Hope, resilience level, and creativity among job-seekers under a work-based welfare program in Australia

Tolentino, Marvin ✉
Central Luzon State University, Philippines (tolentinomarvin@gmail.com)

Maliwat, Eric
Febias College of Bible; Sydney Institute - TAFE, New South Wales (ecmaliwat@yahoo.com)

Dullas, Angelo
Central Luzon State University, Philippines (dullas.angelo@yahoo.com)

Abstract

This study aimed to determine the levels of hope and resilience among adult job-seekers in Australia who are currently under the government's work-based welfare program. The researchers also aimed to determine the differences on the level of hope and resilience between creative and non-creative job-seekers, as well as between job-seekers who have Australian and non-Australian origins. The study included job-seekers with Australian, Asian, South American, African and Pacific-Island origins. Forty-nine respondents, aged 22 to 64, were purposively sampled to answer survey questionnaires. To measure self-perceive creativity, the researchers used a single-item self-assessed creativity questionnaire. The Adult Hope Scale (AHS) by Snyder et al. (1991) and Connor Davidson Resilience Scale (CD RISC 10) were used to measure the respondents' hope and resilience, respectively. Results show that he mean total of the respondents' AHS scores is 46.65 (with SD of 11.1) which falls on the above the average description. Meanwhile, the mean total of the respondents' CD RISC 10 scores is 35.22 (with standard deviation of 8.3) which falls on the 3rd quartile and is considered above average. Significant statistical difference on the level of resilience was observed between creative and non-creative respondents, $t(47)=2.473$, $p=.017$. Significant statistical differences were also observed on both levels of hope ($t=-3.22$, $p=.002$) and resilience ($t=-2.80$, $p=.007$) between respondents with Australian and non-Australian origins. These findings open up interesting inquiry whether one's creativity, country of origin or cultural background have a role on developing or demonstrating hope and resilience, especially to migrants workers.

Keywords: hope; resilience; creativity; Australian job-seekers

Hope, resilience level, and creativity among job-seekers under a work-based welfare program in Australia

1. Introduction

Resilience studies continually grow in depth and in numbers for the recent decades. Many researchers sustain their interest on how such human capacity is implicated on improving individual and community mental health. Particular interests were focused on studying the resilience of children and adolescents as well as adults experiencing medical and psychological conditions. This present study, however, focuses on assessing the level of resilience among Australian adults who are currently on their transition from being jobless to being integrated or re-integrated to work. Joblessness or unemployment is seen as one of the contributing factor on decreased quality of life, self-esteem and psychological resilience among individuals, especially when job searching period is prolonged. Moorhouse and Caltabiano (2007) even suggested that the inclusion of psychological intervention to foster resilience must be provided by job network services along with the standard job search training. This was after they studied seventy-seven unemployed job-seekers whose length of job searching was positively associated with depression.

Hope is another human characteristic that has been explored by researchers across different study areas in psychology, medicine society and economics. For example, the study of Rustone, Cooper, and Miaskowski (2010) concluded that hope is an important resource for cancer patients' quality of life. Specifically, direct association between distress and health status was no longer significant with hope as the mediator. While hope is well-explored on respondents with medical and psychopathological cases, this present study is interested to determine the hope level among job-seekers in Australia which is very new on the line. Like resilience, hope can also be seen as positive form of human adaptation to individuals who experience prolonged unemployment.

This research also provides an exploratory investigation on possible connection of creativity and the respondents' hope and resilience level. The respondents of this study are currently undergoing soft-skills training from a private job network services while under the Australian government's welfare program. The nature of the soft-skills training includes production of paper-clay artworks that aims to develop not only creativity, but also enhance the job-seekers' communication, mindfulness and social skills. Result of such inquiry will start up scientific discussion on the possible role of creativity on one's hope and resilience.

Generally, the study was conducted to help the researchers become more informed on the Australian job–seekers' level of hope and resilience. Possible connections of creativity, hope and resilience will provide insights to job network services' supervisors and administrators for appropriate policy-making and program development.

1.1 Definition of hope

Hope is defined as the perceived ability to produce pathways to achieve desired goals and to motivate oneself to use those pathways (Rand & Cheavens, 2012). Goals are abstract mental targets that guide human behaviors. Pathways thoughts are perceived ability to generate multiple routes to desired goals. Agency thought is perceived ability to initiate and sustain movement along a pathway. According to Lopez (2009), hope is defined as the energy and ideas that drive an individual to change his circumstances. They can be seen as goal-directed thinking (goals thinking) in which people perceive that they can produce routes to desired goals (pathways thinking) and the requisite motivation to use those routes (agency thinking). Basing from the Hope Theory concept of Charles Synder of agency and pathways, Kaufman (2011) maintains that a person with hope has the will and determination that goals will be achieved, and a set of different strategies to reach their goals.

