



THE PREDICTIVE VALUE OF GENDER, PERCEIVED PARENTING STYLES AND LONELINESS IN DETERMINING STUDENTS' DISPOSITIONAL AND STATE HOPE LEVEL¹

(ÖĞRENCİLERİN DURUMLUK VE GENEL UMUT DÜZEYLERİNİ
BELİRLERKEN CİNSİYET, ALGILANAN EBEVEYNLİK STİLİ VE
YALNIZLIĞIN YORDAYICI GÜCÜ)

Mustafa TÜRKMEN²
Aylin DEMİRLİ³

ABSTRACT

The main purpose of the present study was to investigate predictive value of (a) gender, (b) perceived parenting styles for mother and father, and (c) loneliness in determining students' dispositional and state hope level. The participants in this study were 302 undergraduate (173 females, 129 males) students enrolled at Ankara University. Participants were administered the UCLA Loneliness Scale, The Measure of Child Rearing Styles Inventory, the State Hope Scale and the Dispositional Hope Scale. The results of multiple regression analysis revealed that perceived permissive/indulgent parenting style, authoritarian parenting style, and authoritative parenting style of mother all predicted loneliness. Moreover, "permissive/indulgent", "authoritarian", and "authoritative" parenting styles of mother and loneliness predicted dispositional and state hope level. Perceived parenting styles for father failed to predict either loneliness or dispositional and state hope levels of students.

Key Words: Loneliness, Parenting Style, State Hope, Dispositional Hope.

ÖZ

Bu çalışmanın genel amacı öğrencilerin durumluk ve genel umut düzeylerinin belirlenmesinde a) cinsiyetin, b) anne ve babanın algılanan ebeveynlik stiline ve c) yalnızlığın yordayıcılığının belirlenmesidir. Çalışmaya Ankara Üniversitesinde okumakta olan 302 (173 kadın, 129 erkek) öğrenci katılmıştır. Katılımcılara UCLA Yalnızlık Ölçeği, Çocuk Yetiştirme Stilleri Ölçeği, Genel Umut Ölçeği ve Durumluk Umut Ölçeği uygulanmıştır. Çoklu regresyon analizleri sonucunda annenin algılanan izin verici/şımartan ebeveynlik stili, otoriter ebeveynlik stili ve açıklayıcı/otoriter ebeveynlik stiline yalnızlığı yordadığı görülmüştür. Ayrıca, annenin "izin verici/şımartan", "otoriter" ve "açıklayıcı/otoriter" ebeveynlik stilleri yalnızlık ile durumluk ve genel umut düzeyini yordamaktadır. Babanın algılanan ebeveynlik stili ise hem yalnızlığı hem de durumluk ve genel umut düzeylerini yordamamaktadır.

Anahtar Sözcükler: Yalnızlık, Ebeveynlik Stili, Durumluk Umut, Genel Umut.

¹ This paper presented at the International Congress of Counseling (Bahçeşehir University, İstanbul) and revised through the feedback.

² Ankara Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Fakültesi. **E-mail:** mturkmen@education.ankara.edu.tr.

³ Ankara Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Fakültesi. **Email:** ademirli@ankara.edu.tr.

INTRODUCTION

The main concern of this study, hope, is one of the remarkable human capacities, is the ability to flexibly represent future events, imagine diverse possible outcomes, and act in light of those representations (Seligman & Csikzentmihalyi, 2000). Among other strengths, hope is particular since it is considered a powerful psychological asset in the face of a challenging environment (Sheldon & King, 2001; Snyder, 2002).

Despite the deficiency of studies investigating the developmental nature of hope, its relations with other personal characteristics, life tasks and importance in future-orientation is well documented (Snyder, 2002). Studies empirically point out positive relationships of hope with higher and better academic performance (Chang, 1998; Curry, Snyder, Cook, Ruby, & Rehm, 1997; Snyder, Cheavens, & Simpson, 1997), athletic performance (Curry et al., 1997), coping better with physical illness (Snyder, Feldman, Taylor, Schroeder, & Adams, 2000; Stanson, Danoff-Burg, Cameron, Bishop, Collins, Kirk, et al., 2000), academic self-efficacy (Atik, Çayırdağ, Demirli, Kayacan, & Çapa Aydın, 2008), better problem solving skills (Atik & Erkan, 2009), better psychological adjustment, elevated feelings of self worth and life satisfaction (Kwan, 2002). On the other hand, hope found to have negative relationship with emptiness, low life-satisfaction (Shorey, Snyder, Rand, Heckmeyer, & Feldman, 2002), low self-esteem and loneliness (Snyder, Cheavens, & Simpson, 1999).

Furthermore, hope found to be related with social competence (Barnum, Snyder, Rapoff, Mani, & Thompson, 1998), pleasure in getting to know others, enjoyment in frequent interpersonal interactions (Snyder, Hoza et al., 1997) and interest in the goal pursuit of others (Snyder, Cheavens, & Simpson, 1997). On the other hand hope had negative relationship with depression (Kwon, 2002), caused increased frustration and aggression against others (Collins & Bell, 1997).

