect’ (Durayappah, 2011). Also, when we evaluate an episode, we tend to rely on how the event ends as well as peak moments in the event, referring to the peak-end rule (Durayappah, 2011). The retrospective impact bias holds that we often predict the future poorly as a result of a tendency to overestimate the impact of past events on our well-being (Durayappah, 2011).

As people, we often predict how we will feel about a particular event without realizing the extent to which we will in fact reconstruct an event, just by doing that. We tend to overestimate the duration of our feelings about negative events, as a result of underestimating our immunity to negative affect which is also known as immune neglect (Durayappah, 2011).
Hence, we often fall prey to a common key bias between our future and our present self, if we think that we will like what we want.

Consequently, when evaluating life satisfaction individuals do so by means of their interpretation of such an event, whether it be that these individuals are guided by their positive or negative affect, and in so doing either evaluating their lives as satisfactory or not. Temporal salience accounts for how one feels at the time of evaluation as our evaluations are affected by the wording of a question and our emotions (Durayappah, 2011). Accordingly, our moods thus facilitate the accessibility of mood-congruent behaviour in re-call; hence positive evaluations of one’s life are a result of one’s positive mood and a recollection of the good aspects of one’s life, at the moment of retrieval.

METHOD

Research design

The current study uses the South African data of the International Survey on Children’s Well-Being Project (Phase One). This project aimed to collect data on children’s lives and daily activities, the manner in which they utilize their time and their perceptions and evaluations of their personal well-being, thereby, hoping to raise awareness of children’s well-being and their life situations, in order to influence government policies and services (ISCWeB, 2010)

The current study focussed on specific areas within the Children’s World’s project, more specifically, on the measurement of two variables namely; hope and life satisfaction, with the manifestation of income level as a moderator variable. This study follows a quantitative methodological framework and uses a cross-sectional, correlation design.

Research participants and sampling

The sampling frame for the study included 12 year old children attending primary schools within the four Education Management District Councils (EMDC’s) of the Western Cape Education Department (WCED) Metropole. A two stage stratified random sampling protocol was followed, ensuring that children from various cultural, income, and geographical groups were selected. In the first stage schools were stratified according to their location within the EMDC’s. Thereafter, schools were stratified by income level (middle or low income) and randomly selected from these strata. While it was envisaged to obtain an equal number of schools from low and middle income communities, the final sample consisted of eight
schools from low income and seven from middle income communities. All the 12 year old children in the schools were selected to participate. A total of 1048 children participated in the study. After the data was cleaned, the damaged and incomplete questionnaires were discarded. The final sample consisted of 1004 participants, as indicated in table one. Of these, 58.6% were from the low income group and 41.4% from the middle income group. Girls comprised 53.9% of the sample, whilst boys comprised 46.1% of the sample.

Table 1:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distribution of participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data collection tools

The original survey instruments developed by the core research group were in English and Spanish. For the purpose of the South African study, the English version of the questionnaire was adapted to the South African context. This process included the cognitive testing, translation into Afrikaans and piloting of the 12 year old questionnaire. The cognitive testing process involved two focus groups with 10 children each. The participants of the focus groups were purposively selected from primary schools within the sampling frame. The responses from the participants of the focus groups assisted in the phrasing, refining and modification of items on the questionnaire. Thereafter, the revised questionnaire was translated in Afrikaans using the backward translation method. Following the translation, both questionnaires (English and Afrikaans) were piloted with a sample of 100 twelve year old children, randomly selected from low and middle income schools, located in the sampling frame. This process focused on gathering pertinent information relating to how the test-takers responded to the stimulus material, the ordering or sequencing of the items, and the length of the questionnaires. Information gathered during the pilot was used to revise and finalise the questionnaires. A number of internationally validated scales were included in the questionnaire. These included the Student Life Satisfaction Scale (Huebner, 1991), the Personal Well-Being Index-School Children (Cummins & Lau, 2005), the single-item scale on Overall Life Satisfaction (Cummins & Lau, 2005), and the Children’s Hope Scale (Snyder et al., 1997). Of these, the CHS and the SLSS are reported on in the current study.
**Children’s Hope Scale (CHS).**

The CHS is a 6-item scale with responses ranging from 1= none of the time, to 6= all of the time (Snyder, 1995; Marque, Pais-Robeiro & Lopez, 2011). This 6-point Likert type self-report measure (Snyder, 1995) is based on Snyder’s Hope Theory (Snyder et al., 1997). Possible scores range from 6 to 36, with high scores denoting higher levels of hope (Marque et al., 2011). This measure was developed and validated for use with children aged 7 to 16 years (Lopez et al., 2000). Three of the items contain questions evaluating ‘pathways thinking’ (e.g. I can think of many ways to get the things in life that are most important to me), as well as, three questions that examine ‘agentic thinking’ (e.g. I am doing just as well as other kids of my age) (Marque et al., 2011). This scale produces the following acceptable psychometric properties; (a) internal consistencies with cronbach alpha’s ranging from 0.72 to 0.86; (b) test-retest reliabilities of 0.71 to 0.73 over one month; and (c) convergent and discriminant validities (Lopez et al., 2009). Also, the CHS reports an overall cronbach alpha of 0.81 for this study sample, which is acceptable.