The concept of hope gained much research attention because of its promising implications on clinical and coaching practices. In a study published in the Social Indicators Research, Cheavens and her colleagues (2006) tested a hope therapy treatment with a sample of 32 people recruited through newspaper ads and flyers. The ads asked for participants willing to attend weekly group meetings designed to increase participants' abilities to reach goals. The researchers specifically looked for people who were not diagnosed with depression or other mental illnesses, but who felt dissatisfied with where they were in life. In this study, about half the participants took part in eight, two-hour group sessions led by trained leaders. As part of these sessions, they were taught new hope-related skills, including identifying goals, ways to achieve them, and how to motivate themselves. Results showed that those who participated in the hope therapy had reduced depressive symptoms compared to the control group that did not participate.

In another study, psychologists at the Royal Marsden Hospital in London investigated women with early-stage breast cancer and found that risk of death increased significantly among those who lacked hope. Hopeful patients were found to manage their illness by themselves, instead of letting outsiders make all the decisions (Nowinski, 2011). Hope also appears to buffer anxiety about death and dying. In another study, using his Comprehensive Hope Scale, Scioli (as cited in Palmer, 2014) showed a group of young adults a 10-minute clip from the movie Philadelphia, in which Tom Hanks plays a man dying of AIDS. Scioli then gave them a questionnaire to measure their fear of dying and death. The results showed that anxiety about death did not spike in people who scored high in hope but did spike in low scorers. In the study of Slezáčková, Cefai, and Prošek (2018) involving 267 Czech and Maltese respondents aged 18 to 79 years old, correlates of perceived hope were identified. High level of generativity, low level of loneliness and spirituality were found to be significant predictor of perceived hope among the respondents.

Most hope studies are explored from adults with clinical and disability cases such as cancer, depression, old age, schizophrenia, anxiety disorders, among others. This study however, focuses on determining the hope level nonclinical adults.

1.2 Resilience

The American Psychological Association (2014) defines resilience as "the process of adapting well in the face of adversity, trauma, tragedy, threats or even significant sources of stress. Resilience is also defined as a dynamic process wherein individuals display positive adaptation despite experiences of significant adversity or trauma, characterizes the two-dimensionality of the construct. Adversity, also referred to as risk, typically encompasses negative life circumstances while positive adaptation represents the behavioral manifestation of social competence and successful accomplishments of various developmental tasks (Luthar & Cicchetti, 2000). Determinants of resilience can be inferred from biological, psychological, social and cultural factors that interact with one another to determine how one responds to stressful experiences (Southwick, Bonanno, Masten, Panter-Brick, & Yehuda, 2014).

The study of Gomez, Vincent, and Toussaint (2013) involving 48 adolescents (aged 12 to 18) and 31 adults (aged 34 to 84) investigated the psychosocial predictors of resilience by completing eight validated self-report questionnaires over eight-week period. Results showed that age, positive affect, gratitude and subjective happiness are predictors of resilience. Also, the relationship of gratitude, positive affect and happiness with resilience were consistently stronger for adults than their adolescent counterparts. In another study that explored the correlates of resilience among adult American Indians, gender, age, education level and degree of enculturation (using multi-group ethnic identity measure) variables were tested using linear regression analysis (Bradway, 2011). Generating quantitative data from 103 American Indians living off-reservation in a northwestern state, the study found out that higher enculturation was associated with higher resilience. Other predictors such as gender, age and education level were not statistically related to resilience. This finding suggests that cultural factors play an important role on resilience outcomes. Another study explored the role of resilience in mediating depression among Iranian immigrants living across Australia (Hosseini, Kakuma,

Ghazinour, Davern, Evans, & Minas, 2017). They also investigated the association between levels of depression along with socio-demographic and migration variables. They found out that with resilience as mediator, respondents with higher education level, who experienced moderate level of discrimination, and those who are married tend to have lower level of depression. In addition in the study of Dullas and Acoba (2013) and Tolentino and Dullas (2015) found that among Male Filipino Farmers and Children engaged in farming, resilience is an important component of one's happiness. Their study implied that one major contributor to farmers happiness is the ability to bounce back to difficult situation involving farming activities which includes coping towards calamities, physical discomforts, and economic struggles.

Cited studies thus suggest that adult resilience are both influence by individual psycho-social factor (like happiness, gratitude, positive emotion) but also by socio-cultural factors such as level of enculturation and experience of discrimination. This present study aims to determine the level of resilience among Australians (both with Australian and non-Australian origins) who are currently seeking employment.

