Spring 2022

The Eschatological Hope Scale: Construct Development and Measurement of Theistic Eschatological Hope

Charlotte vanOyen-Witvliet
Hope College, witvliet@hope.edu

M. Elizabeth Lewis Hall
Biola University

Julie J. Exline
Case Western Reserve University

David C. Wang
Biola University

Lindsey M. Root Luna
Hope College, rootluna@hope.edu

See next page for additional authors

Recommended Citation

Witvliet, C. V. O., Hall, M. E. L., Exline, J., Wang, D. C., Root Luna, L M., Van Tongeren, D. R., Myers, D. G., Abernethy, A. D. & Witvliet, J. D. (2022). The Eschatological Hope Scale: Construct development and measurement of theistic eschatological hope. Journal of Psychology and Christianity, 41(1), 16-35.

Journal of Psychology and Christianity
2022, Vol. 41, No.1, 16-35

ISSN 0733-4273

The Eschatological Hope Scale: Construct Development and Measurement of Theistic Eschatological Hope

Charlotte V.O. Witvliet[1], M. Elizabeth Lewis Hall[2], Julie J. Exline[3], David C. Wang[2], Lindsey M. Root Luna[1], Daryl R. Van Tongeren[1], David G. Myers[1], Alexis D. Abernethy[4], and John D. Witvliet[5]

[1]Psychology Department, Hope College
[2]Rosemead School of Psychology, Biola University
[3]Department of Psychological Sciences, Case Western Reserve University
[4]School of Psychology & Marriage and Family Therapy, Fuller Theological Seminary
[5]Calvin Institute of Christian Worship, Calvin University; Calvin Theological Seminary

Nicholas DiFonzo served as Action Editor.

This study aimed to expand psychological research on hope by contributing a construct and scale to measure central dimensions of theistic eschatological hope derived from Christian scriptures. Eschatological hope was conceptualized as the anticipation that God will make all things new, raising people to everlasting life with God in joyful celebration, including people from every culture and nation, ending all personal pain and suffering, eliminating all societal evil and harm, and bringing reconciliation and healing to all of creation. We developed the Eschatological Hope Scale with three studies (N = 1,466). Exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses supported the single-factor structure of a 6-item scale with excellent internal consistency (Cronbach's $\alpha > .91$) and good test-retest reliability. The Eschatological Hope Scale evidenced construct validity, showing significant non-redundant correlations with measures of temporal hope, religiosity, and spirituality. The Eschatological Hope Scale scores positively correlated with gratitude, forgivingness, and life hardship patience. Scores inversely correlated with depressed and anxious symptoms, negative religious coping, and negative attitudes toward God. Scores were not significantly correlated with extrinsic religiosity and searching for meaning. The Eschatological Hope Scale demonstrated incremental validity beyond other variables (hope and optimism, depression and anxiety, and religiosity) to predict three target variables: perceived presence of meaning in life, ultimate meaning, and flourishing. We offer the Eschatological Hope Scale as a gateway scale to catalyze further developments in measuring eschatological hope. We hope this work will facilitate research on the experience of living with ultimate hope across cultures and faith traditions, in seasons of suffering and celebration.

Eschatological hope is central to the Christian tradition. Yet *eschatological* hope is not in the vocabulary of many religious believers who otherwise refer to Christian hope (e.g., Bruininks, 2012). A vivid and widely known example of such hope is the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.'s *I Have a Dream* speech, which offered a vision of ultimate justice and shalom that transforms how we ought to approach everyday life (Myers, 1980). Whereas existing psychological approaches to hope focus on human agency to attain proximal goals (Snyder et al., 1991) with

Author Note

Charlotte Witvliet gratefully acknowledges Nicholas Gibson for conversations about the project, Shengjie Chen for feedback on this project, and many interdisciplinary conversation partners from Leading with the Soul, a multi-year and multi-disciplinary group of Christian thought leaders, as well as the Center for Pastoral Theologians and colleagues who have suggested philosophical, theological, and psychological resources for conceptualizing and measuring eschatological hope. The first author also thanks the editor, editorial consultant, anonymous reviewers, and Sabrina Blank for proofreading. Charlotte Witvliet thanks the Templeton Religion Trust (TRT0171) for grant support on the topic of welcoming accountability to God, which has shaped her thinking. Julie Exline thanks the John Templeton Foundation for grant support (#36094 and #59916).

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Charlotte Witvliet, Psychology Department, Hope College, 35 E. 12th St., Holland, MI 49423. Email: witvliet@hope.edu

social support and spirituality (Scioli et al., 2011), eschatological hope focuses on God's work to fulfill promises of everlasting life in a reconciled and renewed creation, with God as the source, means, and final end of believers' ultimate hope (DeYoung, 2014; Kinghorn, 2013).

The breadth of Christian scriptures, theology, and philosophy referenced throughout this paper shaped an emic approach from within Christianity to understand and communicate eschatological hope in a way that resonates across diverse Christian ecumenical expressions over time and diverse cultures globally, with Christ as the center and final end of our ultimate hope (Daley, 1991). At the outset, we recognize that particular Christian approaches will accent specific aspects of a Christian eschatology—C. S. Lewis' (1942) *The Weight of Glory* centered human experiences, whereas Middleton (2014) situated human anticipation of everlasting life within a broader vista that includes the renewal of all creation. A wide array of Christian eschatological hope resources shaped our conceptualization and definition of the construct, as referenced in that section. The resulting construct and scale content representatively, although not exhaustively, named dimensions in a Christian eschatological vision that align with standard academic theological monographs and dictionary articles on Christian eschatology. This approach also distinguished Christian from alternative eschatological visions (e.g., the myth of progress; Bauckham & Hart, 1999; Polkinghorne, 2002; Wright 2008).

In this examination of eschatological hope, we construe it as a virtue, drawing extensively on the work of DeYoung (2014), Pinches (2014), and Roberts (2007). People characterized by eschatological hope aim toward the desired good future God promises to bring about. Such a vision of a final end can orient present goals and guide prioritization of immanent goals worth pursuing (see Kinghorn, 2013). Eschatological hope involves a habit of aiming in the direction of the new creation in ways that promote flourishing.

DeYoung (2014) drew on work by Aquinas to clarify that the human experience and expression of the virtue is reliant on divine power and mercy. Bauckham and Hart (1999) stated that Christian hope "neither attempts what can only come from God nor neglects what is humanly possible" (p. 43). Theological hope is distinguished from complacent presumptuousness and from helpless despair, acknowledging that we do not yet fully experience and, thus, still actively rely on God's work even as we align efforts now in the direction of our future final end with God (DeYoung, 2014).

Experiencing eschatological hope involves anticipating that God's promises in Christ will be fulfilled through the power of the Holy Spirit (Spencer, 2005). Trusting with Julian of Norwich that ultimately all will be well (Julian & Skinner, 1996), theological hope can be characterized by steadfastness (Ryken et al., 1998), strength to wait (Smedes, 1998), fortitude to face obstacles (Pinches, 2014), and patience in hardship (Tongue, 2017).

Eschatological hope can also involve acute awareness of a *hope-gap*, which we conceptualize as the chasm between the suffering, injustice, and divisions of the present compared to the healing, justice, and mercy of the new creation. People with eschatological hope often experience yearning, even an aching longing, for the fulfillment of God's promises. Kapic (2017) observed that both hope and lament are present in faithful suffering, and both are absent in detached stoicism. Hope without any lament reveals merely naïve optimism. Lament without hope entails despair (Kapic, 2017, p. 33).