**Student Life Satisfaction Scale (SLSS).**

The SLSS is a 7-item measure of global life satisfaction (Huebner, Suldo & Valois, 2005). This measure was developed and validated for use with children aged 8-18 (Huebner, 1991). Respondents are asked to answer the questions based on the thoughts they had in the last few weeks (Huebner, 1991) and this requires respondents to rate their satisfaction with respect to items that are domain-free (e.g. My life is better than most kids vs. My family life is better than most kids) (Huebner et al., 2004). Six response choices exist, which are presented as an affirmation (Huebner et al., 2004) and range from 1= strongly disagree to 6= strongly agree (Huebner, 1991). Scores range from 7-42, with the higher scores denoting higher levels of global satisfaction with life (Huebner, 1991). The measure reports an internal consistency of $\alpha=0.82$ and an adequate two-week test-retest reliability of $r = 0.74$, (Huebner, 1991). The SLSS reports a cronbach alpha of 0.60, for this study sample. Field (2009) posits that when psychological constructs are being measured, values of below 0.70 are expected, as a result of the diversity in the construct being measured. Also, the cronbach’s alpha of a scale is related to the number of items on the scale, so a scale with few items is expected to have a lower cronbach value and a scale with many items will have a greater cronbach’s alpha. Construct validity is prevalent in studies showing positive relationships with self-esteem and
positive affect and negative relationships with measures of anxiety, depression and loneliness (Huebner, 1991). The SLSS has also shown good cross cultural adaptation with children aged 8–18, across a range of contexts (see e.g. Casas, Tiliouine, Figure, 2014; Jones, 2011).

**Procedure of data collection**

Permission to conduct the study was obtained from the University of the Western Cape’s (UWC) Research Ethics Committee, and the Western Cape Education Department (WCED) Ethics Committee. Following the ethical clearance, the principals of the selected schools were presented with an information session concerning the study. Once all the selected schools agreed to participate, written informed consent was obtained from the principals of the schools, parents, and learners. Questionnaires were administered in collaboration with the classroom teachers and were read to the participants while they completed the questionnaire. Completed questionnaires were then assigned an identity number, coded according to the school and subsequently captured. Thereafter data was cleaned and screened for accuracy of data entry in preparation for data analysis.

**Data Analysis**

The IBM Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (IBM SPSS v.21) software was used to analyse the data. The Pearson Product-Moment Correlational analysis was used to explore the relationship between variables; hope and life satisfaction, thus addressing hypotheses one and two, as follows:

**Hypothesis 1:** there is no significant relationship between hope and life satisfaction among children in a low income community,

**Hypothesis 2:** there is no significant relationship between hope and life satisfaction among children in a middle income community (Pretorius, 2007).

The Process tool for moderation analysis (referring to the analysis of a third variable which influences the relationship between a dependent and an independent variable), was used to test hypothesis three, namely:

**Hypothesis 3:** The relationship between hope and life satisfaction is not moderated by income level.
This tool is useful in determining the extent to which income level exerts an influence on the relationship between hope and life satisfaction (Field, 2013).

**Ethics statement**

Ethics clearance was obtained for the Children’s World’s: International Survey on Children’s Well Being (2012), as well as, consent obtained from the principal investigator to use the secondary data from the project. Research participants were well informed with respect to the nature and purpose of the study and had to sign a letter of informed consent confirming their participation in the study. The researcher endorsed conduct that is in line with the ethics outlined by the UWC and of the WCED. This ensured that participants were well aware of the following; participants may participate freely and without reasonable risk, participants will be treated with human dignity that is trust, respect and empathy and may withdraw at any time from the research study without prejudice, they will remain anonymous throughout the study and the data that will be collected are kept in a secure location where only key researchers have access.

**RESULTS**

**Significant relationship between hope and life satisfaction in low income communities**

The Pearson Correlation Analysis has been used to determine the relationship between hope and life satisfaction for the low income group, displayed in table three.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Life Satisfaction</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Hope</th>
<th>Pearson Correlation</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Life Satisfaction</td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.479*</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>.479*</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>584</td>
<td>578</td>
<td>Hope</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>578</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .001

The Pearson Correlation coefficient shows a positive, moderate relationship between hope and life satisfaction for the low-income group ($r = .48$). Therefore an increase in one’s level
of hope is associated with a significant increase in one’s satisfaction with life. The null hypothesis is therefore rejected.

**Significant relationship between hope and life satisfaction in middle income communities.**

A Pearson Correlation Analysis has been conducted to determine hypothesis two. Table four displays the relationship between hope and life satisfaction for the middle income group.

Table 4
*Correlation between hope and life satisfaction for middle-income group*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Life Satisfaction</th>
<th>Hope</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.417*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>413</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .001

The Pearson Correlation analysis shows that a positive relationship exists between hope and life satisfaction for the middle-income group (r = .42). Therefore, an increase in one’s level of hope is associated with a significant increase in one’s satisfaction with life. The null hypothesis is therefore rejected.

**Income-level significantly moderates the relationship between hope and life satisfaction**

The Process Tool for Moderation Analysis (Field, 2013) has been used to determine whether income level has a moderating effect on the relationship between hope and life satisfaction (see table five).

Table 5
*Linear model of predictors of Life Satisfaction*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>b</th>
<th>SE B</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>18.50</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>124.58</td>
<td>p &lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[18.21, 18.79]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income (centred)</td>
<td>-1.29</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>-4.46</td>
<td>p &lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[-1.87, -.73]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For this model, hope ($t = 15.58, p < .001$) and income level ($t = -4.46, p < .001$) are both significant predictors of children’s life satisfaction. The interaction between hope and income is significant ($t = -2.48, p < .05$), thus moderation is present. For the low-income group, there is a significant relationship between hope and life satisfaction, $b = .43$, 95% CI $[.36, .49]$, $t = 12.17, p < .001$. At the mean value of income, there is a significant relationship between hope and life satisfaction, $b = .31$, 95% CI $[.25, .37]$, $t = 9.88, p < .001$. Hope and income level account for 22.84% of the variation in Life Satisfaction. The $F$-ratio is 90.05 and is significant at $p < .001$. The model is thus a significant fit to the data. The null hypothesis is therefore rejected. Furthermore, the finding of moderation was followed-up with a simple slopes analysis displayed in figure one.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$b$</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>$t$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hope (centred)</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>[.33, .42]</td>
<td>15.58</td>
<td>$p &lt; .001$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income x Hope</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>[-.21, -.02]</td>
<td>-2.48</td>
<td>$p &lt; .05$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $R^2 = .23$
Figure 1
Simple slopes analysis of the relationship between hope and life satisfaction at two levels of income level

The figure above shows a positive relationship between hope and life satisfaction at both income levels. However, the relationship is significantly stronger for the low income group than for the middle income group. This means that hope has a more pronounced impact on life satisfaction for the low-income group than the middle-income group.