1.3 Creativity

According to Sternberg (2009) creativity involves the capacity to produce something that is both original and worthwhile. In simple terms, creativity is often defined as the ability to come up with new and useful ideas (Beaty, 2018).

Researchers looked on personality correlates of creativity. Furnham and Bachtiar (2008) investigated the relationship of personality and intelligence with creativity. They used the Big Five NEO FFI as personality measure, the Wonderlic Personnel Test as measure of intelligence, and the Biographical Inventory of Creative Behaviors and a self-rated measure of creativity, among others. They study found that extraversion was significantly related to all measures of creativity. Intelligence, on the other hand, does not any incremental variance in predicting the creativity scores. Another study also looked on abstract reasoning and Big Five personality as correlates of creativity among 585 British adults (Furnham, Crump, & Swami, 2009). They administered series of tests such as the revised NEO Personality Inventory, the Graduate and Managerial Assessment for abstract reasoning and the Consequences Test for divergent thinking. It was found that openness to experience and extraversion are significant correlates of divergent thinking or creativity for British occupational sample.

While it is a common knowledge that notable artists had genetic predisposition to be extremely creative, researches from the past still suggest that creativity can be learned and acquired through self-regulation. A study cited by Novotney (2009) which was featured on Creativity Research Journal (Vol. 20, No.1) found that seventy-four (74) city employees in Orange County, California increases their creativity level after being exposed to a creativity training that strengthened four skills sets such as skills on capturing new ideas, seeking out challenging tasks, broadening one's knowledge and surrounding oneself with interesting things and people. Gasper (2004) found that a specific emotional state affect one's creativity. After involving undergraduates as respondents, it was found that sadness inhibits new ideas. Compared with people in sad or neutral moods, those in happy moods are better at coming up with unusual word associations, generating story endings and writing numerous answers to divergent thinking tasks.

According to Aguilar (2018), creativity is a resource for coping with stress and boosting creativity can be a good way to cultivate resilience among people. Creative process enables a person to see the root of a problem and see a situation in a different light. Metzl and Morrell (2008) discussed the concept of creative adaptation which is theoretically close to the concept of resilience wherein creative adaptation inspires functioning in a uniquely positive manner (novelty) and yet in a manner that considers the environment and specific context. They proposed that creativity has an important role to play within the conceptualization of resilience as a multifactor process. Such connection between the two concepts has practical applications for therapy and research where creative processes and production of creative ideas may be used to promote resilience through

expressive therapy.

The present study looked on the Australian job-seekers' self-perceived creativeness and how such self-perception differ on their resilience and hope scores.

1.4 Significance of the study

Hope and resilience studies were often investigated using respondents with clinical diagnoses and are less explored using nonclinical respondents. This present study would supply additional knowledge to regarding the hope and resilience level among adults who are presently on a career transition (i.e., actively seeking job). Hope and resilience data among this kind population will be beneficial to policy and program makers to continually develop and improve their current services that would contribute to their over-all well-being and quality of life. The study also seeks to determine the differences on the levels of hope and resilience among creative and non-creative respondents. The result will supply additional inputs on the common claims that creativity can foster resilience and cultivate optimism. Such knowledge is expected to offer helpful implications on therapy and research which focus on cultivating hope and enhancing resilience.

1.5 This present study

The present study was conducted to determine the percentage of Australian job-seekers who perceive themselves as either creative or non-creative; to measure the respondents' level of hope and resilience using self-report questionnaires; to determine the differences on the level of hope and resilience between the respondents who consider themselves creative and non-creative; and to determine the differences on the level of hope and resilience between respondents who have Australian and non-Australian origin. The researchers hypothesized that there is no significant difference on the level of hope and resilience between creative and non-creative Australian job-seekers. It is also hypothesized that there is no significant difference on the level of hope and resilience between respondents with Australian and non-Australian origins.

2. Methodology

2.1 Research design

The study employed descriptive method to determine the Australian job-seekers' socio-demographic data (such as their age, sex and country of origin), self-perceived creativeness, level of hope and level of resilience. The study aimed to determine the levels of the respondents' hope and resilience, the differences on the level of hope and resilience between creative and non-creative Australian job-seekers included in this study, and the differences on the level of hope and resilience between respondents with Australian and non-Australian origin.

2.2 Respondents and sampling method

The study included forty-nine (49) adult Australian job-seekers whose ages range from 22 to 64 and are living in New South Wales. The respondents were all Australian citizens (both by birth and naturalized process).They are under a government welfare program that aims to assist clients on their transition to work by developing their soft skills for employment. The researchers used purposive sampling method to identify the respondents since the study was concerned about the particular group which is the Australian job-seekers who are currently under a government welfare program in New South Wales. With the help of the respondents' supervisor, respondents were identified.