Those with eschatological hope have been described as wayfarers (Kinghorn, 2013) who travel with eyes wide open, senses alert to glimpse signposts of their desired destination. While on the lookout for the in-breaking of God's kingdom here and now ("already"), they recognize that its fulfillment is still to come (and, thus, is "not yet" fully evident). Such signposts—experiences of beauty, healing, justice, and inclusion across generations and cultures and divisions—are foretastes of the new creation, connecting the proximal to the ultimate. As Bauckham (2007) noted,

> The fullness of eschatological salvation is already anticipated in all kinds of flourishing in human community inspired by the Spirit of God, especially when priority is given to the poor and the marginalized, with whom Jesus especially identified the kingdom of God. (p. 320)

Further, hopeful Christians can experience a purposeful summons, a missional calling by God, to respond to injustices and brokenness

here and now (Pinches, 2014; Smith, 2017; Spencer, 2005). DeYoung (2014) has drawn attention to what Aquinas described as a "desire for an *arduous* [emphasis added] future good, which is difficult, but possible to obtain (ST I-II 40.1)" (p. 389). This approach to eschatological hope can promote an orientation that addresses present problems in light of the ultimate vision of the promised future. However, eschatological hope can be distorted by an escapism in which a focus on future glory can detract from addressing present problems in the world God so loves. Ernst (2017) has helpfully contrasted an escapist version of eschatological hope with an engaged and complex hope grounded in secure attachment to God that is more communal, clear-eyed, and courageous—connecting the ultimate future to active work that "transforms the reality of the present" (p. 202). It is important to notice that Ernst (2017) and the authors of the current paper differ in their use of the term "eschatological hope." Ernst (2017) used the term in reference to escapist hope that is merely future oriented. We emphasize an engaged approach to eschatological hope that is similar to what Ernst (2017) commended in the complex hope shown by Emmett Till's mother, Mamie Bradley: "In her pain she offered her lament and demanded justice here and now. . . relying on the rich history of women who had hope in the holler and comfort in the resurrected Christ" (p. 203). With heightened awareness of present injustices and suffering (Hart, 2010), eschatological hope may energize efforts to feed the hungry, welcome the stranger, take action steps to address racism and social justice, care for the ill, and steward creation—aiming in the direction of what will one day be, when all will be fed, welcomed, included, and healed in a restored and new creation. We concur with Ernst (2017) that some expressions of eschatological hope are problematically escapist, and we commend future work that builds on the gateway scale we will offer to understand the range of active and passive responses to injustice, trauma, and violence across the spectrum of Christian traditions.

This dynamic interplay of steadfast assurance, deep longing, alert attentiveness, and missional calling begins to hint at the rich complexity of both Christian theological eschatological reflection and how it may or may not be experienced psychologically by believers in different generations, cultures, socioeconomic, and denominational contexts. No single parsimonious definition or measurement tool can adequately address all of this nuance. At the same time, a strategic first step is possible: to develop a foundational or gateway scale closely linked with a broad definition of eschatological hope worded in ways that are accessible to believers across generational, cultural, and denominational contexts while foregrounding scriptural themes that are widely embraced across the spectrum of Christian traditions.

Christian Eschatological Hope: Definition and Measure Development

We seek to offer a definition of Christian eschatological hope as the anticipation that God's promised future of everlasting life will come about, grounding it in several key themes that occur across scriptural texts about God's ultimate future:

1. God is the primary agent of ultimate eschatological ends—the one who will be setting all things right in a new creation (2 Cor. 5:5, Rev. 21:5).
2. As Christ was resurrected, so, too, the dead will be resurrected, with people raised to new everlasting life with joy that will include celebration and feasting (Is. 35:5-6, Rom. 8:11, 1 Cor. 15:42-44, 53-54, 2 Cor. 5:1-4, Rev. 19:9).
3. People from every place, culture, and language will be included (Is. 60:1-7, Rev. 7:9-10, Rev. 21:24-26).
4. All pain and crying, suffering and death will come to an end (Is. 35:10, Is. 65:19, Rev. 21:4).
5. This promise further extends to the elimination of all evil, war, violence, and injustice—addressing not only personal pain, but also relational and societal travail (Is. 2:4, Mic. 4:1-4).
6. God will reconcile all things (Col. 1:20), such that righteousness and peace will flourish (Is. 11:6-9, Is. 35:1-7, Is. 65:25), and healing will come to the nations (Rev. 22:2), as well as the entire cosmos, which God so loves (John 3:16).

In light of these themes, we offer this definition: *Christian eschatological hope is the anticipation that (a) God will make all things new, (b) raising people to everlasting life with God in joy-*

ful celebration, (c) including people from every culture and nation, (d) ending all personal pain and suffering, (e) eliminating all societal evil and harm, and (f) bringing reconciliation and healing to all of creation.

We view this definition as broadly consonant with common themes in several influential theological works about eschatology across the spectrum of Christian traditions (e.g., Almen & Sklba, 2011; Althouse & Waddell, 2010; Green et al., 2020; Hoekema, 1979; Middleton, 2014; Moltmann, 1967; Ratzinger, 1977; Walls, 2010). Whereas these writings debate elements in a full-orbed doctrine of final things, they also share a common vision of God's work to ensure that goodness will overcome evil, suffering will end, and all things will be reconciled by God in Christ through the power of the Holy Spirit, with people from every culture sharing in life together with God. These elements resonate with Christians from many traditions around the world, shaping our approach to develop a scale that can be used more widely than one featuring terminology that would be more idiosyncratic to a particular subtradition.

Our overarching research aim was to develop a single-factor measure of the construct of eschatological hope that emerged from Christian scripture. This included exploratory factor analysis and confirmatory factor analyses in separate self-identified Christian samples, as well as the analysis of test-retest reliability. We also examined the Eschatological Hope Scale's construct validity and incremental validity to go beyond existing measures to predict meaning and flourishing.

Study 1: Exploratory Factor Analysis

The purpose of this initial study was to test a set of items honed and winnowed through written feedback about readability and construct fit, as well as interdisciplinary dialogue with theologians, philosophers, psychiatrists, psychology students, and psychological scientists to yield a single-factor measure of eschatological hope. The EFA items were developed out of an iterative process among Christians spanning multiple disciplines. Several steps informed the authors' approach. Specifically, the first and last authors participated in a multiyear interdisciplinary and ecumenical Christian working group among whom were systematic theologians and pastors who read scripture and theological resources, including a focus on eschatological hope. The lead author sought to develop accessible wording to capture eschatological hope themes that reflected orthodox Christian theology with an eschatological vision focused on God's promises for humans and all creation. From there, item wording was honed and items were winnowed in light of feedback on the accuracy, readability, and fit between the construct and items provided by the first author's colleagues, including co-authors David Myers, Lindsey Root Luna, Daryl Van Tongeren, Julie Exline, and John Witvliet, as well as others in the acknowledgements.

The aim was for the language to be understandable for people shaped by an array of Christian traditions, as well as those new to the faith and those shaped by being in a Christian community. A secondary aim was to avoid jargon that could give a false impression that this was a theological or doctrinal test—or terminology that could be idiosyncratic to particular traditions. Accordingly, the items in Study 1 emerged from a Christian emic approach and reflect a recognizable theological orthodoxy, while also using broad language. We recognize that by using the language of "God" and not specific trinitarian language, the wording of the scale may have wider theistic resonance. We acknowledge that it would have been ideal to have many more items for the EFA. We eliminated items based on discussion and written feedback about item wording and construct fit. We then tested a set of items identified in relation to the six scriptural themes noted, as well as items related to the role of spiritual identity and God's action in the experience of hope (see Appendix A).

Method

We assessed the factor loadings of 15 items, verified the single-factor structure of the items, and examined the internal consistency of the measure.

Participants and Procedure

Institutional review board (IRB) approval for the study was obtained, and informed consent was secured by participants before completion of the measures and debriefing via an online study management system. We recruited participants through Amazon's Mechanical Turk

(MTurk), using the following quality controls. Participants were from the United States, with a 95% approval rating and previous completion of at least 100 successful tasks on MTurk (Peer et al., 2013). We removed participants with a religious affiliation other than Christianity, who failed an attention check question, or who did not meet a minimum time requirement for completing the survey, resulting in a total of 353 respondents. The resulting sample consisted of 173 men (49%), 177 women (50.1%), and three participants who did not indicate gender. Ages ranged from 20 to 81 years of age (M = 34.83, SD = 9.84). Participants included 248 self-identified European American non-Hispanic participants (70.3%); of the remainder, 37 (10.5%) identified as Black/African American, 29 (8.2%) as Hispanic/Latino/a, 17 (4.8%) as Asian/Asian American, 6 (1.7%) as Native Hawaiian, 6 (1.7%) as American Indian or Alaska Native, 2 (.6%) as Middle Eastern, and 7 (2%) as biracial/multiracial. One person (.3%) did not provide information about race or ethnicity. The sample was primarily Protestant (n = 253, 71.7%); other affiliations included 97 (27.5%) Catholic, and 3 (.8%) Orthodox.

Materials

Fifteen eschatological hope items were tested using the scale instructions provided in Appendix B. Additional items related to prayer, humility, and suffering were tested for other scale development work by Hall and colleagues (2021) and were not analyzed here.