DISCUSSION

Relationship between hope and life satisfaction

The current study found a significant positive relationship between hope and life satisfaction among adolescents in both low and middle income communities in Cape Town. This finding is in line with the results yielded by Gilman and Huebner (2006), as well as with the findings by Park and Peterson (2006), who identified hope as a character strength, being positively associated with life satisfaction.
Adolescent life satisfaction is also linked to stressful life events and psychopathological behaviour, therefore participants reporting a sense of life satisfaction, are better able to mediate and control the impact of stressful life events and to externalise problem behaviour (McKnight, Huebner, & Suldo, 2002). Essentially, having a sense of life satisfaction means having an intrapersonal strength which helps buffer against the development of psychopathology, in the face of increasing stressful life events, as experienced by South African youth.

The majority of participants indicated on the SLSS that they are, generally, satisfied with their lives. This means that they are at minimal risk of experiencing negative outcomes such as, mental and physical health problems (see Frisch, 2000, for a review), and more susceptible to the experience of positive outcomes in their intrapersonal, interpersonal, vocational, health, and educational arenas (Lyubormirsky, King & Diener, 2003). This, according to the 3P model of subjective well-being, indicates a positive recollection of the good aspects of the participants’ lives. Ultimately this means that participants are thus guided by positive affect and so evaluate their lives as satisfactory.

Participants from both low and middle income communities generally seem to experience a high sense of hope. This finding could be attributed to participants perceiving themselves as being able to reach their desired goals and as a result, are not at risk for negative psychological outcomes, caused by repeated goal blockages and unsuccessful attempts, which might exacerbate the symptoms for depression (Snyder, 1994). Their account of their sense of hope is associated with a level of personal control (Norwicki & Strickland, 1973). Huebner (1991) therefore suggests that internal locus of control is among the strongest correlates of life satisfaction, between children aged 10 to 13. Accordingly, the two core aspects measured by the CHS are successful agency and pathways, thus placing the emphasis on the child to direct his or her life. These aspects are vital in the learning of school information which is facilitated by children’s capacities to form goals and to use pathways effectively, in order to pursue those goals.

Twelve year old children are starting out to develop the capacity for abstract, scientific thinking and are able to think about possible occurrences, thus, with reference to the concept of hope, participants are able to think of alternative solutions to their problems and are able to hypothesize about the possible factors that may affect the outcome (Louw & Louw, 2007). It
is of note that participants’ hope is strongest during the transition to formal operational thinking, as they imagine that their unique personal destiny will lead to the fulfilment of their dreams (Louw & Louw, 2007). Generally, 12 year olds are better able to monitor their progress towards a goal and at redirecting actions that prove unsuccessful (Louw & Louw, 2007). This type of thinking gradually declines as abstract reasoning becomes better established, hence, should this study be conducted among 13 to 18 year old children, this would most probably display a variation in their sense of hope (Louw & Louw, 2007). Notwithstanding, children should be encouraged to have a sense of hope, to have a goal together with possible ways of attaining those goals, as this will help them to achieve a sense of life satisfaction (Bronk et al., 2009). Furthermore, it is important to note that the baseline for life satisfaction among children and youth whose basic needs (e.g. food, clothing, shelter) are met, is generally positive (Gilman & Huebner, 2006).

Considering the age of the participants, brings forth the question of whether their indication of hope, is as a result of the experience of naïve hope, or whether it is as a result of realistic hope; naïve hope being based on wishful thinking and realistic hope being based on trust that comes from evidence and experience (Chappell, 2013). This invites the question: How much exposure to evidence and experience, a 12 year old has gained? Although their sense of hope appears to be heightened during this stage, many would argue that this sense of hope is largely a form of naïve hope, rather than realistic hope (Chappell, 2013). Moreover, it is said that this type of hope gives children an illusion of joy, rather than improving their perspective in a way that gives them a more positive attitude (Chappell, 2013). Only with maturation will children’s perspectives improve. Therefore, naïve hope appears to be the form of hope that an average 12 year old would experience. Furthermore, participant’s sense of hope can also be attributed to a slight positive self-bias which is adaptive for children (Snyder, 2003) and is also accounted for by the 3P Model of Subjective Well-being. This model posits that biases factor into the evaluations we make of our lives, thereby reconstructing events in our favour after they have occurred (Durayappah, 2011).

Results of this study indicate that participants of both low and middle income communities generally seem to have a sense of hope. This implies that these participants are likely to experience optimal human development in a variety of ways (Bronk et al., 2009), that they are psychologically healthier than their peers (Shek, 1993), they are equipped in overcoming life’s challenges, enabled to endure life’s hardships and better able to navigate and resolve
their identity crises (Erickson, 1968). Having a sense of hope is indicative of having a meaningful life, it reflects SWB and represents a focus on significant future aims. Therefore, having a sense of hope, implies that participants perceive themselves as having the will to act effectively, in producing workable plans to reach their goals (Bronk et al., 2009). Furthermore, participants’ sense of hope not only shows their will to pursue a goal, but more importantly that they know the way of doing so, thus having a sense of agency. Further evidence has also been provided for the association between hope, life satisfaction, and financial circumstances (Dolan et al., 2008; Proctor et al., 2009, as cited in Lavy & Littman-Ovadia, 2011.