2.3 Time and locale of the study

The study was conducted on third week of January 2019. The schedule of the administration of survey

questionnaires was during the one their sessions. The locale of the study was in the suburban parts of metropolitan Sydney in New South Wales, Australia.

2.4 Research instruments

To determine the respondents' socio-demographic characteristics, a survey questionnaire was created to obtain their age, sex and country of origin. The respondents also answered a single-item self-assessed creativity which is answerable by 'yes or no' response. The researchers used the Connor-Davidson Resilience Scale 10 to determine the respondents' resilience level. The CD-RISC 10 is designed as a self-rating scale answerable by a 5-point Likert items. The respondents are directed to respond to each statement with reference to the previous month or by how they think they would have reacted in a given situation (Davidson & Connor, 2017). Yu and Zhang (2007) noted the CD-RISC to show strong psychometric properties in a Chinese adult population, almost 75% of whom were between ages 20-49. Good internal consistency was obtained (Cronbach α coefficient = .91).

Another instrument was used to measure the respondents' hope level. The Adult Hope Scale (Snyder et al., 1991) is a 12-item self-report inventory designed to measure a person's level of hope. Four items are pathways subscale, four items are agency subscales and four items are distracters. A total hope score is determined when scores on pathways and agency items are totaled. Possible scores range from 8 to 64 with items answerable by an 8-point Likert scale. The AHS has good internal reliability (.74-.84) and test-retest correlations (.82 over ten weeks, with the Cronbach alpha's score of .83 on hope. The current study used the instrument to describe the Australian job-seekers' level of hope.

2.5 Data gathering procedure

The researchers secure permissions to the host organization and partner organization that handles the group through verbal and written request for participation. The respondents were also invited to answer the survey and the researchers explained the purpose of the study. The researchers let the respondents complete the survey by themselves. Respondents who have difficulty understanding English language were assisted by their co-respondents to translate each item for them. All respondents were also asked whether they perceive themselves creative or not before completing the hope and resilience scales. The word 'creative' were uniformly defined by the researchers as '*someone who can generate new and original ideas that may be useful in solving problems, communicating to others and entertaining oneself*' (Franken, 2002). After completing the self-administered survey questionnaire, the data were gather and analyzed.

2.6 Data analysis

To analyze the respondents' socio-demographic characteristics, self-perceive creativeness, level of hope and level of resilience, the researchers used frequency, percentage, mean and standard deviation analysis. To determine the differences on the levels of hope and resilience between the creative and non-creative groups, independent sample t-test analysis was used.

3. Results and discussion

3.1 Socio-demographic characteristics

The respondents were composed of adult Australian job-seekers whose ages range from 22 to 64 years old. The average age of the respondents is around 41 years old. Ten (10) of them are on their 20s while four (4) of them are already on their 60s. Of the total of forty-nine respondents, eighteen (18) of them are males which comprised the 37% of the respondents while thirty-one (31) of them are females which comprised the 63% of the respondents.

As for the nationalities, all of the respondents were Australian citizens both through birth and naturalization processes. More than half of them (27 or 55%) were born in Australia while the rest were born in different regions of the world such as in the Pacific Islands (Fiji), Asia (Philippines, Turkey, Bangladesh, Vietnam, Lebanon, Kuwait, Iraq, Syria, and Afghanistan), South America (Chile) and Africa (Morocco). The respondents currently living in the suburban parts of metropolitan Sydney, New South Wales (see Table 1).

Table 1

The respondents' country of origin

Country of Origin	Frequency (Percentage)
Australia	27 (55.10%)
Syria	4 (8.20%)
Vietnam	4 (8.20%)
Fiji	3 (6.10%)
Chile	2 (4.10%)
Iraq	2 (4.10%)
Afghanistan	1 (2%)
Bangladesh	1 (2%)
Kuwait	1 (2%)
Lebanon	1 (2%)
Morocco	1 (2%)
Turkey	1 (2%)
Philippines	1 (2%)

3.2 Frequency of creative and non-creative respondents

Using a single-item self-assessed creativity, the respondents answered whether they consider themselves as creative or not. The word 'creative' were uniformly defined by the researchers to the respondents as '*someone who can generate new and original ideas that may be useful in solving problems, communicating to others and entertaining oneself*' (Franken, 2002). Thirty one (31 or 63%) of them consider themselves as creative while eighteen (18 or 37%) of them do not consider themselves creative. Among the 18 male respondents, eleven (11 or 61%) consider themselves creative while among the 31 female respondents twenty (20 or 64%) consider themselves creative. Majority of the respondents consider themselves creative.