Snyder and his colleagues (1991) have conceptualized hope as a cognitive, goal-directed phenomenon. Snyder's model focuses not only on expectancies but also on the motivation and planning that are necessary to attain goals. Snyder defines hope as expecting the best in the future and working to achieve it. In other words hope is a thinking way, with feelings playing an important, contributory role (Snyder, 2002).

Hope has three components; goal, pathways and agency. As aforementioned, hope theory assumes that human actions are goal directed. The goal is the cognitive component of hope which provides the targets of mental actions sequences. Pathways' thinking entails the production of possible routes to reach this goal and agency provides motivation and energy to begin and continue using a pathway through all stages of the goal pursuit (Snyder, 2002; Snyder, 1995). During such blockages, agency helps people to

channel the requisite motivation to the best alternate pathway (Snyder, 2002; Snyder, 1995; Snyder, et al., 1991).

Hope model contains both feed forward and feedback emotion laden mechanisms that contribute to the individual's success in his or her pursuits. Specifically, persons who successfully pursue goals under unimpeded or impeded circumstances thereafter experience positive emotions; conversely persons who are blocked by impeding situations experience negative emotions. In other words, emotions follow cognitions and then feedback to inform the connectedness of his or her goal directed thinking (Snyder, et al., 1996). Thus, people reporting higher hope level focus on success which combined with the development of alternative pathways may enable high hope people to persevere and retain their agency when encountering obstacles.

As an emotion laden mechanism, there is relatively strong negative relationship with hope and loneliness. Previous researches have demonstrated that hope level decreases if the person feels lonely (Lekander, 2000; Petiet, 1983). Snyder indicated that, loneliness and frustration are foretells of low-hope person (Snyder, 1999). Lonely people are found to perceive themselves in a negative and self-depreciating manner, believing that they are inferior, worthless, unattractive, unlovable, and socially incompetent individuals (Horowitz, French, & Anderson, 1982; Jones, Freemon, & Goswick, 1981; Jones & Moore, 1987; Jones, Sansone, & Helm, 1983). Thus, unlike high-hope people, low-hopers are extremely busy with how they can protect themselves psychologically. They manifest a lack of confidence about themselves and to compound matters, spend much of their time ruminating and worrying about being stuck (Snyder, 1999). Their anxieties even further exacerbate their critical and extremely negative self-talk (Snyder, Lapointe, Crowson, & Early, 1998). In the midst of a problem, instead of thinking about how to find a pathway around an impediment, the low-hope person fantasizes about escaping rather than analyzing possibilities.

Lastly, people with lower hope level reported being very lonely and lacking friends with whom they can talk. Indeed, they have a fear of interpersonal closeness (Snyder, 1999). Loneliness is associated with a perceived lack of interpersonal intimacy and negatively related to willingness to self-disclosure (Chelune, Sultan, & Williams, 1980)

Snyder and colleagues are also conceptualized hope as a learned thinking pattern (Snyder et al., 1991). Thus, a person's pathways and agency thinking are learned over the course of childhood and later. Most people who showed lack of hope were not taught to think in a hopeful manner since the hope is being developed in the context of a secure and supportive caregiver relationship in which children are taught to think hopefully (Shorey, Snyder, Yang, & Lewin, 2003). Snyder uses "coaching" term to define the teaching and modeling role of parents to generating hopeful manner (Snyder et al., 1991).

In Snyder's hope theory, the coach typically helps in the formation of goals, teaches the causal thinking essential to achieve those goals and is a source of inspiration and motivation (Snyder, 2002; Snyder, 1995; Snyder, et al., 1991). Growing children thus come to view themselves as being capable to attain desired goals. Even as an adult, individuals who are reporting higher hope level continue to reflect their coach's hopeful thinking way (Snyder, Cheavens, & Sympson, 1997).

In this regard, Baumrind's (1991) research is relevant because it links family interactions to cognitive competence and agentic thinking through analyses of prototypic parenting styles: authoritative, authoritarian, permissive and neglecting-rejecting. Baumrind identified adaptive and maladaptive patterns of parental behavior that were proposed to result from parents' levels of demandingness and responsiveness (Baumrind, 1966; Baumrind, 1967; Sümer & Güngör, 1999).

Accordingly, authoritative parents construct a useful balance of demandingness and responsiveness. They monitor and setting clear standards for their children's behavior. Authoritative parents are viewed as exercising firm, and negotiated relationship. They control in a warm and loving environment. Those parents raise their children for recognized qualities and competencies and the children, in turn, show the highest levels of internalization of parental standards (Baumrind, 1991; Leman, 2005).

In contrast authoritarian parents are not responsive but highly demanding and directive. They demand for unquestioning obedience. They are more likely to resort to punitive discipline styles to control the behavior of their children and they give their child little room for negotiation. Permissive parents are more responsive than demanding; they are lenient and allow their children to regulate their own behaviors (Baumrind, 1966; Baumrind, 1967; Sümer & Güngör, 1999). Those parents believe that any form of control or discipline inhibits the child's natural tendencies and prospects of self-actualization (Kim & Chung, 2003). Lastly, rejecting-neglecting parents are neither responsive nor demanding; they do not monitor structure or provide support, and may actively reject their children (Baumrind, 1966; Baumrind, 1967; Sümer & Güngör, 1999).