Results and Discussion

Exploratory factor analysis (EFA) of item data used promax rotation, because any factors that emerged from our scale were assumed to be correlated. Inspection of eigenvalues and scree plot revealed a marked gap between the first and second factors (Factor 1 eigenvalue = 9.55; Factor 2 eigenvalue = 0.68), supporting a single factor. Furthermore, results from parallel anal-

Table 1

EFA Study 1 and CFA Study 2 Items and Factor Loadings

Item	EFA Loading	CFA Loading
I live with awareness of God as the primary source of my hope.	.80	.84
I live with confidence that the goodness of God will ultimately triumph over evil.	.80	.91
I live with assurance that God will ultimately reconcile all things.	.83	.77
I live with the expectation that God will remove suffering for eternity.	.75	.90
I live with trust that, ultimately, God will make all things new.	.78	
I experience hope when I think about everlasting life.	.76	
I feel hope because I am God's child.	.82	
My spiritual identity gives me hope.	.82	
Even when I suffer, I entrust my future to God.	.79	
I believe I will live with God forever.	.83	.85
I believe that God will ultimately draw together people from every place and culture.	.72	.80
I have hope in God's goodness.	.78	
I have hope because I am part of the body of Christ.	.78	
My hope is based in Christ's resurrection.	.69	
I have hope because the Holy Spirit is at work in the world.	.76	
Cronbach's α	.96	.94

Note. All factor loadings $p < .01$.

ysis (O'Connor, 2000) indicated that real data eigenvalues exceeded random data eigenvalues for only the first factor, again supporting a single-factor model. The first factor accounted for 63.69% of the scale's total variation, with all 15 items loading strongly on Factor 1, with Cronbach's $\alpha = .96$. See Table 1.

Altogether, the EFA results commended a single-factor scale, for which all items loaded strongly. The high alpha further commended reducing the scale to a smaller number of items that would still sample the defined construct of eschatological hope.

Study 2: Confirmatory Factor Analysis

This study conducted confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) on a subset of scale items.

Method

Study 1 yielded a Cronbach's α of .96, which suggests some items may be redundant and the scale had too many items. In order to sufficiently tap the construct of eschatological hope while decreasing the number of items, the first author solicited the written feedback on item selection for construct fit and coverage from three Christian theologians who work and write ecumenically and further feedback from the same initial psychologists plus one additional psychologist, all of whom identify as Christian across a range of denominations. The resulting six items were judged to be aligned with the eschatological hope construct and represent the definition presented in the introduction.

Participants and Procedure

Data came from a larger web-based study, "Religious and Spiritual Issues in College Life" (N = 3,958), of Introductory Psychology students at a private research university (n = 939) and a public research university from the Great Lakes region (n = 1,938), as well as a Christian university from the West coast (n = 1,081). All universities provided Institutional Review Board approval. Participants provided informed consent before completion of the measures via Qualtrics and were debriefed afterward. For this CFA, we analyzed data from 877 undergraduate students (36% male, 64% female; mean age = 18.99, SD =1.43; range = 18-42 years) who completed the eschatological hope items, endorsed some belief in God with whom a relationship was possible, and who identified their religious/spiritual tradition as Christian. With multiple responses allowed, participants self-identified as White (72%), Asian or Pacific Islander (14%), African American or Black (11%), Latino or Hispanic (8%), Native American, American Indian, or Alaska Native (1%), and other or mixed race/ethnicity (1%).

Materials

The six eschatological hope items shown in Table 1 were tested in this separate sample.

Results and Discussion

IBM's Amos software (version 26) was used to estimate relations among the study variables and to derive model fit of our one-factor model. For SEM, small values are preferable for χ^2 (thus, leading the null hypothesis to be accepted, $p > .05$). However, χ^2 is very sensitive to sample size and, in large samples, the χ^2 values tend to also be large, with $p < .05$ (Jöreskog & Sörbom, 1993). Thus, most researchers, especially when using larger samples (i.e., 200 or more), focus on alternate indices such as the comparative fit index (CFI), standardized root mean square residual (SRMR), and root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA). Higher CFIs indicate better fit, with 1.0 as the maximum and .95 or greater considered acceptable (Hu & Bentler, 1999). For SRMR and RMSEA, lower numbers indicate better fit, with recommended cutoff values for good fit being approximately .08 for SRMR and .06 for RMSEA (Hu & Bentler, 1999). Results for this one-factor CFA model showed good fit to the data (χ^2=146.93, $p < .01$, CFI = .98, SRMR = .02, RMSEA = .062). All factor loadings were substantial and significantly different than zero ($p < .001$); standardized loadings for the six items are in Table 1. Cronbach's α was .94. In sum, CFA results revealed a single-factor scale with high internal consistency and strong item loadings.

Study 3: Eschatological Hope Scale CFA, Test-Retest Reliability, Construct Validity, and Incremental Validity

This study aimed to verify the internal consistency of the scale in a geographically and ethnically diverse community sample of adults, examined test-retest reliability, and tested construct and incremental validity. To enhance readability in light of feedback by an expert in the psychology of religion, we simplified the

wording for five of the six items (e.g., replacing "I live with awareness of God as the primary source of my hope" with "God is the source of my hope"), as shown in Table 2 and Appendix B.

The items comprising the Eschatological Hope Scale conceptually tapped the construct of Christian eschatological hope. In assessing the scale's construct validity, we predicted that it would show convergent validity with theoretically relevant constructs. Specifically, because of positivity about the future within etic measures of hope agency and pathways that emphasize human action and optimism that emphasizes general expectancies (Alarcon et al., 2013), we predicted modest positive correlations with the Eschatological Hope Scale, which emphasizes ultimate outcomes rooted in God's promises. Conversely, because hopelessness and pessimism have negativity regarding the proximal future, we predicted modest inverse correlations with the Eschatological Hope Scale. Because the Eschatological Hope Scale is derived from scripture and theological sources that shape Christian faith, we predicted it would have positive correlations with other positive faith-engaged measures of religious commitment and participation, intrinsic religiosity, positive trusting attitudes toward God, positive religious coping, and spiritual fortitude. By contrast, we hypothesized inverse correlations between Eschatological Hope Scale scores and adverse spiritual or religious indicators, including negative attitudes toward God and negative religious coping. Because etic measures of hope have been found to be directly correlated with gratitude, forgivingness, and patience (Witvliet et al., 2018), and because theological work links eschatological hope to patience in hardship (Tongue, 2017), we predicted that the Eschatological Hope Scale, which taps the theological virtue of hope, would be directly correlated with measures of these three virtue-related measures. Finally, because of the widely acknowledged inverse relationship of etic proximal hope and optimism to symptoms of depression and anxiety (e.g., Alarcon et al., 2013; Kinghorn, 2013), we predicted modest inverse correlations between the emic measure of ultimate Christian hope with measures of depression and anxiety. Testing discriminant validity, we predicted that eschatological hope would not be correlated with theoretically unrelated constructs: extrinsic religiosity and the search for meaning. Finally, we included a measure of socially desirable responding as part of scale development.

We tested incremental validity of the Eschatological Hope Scale in three models, each with three target variables focused on having a sense of the meaning in life now (Steger et al., 2006), the ultimate meaning of one's life (Exline et al., 2014), and flourishing (Keyes, 2012). For Model 1, we predicted the Eschatological Hope Scale scores would explain additional variance beyond trait hope agency, pathways, optimism, and pessimism in measures of (a) the presence of meaning in life, (b) ultimate meaning, and (c) flourishing. For Model 2, we hypothesized that Eschatological Hope Scale scores would explain additional variance beyond religious

Table 2

Study 3 CFA Items and Factor Loadings for the Eschatological Hope Scale

Item	Loading
God is the source of my hope.	.77
I am confident that God will overcome evil.	.78
I trust that God will remove suffering for eternity.	.80
I am sure that God will ultimately reconcile all things.	.83
I believe that God will ultimately draw together people from every place and culture.	.74
I trust that I will live with God forever.	.78
Cronbach's α	.91

Note. All factor loadings $p < .01$.

commitment and participation and positive and negative religious coping in (a) the presence of meaning in life, (b) ultimate meaning, and (c) flourishing scores. For Model 3, we tested the prediction that Eschatological Hope Scale scores would explain additional variance beyond depression and anxiety symptoms in (a) the presence of meaning in life, (b) ultimate meaning, and (c) flourishing.

Method

Participants

With Institutional Review Board approval, MTurk participants gave informed consent, completed measures, and were debriefed. Participants were 235 U.S. adults (51. 5% male, 48.5% female; mean age = 34.94, *SD* = 10.55; range = 20-80 years) who responded to an MTurk invitation to participate in a study of Christians who had experienced some suffering. Participants were from the United States, had a 95% approval rating, had completed at least 100 successful tasks, endorsed "Christianity" as their religious affiliation, and correctly answered three attention checks. This sample also participated in Hall and colleagues' (2021) third study developing a measure of sanctification of suffering, which was not the focus of the present study. Participants self-identified as Protestant (60.4%), Catholic (37.0%), and Orthodox (2.6%). They self-identified as follows: 16.2% African American or Black, 1.2% American Indian or Alaska Native, 8.1% Asian or Asian-American, 62.6% European American (Non-Hispanic), 9.3% Hispanic or Latina/o/x, and 2.6% multiracial or biracial.