**Income level as a moderator in the relationship between hope and life satisfaction**

The current study found that the relationship between hope and life satisfaction appears to be stronger for the low-income group than what it is for the middle-income group. One would expect that children from middle-income communities have a stronger sense of life satisfaction and hope than their lower income counterparts. This finding is unexpected, especially considering evidence from Peiró (2006) and Heady et al. (2008), who found that life satisfaction was strongly, positively correlated with standards of living and financial life satisfaction. Their findings suggest that individuals belonging to a higher income group will be more satisfied with their lives and experience a greater sense of hope, than their lower income counterparts.

The findings of this study indicate that income level does in fact moderate the relationship between hope and life satisfaction. The impact of income level, more specifically with reference to the availability of resources, is regarded as a significant role player in participants’ pursuit of their goals and may have an impact on their hope and life satisfaction (Merkaš & Brajša-Žganec, 2011). In contrast, Snyder (1994) found that family income was not related to scores on the CHS. This can also be attributed to children receiving the necessary, yet sufficient, care and attention from their caregivers, thus elevating their levels of hope. This explains the finding of non-significant differences between low and middle income communities with regards to hope.

Forgeard et al. (2011) assert that life satisfaction judgements depend on the standards these participants have set for themselves, hence participants with similar objective circumstances may judge their lives to be more or less satisfying. This is evident in the current study, as
participants were approached in a setting surrounded by others who live in the same circumstance as them. For this reason they did not evaluate their lives in relation to other participants who live in different or better circumstances. Furthermore, van Praag (2011) argues that well-being varies according to the reference group, person or social type, individuals happen to compare themselves to. Hence, comparisons to reference groups affect the feelings of an individual’s SWB (Van Praag, 2011), this will of course result in greater variance, of which in the current study, there seem to be very little variation.

The impact of income level on one's SWB seems to be influenced by the degree to which persons prize material goals over values (Diener & Biswas-Diener, 2002). SWB may be enhanced with more money if it relieves poverty; on the other hand SWB increases minimally for the more affluent individuals whose material desires increase with their income (Diener & Biswas-Diener, 2002). Essentially, income level only enhances SWB insofar as it helps people meet their basic needs (Diener & Biswas-Diener, 2002). It may be that participants from low-income communities see their basic needs as being met, therefore explaining why there are no significant differences between low and middle income communities’ sense of hope and their satisfaction with life.

Ultimately, if the primary caregiver has enough time and energy to foster participants’ hopeful thinking, then family income may not have a major impact upon hope. Although participants living in low income communities do not have enough money available for their care-taking, they may receive the needed love, attention and nurturance, sufficient enough to foster their sense of hope, as opposed to children raised in middle income communities who may lack this, as a result of their caregivers/parents being personally unavailable to them, due to being engrossed in work activities (Snyder, 1994).

Furthermore, results by Bjarnson et al. (2012), show that children who live in less fortunate economic circumstances, are more likely to be less satisfied with their lives. Similarly, findings by Kahneman and Deaton (2010) showed strong correlates between life satisfaction and socio-economic status, thus inferring that high-income is associated with a greater sense of life satisfaction and that low income is associated with low life satisfaction (Sacks et al., 2010), as well as, low emotional well-being. In contrast to these findings, Huebner et al. (2004) found that socio-economic status is not among the strongest correlates with life satisfaction. Surprisingly, the findings of this study indicate that the relationship between
hope and life satisfaction is stronger for participants from low-income communities, in comparison to that of participants living in more fortunate (middle-income communities) economic circumstances.

Although the financial circumstances pose a great challenge to participants living in low income communities (often characterised by poverty, crime and violence and limited resource), the psychological character strength of hope (Valle et al., 2006), may serve as a protective factor for participants, in the face of adversity. This explains why the relationship between hope and life satisfaction, is stronger for the low income group in comparison to that of the middle income group, as participants from the low income group are more susceptible to exposure of adversity, such as violence in the community, than participants belonging to the middle income group. The stronger relationship between hope and life satisfaction, among the low income group can be attributed to participants having a purpose in life. Hence, having a purpose in life, is associated with higher levels of life satisfaction (Erickson, 1968) and requires a sense of agency and pathways (which are core elements embedded in the construct of hope). Therefore, it is this purpose to change many things in their lives that in turn, elevates their sense of life satisfaction (Bronk et al., 2009). This may imply that subjective indicators of hope are more likely to play a critical role in participants’ assessment of their life satisfaction, than the objective indicator of income level (Van Praag, 2011). Moreover, income predicts SWB only if it is related to children’s goals.

3P Model of Subjective Well-Being

Diener and Chang (2011) suggest that people’s evaluations of their lives are mood congruent and time bound, and so their evaluations reflect the state they were in, when evaluating their lives. Hence, the essence of SWB reflects a deep, often positive mood. This means that a positive or negative evaluation is the result of a positive or negative mood that participants may have experienced, at the time they were asked to evaluate their lives. Durayappah (2011) supports this notion by asserting that experience measures subjective well-being in the present. The 3P model of SWB hereby suggests that individuals’ evaluations of their lives are contaminated by mood (Durayappah, 2011), as participants may often use how good they feel at the moment they were asked, as the basis for the judgements they are making about their lives (Forgeard et al., 2011). The immediate context of participants also plays a role in the answers constructed to life satisfaction questions. Since data was collected in schools and
participants were mainly in grade seven, this serves as an indicator of their achievements and the possibility of moving on to secondary level education. Hence, this context is associated with a sense of life satisfaction and hope, as it is generally perceived as a safe environment and one in which you work towards a better future.