Children's orientations toward the future and the way they approach life's challenges are affected differently by each of those parenting styles. This is because parents teach their children how to think as well how to relate with other people and their environment (Dominiquez & Carton, 1997). This is very similar with Snyder's coaching definition. By coping with difficult challenges in a positive way and by persevering in the face of difficulties, parents model hopeful behavior to their children (Snyder, 2002). Parents are primary teachers in installing agency and pathways of thinking (Snyder, 1994) by positive modeling. They encourage the emotion and internalization of the parent's competence and pro-social behaviors. Since authoritative parents

demand high levels of performance in a loving atmosphere, they become affective reinforcing agents. Baumrind (1991) found that adults who remember their parents as authoritative were the most autonomous and creative. Additionally, Snyder stated that adults who recalled their parents as autonomous are found to be hopeful beings (Shorey 2002; Snyder et al., 2000). Furthermore, parenting style is influential on loneliness. Jackson, Pratt, Hunaberg, & Pancer (2005) indicated that individuals who have perceived their parents as authoritative are rated as having higher self esteem but lower loneliness. Also, Jackson (2007) has found a strong relation with loneliness and parental care.

In sum, a persons' pathway's and agency thinking are learned over the course of childhood and later. Most people lack hope because they were not taught to think in this manner, or forces accompanied with negative emotions intervened to destroy such hopeful thought during their childhoods. The person brings this enduring pathways and agency iterative thought process to particular instances of goal pursuit (Snyder, 2002). That enduring hopeful thinking is accompanied by emotions. These negative or positive feelings are emotional feedback so can cycle back to influence the goal pursuit pathway and agency iterative thought process. As such, high-hopers' have positive views about interpersonal relationships and form strong relations to others (Snyder, Cheavens, & Sympson, 1997). Furthermore, higher levels of hope are related to less loneliness and more social competence (Snyder et al., 1997). Although the goal directed cognitions which shaped by parent- infant relation are eliciting the particular emotions, those emotions in turn are shaping and informing the cognitions of the person who is in the throes of a goal pursuit. Although the influence of parenting styles on development of personality, socio-emotional functioning and loneliness has been searched for (Kaplan & Bean, 1976; Santrock, 1994) there are still gaps in the parts related to hope (Valle, Huebner, & Suldo, 2006).

The aim of this research is to investigate possible relationships between parenting style and the concepts of loneliness and hope. This study has sought answers to two primary research questions. The first research question is whether gender, loneliness, and perceived parenting styles of mother and father predicts the dispositional hope level. The second research question is whether gender, loneliness, and perceived parenting styles of mother and father predicts the state hope level.

METHOD

Participants

The instruments were given to 302 students who volunteered to participate in the study at Ankara University. The research group is selected in accordance with study aims since they are late adolescents enrolled the

university who still have bonds with their parents and continue behave in the route of parents as well as friends. Of the students 173 (57.3 %) were females, and 129 (42.7 %) were males. The mean age was 20.6 (SD = 1.75). 274 students (86.4%) reported that their parents are married, 5 of them (1.6%) reported that their parents are separate but not divorced, 6 of the participants (1.9%) reported that their parents were divorced, 1 of them (0.3%) reported that his/her mother was dead, 14 of participants (4.4%) reported their father was dead. 15 of students (4.7%) reported that they are only child, 96 of them (30.3 %) reported they have one sibling, 81 of participants reported they have two siblings (25.6%), 53 of participants (16.7%) reported they have three siblings, 31 of participants reported (9.8%) they have four siblings, and 57 of participants (10.3%) reported they have siblings more than four. 15 of the participants (4.7%) didn't answer the questions.

Instruments

The following five instruments were used to gather data from participants: Demographic Questionnaire, UCLA Loneliness Scale, The Measure of Child Rearing Styles Inventory, Turkish form of State Hope Scale, and Turkish form of Dispositional Hope Scale.

Demographic Questionnaire: A questionnaire which is prepared by the researchers in order to gather information about the participants including their gender, age, major, number of siblings, and civil status of the family.

The Measure of Child Rearing Styles Inventory: The Measure of Child Rearing Styles Inventory was developed by Sümer and Güngör (1999) to measure the perceived parenting styles. The Measure of Child Rearing Styles is a 22-item 5-point Likert type self report measure of child rearing style of mother and father, separately on the same items. More specifically, it measures the two fundamental dimensions of child rearing styles. 11-item subscales measure acceptance/ involvement and strict control/ supervision dimensions. Parenting styles (authoritative, neglectful, authoritarian, permissive/ indulgent) are constructed by crossing perceived parental acceptance/ involvement and strict control dimensions of parenting. The Cronbach alpha coefficients are .94 for the acceptance/ involvement dimension, and .70 for the strict control for father. Also, Cronbach alpha coefficients are .80 for the acceptance/involvement dimension and .94 for the strict control for mother.