Materials

Eschatological Hope Scale. The six-items and response options to assess eschatological hope are provided in Appendix B.

Adult Dispositional Hope Scale. Snyder et al.'s (1991) hope scale has eight scored items (α = .80 in this sample) and four unscored filler items, with Likert responses ranging from *definitely false* (1) to *definitely true* (4). We used the two 4-item subscales: agency (i.e., willpower to achieve goals, such as "I energetically pursue my goals"; current α = .69) and pathways (i.e., wayfinding capacity to achieve goals, such as "There are lots of ways around any problem"; current α = .68).

Hopelessness. We assessed dispositional hopelessness (e.g., "I see my future as gloomy," "I doubt anything is worthwhile") using Dunn and colleagues' (2014) 8-item scale, with Likert responses from *strongly disagree* (1) to *strongly agree* (4); α = .89 in this sample.

Optimism and Pessimism. The brief Scale Optimism-Pessimism-2 scale by Kemper et al. (2017) consists of one item measuring optimism ("How optimistic are you in general") and one item measuring pessimism ("How pessimistic are you in general?"). Ratings options ranged from *not at all* (1) to very (7).

Religious Commitment. We used Worthington and colleagues' (2003) 10-item Religious Commitment Inventory (e.g., "My religious beliefs lie behind my whole approach to life," "I spend time trying to grow in understanding of my faith"), for which responses ranged from *not at all true of me* (1) to *totally true of me* (5); current α = .92.

Religious Participation Scale. Participants self-reported participation in six activities ("Prayed or meditated," "Attended religious/spiritual services or meetings") within the last month (Exline et al., 2000). Response options included *not at all* (1), *once or twice* (2), *about once a week* (3), *more than once a week* (4), *daily or almost daily* (5), more than once a day (6); current sample α = .82.

Intrinsic and Extrinsic Religiosity. To assess motivation for involvement in religious activities, we used Gorsuch and McPherson's (1989) Intrinsic/Extrinsic Revised Scales, with Likert response options ranging from *strongly disagree* (1) to *strongly agree* (5). The 8-item Intrinsic Religiosity Scale (e.g., "I try hard to live all my life according to my religious beliefs") assessed internalized faith-related motivation to engage in religious activities (current α = .78). The 6-item Extrinsic Religiosity Scale (e.g., "I go to church because it helps me to make friends") assessed religious engagement for instrumental reasons (current α = .77).

Attitudes Toward God Scale. We used Wood and colleagues' (2010) 9-item Attitudes toward God Scale (ATGS-9), using a Likert scale ranging from *not at all* (1) to *extremely* (10). The 5-item positive subscale (e.g., "Trust God to protect and care for you," "View God as all-powerful and all-knowing") was used to assess participants' trust in an all-knowing and all-powerful God who loves and protects them (α = .90 in this sample).

The 4-item negative subscale (e.g., "Feel that God has let you down," "Feel angry at God") was used to assess disappointment and anger with God (α = .95 in this sample).

Brief Religious Coping Scale. We measured religious coping using the Brief Religious Coping Scale (Brief RCOPE; Pargament et al., 2000), using both 7-item subscales to assess positive (e.g., "Looked for a stronger connection with God," "Sought God's love and care") and negative (e.g., "Questioned God's love for me," "Wondered what I did for God to punish me") religious coping. Likert scale options ranged from *not at all* (1) to *a great deal* (4). The current study showed strong internal consistency: positive coping α = .85; negative coping α = .92.

Spiritual Fortitude. We administered this three factor scale by Van Tongeren and colleagues (2019), using the 9-item overall score (α = .88) and the 3-item subscales for Endurance (e.g., "My faith helps me withstand difficulties," α = .76), Enterprise (e.g., "I continue to do the right thing despite facing hardships," α = .71), and Redemptive Purpose ("My sense of purpose is strengthened through adversity," α = .80). Likert response options ranged from *strongly disagree* (1) to *strongly agree* (5); current overall α = .88.

Gratitude. The Gratitude Questionnaire (GQ-6; McCullough et al., 2002) assessed dispositional gratitude with six items (e.g., "I have so much in life to be thankful for," "I am grateful to a wide variety of people,"), including two reverse-coded items (e.g., "When I look at the world, I don't see much to be grateful for"). Likert response options ranged from *strongly disagree* (1) to *strongly agree* (7); current α = .77.

Forgivingness. We used the 10-item Trait Forgiveness Scale (Berry et al., 2005) to assess the disposition to be forgiving toward others. Sample items included "I try to forgive others even when they don't feel guilty for what they did," "I am a forgiving person," and the reverse-coded "I feel bitter about many of my relationships." Likert response options ranged from *strongly disagree* (1) to *strongly agree* (5); current α = .85.

Patience in Life Hardships. The life hardships patience subscale of the Patience Scale (Schnitker, 2012) was selected as most relevant for eschatological hope. Its three items were "I am able to wait-out tough times," "I find it pretty easy to be patient with a difficult life problem or illness," and "I am patient during life hardships." Ratings options ranged from *not like me at all* (1) to *very much like me* (5); current α = .76.

Depression. We used the Patient Health Questionnaire-8 (PHQ-8; Kroenke et al., 2009), an 8-item diagnostic tool used by clinicians to assess for depressive disorder symptoms in the past two weeks. Sample items included "Little interest or pleasure in doing things," "Feeling down, depressed, or hopeless," and "Trouble falling or staying asleep, or sleeping too much." Ratings options were *not at all* (1), *several days* (2), *more than half the days* (3), *nearly every day* (4); current sample α = .93.

Anxiety. We assessed anxiety symptom levels in the past two weeks using a clinical screening tool, the Generalized Anxiety Disorder 7-item scale (GAD-7; Spitzer et al., 2006). Sample items included "Worrying too much about different things," "Feeling nervous, anxious, or on edge." Ratings options were *not at all* (1), *several days* (2), *over half the days* (3), *nearly every day* (4); current α = .92.

Meaning in Life. We used Steger and colleagues' (2006) Meaning in Life Questionnaire to assess the presence of meaning with five items (e.g., "I understand my life's meaning," α = .74) and the search for meaning with five items (e.g., "I am seeking a purpose or mission for my life"). Response options ranged from *absolutely untrue* (1) to *absolutely true* (7); current α = .93.

Ultimate Meaning. The 4-item subscale from Exline and colleagues' (2014) Religious and Spiritual Struggles measure assessed struggles regarding ultimate meaning in life (e.g., "Had concerns about whether there is any ultimate purpose to life or existence") over the past few months. Response ratings ranged from *not at all/does not apply* (1) to *a great deal* (5).

Mean scores are reported as reverse scores for ease of interpretation; current sample α = .92.

Flourishing. The 14-item Flourishing Scale (Keyes, 2012) assessed the degree to which respondents experienced hedonic and eudaimonic well-being in the past month. Three items tapped feeling good (e.g., "Happy," "Satisfied"), and 11 items assessed functioning well with purpose in relationships (e.g., "Good at managing the responsibilities of your daily life," "That your life has a sense of direction or meaning to it," "That you had warm and trusting relationships with others"). Responses were never (1), *once*

or twice (2), *about once a week* (3), *two or three times* (4), *almost every day* (5), *every day* (6); current $\alpha = .92$.

Self-Deceptive Enhancement Subscale, Balanced Inventory of Desirable Responding. We used Paulhus' (1984, 2002) self-deceptive enhancement subscale, which is thought to assess the tendency to try to make a favorable impression and has shown a weak, yet reliable, correlation ($r = .12$) with intrinsic religiosity in a meta-analysis of 6 samples with 956 participants total (Sedikides & Gebauer, 2010). It includes 20 items, in which odd numbered items (e.g., "The reason I vote is because my vote can make a difference," "I am confident of my judgments," "It's all right with me if some people happen to dislike me") alternated with reverse-coded even-numbered items (e.g., "It's hard for me to shut off a disturbing thought," "I sometimes lose out on things because I can't make up my mind soon enough," "I don't always know the reasons why I do the things I do"); response options ranged from (1) *not true* to (7) *very true*. Internal consistency in this sample was marginal, $\alpha = .67$, and, thus, further analyses including this measure are not reported.

Results and Discussion

Confirmatory factor analyses used STATA (version 15.0) to estimate relations among items and to derive model fit of the one-factor model. As recommended by Schumacker and Lomax (2004), we used a variety of global fit indices to test the proposed model. Results for our one-factor CFA model indicate good model fit to the data ($\chi^2 = 18.26$, $p < .05$; CFI = .99; SRMR = .02; RMSEA = .066). All factor loadings were substantial and significantly different than zero ($p < .001$); standardized loadings are presented in Table 2. The Cronbach's $\alpha = .91$ indicated excellent internal consistency for the single-factor scale.