The collective view of the three states of time: past, present and the future, jointly results in a global evaluation of SWB. Therefore, life satisfaction being an indicator of SWB, reflects participants’ evaluations of their lives across these temporal states. It is said that a happy event in one’s life is only meaningful if it carries meaning not only to the present self, but also to the past and future self (Durayappah, 2011). What seems to be more prominent in the present is participants’ awareness of their moods and emotions (affect), which may be positive or negative, in essence, how children feel at the present moment in their lives. This state reflects children’s momentary experience in the present, e.g. how they feel at the present moment in time (Durayappah, 2011). Evaluations of the past are made from the perspective of our remembering self, thus reflecting participants’ thoughts and feelings about their past (Durayappah, 2011). Hence, positive reminiscing about the past as well as a sense of gratitude, essentially contributes to children’s life satisfaction. Much emphasis is placed on how children remember themselves, their lives, whether it be positive or negative. The future component of the 3P Model of SWB gives an indication of children’s goals and anticipation towards the achievement of those goals, thereby predicting SWB and as such, representing a sense of structure and meaning to daily life (Durayappah, 2011).

Hence, the significant findings may be attributed to participants spending more time in the good states and less time in the bad states, giving rise to a higher probability of positive evaluations of their lives and a good sense of hope (Durayappah, 2011). Essentially this means that an increase in one’s level of hope is associated with a significant increase in one’s satisfaction with life. Moreover, this evaluation can be accounted for by cognitive biases which exert an influence on how participants evaluate their lives in the present moment, which are not equated for by past evaluations (Durayappah, 2011). This model holds that participants are constantly reconstructing the recall of events in their favour, hence during evaluations, participants may rely on judgements that are favourable to them (Durayappah, 2011). Evaluations about the future may be predicted poorly as a result of overestimating the impact of past events on their well-being (retrospective impact bias) (Durayappah, 2011). Furthermore, moods may influence the accessibility of mood congruent information in recall.
This means that positive evaluations are as a result of thinking about one’s life while being in a positive mood, thus selectively retrieving good aspects of one’s life (Durayappah, 2011).

This would explain the positive, significant association between hope and life satisfaction among participants in both low and middle income communities in Cape Town. Furthermore, the concept of SWB reflects participants’ affective (formed by negative and positive emotions) and cognitive evaluations (embedded in life satisfaction) of their lives (Huebner et al., 2004). Hence, participants’ positive evaluations of their lives lead to higher levels of physical health, greater use of positive coping strategies and a greater internal locus of control (Caprara et al., 2010).

**Summary of findings**

The positive association between hope and life satisfaction implies that children are experiencing positive outcomes in various arenas of their lives and that they are better able to control the impact of stressful life events. It is also important to note that children of this age are generally regarded as having a heightened sense of hope and a positive sense of life satisfaction. This is motivated in terms of where children find themselves cognitively, naturally progressing and experiencing optimal human development, without the differentiation between children from low income communities and those from middle income communities. Although income level moderates the relationship between hope and life satisfaction, hope, in essence, seems to have a more pronounced impact on children’s life satisfaction.

Moreover, children’s search towards their identity is one that involves the feeling of a sense of personal control, hope and life satisfaction. This implies that children are successfully able to resolve their identity crises, while at the same time experiencing psychological health and in turn, SWB. Essentially, children perceive themselves as doing well, keeping in mind the level of naivety associated with their age. The 3P model of SWB thus holds that children generally spend more time in the good states therefore; their evaluations are more likely to be positive, as it reflects their mood congruence, at the time of evaluations (Durayappah, 2011). Furthermore, this model postulates that one draws on how one generally feels when evaluating one’s life. This means that one focuses on the frequency of positive affects in relation to negative affects when assessing how one generally feels. The combination of momentary emotions alongside cognitive assessments of how life is going in general, serves
to indicate one’s SWB (Forgeard et al., 2011). It is important to note that biases may creep in during evaluations causing participants to make use of simple rules in order to make quick decisions regarding their SWB and as a result, not taking all factors into consideration (Durayappah, 2011).

The good life, also known as SWB, allows participants to connect temporal states of the past, present and future, thus allowing for the transference of satisfaction across states. Through this, participants are taught to connect their thoughts across these temporal states and to focus on one temporal state, if necessary. Subsequently, this would be the present state. Participants thus learn how to control their evaluation to the extent where the evaluation does not get in the way of experiencing an event. Ultimately, the 3P Model of SWB recognizes the importance of adaption in the sustainability of subjective well-being (Durayappah, 2011). In addition, this model holds that even though income strongly affects people’s lives, it only has a long term effect on SWB, as this variable is not a stable or continuous component of SWB and does not increase pleasure across all temporal states (Durayappah, 2011).

Literature indicates that most of the studies on hope and life satisfaction were conducted on either adults or college students in American samples. Therefore, it is evident that a dearth of knowledge exists for child specific data with reference to hope and life satisfaction, among a South African sample. The findings of this study indicated that there is a positive, significant relationship between hope and life satisfaction among children in both low and middle income communities and that this relationship is thus moderated by income level. Furthermore, the relationship between hope and life satisfaction is stronger for the low income group, in comparison to that of the middle income group. Hence, the three null hypotheses have been rejected. It is important to note that children of this particular age, generally experience a sense of life satisfaction, as well as a heightened sense of hope, as a result of the phase of cognitive development they find themselves in for this specific age. Although many may expect income level to exert a greater impact on children’s life satisfaction, hope essentially seems to have a greater impact than income level, on children’s sense of satisfaction with their lives.

Finally, hope should be fostered in children as it enables human survival in the midst of adversity. Hope, ultimately feels good, which in turn encourages the behaviour needed for
our survival, as well as increasing one’s sense of life satisfaction. This, in turn, is associated with a greater sense of SWB thus indicating children’s psychological health, as well as their SWB. The experience of SWB is associated with positive social relationships, health and longevity (Diener & Ryan, 2009), and appears to enhance one’s social interaction (Fredrickson, 2001).

Limitations

The study is restricted in its generalizability, as the sample was composed of participants from only one age group, thus data is not comparable across age groups. Moreover, the cross-sectional design of this study only provides a snapshot of participant’s well-being at the present time and as such, should a longitudinal study be conducted there might be a variation in the results. Also, another limiting factor is that participants were sampled from one provincial region, thereby limiting generalizability.