In the present study, nonhierarchical cluster analyses were used to assign participants in to perceived parenting styles by using two underlying child rearing patterns; acceptance/ involvement and strict control/ supervision.

University of California Los Angeles (UCLA) Loneliness Scale: The UCLA Loneliness Scale was developed by Russell, Peplau, & Cutrona (1980). The scale has 20 items with responses on a 4-point Likert scale ranging from 'Never' to 'Often'. It consists of 10 positively worded and 10 negatively

worded statements reflecting satisfaction with social relationships in which higher scores indicate greater loneliness. In the present study, the Turkish version of the UCLA Loneliness Scale (Demir, 1989) was used. The test-retest reliability was found to be .94 and the alpha coefficient was .96. Concurrent validity was demonstrated in that the scale discriminated lonely versus non-lonely people. Correlation between the UCLA Loneliness Scale and the Beck Depression Inventory was found to be .77, while the correlation with the Social Introversion Sub-scale of the Multiscore Depression Inventory was .82 (Demir, 1989).

State Hope Scale (SHS): The original State Hope Scale was developed by Snyder (1996). It was used to assess students' hope towards specific, present goal-related situations. The SHS is an eight-point-Likert type scale, composed of three Pathways thinking items and three Agentic thinking items. Also, total score can be found by the sum of items. The possible maximum score obtained from the scale is 48 and the minimum is 6.

The overall Cronbach alpha coefficient for the original form of SHS was .88, and the Cronbach alpha coefficient for agency subscale is .86 and pathway subscale is .59 (Snyder et al., 1996).

Adaptation study of the SHS was carried out by Denizli (2004). Factor analyses were conducted to examine the construct validity of the Turkish form of SHS. Two factors were found consistent with the original form of SHS. Reliability studies of the Turkish form of the SHS revealed that internal consistency coefficients was .48 for overall scale, .58 for pathways thinking and .66 for agentic thinking subscales (Denizli, 2004).

Dispositional Hope Scale (DHS): The original Dispositional Hope Scale was developed by Snyder et al. (1991). The DHS is a four point Likert scaling and twelve items formed the scale. The Cronbach alpha coefficients ranged from .71 to .76 for the overall scale, from .71 to .76 for the agency subscale, and from .63 to .80 for the pathways subscale (Snyder et al., 1996).

The DHS was translated into Turkish by Akman and Korkut (1993). For the overall scale, an internal consistency coefficient of .65 and the retest correlation coefficient of .66 were found in a four-week interval. Later, Denizli (2004) also reported a one-factor solution for the Turkish DHS named pathways thinking, with an eigenvalue of 2.474 that explained the 31% of the total variance. On the other hand, Kemer (2006) conducted a separate factor analysis to obtain further evidence whether the construct validity differs from the original form in her sample. Results of the factor analysis yielded two factors with Eigenvalues with 3.451 for factor one and 1.488 for factor two, respectively. This two-factor solution approximately explained 50% of the total variance. Cronbach alpha reliability was also calculated for the DHS in this research sample. The results showed that Cronbach alpha coefficient were .51 for overall scale, .72 for Pathways subscale and .66 for Agency subscale.

RESULTS

In the present study, Non-hierarchic cluster analysis was used to assign participants into groups on the basis of perceived parenting patterns by using two underlying child rearing dimensions; acceptance/ involvement and strict control/ supervision.

Authoritative maternal parenting scored high on both acceptance/ involvement ($M = 53$) and strict control/ supervision ($M = 40$) dimensions in contrast to the neglectful parenting that scored lowest on both ($M = 13$, $M = 16$) dimensions. Moreover, permissive/ indulgent parenting showed the high acceptance/ involvement ($M = 43$) and low strict control/ supervision ($M = 12$) in contrast to authoritarian parenting which yielded low acceptance/ involvement ($M = 27$) and high strict control/ supervision ($M = 54$).

Perceived paternal authoritative parenting scored high on both acceptance/ involvement ($M = 42$) and strict control/ supervision ($M = 43$) dimensions in contrast to the neglectful parenting which scored lowest on both acceptance/ involvement ($M = 11$) and strict control/ supervision ($M = 11$) dimensions. Moreover, permissive/ indulgent parenting had high acceptance/ involvement ($M = 55$) and low strict control/ supervision ($M = 12$). On the contrary; authoritarian parenting yielded low acceptance/ involvement ($M = 12$) and high strict control/ supervision ($M = 55$).

Multiple Regression analysis was conducted to predict the effect of the independent variables. Gender and parenting styles of mothers and fathers were used for multiple regression analysis as dummy variables. Before conducting the analysis, major assumptions of the multiple regression analysis were checked out. The results of these statistics demonstrated that normality was not violated. The significance level is set as $\alpha = .05$.

Multiple Regression Analysis for Dispositional Hope

Gender, perceived maternal parenting style, perceived parental parenting style and loneliness were significant predictors of dispositional hope. $R^2 = .21$, and adjusted $R^2 = .19$, $F_{(8, 293)} = 8.22$, $p = .00$.