Test-Retest Reliability

All participants were re-contacted at four months, yielding 46 completers. Intraclass correlation coefficient (ICC) estimates and their 95% confidence intervals were calculated using SPSS based on a mean-rating ($k = 2$), absolute-agreement, 2-way mixed-effects model. The average measures ICC was .78, with a 95% confidence interval from .60 to .88, $F(44, 44) = 4.51$, $p < .001$, indicating good test-retest reliability (Koo & Li, 2016). These test-retest results were consistent with a dispositional approach to measuring the virtue.

Construct Validity

Table 3 shows the Eschatological Hope Scale's construct validity results. Table 4 reports the Eschatological Hope Scale's incremental validity results for three models that predict meaning presence, ultimate meaning, and flourishing.

The results show predicted correlations between the Eschatological Hope Scale and measures of hope and optimism, as well as hopelessness and pessimism—while also going beyond them to predict meaning in life, ultimate meaning, and flourishing. Eschatological hope positively correlated with the religious measures in the predicted directions—going beyond religious commitment, religious participation, and positive and negative religious coping to predict meaning in life and ultimate meaning, as well as flourishing in life. Eschatological Hope Scale scores also correlated with measures of three other virtues: gratitude, forgivingness, and patience in life hardships. Further, Eschatological Hope Scale scores had weak, yet significant, inverse relationships to symptoms of depression and anxiety—and went beyond these psychological symptoms of suffering to account for variance in the presence of meaning in life, ultimate meaning, and flourishing. These results are theoretically meaningful, commending the value of the Eschatological Hope Scale as a short tool that may be particularly useful in populations for whom questions of virtues, meaning, suffering, and flourishing are salient.

General Discussion

We adopted an emic approach to define the construct of Christian eschatological hope and develop the Eschatological Hope Scale. Grounded in scripture and informed by scholarship in theology, philosophy, and psychology, the items for Study 1 were developed, winnowed, and tested with exploratory factor analysis. In a separate sample, Study 2 confirmed the single-factor structure of a 6-item scale. Study 3 tested simpler wording of the Eschatological Hope Scale in a new community sample, confirming its internal consistency, test-retest reliability, construct validity, and incremental validity.

The Eschatological Hope Scale showed predicted associations with (a) etic measures of

hope, hopelessness, optimism, and pessimism, (b) religious measures, (c) virtues, and (d) symptoms of depression and anxiety. Furthermore, the Eschatological Hope Scale demonstrated incremental validity—going beyond other measures to predict meaning in life, ultimate meaning, and flourishing. The eschatological hope construct and Eschatological Hope Scale (see Appendix B) contribute to several literatures.

Eschatological Hope, Temporal Hope, and Optimism

This work supports distinguishing between the experience of ultimate hope in God and finite hope that is temporally-focused (Roberts, 2007). As Kinghorn (2013) observed, immanent goal-focused hope relies on human willpower and cognitive wayfinding (Snyder et al., 1991), whereas Aquinas' theological hope relies on God's summons and provision for wayfarers who find their final end in God. Although we incorporated measures of both hope and hopelessness, future work should extend this to include a broader array of hope scales that incorporate broader approaches to spirituality and purpose (e.g., Herth, 1992; Scioli et al., 2011). Findings also echo distinctions between eschatological hope and optimism (Kapic, 2017; Hart, 2010; Roberts, 2007). As Plantinga (1993) observed, optimism assumes bad things will not happen; Christian hope focuses on God's promises even when bad things do happen.

Faith and Hope

This research found that eschatological hope was associated with faith indicators of commitment, connection, and coping. Higher eschatological hope was associated with religious commitment, participation, intrinsic religiosity, and positive attitudes toward God. Although eschatological hope may be dependent on Christian orthodoxy, it is likely that not all Christians with orthodox beliefs live with awareness of eschatological hope—a question for future research. Such work could also address the ways in which particular practices (e.g., communal worship, sacraments, sabbath) may foster eschatological hope. We also commend assessing sub-

Table 3

Study 3 Eschatological Hope Correlations with Construct Validity Measures

Hope & Optimism		Religiosity & Spirituality		Virtues		Distress		Meaning & Flourishing	
Hope Agency	.37***	Religious Commitment	.70***	Gratitude	.46***	Depr.	-.19**	Meaning Presence	.49***
Hope Pathways	.36***	Religious Participation	.48***	Forgivingness	.45***	Anx.	-.20**	Meaning Search	-.07
Hopeless	-.42***	Positive Attitude Toward God	.74***	Patience in Hardship	.45***			Ultimate Meaning	.25***
Optimism	.37***	Negative Attitude Toward God	-.22***					Flourish	.51***
Pessimism	-.23***	Intrinsic Relig.	.68***						
		Extrinsic Relig.	.09						
		Pos. Rel. Coping	.68***						
		Neg. Rel. Coping	-.16*						
		Spiritual Fortitude	.65***						
		SF – Endurance	.67***						
		SF – Enterprise	.50***						
		SF – Redemp. Purpose	.52***						

Note. The ultimate meaning score was reversed to clarify interpretation.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

groups for whom eschatological hope may conflate with just-world thinking, which could be associated with avoidance of addressing suffering and injustices—rather than complex hope that pursues change (see Ernst, 2017). Future work could also clarify whether eschatological hope is evident in times of hardship among people who no longer identify as Christian.

Notably, the Study 3 sample was comprised of self-identified Christians who reported having suffered. They showed an association between eschatological hope and assessments of religious coping with difficult life events and spiritual fortitude—including capacities to withstand difficulties, persist in hardship, and experience purpose even in adversity (Pargament et al., 2000; Van Tongeren et al., 2019). These findings connect better to Ernst's (2017) conceptualization of complex hope, as opposed to escapist eschatology, and Kapic's (2017) conceptualization that emphasizes the importance of experiencing both lament and hope in suffering. The current findings also commend future research with people who may find the theorized *hope-gap* to be especially difficult, including people who have experienced suffering through intergenerational racialized trauma, violence, oppression, marginalization, mental illnesses, physical illnesses, and terminal illnesses.

Eschatological Hope and Other Virtues

Eschatological hope involves a capacity for patiently waiting with a steadfast resilience amid hardships (cf. Ryken, et al., 1998; Schnitker, 2012; Smedes, 1998; Tongue, 2017)—similar

Table 4

Study 3 Incremental Validity Hierarchical Regressions Testing Eschatological Hope

Model 1: Eschatological Hope beyond Religious Commitment, Participation, and Coping				
Variable	B	*SE*	*t*	*p*
Meaning in life – presence				
Step 1: R^2 = .25, $F(4, 228)$ = 18.72, p < .001				
Rel. Commit.	.26	.13	2.53	.012
Rel. Participat.	-.04	.11	-0.43	.666
Pos. Rel. Coping	.25	.14	3.14	.002
Neg. Rel. Coping	-.24	.08	-3.69	<.001
Step 2: R^2 change = .03, $F^{change}(1, 227)$ = 10.22, p^{change} = .002				
E. Hope	.29	.11	3.20	.002
Ultimate meaning				
Step 1: R^2 = .50, $F(4, 228)$ = 57.63, p < .001				
Rel. Commit.	.23	.12	2.79	.006
Rel. Participat.	-.25	.10	-3.19	.002
Pos. Rel. Coping	.06	.13	0.91	.367
Neg. Rel. Coping	-.62	.08	-11.97	<.001
Step 2: R^2 change = .01, $F^{change}(1, 227)$ =6.07, p^{change} = .014				
E. Hope	.18	.10	2.46	.014
Flourishing				
Step 1: R^2 = .28, $F(4, 228)$ = 22.52, p < .001				
Rel. Commit.	.44	.10	4.47	<.001
Rel. Participat.	-.01	.08	-0.10	.920
Pos. Rel. Coping	.12	.11	1.57	.118
Neg. Rel. Coping	-.09	.07	-1.43	.155
Step 2: R^2 change = .03, $F^{change}(1, 227)$ = 9.68, p^{change} = .002				
E. Hope	.27	.09	3.11	.002

Table 4 continued

Study 3 Incremental Validity Hierarchical Regressions Testing Eschatological Hope