3.3 Level of hope

The respondents answered the Adult Hope Scale developed by Snyder et al. (1991) which is composed of 12-items (four of which measure agency thinking component of hope, four of which measure the pathway thinking component of hope and four filler items). To compute for the total hope score, agency and pathway subscales are summed. Each item is answerable by eight-point scales with 1 being the lowest possible score and eight as the highest. Snyder et al. (1991) suggested that 64 is the perfect hope score and 32 is the mid-score. The table shows that the respondents' hope score which is 46.65 is above the normal level with 11.1 as the predictable difference (see Table 2). This suggests that the respondents have above average level of hope as measured by the Adult Hope Scale. Despite unemployment, the level of hope among Australian job-seekers remains above the average level.

While this study is not interested on the factors that cause high level of hope, the respondents' above average score on hope measure can be in part due to their involvement on the Australian government's welfare program that support their job search activities. This can be further qualified by conducting another series of study comparing the hope level between job-seekers who are under the government's job services program and those job-seekers not listed on the program. In addition, there is very little difference on the level of hope among male (with the mean score of 46.3) and female (46.8) respondents.

Table 2

The respondents' level of hope

Items	Mean (SD)
Agency Subscale	22.89 (6.2)
I energetically pursue my goals.	5.91 (1.7)
My past experiences have prepared me well for my future.	5.67 (1.9)
I've been pretty successful in life.	5.53 (2.1)
I meet the goals that I set for myself.	5.77 (2.0)
Pathways Subscale	23.75 (5.6)
I can think of many ways to get out of jam	5.83 (1.9)
There are lots of ways around any problem.	6.28 (1.7)
I can think of many ways to get things in life that are important to me.	5.67 (2.0)
Even when others get discouraged, I know I can find a way to solve the problem.	5.95 (1.9)
Total Hope(Agency Subscale + Pathway Subscale)	46.65 (11.1)

3.4 Hope among creative and non-creative respondents

Using descriptive analysis, the respondents' mean scores on Adult Hope Scale was compared based on two groupings: those who consider themselves creative (*n*=31) and those who consider themselves not creative (*n*=18). The table shows the breakdown of scores on the two subscales (agency and pathway) and the total hope score. Results show that creative group have a mean agency subscale score of 23.90 and pathway score of 24.70.Combining the two subscales, the total hope level of the creative respondents is 48.70 (*SD*=10.4). Meanwhile the noncreative group has a mean agency subscale score of 21.10 and pathway score of 22. Combining the two subscales, the total hope level of the non-creative respondents is 43.10 (*SD*=11.6). This suggests the hope subscales and the total hope scores of creative group is consistently higher than their noncreative counterparts (see Table 3).

Both scores of creative and non-creative groups are higher than the Adult Hope Scale (AHS) median score of 32. However, when compared to the mean score (46.34, standard deviation of 7.93) obtained from the 17-year old Australian norms, the mean score of creative Australian adult respondents (48.70) is higher than the Australian adolescent respondents on the study of Venning and Kettler (2009). Meanwhile, the mean score (43.10) of the respondents who do not consider themselves creative is lower than the aforementioned Australian adolescents' mean score on AHS.

Table 3

The comparison of means on the hope level among creative and non-creative respondents

AHS Scales	With Australian Origin	With Non-Australian Origins
Agency Sub-scale	23.90	21.10
Pathway Sub-scale	24.70	22.00
Total Hope	48.70 (10.40)	43.10 (11.6)

To determine the statistical significance of the observed differences on the mean scores on AHS of creative and non-creative respondents, independent sample t-test was computed. With a total of 49 respondents, the table shows that creative and non-creative respondents' scores on Adult Hope Scale do not differ significantly, *t* (47)= 1.738, *p*=.089 (see Table 4).

Table 4

Statistical difference on hope level by the respondents

	Mean	SD	df	*t*-value	*p*
Creative	48.70	10.40	47	1.738	.089
Non-creative	43.11	11.64			

The result indicates that creative and non-creative Australian job-seekers included in this study do not differ

significantly on their hope level. The result therefore does not reject the null hypothesis that there is no significant difference on the level of hope between the creative and non-creative Australian job-seekers participated in this study.