Table 1. Model Summary of Stepwise Multiple Regression Analysis and The Bivariate and Partial Correlations and the β Values.

Model	β	ΔR^2	R^2	ΔF	Correlations			Durbin-Watson
					Zero-order	Partial	Part	
1	(Constant)	.19	.21	9.78				1.94
	Mother- authoritarian	.29*			-.19*	.10*	.09*	
	Mother- authoritative	.40*			.04*	.14*	.12*	
	Mother- permissive/ indulgent	.45*			.18*	.13*	.12*	
	Gender	-.04*			.01	-.04	-.04	
	Father-authoritarian	.06			-.09	.04	.04	
	Father-authoritative	.06			-.08	.03	.03	
	Father- permissive/ indulgent	.11			.19	.06	.06	
	Loneliness	.37*			.43*	.35*	.34*	

Predictors: (Constant), Loneliness Mother- authoritative, gender, Father-authoritarian, Father-permissive/ indulgent, Mother-authoritarian, Father-authoritative, Mother-permissive/ indulgent

Dependent Variable: Dispositional Hope

It was observed (Table 1) that in the overall model, permissive/indulgent maternal parenting style was positively associated with dispositional hope level with Beta value of $\beta = .45$, $p < .00$. Authoritarian and authoritative maternal parenting styles were predicted dispositional hope with Beta value of $\beta = .40$, $p < .00$, $\beta = .29$, $p < .00$. Lastly, loneliness positively predicted dispositional hope with Beta value of, $\beta = .37$, $p < .00$.

Partial and zero- order bivariate correlations were reported for each of the individual variables in gender, maternal parenting style and paternal parenting style and loneliness. Of the independent variables, loneliness was seen as the most strongly correlated variable. Also, perceived parenting styles of mother, namely, authoritarian, authoritative, and permissive/ indulgent were significantly correlated with dispositional hope level.

Multiple Regression Analysis for State Hope

Gender, perceived parenting style for mother, perceived parenting style for father and loneliness significantly predicted state hope. $R^2 = .15$, and adjusted $R^2 = .13$, $F_{(8, 293)} = 8.22$, $p = .00$.

Table 2: Model Summary of Stepwise Multiple Regression Analysis and The Bivariate and Partial Correlations and the β Values.

Model	β	ΔR^2	R^2	ΔF	Correlations			Durbin-Watson
					Zero-order	Partial	Part	
1	(Constant)	.13	.15	6.57				1.96
	Mother- authoritarian	.36*			-.12*	.12*	.11*	
	Mother- authoritative	.41*			.02*	.13*	.13*	
	Mother- permissive/ indulgent	.48*			.14*	.13*	.12*	
	Gender	-.01			.02	-.01	-.01	
	Father-authoritarian	.08			-.07	.05	.05	
	Father-authoritative	.11			-.03	.06	.06	
	Father-permissive/ indulgent	.11			.13	.06	.06	
	Loneliness	.31*			.36*	.30*	.29*	

Predictors: (Constant), Loneliness Mother- authoritative, gender, Father-authoritarian, Father-permissive/ indulgent, Mother-authoritarian, Father-authoritative, Mother- permissive/ indulgent,

Dependent Variable: State Hope

In the overall model, permissive/indulgent parenting style of mother was positively associated with loneliness with a Beta value of $\beta = .48$, $p < .00$. Also, authoritarian parenting style for mother predicted loneliness with Beta value of $\beta = .41$, $p < .00$, $\beta = .36$, $p < .00$. Lastly, loneliness positively predicted loneliness with Beta value of, $\beta = .31$, $p < .00$.

Partial and zero- order bivariate correlations were reported for each of the individual variables in gender, maternal parenting style and paternal parenting style and loneliness.

Similar to correlations of dispositional hope, loneliness was seen as the most strongly correlated variable of state hope level. Also, authoritarian, authoritative, and permissive/ indulgent parenting styles for mother were significantly correlated with state hope level.

DISCUSSION

The findings from the current study contribute to our understanding of possible effects on dispositional hope level and state hope level of individuals. For the first research question, predicting the dispositional hope level, it was revealed that the variables involved in the regression equation which are

gender, loneliness, parenting styles for mother and father separately, have collectively explained %21 of the total variance of the dispositional hope level. While gender, loneliness, and parenting styles of mother have been significant predictors of dispositional hope level, parenting styles of father were not significant predictors.

Gender was the weakest significant predictor of dispositional hope level. This finding is consistent with Jackson *et al* (2005) findings. Loneliness was another predictor of dispositional hope level. This finding is also consistent with earlier studies at which loneliness was found to be strongly and negatively correlated with hope. The studies point that loneliness causes feelings of hopelessness (Buchholz & Catton, 1999), emptiness, worthlessness and failure (Ruchkin, Eisemann, & Hagglöf, 1999; Wei, Shaffer, Young, & Zakalik, 2005). As aforementioned, although hope is a cognitive mechanism it also has an emotional side. Hopeful thinking necessitates motivation and desire to reach the goal. On the other hand high loneliness lowers the general desire and motivation of the person to reach the goal. Thus, as study shows higher loneliness lowers the dispositional hope of the persons.