Model 2: Eschatological Hope beyond Trait Hope Pathways, Agency, and Optimism				
Variable	B	*SE*	*t*	*p*
Meaning in life – presence				
Step 1: R^2 = .24, F(3, 230) = 24.10, p < .001				
Hope Agency	.30	.16	3.84	<.001
Hope Path.	.06	.16	0.74	.461
Optimism	.22	.06	3.33	.001
Step 2: R^2 change = .09, F^{change} (1, 229) = 31.10, p^{change} < .001				
E. Hope	.34	.07	5.58	<.001
Ultimate meaning				
Step 1: R^2 = .02, F(3, 230) = 1.32, p = .27				
Hope Agency	.05	.21	0.50	.617
Hope Path.	.09	.21	1.08	.282
Optimism	.01	.08	0.06	.951
Step 2: R^2 change = .05, F^{change} (1, 229) = 12.59, p^{change} < .001				
E. Hope	.25	.10	3.55	<.001
Flourishing				
Step 1: R^2 = .43, F(3, 230) = 58.23, p < .001				
Hope Agency	.24	.11	3.50	.001
Hope Path.	.12	.11	1.88	.062
Optimism	.43	.04	7.43	<.001
Step 2: R^2 change = .06, F^{change} (1, 229) = 27.99, p^{change} < .001				
E. Hope	.28	.05	5.29	<.001
Model 3: Eschatological Hope beyond Depressed and Anxious Symptoms				
Variable	B	*SE*	*t*	*p*
Meaning in life – presence				
Step 1: R^2 = .12 F(2, 231) = 15.48, p < .001				
Depressed Symptoms	-.14	.16	-1.13	.260
Anxious Symptoms	-.22	.16	-1.82	.070
Step 2: R^2 change = .18, F^{change} (1, 230) = 59.38, p^{change} < .001				
E. Hope	.43	.07	7.71	<.001
Ultimate meaning				
Step 1: R^2 = .59, F(2, 231) = 169.58, p < .001				
Depressed Symptoms	-.24	.13	-2.91	.004
Anxious Symptoms	-.56	.12	-6.81	<.001
Step 2: R^2 change = .01, F^{change} (1, 230) = 6.54, p^{change} = .011				
E. Hope	.11	.06	2.56	.011
Flourishing				
Step 1: R^2 = .06, F(2, 231) = 6.70, p =.001				
Depressed Symptoms	-.14	.14	-1.11	.268
Anxious Symptoms	-.10	.13	-0.83	.407
Step 2: R^2 change = .23, F^{change} (1, 230) = 72.99, p^{change} < .001				
E. Hope	.49	.06	8.54	<.001

to spiritual fortitude (Van Tongeren et al., 2019). It can also involve looking for signposts or foretastes of the new creation, which aligns with a capacity to notice good gifts and appreciate them in gratitude (McCullough et al., 2002). An eschatological summons to aim in the direction of God's reconciling and healing work also coheres with accountable forgiveness—so that both peace and justice meet now in anticipation of the new creation (cf. Polkinghorne, 2002).

The Eschatological Hope Scale is distinct from existing virtue scales, including patience, gratitude, and forgivingness. It offers researchers a tool to learn about Christian eschatological hope as a virtue. Many virtues that psychologists study have broad connections to Christian theology (e.g., gratitude, forgivingness, patience, humility, accountability), and future work could assess whether bolstering eschatological hope could also strengthen these virtues. Such research could examine whether eschatological hope operates like social virtues to promote relational well-being, with spiritual flourishing in relation to God.

Eschatological Hope and Psychological Symptoms

The psychological experience of hope in God can involve both positivity and lament, noticing and responding to present injustices and suffering. Further, people of faith with ultimate hope in God are still affected by the biopsychosocial realities of depression and anxiety. This study shows that, similar to hope-agency (Snyder et al., 1991), eschatological hope had very modest inverse associations with depressed and anxious symptoms, whereas hopelessness (Dunn et al., 2014) had moderately strong direct associations with these symptoms. This echoes widely recognized patterns linking hope, hopelessness, and optimism to anxiety and depression (Kinghorn, 2013).

Future clinical research could address eschatological hope in interventions that integrate psychological and chaplain services, particularly in caring for self-identified Christians. The eschatological hope framework could be helpful for work with Christian patients in psychiatric crisis or those who face terminal illness. Eschatological hope would also be relevant in contexts of trauma and injustice, where Christians may try to resolve failed temporal hope and turn to God for ultimate hope. Qualitative methods could be used to uncover patterns of escapism versus complex expressions of eschatological hope.

Eschatological Hope, Presence of Meaning, Ultimate Meaning, and Flourishing

This research points to the contribution of eschatological hope to experiencing meaning in life now (Steger et al., 2006) and ultimate meaning that one's life matters, makes a difference in the world, and has a deeper purpose (Exline et al., 2014). Flourishing connects positive feelings to functioning well in the context of relationships and social structures with a sense of purpose (Keyes et al., 2012).

We tested three different models, which revealed that the Eschatological Hope Scale went beyond other predictors—hope agency, hope pathways, and optimism; religious commitment and participation and positive and negative religious coping; and psychological symptoms of depression and anxiety—to account for significant additional variance in presence of meaning in life, ultimate meaning, and flourishing scores (see Table 4). Thus, the Eschatological Hope Scale contributes to the literatures on hope, religiosity, and suffering. Many people draw a sense of meaning from their religious and spiritual beliefs, and eschatological hope may be a powerful source of meaning because it combines both religiosity and hope. Such hope may be an especially important source of existential solace that sustains meaning and buffers flourishing in people who are experiencing deep hardship or suffering.

Conclusion

Eschatological hope is anticipation that God will make all things new, raising people to everlasting life with God in joyful celebration, including people from every culture and nation, ending all personal pain and suffering, eliminating all societal evil and harm, and bringing reconciliation and healing to all of creation. People with such hope are neither presumptuous nor despairing. They may experience eschatological hope with steadfastness in waiting, the capacity to lament, heightened awareness of hopeful indicators, and an active summons to notice and respond to injustices and suffering (Hart, 2010; Pinches, 2014; Spencer, 2005). As agents of justice and renewal in the world, Christians with a new creation vision are called to step into the

hope-gap—places of injustice, pain, disease, discord, and destruction. They are called to bring their abilities to align with the goal of reconciled, healed, whole, and renewing experiences for all people with a place at the table of plenty in the new creation that God will bring about.

We hope that the current work will serve as a foundation for further developments of eschatological hope in psychology and religion. For example, future work could build on this gateway scale using qualitative and quantitative methods to probe the lived experiences and expressions of eschatological hope within and across denominations, cultures, generations, and socioeconomic contexts beyond the Western, educated, industrialized, rich, and democratic (WEIRD) community adult and U.S. university samples tested here (Heinrich et al., 2010). Accordingly, we see the value of continued research that centers the voices of persons who have experienced oppression. We note that African-American church history features a remarkable legacy of spirituals, blues, and gospel music, which give voice to life challenges and provide hope by affirming the ultimate goodness of life lived with awareness of God's providence (Cooper-Lewter & Mitchell, 1986; see also Harvey, 2011). Given their common origins during slavery, segregation, and racism (Harvey, 2011), historically-Black congregations in the United States have cultivated the ability to bridge the hope-gap through practices that nurture, sustain, and guide in times of trial and triumph by

> laying before God the tough burdens of life concerns, and desires for the present and future; expressing deep emotion and lament connected with personal and communal plight and possibility; and re-framing and affirming a positive Black identity that counters the negative one found in larger society. (Floyd-Thomas et al., 2007, p. 179)

Social justice has been an enduring focus in the Black church, with a sense of God's liberating role in this calling (Cone, 2010). In light of this, we recommend that future research employ mixed methods approaches that assess eschatological hope with the scale we offer, while also exploring the phenomenological experiences of Christians in a variety of cultures.

It may also be fruitful to assess how the broadly worded emic Eschatological Hope Scale performs in comparison to modified or supplemental measures using explicitly Trinitarian language that identifies how each element is grounded in the work of Christ by the power of the Holy Spirit. We also hope that further qualitative and quantitative mixed methods work will elucidate the relationships of eschatological hope and other virtues, such as gratitude to God, divine forgiveness, and welcoming accountability to God for how we live in relation to God, people, the world, and the cosmos.

The Eschatological Hope Scale, provided in Appendix B, is a short single-factor scale with strong psychometric properties, test-retest reliability, construct validity, and incremental validity. We hope that this scale will catalyze research on the experience of eschatological hope across diverse cultures, faith expressions, and developmental stages, with particular value for populations in times of both suffering and celebration in life.

References

Alarcon, G. M., Bowling, N. A., & Khazon, S. (2013). Great expectations: A meta-analytic examination of optimism and hope. *Personality and Individual Differences, 54*(7), 821-827. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2012.12.004

Almen, L., & Sklba, R. (2011). *Hope of eternal life: Lutherans and Catholics in dialogue*. Lutheran University Press.