3.5 Level of resilience

Using the self-rating scale of Connor-Davidson Resilience Scale-10 with possible scores ranging from 0 to 40, the respondents' resilience level was measured. The mean score obtained was 35.22 with a standard deviation of 8.3. The interpretation was based from the CD RISC-10 scores obtained from the US general population (n=764) with 32 as the median score. Using descriptive analysis, the result shows that the respondents' resilience level (35.22) falls on the 3rd quartile and is above the median score. This suggests that their resilience level is above average (see Table 5).

For the readers who might be interested on the sex differences on resilience level among the Australian job-seekers, the following are observed. Male respondents have a mean score on CD RISC-10 resilience of 35.0 (SD=7.7) while their female counterparts obtained 35.35 (SD=9.5). Using mean comparisons analysis, there is very little sex differences on the respondents' resilience level. Results suggest that despite the respondents' job status, they still have above average resilience.

Table 5

The level of resilience of the respondents

Mean (n=49)	SD	Quartile	Description
35.22	8.3	3rd	Above Average

3.6 Resilience among creative and non-creative respondents

Using descriptive analysis, the respondents' mean scores on CD RISC10 was compared based on two groupings: those who consider themselves creative and those who consider themselves not creative. Results show that the creative group have a mean total resilience score of 37.50 (n=31) with standard deviation of 8.0; while the noncreative group have a mean total resilience score of 31.33 (n=18) with standard deviation of 8.9. This suggests the mean total resilience score of creative Australian job-seekers is higher than their noncreative counterparts' score (see Table 6).

Table 6

Mean comparisons on the level of resilience between creative and non-creative respondents

	Creative Respondents	**Non-creative Respondents**
CD-RISC10 Score	37.50 (8.0)	31.33 (8.9)

To determine the statistical significance of the observed differences on the mean scores on CD RISC 10 of creative and non-creative respondents, independent sample t-test was computed. With a total of 49 respondents, the table shows that creative and non-creative respondents' scores on CD RISC 10 have a significant difference, $t(47)$= 2.473, p=.017. Creative respondents have higher resilience score than their non-creative counterparts (see Table 7).

Table 7

Statistical difference on resilience level of the respondents

	Mean	SD	df	t-value	p
Creative	37.50	8.09	47	2.473	.017*
Non-creative	31.33	8.90			

Note. *highly significant ($p \leq$ .05).

The result indicates that creative and non-creative Australian job-seekers included in this study differ

significantly on their resilience level. The result therefore rejects the null hypothesis that there is no significant difference on the level of resilience between the creative and non-creative Australian job-seekers participated in this study. The result supports the statement of Metzl and Morrell (2008) that theoretical connections might exist between creativity and resilience which can be explored for possible conceptual and practical implications. While both groups have above the average level of resilience, it was found that those who perceive themselves as creative have significantly higher level of resilience than those who consider themselves non-creative.

3.7 Comparison of hope scores between respondents with Australian and non-Australian origin

The table shows that respondents with Australian origin have a mean agency score of 20.5 and mean pathway score of 22.1. Combining the two subscales to compute for their mean hope score, the group obtained a mean score of 42.6 with standard deviation of 10.67.Meanwhile the respondents with non‑Australian origin have a mean agency score of 26.09 and mean pathway score of 25.95. Combining the two subscales to compute for their mean hope score, the group obtained a mean score of 52.04 with standard deviation of 9.38 (see Table 8).

Table 8

Mean comparisons of hope scores between respondents with Australian and Non-Australian origin

AHS Scales	With Australian Origin	With Non-Australian Origins
Agency Sub-scale	20.50	26.09
Pathway Sub-scale	22.10	25.95
Total Hope	42.60 (10.67)	52.04 (9.38)

The study has 28 respondents with Australian origin and 21 respondents with 21 non‑Australian origins. Respondents with non-Australian origin have consistently higher mean scores on all hope subscales (agency and pathway) and the total hope scale than their Australian counterparts.

To determine the statistical difference between the groups' level of hope, independent sample t-test was used. With a total of 49 respondents, the table shows that the scores of the respondents with Australian and non-Australian origin on AHS have a significant difference, $t(47)=-3.22$, $p=.002$ (see Table 9).

Table 9

Statistical difference on the level of hope between the groups of respondents

	Mean	*SD*	*df*	*t*-value	*p*
Australian Origin	42.60	10.67	47	-3.22	.002*
Non-Australian Origin	52.04	9.38			

Note. *highly significant ($p\le .05$).

Respondents with non-Australian origin have higher hope score than their non-Australian counterparts. This result rejects the study's hypothesis that there is no significant difference on the level of hope between respondents with Australian and non-Australian origins. This is an interesting finding which future researcher could further prove that hope can be understood by determining an individual's country of origin or cultural background. Nevertheless, both groups' scores still fall on above average level of hope.