Maternal parenting styles were also significant predictors of dispositional hope; however paternal parenting styles were not significant. Similar to loneliness, any study investigating the relation of dispositional hope and parenting styles could not be found. Indirect studies point out that democratic family attitudes predict dispositional optimism of high school and university students (Jackson *et al.*, 2005) Maternal parenting styles have been found effective not only on dispositional hope level but also on the composition and development of other personality characteristics, social skills and social relations of individuals. Findings of study show the formation of the dispositional hope which is general attitude of the person responding to the affairs is mostly due to mothers coaching behaviors.

For the last research question, the results of the multiple regression analysis predicting the state hope level revealed that the variables which were gender, loneliness, maternal parenting styles, and paternal parenting styles involved in the regression equation, have collectively explained the %15 of the total variance of state hope level. Loneliness and maternal parenting style were significant predictors of state hope level. But, gender and paternal parenting styles were not significant predictors. Loneliness was found significantly related to state hope level. It is assumed that this relation is caused by the dynamics of loneliness phenomenon. Negative feelings connected to loneliness such as depression, anxiety, pessimism, hopelessness, emptiness, worthlessness and sadness (Brage, et al., 1994; deMinzi, 2006; Russel, et al., 1984; Wei et al., 2005) are assumed as causes to the decrease of state hope level.

For all of the research questions of the present study, the most predictive parenting style was permissive/ indulgent maternal parenting style.

Also, authoritative parenting style was found the second most predictive parenting style and authoritarian was the third predictive parenting style.

It is assumed that permissive/indulgent maternal parenting style is highly related to state hope level because of its characteristic which does not provide clear standards and does not require mature behavior by allowing considerable self-regulation, and avoiding confrontation. Also, permissive/indulgent parenting style does not take responsibility for guiding their children's actions and place few restrictions, rules and limits on their children's behavior (Ang & Goh, 2006; Baumrind, 1966; Baumrind, 1967; Darling, 1999; Darling & Steinberg, 1993).

On the other hand, there is not any relation between paternal parenting styles and state hope level because social functions of father do not provide children with such relation. The result about maternal and paternal parenting styles could be explained by the cultural construction of fatherhood and motherhood in Turkish culture. Father as an authoritative figure in Turkish family states the rules and controls the daily life. Thus have an important effect on state hope level which is short term and changeable in time. On the other hand poor and limited interaction and communication with children lowers influence on formation of behavior and cognition in long term. So, the effect of father on dispositional hope which is general and permanent type of hope is not seen.

For a very long period of time the influence of the father on the development of child has been ignored in Turkish culture. Although, men took part in children's education only as the authoritative figures and disciplining individuals in the past, today they have started to take more responsibility in child care and education especially in urban areas yet it seems poor. Thus, the role of fatherhood on the development of child's personality and social relations needs to be investigated. Also, investigations about the relationship of parenting styles with loneliness and hope level are relatively limited. It is a necessity to make researches considering different socio-economic levels, zones, and cultural backgrounds. Another necessity is to develop culturally appropriate intervention and counseling programs to cope with loneliness and increase hope level.

REFERENCES

- Akman, Y. ve Korkut, F. (1993). Umut ölçeği üzerine bir çalışma. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi* , 9,193-202
- Ang, R. P. & Goh, D. H. (2006). Authoritarian parenting style in Asian societies: A cluster- analytic investigation. *Contemporary Family Therapy*, 28(1), 131-149.

- Atik, G., & Erkan, Z. (2009, September). Academic self-efficacy and problem solving as predictors of hope levels of Turkish high school students. Paper presented at the European Conference on Educational Research, Vienna, Austria.
- Atik, G., Çayırdağ, N., Demirli, A., Kayacan, N., & Çapa Aydın, Y. (2008, October). Hope and perceived support as predictors of academic self-efficacy among graduate students. Poster session presented at the 11th International Conference Further Education in the Balkan Countries, Konya, Turkey.
- Babyak, M. A., Snyder, C. R., & Yoshinobu, L. (1993). Psychometric properties of the Hope Scale: A confirmatory factor analysis. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 27, 154-169.
- Barnum, D. D., Snyder, C. R., Rapoff, m. A., Mani, M. M., & Thompson, R. (1998). Hope and social support in the psychological adjustment of pediatric burn survivors and matched controls. *Children's Health Care*, 27, 15-30
- Baumrind, D. (1966). Effects of authoritative parental control on child behavior. *Child Development*, 37(4), 887-907.
- Baumrind, D. (1967). Child care practices anteceding three patterns of preschool behavior. *Genetic Psychology Monographs*, 75(1), 43- 88.
- Baumrind, D. (1991). The influence of parenting style on adolescent competence and substance use. *Journal of Early Adolescence*, 11, 56-95.
- Brage, D., Meredith, W., & Woodward, J. (1994). A causal of adolescent depression. *Journal of Psychology Interdisciplinary & Applied*, 128(4), 455- 469.
- Buchholz, E. S. & Catton, R. (1999). Adolescents' perceptions of aloneness and loneliness. *Adolescence*, 34, 203–213.
- Chang, E. C. (1998). Hope, problem-solving ability, and coping in a college student population: Some implications for theory and practice. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 54, 953-962.
- Chang, E. C. & DeSimone, S. L. (2001).the influence of hope on appraisals, coping, and dysphoria: A test of hope theory. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychological*, 54, 953-962.
- Chelune, G. J., Sultan, F. E., & Williams. C. L. (1980). Loneliness, self-disclosure, and interpersonal effectiveness. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 27(5), 462- 468.
- Cheavens, J. (2000). Hope and depression: light through the shadows. In C. R. Snyder (Ed.), *Handbook of hope: Theory, measures, and applications* (pp. 321- 340) San Diego: Academic Press.
- Collins, K. & Bell, R. (1997). Personality and aggression: the dissipation-rumination scale. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 22, 751- 755.