Althouse, P., & Waddell, R. (2010). *Perspectives in Pentecostal eschatologies: World without end*. James Clarke & Co.

Bauckham, R. (2007). Eschatology. In J. Webster, K. Tanner, & I. Torrance (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of systematic theology* (pp. 306-322). Oxford.

Bauckham, R., & Hart, T. (1999). *Hope against hope: Christian eschatology at the turn of the millennium*. Eerdmans.

Berry, J. W., Worthington, E. L., Jr., O'Connor, L.,E., Parrott, L., & Wade, N. G. (2005). Forgivingness, vengeful rumination, and affective traits. *Journal of Personality, 73*(1), 183-226. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6494.2004.00308.x

Bruininks, P. (2012). The unique psychology of hope. In J. Begbie, T. Hart, & C. Hopps (Eds.), *Patterns of promise: Art, imagination and Christian hope* (pp. 115-128). Ashgate.

Cone, J. H. (2010). *A Black theology of liberation* (40th anniversary ed.). Orbis Books.

Cooper-Lewter, N. C., & Mitchell, H. H. (1986). *Soul theology: The heart of American Black culture*. Harper & Row.

Daley, B. E. (1991). *The hope of the early church: A handbook of patristic eschatology*. Baker Academic.

DeYoung, R. K. (2014). Practicing hope. *Res Philosophica, 91*(3), 387-410.

Dunn, S. L., Olamijulo, G. B., Fuglseth, H. L., Holden, T. P., Swieringa, L. L., Sit, M. J., Rieth, N. P., & Tintle, N. L. (2014). The State–Trait Hopelessness Scale: Development and testing. *Western Journal of Nursing Research, 36*(4), 552-570. https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0193945913507634

Ernst, K. (2017). Terror of hope: The integration of attachment theory and womanist theology. *Pastoral Psychology, 66*, 201–212. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11089-016-0739-8

Exline, J. J., Yali, A. M., & Sanderson, W. C. (2000). Guilt, discord, and alienation: The role of religious strain in depression and suicidality. *Journal of Clinical Psychology, 56*(12), 1481–1496. https://doi.org/10.1002/1097-4679(200012)56:12<1481::aid-1>3.0.co;2-a

Exline, J. J., Pargament, K. I., Grubbs, J. B., & Yali, A.M. (2014). The Religious and Spiritual Struggles Scale: Development and initial validation. *Psychology of Religion and Spirituality, 6*, 208-222. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0036465

Floyd-Thomas, S., Floyd-Thomas, J., Duncan, C. B., Ray, S. G., Jr., & Westfield, N. L. (2007). *Black church studies: An introduction*. Abingdon Press.

Gorsuch, R. L., & McPherson, S. E. (1989). Intrinsic/extrinsic measurement: I/E-Revised and single-item scales. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 28*(3), 348-354. https://doi.org/10.2307/1386745

Green, G. L., Pardue, S. T., & Yeo, K.-K. (2020). *Majority world theology: Christian doctrine in global context*. IVP Academic. https://doi.org./10.2307/13867455

Hall, M. E. L., McMartin, J., Wang, D., Shannonhouse, L., Aten, J. D., Silverman, E. J., & Decker, L. A. (2021). The Christian Sanctification of Suffering Scale: Measure development and relationship to well-being. *Mental Health, Religion & Culture*. https://doi.org/10.1080/13674676.2021.1884670

Harvey, P. (2011). *Through the storm, through the night: A history of African American Christianity*. Rowman & Littlefield.

Hart, T. (2010). Eschatology. In G. R. McDermott (Ed.), *The Oxford handbook of Evangelical Theology* (pp. 262-275). Oxford.

Henrich, J., Heine, S. J., & Norenzayan, A. (2010). The weirdest people in the world? *Behavioral and Brain Sciences, 33*(2-3), 61-83. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0140525X0999152X

Herth, K. (1992). Abbreviated instrument to measure hope: Development and psychometric evaluation. *Journal of Advanced Nursing, 17*(10), 1251–1259. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2648.1992.tb01843.x

Hoekema, A. (1979). *The Bible and the future*. Eerdmans.

Hu, L., & Bentler, P. M. (1999). Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural Equation Modeling: An Interdisciplinary Journal, 6*(1), 1-55. https://doi.org/10.1080/10705519909540118

Jöreskog, K. G., & Sörbom, D. (1993). *LISREL 8: Structural equation modeling with the SIMPLIS command language*. Scientific Software International; Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Julian, & Skinner, J. (1996). *Revelation of love*. Doubleday.

Kapic, K. M. (2017). *Embodied hope: A theological meditation on pain and suffering*. IVP Academic.

Kemper, C. J., Wassermann, M., Hoppe, A., Beierlein, C., & Rammstedt, B. (2017). Measuring dispositional optimism in large-scale studies: Psychometric evidence for German, Spanish, and Italian versions of the Scale Optimism-Pessimism-2 (SOP2). *European Journal of Psychological Assessment, 33*(6), 403–408. https://doi.org/10.1027/1015-5759/a000297

Keyes, C. L., Eisenberg, D., Perry, G. S., Dube, S. R., Kroenke, K., & Dhingra, S. S. (2012). The relationship of level of positive mental health with current mental disorders in predicting suicidal behavior and academic impairment in college students. *Journal of American College Health, 60*(2), 126-133. https://doi.org/10.1080/07448481.2011.608393

Kinghorn, W. (2013). "Hope that is seen is no hope at all": Theological constructions of hope in psychotherapy. *Bulletin of the Menninger Clinic, 77*(4), 369-395. https://doi.org/10.1521/bumc.2013.77.4.369

Koo, T. K., & Li, M. Y. (2016). A guideline of selecting and reporting intraclass correlation coefficients for reliability research. *Journal of Chiropractic Medicine, 15*(2), 155–163. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcm.2016.02.012

Kroenke, K., Strine, T. W., Spitzer, R. L., Williams, J. B., Berry, J. T., & Mokdad, A. H. (2009). The PHQ-8 as a measure of current depression in the general population. *Journal of Affective Disorders,114*(1-3), 163-173. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jad.2008.06.026

Lewis, C. S. (1942). *The weight of glory*. Macmillan.

McCullough, M. E., Emmons, R. A., & Tsang, J. (2002). The grateful disposition: A conceptual and empirical topography. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 82*(1), 112-127. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.82.1.112

Middleton, J. R. (2014). *A new heaven and a new earth: Reclaiming biblical eschatology*. Baker Academic.

Moltmann, J. (1967) *Theology of hope: On the ground and the implications of a Christian eschatology*. Harper & Row.

Myers, D. G. (1980). *The inflated self: Human illusions and the biblical call to hope*. Seabury.

O'Connor, B. P. (2000). SPSS and SAS programs for determining the number of components using parallel analysis and Velicer's MAP text. *Behavior Research Methods, 32*, 396-402. https://doi.org/10.3758/BF03200807

Pargament, K. I., Koenig, H. G., & Perez, L. (2000). The many methods of religious coping: Development and initial validation of the RCOPE. *Journal of Clinical Psychology, 56*(4), 519-543. https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1097-4679(200004)56:4<519::AID-JCLP6>3.0.CO;2-1

Paulhus, D. L. (1984). Two-component models of socially desirable responding. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 46*, 598-609. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.46.3.598

Paulhus, D. L. (2002). Socially desirable responding: The evolution of a construct. In H. I. Braun, D. N. Jackson, & D. E.Wiley (Eds.), *The role of constructs in psychological and educational measurement* (pp. 49–69). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Peer, E., Vosgerau, J., & Acquisti, A. (2013). Reputation as a sufficient condition for data quality on Amazon Mechanical Turk. *Behavior Research Methods, 46*, 1023–1031. https://doi.org/10.3758/s13428-013-0434-y

Pinches, C. (2014). On hope. In K. Timpe & C. A. Boyd (Eds.), *Virtues and their vices* (pp. 349-368). Oxford.

Plantinga, C., Jr. (1993). *Assurances of the heart*. Zondervan.

Polkinghorne, J. (2002). *The God of hope and the end of the world*. Yale University Press.

Ratzinger, J. C. (1977). *Eschatology: Death and eternal life*. Catholic University of America Press.

Roberts, R. C. (2007). *Spiritual emotions: A psychology of Christian virtues*. Eerdmans.

Ryken, L., Wilhoit, J. C., Longman, R., III. (1998). Hope. In L. Ryken, J. C. Wilhoit, & T. Longman, III (Eds.), *Dictionary of biblical imagery* (p. 399). IVP Academic.