Considering hope as a predictor of both academic and life satisfaction (Chang, 1998), the results of this study may have been biased, as a result of having done this evaluation in a classroom setting, which is generally associated with growth and hope toward a brighter future. Also, a limitation of having used self-report measures is that they provide the opportunity for participants to represent themselves in a socially desirable way. Hence, participants’ responses to the scales might not be a true reflection of their SWB. Furthermore, having participants approach the transitioning phase from grade seven to grade eight, may have rendered participants to report a greater sense of life satisfaction than what they are actually experiencing. The SLSS provides an overall account of one’s life satisfaction and so it does not provide insight into life satisfaction across various domains (such as satisfaction with family, friends and school) that are of interest to children and youth (Huebner & Gilman, 2003).

Recommendations

In order to obtain a more differentiated picture of the well-being of children, a multidimensional measure would be useful in assessing life satisfaction across multiple domains of interest to children (Huebner & Gilman, 2003). It is evident from the literature, that there is a conspicuous lack of research investigating the relationship between hope and life satisfaction among adolescents within the South African context. Hence, future research
in this field is required. This kind of research should be conducted on a sample that is representative across age groups, across cities, as well as, income level.

Future research may benefit from establishing the parameters, on what would be classified as a low-income or middle-income community, within the South African context. Once these parameters has been established, including participants from not only low and middle income communities, but also high-income communities, will allow for a greater comparative analysis.

Due to the diversified South African population, future research could also benefit from gaining an understanding of the meaning of SWB in various cultures. As such, future studies should focus on an in-depth exploration of both constructs (hope and life satisfaction), across age groups. Normative data should be collected for the CHS, therefore allowing to differentiate between normal, low and high hope for children. Moreover, qualitative research would add richer data on children’s perceptions of their well-being, in collaboration with the already existing quantitative data.

Also, the application of SWB as social indicators of national well-being, would be valuable to future research (Pavot & Diener, 2013), thereby proposing that a study such as this, be conducted on a national scale. In addition to this, Pavot and Diener (2013) also propose that cross-sectional studies should be replaced by longitudinal research that specifically measures affective and cognitive aspects of SWB, reciprocally.
REFERENCES


Boldridge, E. A. (2002). The role of hope in the academic and sport achievements of division I college football players. Submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts in Clinical Psychology.


APPENDIX A: PERMISSION LETTER

UNIVERSITY of the WESTERN CAPE

DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY
Private Bag X 17, Bellville 7535, South Africa, Telephone: (021) 959-2842
Fax: (021) 959-3515 Telex: 52 6661

Chair
CHD

Dear Professor Frantz

Permission: Claudia Raats

02/04/2013

Ms Raats is a registered student in the M.A Research Psychology programme. She has submitted her proposal in fulfillment of the mini-thesis component of the degree. Her thesis forms part of a larger registered UWC project entitled “The influence of hope on children’s perceptions of well-being”.

As the principal investigator I hereby give permission for her to submit her research as a subproject of the larger registered project.

For additional information please contact me at any of the above numbers.

Regards

S. Savahl
Principal Investigator
Supervisor
Department of Psychology
University of the Western Cape
APPENDIX B: ETHICAL CLEARANCE

OFFICE OF THE DEAN
DEPARTMENT OF RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT

UNIVERSITY of the WESTERN CAPE

28 March 2013

To Whom It May Concern

I hereby certify that the Senate Research Committee of the University of the Western Cape has approved the methodology and ethics of the following research project by:
Dr S Savahl (Psychology)


Registration no: 09/2/19

Any amendments, extension or other modifications to the protocol must be submitted to the Ethics Committee for approval.

The Committee must be informed of any serious adverse event and/or termination of the study.

Ms Patricia Josias
Research Ethics Committee Officer
University of the Western Cape
APPENDIX C: CONSENT FROM WESTERN CAPE GOVERNMENT

Directorate: Research

Audrey.wyngaard2@pgwc.gov.za
Tel: +27 021 467 9272
Fax: 0865902282
Private Bag x9114, Cape Town, 8000
wced.wcape.gov.za

REFERENCE: 20120724-0056
ENQUIRIES: Dr A T Wyngaard

Dr Shazly Savahl
Department of Psychology
Faculty of Community and Health Sciences
UWC

Dear Dr Shazly Savahl

RESEARCH PROPOSAL: CHILDREN'S WORDS: INTERNATIONAL SURVEY ON CHILDREN'S WELL-BEING

Your application to conduct the above-mentioned research in schools in the Western Cape has been approved subject to the following conditions:

1. Principals, educators and learners are under no obligation to assist you in your investigation.
2. Principals, educators, learners and schools should not be identifiable in any way from the results of the investigation.
3. You make all the arrangements concerning your investigation.
4. Approval for projects should be conveyed to the District Director of the schools where the project will be conducted.
5. Educators’ programmes are not to be interrupted.
6. The Study is to be conducted from **20 July 2012 till 28 September 2012**
7. No research can be conducted during the fourth term as schools are preparing and finalizing syllabi for examinations (October to December).
8. Should you wish to extend the period of your survey, please contact Dr A.T Wyngaard at the contact numbers above quoting the reference number?
9. A photocopy of this letter is submitted to the principal where the intended research is to be conducted.
10. Your research will be limited to the list of schools as forwarded to the Western Cape Education Department.
11. A brief summary of the content, findings and recommendations is provided to the Director: Research Services.
12. The Department receives a copy of the completed report/dissertation/thesis addressed to:

   **The Director: Research Services**
   Western Cape Education Department
   Private Bag X9114
   CAPE TOWN
   8000

We wish you success in your research.