- Curry, L. A., Snyder, C. R., Cook, D. L., Ruby, B. C., & Rehm, M. (1997). The role of hope in student-athlete academic and sport achievement. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 73, 1257-1267.
- Darling, N. (1999). Parenting style and its correlates. *Clearinghouse on Elementary and Early Childhood Education*, ERIC Digest ED-PS-99-3.
- Darling, N. & Steinberg, L. (1993). Parenting styles context: an integrative model. *Psychological Bulletin*, 113(3), 487-496.
- deMinzi, R. M. C. (2006). Loneliness and depression in middle and late childhood: The relationship to attachment and parental styles. *The Journal of Genetic Psychology*, 167(2), 189- 210.
- Demir, A. (1989). UCLA Yalnızlık ölçeğinin geçerlik ve güvenirliği. [Reliability and validity of UCLA Loneliness Scale] *Psikoloji Dergisi*, 6(22), 1- 6.
- Denizli, S. (2004). The role of hope and study skills in predicting test-anxiety levels of university students. Unpublished master's thesis, Middle East Technical University, Ankara, Turkey.
- Dominiquez, M. M. & Carton, J. S. (1997). The relationship between self-actualization and parenting style. *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality*, 12, 1093-1100.
- Elliot, T. R., Witty, T. E., Herrick, S., & Hoffman, J. T. (1991). Negotiating reality after psychological loss: Hope, depression, and disability. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 61, 608-613.
- Heaven, P. & Ciarrochi, J. (2008). Parental styles, gender and the development of hope and self-esteem. *European Journal of Personality*, 22, 707-724.
- Horowitz, L. M., French, R. S., & Anderson, C. A. (1982). *The Prototype of a lonely person*. In Peplau, L. A., & Perlman, D. (Eds.). *Loneliness: A sourcebook of current theory, research and therapy*, pp. 183-205, New York: Wiley- Interscience.
- Jackson, T. (2007). Protective self-presentation, sources of socialization, and loneliness among Australian adolescents and young adults. *Personality and Individual Differences* 43 (6), 1552-1562.
- Jackson, J., & Cochran, S. D. (1990). Loneliness and psychological distress. *The Journal of Psychology*, 125, 257-262.
- Jackson, L. M., Pratt, M. W. Hunsberger, B., Pancer, S. M. (2005). Optimism as a Mediator of the Relation Between Perceived Parental Authoritativeness and Adjustment Among Adolescents: Finding the Sunny Side of the Street. *Social Development*, 14 (2), 273-304.
- Jones, W. H., Freemon, J. E., & Goswick, R. A. (1981). The persistence of loneliness: Self and other determinants. *Journal of Personality*, 49, 27-48.
- Jones, W. H., & Moore, T. L. (1987). Loneliness and social support. *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality*, 2 (2), 145–156.

- Jones, W. H., Sansone, C., & Helm, B. (1983). Loneliness and interpersonal judgments. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 9, 437- 441.
- Kalliopuska, M. & Laitinen, M. (1991). Testing loneliness on differential loneliness scale. *Psychological Reports*, 69, 27-34.
- Kaplan, A. G. & Bean, J. P. (1976). *Beyond sex-role stereotypes: Reaching towards a psychology of androgyny*. Boston: Little Brown.
- Kemer, G. (2006). The role of self-efficacy, hope, and anxiety in predicting university entrance examination scores of 11th grade students. Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Orta Doğu Teknik Üniversitesi, Ankara.
- Kim, H. & Chung, R. H. (2003). Relationship of recalled parenting style of self-perception in Korean American collage students. *The Journal of Genetic Psychology*, 164(4), 481-492.
- Kwon, P. (2002). Hope, defense mechanisms, and adjustment: Implications for false hope defensive hopelessness. *Journal of Personality*, 70, 207-231.
- Lekander, B. J. (2000). The relationship of coping, hope, loneliness and spiritual perspective in adult caregivers of hospitalized adults. University of Minnesota. *Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation*. USA.
- Leman, P. J. (2005). Authority and moral reasons: Parenting style and children's perceptions of adult rule justifications. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 29(4), 265-270.
- Magaletta, P. R., & Oliver, J. M. (1999). The hope construct, will and ways: their relative with self-efficacy, optimism, and general well-being. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 55, 539-551.
- Onwuegbuzie, A. J. & Daley, C. E. (1999). Relation of hope to self-perception. *Perceptual and Motor Skill*, 88, 535-540.
- Peplau, L. A., & Perlman, D. (1984). Loneliness research: A survey of empirical findings. In Peplau, L. A., Goldston, S. E. (Eds.). *Preventing the Harmful Consequences of Severe and Persistent Loneliness*, 13- 47. Rockville Maryland: National Institute of Mental Health.
- Petiet, C. A. (1983). *Hope*: The major predictor of positive resolution after marital loss. Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association (91st, Anaheim, CA, August 26-30, 1983) ERIC: ED246323.
- Ruchkin, V. V., Eisemann, M., & Hagglöf, B. (1999). Hopelessness, loneliness, self-esteem, and personality in Russian male delinquent adolescents versus controls. *Journal of Adolescent Research*, 14(4), 466- 477.
- Russell, D., Cutrona, C. E., Rose, J., & Yurko, K. (1984). Social and emotional loneliness: An examination of Weiss's typology of loneliness. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 39, 472-480.