Schnitker, S. (2012). An examination of patience and well-being. *The Journal of Positive Psychology, 7*(4), 263-280. https://doi.org/10.1080/17439760.2012.697185

Schumacker, R. E., & Lomax, R. G. (2004). *A beginner's guide to structural equation modeling*. Psychology Press. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781410610904

Scioli, A., Ricci, M., Nyugen, T., & Scioli, E. R. (2011). Hope: Its nature and measurement. *Psychology of Religion and Spirituality, 3*(2), 78-97. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0020903

Sedikides, C., & Gebauer, J. E. (2010). Religiosity as self-enhancement: A meta-analysis of the relation between socially desirable responding and religiosity. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 14*(1), 17-36. https://doi.org/10.1177/1088868309351002

Smedes, L. (1998). *Keeping hope alive*. Nelson World Publishing.

Smith, S. (2017). Theology of hope. In D. J. Trier & W. A. Ellwell (Eds.), *Evangelical dictionary of theology*. (p. 401). Baker.

Snyder, C. R., Harris, C., Anderson, J. R., Holleran, S. A., Irving, L. M., Sigmon, S. T., Yoshinubu, L., Gibb, J. , Langelle, C., & Harney, P. (1991). The will and the ways: Development and validation of an individual-differences measure of hope. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 60*(4), 570-585. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.60.4.570

Spencer, S. R. (2005) Hope. In K. J. Van Hoozer (Ed.), *Dictionary for theological interpretations of the Bible* (pp. 305-307). Baker.

Spitzer, R. L., Kroenke, K., Williams, J. B., & Löwe, B. (2006). A brief measure for assessing Generalized Anxiety Disorder. *Archives of Internal Medicine, 166*, 1092-1097. https://doi.org/10.1001/archinte.166.10.1092

Steger, M. F., Frazier, P., Oishi, S., & Kaler, M. (2006). The meaning in life questionnaire: Assessing the presence of and search for meaning in life. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 53*(1), 80–93. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0167.53.1.80

Tongue, D. H. (2017). Hope. In D. J. Trier & W. A. Ellwell (Eds.), *Evangelical dictionary of theology* (p. 401). Baker.

Van Tongeren, D. R., Aten, J. D., McElroy, S., Davis, D. E., Shannonhouse, L., Davis, E. B., & Hook, J. N. (2019). Developmental and validation of a measure of spiritual fortitude. *Psychological Trauma: Theory, Research, Practice, and Policy, 11*, 588-596. https://doi.org/10.1037/tra0000449

Walls, J. (2010). *The Oxford handbook of eschatology*. Oxford University Press.

Witvliet, C. V. O., Richie, F. J., Root Luna, L. M., & Van Tongeren, D. R. (2018). Gratitude predicts

hope and happiness: A two-study assessment of traits and states. T*he Journal of Positive Psychology, 14*, 271-282. doi.org/10.1080/17439760.2018.1424924

Wood, B. T., Worthington, E. L., Jr., Exline, J. J., Yali, A. M., Aten, J. D., & McMinn, M. R. (2010). Development, refinement, and psychometric properties of the Attitudes Toward God Scale (ATGS-9). *Psychology of Religion and Spirituality, 2*(3), 148–167. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0018753

Worthington, E. L., Jr., Wade, N. G., Hight, T. L., Ripley, J. S., McCullough, M. E., Berry, J. W., Schmitt, M. M., Berry, J. T., Bursley, K. H., & O'Connor, L. (2003). Religious commitment inventory—10. PsycTESTS Dataset. https://doi.org/10.1037/t00512-000

Wright, N. T. (2008). *Surprised by hope: Rethinking heaven, the resurrection, and the mission of the church*. Harper One.

Authors

Charlotte vanOyen Witvliet (PhD in Clinical Psychology, Purdue University) is professor of psychology at Hope College. Her research uses a biopsychosocial-spiritual framework to study emotion, mental health, and virtues such as forgiveness, gratitude, hope, and accountability.

M. Elizabeth Lewis Hall (PhD in Clinical Psychology, Rosemead School of Psychology, Biola University) is professor of psychology at Biola University. Her primary research interests include meaning-making in suffering and gender issues in a Christian context.

Julie J. Exline (PhD in Clinical Psychology, Stony Brook University) is professor of psychology at Case Western Reserve University in Cleveland, Ohio. She studies religious and spiritual struggles, as well as supernatural beliefs, attributions, and experiences.

David C. Wang (ThM in Spiritual Theology, Regent College; PhD in Counseling Psychology, University of Houston) is associate professor of psychology at Rosemead School of Psychology (Biola University). His research interests include trauma/traumatic stress and various topics related to multicultural psychology and social justice.

Lindsey M. Root Luna (PhD in Clinical Psychology, University of Miami) is associate professor of psychology at Hope College. Her research interests include virtues, self regulation, mental health, and religion and spirituality.

Daryl R. Van Tongeren (PhD in Social Psychology, Virginia Commonwealth University) is associate professor of psychology at Hope College. His primary research interests include meaning in life, religion, and virtues, such as humility and forgiveness.

David G. Myers (PhD in Social Psychology, University of Iowa) is a Hope College professor of psychology and a communicator of psychology science through textbooks and other writings, including a blog: TalkPsych.com. His social psychological research has extended from experiments on group polarization to discerning predictors of human happiness.

Alexis Abernethy (PhD in Clinical Psychology, University of California, Berkeley) is professor of clinical psychology in the School of Psychology & Marriage and Family Therapy at Fuller Theological Seminary. Her research interests include psychological factors in corporate worship, spirituality dimensions in cancer screening and survivorship, and spirituality factors in psychiatric inpatients.

John D. Witvliet (PhD in Liturgical Theology, University of Notre Dame) is professor of worship at Calvin University and Calvin Theological Seminary. His research explores Christian systematic theology and the connections between theological convictions and public worship practices across the spectrum of Christian denominations throughout history and across cultures.

Appendix A

Scriptural Themes and EFA Items

Scriptural Themes	EFA Scale Items
God is the primary agent of ultimate eschatological ends—the one who will be setting all things right in a new creation (2 Cor. 5:5, Rev. 21:5).	1. I live with awareness of God as the primary source of my hope 2. I live with trust that ultimately, God will make all things new. 3. I have hope in God's goodness.
As Christ was resurrected, so too, the dead will be resurrected, raised to new everlasting life with everlasting joy that will include celebration and feasting (Is. 35:5-6, Rom. 8:11, 1 Cor. 15:42-44, 53-54, 2 Cor. 5:1-4, Rev. 19:9).	5. I experience hope when I think about everlasting life. 6. I believe I will live with God forever. 14. My hope is based in Christ's resurrection.
People from every place, culture, and language will be included (Is. 60:1-7, Rev. 7:9-10, Rev. 21:24-26).	4. I believe that God will ultimately draw together people from every place and culture.
All pain and crying, suffering and death will come to an end (Is. 35:10, Is. 65: 19, Rev. 21:4).	7. I live with the expectation that God will remove suffering for eternity. 8. Even when I suffer, I entrust my future to God.
This promise further extends to the elimination of all evil, war, violence, and injustice—addressing not only personal pain, but also relational and societal travail (Is. 2:1-2, Micah 4:1-4).	9. I live with confidence that the goodness of God will ultimately triumph over evil
God will reconcile all things (Col. 1:20), such that righteousness and peace will flourish (Is. 11:6-9, Is. 35:1-7, Is. 65:25), and healing will come to the nations (Rev. 22:2) and the entire cosmos, which God so loves (John 3:16).	10. I live with assurance that God will ultimately reconcile all things.
	11. I feel hope because I am God's child. 12. My spiritual identity gives me hope. 13. I have hope because I am part of the body of Christ. 15. I have hope because the Holy Spirit is at work in the world.

Appendix B

Eschatological Hope Scale

For each statement below, please choose the response that honestly reflects YOUR ACTUAL EXPERIENCE (rather than what you think you should be like). Substitute the names you use for God so that you can answer the question honestly. Choose the response that best represents HOW YOU TYPICALLY ARE.

Note: If a statement does not fit at all with your beliefs or experience, then you would select "Not at all like me" for that item. If a statement fits somewhat with your typical beliefs or experiences, then you would select "Somewhat like me" for that item.

TYPICALLY...	Not at all like me (1)	A little like me (2)	Somewhat like me (3)	A lot like me (4)	Exactly like me (5)
1. God is the source of my hope.					
2. I am confident that God will overcome evil.					
3. I believe that God will ultimately draw together people from every place and culture.					
4. I am sure that God will ultimately reconcile all things.					
5. I trust that God will remove suffering for eternity.					
6. I believe I will live with God forever.					