Kind regards.
Signed: Dr Audrey T Wyngaard
for: **HEAD: EDUCATION**
DATE: 24 July 2012
CONSENT FORM

Dear Parent/Guardian,

Title of Research Project: Children's Worlds: International Survey on Children's Well-Being
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If the questionnaire or any part of this process results in any emotional discomfort counselling will be arranged by the researcher without cost.

The study has been described to me in a language that I understand and I freely and voluntarily agree to participate. My questions about the study have been answered. I understand that my identity (name) will not be disclosed and that I may withdraw from the study without giving a reason at any time and this will not negatively affect me in any way.
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ASSENT FORM

Dear Learner,

Title of Research Project: Children's Worlds: International Survey on Children's Well-Being

The Department of Psychology at the University of the Western Cape is conducting a research study on children's well-being. The study is entitled ‘Children’s Worlds’ and is being conducted in collaboration with various Universities from Europe and South America. If you agree to participate, you will be asked to complete a survey consisting of questions about different aspects of your well-being. This survey contains no right or wrong answers and should not take you longer than 30 minutes to complete. You will be anonymous, which means that no-one will know your name or your answers on the survey. Only the primary researchers will have access to the surveys which will be kept in a secure location. You have the option of withdrawing from the study at any time. The research process is guided by strict ethical considerations of the University of the Western Cape and the Western Cape Education Department and will be adhered to at all times. Your participation in this research is completely voluntary, therefore you can stop participating at any time without negative consequence.

If the questionnaire or any part of this process results in any emotional discomfort counselling will be arranged by the researcher without cost.

The study has been described to me in a language that I understand and I freely and voluntarily agree to participate. My questions about the study have been answered. I understand that my identity (name) will not be disclosed and that I may withdraw from the study without giving a reason at any time and this will not negatively affect me in any way.

Participant’s signature…………………… Date……………………

Should you have any further queries regarding this study or wish to report any problems you have experienced related to the study, please feel free to contact the study co-ordinator, Dr. Shazly Savahl:

Study Coordinator’s Name: Dr Shazly Savahl
University of the Western Cape
Telephone: (021) 959-2826
Email: ssavahl@uwc.ac.za
APPENDIX E: QUESTIONNAIRE

Hello,

We are a group of researchers at the University of the Western Cape interested in knowing the opinions of young people of your age.

We would be very grateful if you would answer this questionnaire for us. It is ANONYMOUS, in other words, no one will know your answers.

There are no right or wrong answers, we are only interested in knowing your choices, opinions and feelings.

For each question, please choose the option that best describes your personal situation or position.

Name of school: __________________________________________

Town: __________

Today’s date: ...../....../2012
1. I am ____ years old.

2. I am a: Boy □  Girl □

3. I live in the town or city of:

.........................................................................................................................................................

4. I was born in this country: Yes □  No □

(If “no”, name of the country: .................................................................)
Your home and the people you live with

5. Where I live.

I live with my mother and father
Sometimes I live with my mother and sometimes I live with my father
I live only with my mother
I live only with my father
I live with my grandparent/s
I live with my uncle or aunt
I live with other family
I live in a foster home
I live in a children’s home

6. How much do you agree or disagree with each of these sentences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very much disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither disagree nor agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Very much agree</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I feel safe at home</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have a quiet place to study at home</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My parents (or the people who look after me) listen to me and take note of what I say</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When my family is together we have a good time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My parents (or the people who look after me) treat me fairly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. How satisfied are you with each of the following things in your life?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>0 = Completely dissatisfied</th>
<th>5 = Neither dissatisfied nor satisfied</th>
<th>Completely satisfied = 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The house or flat where you live?</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The people who live with you?</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All the other people in your family?</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your family life?</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. How often in the past week have you spent time doing the following things with your family?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Once or twice</th>
<th>Most days</th>
<th>Every day</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Talking together</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having fun together</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning together</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Money and things you have

9. How often do you get pocket money?

- I don’t get pocket money □
- I get pocket money, but not regularly □
- I get pocket money every week □
- I get pocket money every month □
- Don’t know □

10. Which of the following things do or don’t you have?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• School clothes in good condition □ □ □</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A computer to use at home □ □ □</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Access to Internet □ □ □</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A cell phone □ □ □</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. How satisfied are you with all the things you have?

0 = Completely dissatisfied 5 = Neither dissatisfied nor satisfied 10 = Completely satisfied

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

12. How often do you worry about how much money your family has?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. How many adults that you live with have a job and earn money?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>None</th>
<th>One</th>
<th>Two</th>
<th>More than 2</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Your friends and other people

14. How much do you agree or disagree with each of these sentences?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Very much disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither disagree nor agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Very much agree</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My friends are usually nice to me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have enough friends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. How satisfied are you with each of the following things in your life?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>0 = Completely dissatisfied</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Your friends?</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>The people who live in your area?</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>Your relationships with people?</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>
</tbody>
</table>

16. How often in the past week have you spent time doing the following things with your friends? (Not at school)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Once or twice</th>
<th>Most days</th>
<th>Every day</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Talking together</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having fun together</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting to study (Not at school)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### The area where you live

17. How much do you agree or disagree with each of these sentences?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very much disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither disagree nor agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Very much agree</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The city council asks young people their opinion about things that are important to them</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In my area there are enough places to play or to have a good time</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel safe when I walk around in the area I live in</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. How satisfied are you with each of the following things about the area where you live?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0 = Completely dissatisfied</th>
<th>5 = Neither dissatisfied nor satisfied</th>
<th>Completely satisfied = 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The police in your area?</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How you are treated when you go to the doctor?</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The outdoor areas children can use in your area?</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The area where you live?</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
19. How much do you agree or disagree with each of these sentences?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sentence</th>
<th>Very much disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither disagree nor agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Very much agree</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My teachers listen to me and take note of what I say</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like going to school</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My teachers treat me fairly</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel safe at school</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20. How often in the last month have you been?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Once</th>
<th>2-3 times</th>
<th>More than 3 times</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hit by other children in your school?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felt like you have been left out by other children in your class?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21. How satisfied are you with each of the following things in your life?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>0 = Completely dissatisfied</th>
<th>5 = Neither dissatisfied nor satisfied</th>
<th>Completely satisfied = 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The school you go to?</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other children in your class?</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your school marks?</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your school experience?</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## How you use your time