3.8 Comparison of resilience level between respondents with Australian and non-Australian origin

The table shows that the respondents with Australian origin have the mean score on CD RISC10 of 32.35 with the standard deviation of 6.90 while the respondents with non-Australian origin obtained a mean score of 39.04 with standard deviation of 9.79 (see Table 10). The study has 28 respondents with Australian origin and 21 respondents with 21 non‑Australian origins. Respondents with non-Australian origin have higher scores on resilience than their Australian counterparts based on the result of CD RISC 10.

Table 10

Mean comparisons of resilience scores of respondents with Australian and Non-Australian origin

	With Australian Origin	With Non-Australian Origins
CD-RISC10 Score	32.35 (6.90)	39.04 (9.79)

To determine whether the observed difference on their CD RISC 10 scores is statistically significant, independent sample t-test was used. Result shows that the scores of the respondents with Australian and non-Australian origin on AHS have a significant difference, $t(47)=-2.80$, $p=.007$ (see Table 11).

Table 11

Statistical difference on the level of resilience between the groups of respondents

	Mean	*SD*	*df*	*t*-value	*p*
Australian Origin	32.35	6.90	47	-2.80	.007*
Non-Australian Origin	39.04	9.79			

Note. *highly significant ($p \le .01$).

Respondents with non-Australian origin have higher resilience score than their non-Australian counterparts. The result suggests the importance of considering one's cultural background (i.e, country of origin, customs, norms and language) in understanding resilience. The notion of cultural resilience suggests that individuals can deal with and overcome adversity not just based on individual characteristics alone but also by generating support from larger socio-cultural resources (Clauss-Ehlers, 2015). While both groups have obtained above average scores on resilience, the respondent with Australian origin reported significantly higher level of resilience than their Australian-born counterparts. This result rejects the null hypothesis cited earlier in this study.

4. Conclusion

The study aimed to determine the level of hope and resilience among job-seekers in Australia. It also explored the differences on the level of hope and resilience between four groups: job-seekers who perceive themselves as creative, job-seekers who perceive themselves as non-creative, job-seekers who have Australian origin, and job-seekers with non-Australian origins. Results show that job-seekers in Australia who are benefiting from the government's job and employment program have high level of hope and resilience. This means that they can think of ways to get to their desired goals and have motivation to achieve it. They see themselves as generally capable of bouncing back to normal functioning in spite of adversity.

Significant difference on the level of resilience between creative and non-creative Australian job-seekers is also an interesting and unique finding of this study. More researches are needed to establish the specific role of creativity on fostering resilience. It is also good to ask whether it is the trait of resilience that actually push an individual to be creative, or vice versa. When proven, it can add to bodies of knowledge that support the impact of creative-expressive intervention in fostering resilience to both children and adult clients. Another interesting findings are the observed significant differences on the level of hope and resilience among job-seekers who have Australian and non-Australian origin. Job-seekers who have non-Australian origin have consistently higher scores on hope scales and resilience than their Australian-born counterparts. These findings open up another interesting inquiry whether one's country of origin or cultural background has a role on developing or demonstrating hope and resilience, especially to migrant workers.

5. References

Aguilar, E. (2018). Boosting resilience through creativity. Retrieved from
　　　https://www.edutopia.org/article/boosting-resilience-through-creativity

American Psychological Association. (2014). *The road to resilience.* Retrieved from
　　　http://www.apa.org/helpcenter/road-resilience.aspx

Beaty, R. (2018). New study reveals why some people are more creative than others. Retrieved from

https://theconversation.com/new

Bradway, B. (2011). Correlates of resilience among American Indians in a Northwestern US State. Retrieved from https://scholarworks.walden.edu/dissertations/976/

Cheavens, J., Feldman, D. B., Gum, A., Michael, S., & Snyder, C. R. (2006). Hope therapy in community sample: A pilot investigation. *Social Indicators Research, 77*, 61-78. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-005-5553-0

Clauss-Ehlers, C. (2015). *Cultural resilience*. Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-387-71799-9_115

Davidson, J. R. T., & Connor, K. M. (2017). *Connor-Davidson Resilience Scale (CD-RISC) Manual*. CDRISC.

Dullas, A. R., & Acoba, E. F. (2013). *Concept of happiness among Filipino farmers: A qualitative and quantitative view*. Germany: Lambert Academic Publishing.

Franken, R. E. (2002). *Human motivation* (3rd ed.). Wadsworth/Thomson Learning.

Furnham, A. Crump, J., & Swami, V. (2009). Abstract reasoning and Big Five personality correlates of creativity in British occupational sample. *Imagination, Cognition and Personality, 28*(4), 361-370. https://doi.org/10.2190/IC.28.4.f

Furnham, A., & Bachtiar, V. (2008). Personality and intelligence as predictors of creativity. *Personality and Individual Differences, 45*(7), 613-617. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2008.06.023

Gasper, K. (2004). Permission to seek freely? The effect of happy and sad moods on generating old and new ideas. *Creativity Research, 16*(2-3), 215-229. https://doi.org/10.1080/10400419.2004.9651454

Gomez, M., Vincent, A., & Toussaint, L. (2013). Correlates of resilience in adolescents and adults. *International Journal of Clinical Psychiatry and Mental Health, 1,* 18-24.

Hosseini, A., Kakuma, R., Ghazinour, M., Davern, M., Evans, W., & Minas, M. (2017). Migration experience, resilience and depression: A study of Iranian immigrants living in Australia. *International Journal of Culture and Mental Health, 10*(1), 108-120. https://doi.org/10.1080/17542863.2016.1270977

Kaufman, S. B. (2011). *The will and ways of hope.* Retrieved from https://www.psychologytoday.com/intl/blog/beautiful-minds/201112/the-will-and-ways-hope

Lopez, S. J. (2009). *Why hope matters now.* Retrieved from https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/blog/imperfect-spirituality/201902/why-hope-matters

Luthar, S., & Cicchetti, D. (2000). The construct of resilience: Implications for interventions and social policies. *Developmental Pathology, 12*(4), 857-885. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0954579400004156

Metzl, E., & Morrell, M. (2008). The role of creativity in models of resilience: Theoretical exploration and practical applications. *Journal of Creativity in Mental Health, 3*(3), 303-318. https://doi.org/10.1080/15401380802385228

Moorhouse, A., & Caltabiano, M. (2007). Resilience and unemployment: Exploring risk and protective influences for the outcome variables of depression and assertive job-searching. *Journal of Employment Counseling, 44*(3), 115-125. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.2161-1920.2007.tb00030.x

Novotney, A. (2009). The science of creativity. Retrieved from https://www.apa.org/gradpsych/2009/01/creativity

Nowinski, J. (2011). Hope and survival: The power of psychological resilience. Retrieved from https://www.huffpost.com/entry/hope-survival_b_819005

Palmer, L. (2014). Towards a psychology of hope. Retrieved from http://www.dailygood.org/story/798/towards-a-psychology-of-hope-louise-danielle-palmer/

Rand, K. L., & Cheavens, J. S. (2012). Hope theory. In S. J. Lopez & C. R. Snyder (Eds.), *The oxford handbook of positive psychology* (2nd ed.). https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780195187243.013.0030

Rustone, T., Cooper, B., & Miaskowski, C. (2010). The importance of hope as a mediator of psychological distress and life satisfaction in a community sample of cancer patients. *Cancer Nursing, 33*(4), 258-267. https://doi.org/10.1097/NCC.0b013e3181d6fb61

Slezáčková A., Cefai C., & Prošek T. (2018). Psychosocial correlates and predictors of perceived hope across cultures: A study of Czech and Maltese contexts. In A. M. Krafft, P. Perrig-Chiello, & A. M. Walker (Eds.), Hope for a good life. *Social Indicators Research Series, 72,* 165-197. Springer, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-78470-0_8

Snyder, C. R., Harris, C., Anderson, J. R., Holleran, S. A., Irving, L. M., Sigmon, S.T., et al. (1991). The will and

the ways: Development and validation of an individual-differences measure of hope. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 60,* 570-585. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.60.4.570

Southwick, S., Bonanno, G., Masten, A., Panter-Brick, C., & Yehuda, R. (2014). Resilience definitions, theory, and challenges: interdisciplinary perspectives. *European Journal of Psychotraumatology, 5*(1). https://doi.org/10.3402/ejpt.v5.25338

Sternberg, R. (2009). *Cognitive psychology* (5th ed., pp. 479-477). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Tolentino, M., & Dullas, A. R. (2015). Subjective well-being of Filipino farm children. *International Journal of Research Studies in Psychology, 4*(4), 47-60. https://doi.org/10.5861/ijrsp.2015.1265

Venning, A., & Kettler, L. J. (2009). Normative data for the Hope Scale using Australian adolescents. *Australian Journal of Psychology, 61*(2), 100-106. https://doi.org/10.1080/00049530802054360

Yu, X., & Zhang, J. (2007). A comparison between the Chinese version of Ego-Resiliency Scale and Connor-Davidson Resilience Scale. *Psychological Science, 30*(5), 1169-1171. https://doi.org/10.1037/t60027-000