22. How often do you usually spend time doing the following activities when you are not at school?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Rarely or never</th>
<th>Less than once a week</th>
<th>Once or twice a week</th>
<th>Everyday or almost everyday</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Taking lessons that are different than at school (like music, sports, dancing, languages, religious instruction)</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participating in leisure/sports activities (like sports clubs, youth movement, scouts)</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanging out with friends</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading for fun (not homework)</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping with housework</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doing homework</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watching TV or movies, or listening to music</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playing sports on a team</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playing sports or doing exercise (but not on a team!)</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using a computer</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spending time by myself</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taking care of brothers or sisters or other family members</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
More about you

23. How satisfied are you with each of the following things in your life?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How you use your time?</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>The freedom you have?</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>The amount of choice you have in your life?</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>Your health?</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>The way that you look?</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>Yourself?</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>What you do in your free time?</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>How you are listened to by adults?</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>Your self-confidence?</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>Your life as a whole?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

24. In the past year, ....

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>...have you moved house?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...have you moved into a different neighbourhood?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...have you changed schools?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...have you lived in another country for more than a month?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
25. Are you living with the same parents or carers you used to live one year ago?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How you feel about yourself

26. In the last month, how many days did you miss school because you felt sick?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Never</th>
<th>1-2 days</th>
<th>3-5 days</th>
<th>6-10 days</th>
<th>More than 10 days</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

27. How much do you agree or disagree with each of these sentences?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I worry about things a lot</th>
<th>Very much disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither disagree nor agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Very much agree</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I feel lonely</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I feel positive about my future</th>
<th>Very much disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither disagree nor agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Very much agree</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I am allowed to be outside my home without adults</th>
<th>Very much disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither disagree nor agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Very much agree</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

28. How satisfied are you with each of the following things in your life?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>About how safe you feel?</th>
<th>0 = Completely dissatisfied</th>
<th>5 = Neither dissatisfied nor satisfied</th>
<th>Completely satisfied = 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 1 2 3</td>
<td>4 5 6</td>
<td>7 8 9 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With the things you want to be good at?</td>
<td>0 1 2 3</td>
<td>4 5 6</td>
<td>7 8 9 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About doing things away from your home?</td>
<td>0 1 2 3</td>
<td>4 5 6</td>
<td>7 8 9 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About what may happen to you in the future?</td>
<td>0 1 2 3</td>
<td>4 5 6</td>
<td>7 8 9 10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
29. Overall, how happy have you been feeling during the last two weeks?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0 = Extremely unhappy</th>
<th>5 = Neither unhappy nor happy</th>
<th>Extremely happy = 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
30. Please tell us how much you agree or disagree with each of the following sentences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sentence</th>
<th>Very much disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither disagree nor agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Very much agree</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My life is going well</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My life is just right</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would like to change many things in my life</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I wish I had a different kind of life</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have a good life</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have what I want in life</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My life is better than most young people my age</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

31. Please answer the following questions about children’s rights

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I know what rights children have</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have heard about the children’s rights convention</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think in my country, adults respect children’s rights</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

32. Imagine you are 21: at this age how much do you think you would like other people to appreciate the following qualities about you

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality</th>
<th>0 = Not at all</th>
<th>Very much = 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hope</th>
<th>Environment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Please tell us how you feel about the following.</td>
<td>Please tell us how much you agree or disagree with the following sentences.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Hope

1. I think I am doing very well.
2. I can think of many ways to get the things in life that are most important to me.
3. I am doing just as well as other children my age.
4. When I have a problem, I can come up with lots of ways to solve it.
5. I think the things I have done in the past will help me in the future.
6. Even when others want to quit, I know that I can find ways to solve the problem.

### Environment

1. Plants and animals have as much right as people to live.
2. There are too many (or almost too many) people on earth.
3. People are clever enough to keep from ruining the earth.
4. People must still obey the laws of nature.

| Your friendliness | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
| Your relationships with people | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Your money | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
| Your power | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
| Your family | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
| Your personality | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
| Your kindness | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
| Your image | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
5. When people mess with nature it has bad results.  
6.* Nature is strong enough to handle the bad effects of the way we live.  
7.* People are supposed to rule over the rest of nature.  
8. People are treating nature badly.  
9.* People will someday know enough about how nature works to be able to control it.  
10. If things don’t change, we will have a big disaster in the environment soon.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sentences</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. When people mess with nature it has bad results.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.* Nature is strong enough to handle the bad effects of the way we live.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.* People are supposed to rule over the rest of nature.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. People are treating nature badly.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.* People will someday know enough about how nature works to be able to control it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. If things don’t change, we will have a big disaster in the environment soon.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Finally

We are currently testing this questionnaire and we would be interested in hearing your opinions to help us improve it.

33. Please tell us whether you agree or disagree with the following sentences about the questionnaire.

- The questionnaire is too long:  
  - Agree: ☐  
  - Don’t know: ☐  
  - Disagree: ☐

- The questionnaire is easy to fill out:  
  - Agree: ☐  
  - Don’t know: ☐  
  - Disagree: ☐

- The questionnaire is boring:  
  - Agree: ☐  
  - Don’t know: ☐  
  - Disagree: ☐

- In the questionnaire I am asked things that I think are important:  
  - Agree: ☐  
  - Don’t know: ☐  
  - Disagree: ☐

Thank you for your participation.

Have a great day!