- Russell, D., Peplau, L. A., & Cutrona, C. E. (1980). The revised UCLA Loneliness Scale: Concurrent and discriminant validity evidence. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 39, 472- 480.
- Santrock, J. (1994). *Child Development*, (6th ed.). Medicine: Brown & Bandmark.
- Seginer, Rachel & Lilach, E. (2004). How adolescents construct their future: the effect of loneliness on future orientation. *Journal of Adolescence*, 27, 625–643.
- Seligman, M.E. P. & Csikzentmihalyi, M. (2000). Positive psychology: An introduction. *American Psychologist*, 55, 5-14.
- Sheldon, K. M. & King, L. (2001). Why positive psychology is necessary. *American Psychologist*, 56, 216- 217.
- Shorey, H. S., Snyder, C. R., Kevin, L. R., Hockemeyer, J. R., & Feldman, D. B. (2002). Somewhere over the rainbow: Hope theory weathers its first decade. *Psychological Inquiry*, 13(4), 322-331.
- Shorey, H. S., Snyder, C. R., Yang, X., & Lewin, M. R. (2003). The role of hope as a mediator in recollected parenting, adult attachment, and mental health. *Journal of Psychological and Clinical Psychology*, 22(6), 685-715.
- Snyder, C. R. (1994). *The psychology of hope: You can get there from here*. New York: Free Press.
- Snyder, C. R. (1995). Conceptualizing, measuring, and nurturing hope. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 73, 355-360.
- Snyder, C. R. (1996). To hope, to lose, and hope again. *Journal of Personal and Interpersonal Loss*, 1, 3-16.
- Snyder, C. R. (1999). Hope, goal blocking thoughts, and test- related anxieties. *Psychological Reports*, 84, 206- 208.
- Snyder, C. R. (2002). Hope theory: Rainbows in the mind. *Psychological Inquiry*, 13(4), 249-275.
- Snyder, C.R., Sypson, S. C., Ybasco, F. C., Borders, T. F., Babyak, M. A. & Higgins, R. L. (1996). Development and validation of the state hope scale. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 70 (2), 321-335.
- Snyder, C. R., Cheavens, J., Sympson, S. C. (1997). Hope: An individual motive for social commerce. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice*, 1, 107-118.
- Snyder, C. R., Feldman, D. B., Taylor, J. D., Schroeder, L. L., & Adams, V., III. (2000). The roles of hopeful thinking in preventing problems and enhancing strengths. *Applied and Preventive Psychology*, 15, 262-295.
- Snyder, C. R., Lapointe, A. B., Crowson Jr., J. J., & Early, S. (1998). Preferences of high- and low-hope people for self-referential input. *Cognition & Emotion*, 12, 807-823.

- Snyder, C. R., Harris, C., Anderson, J. R., Holleran, S. A., Irving, L. M., Sigman, 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.
- Snyder, C. R., Hoza, B., Pelham, W. E., Rapoff, M., Ware, L., Danovsky, M. et al. (1997). The development and validation of the Children's Hope Scale. *Journal of Pediatric Psychology*, 22, 399-421.
- Snyder, C. R., Sympson, S. C., Ybasco, F. C., Borders, T. F., Babyak, M. A., & Higgins, R. L. (1996). Development and validation of the State Hope Scale. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 70, 312-335.
- Sümer, N. & Güngör, D. (1999). The impact of perceived parenting styles on attachment styles. (Çocuk yetiştirme stillerinin bağlanma stilleri, benlik değerlendirmeleri ve yakın ilişkiler üzerindeki etkisi) *Türk Psikoloji Dergisi*, 14(44), 61- 62.
- Stanson, A. L., Danoff-Burg, S., Cameron, C., Bishop, M., Collins, C. A., Kirk, S. B., et al. (2000). Emotionally expressive coping predicts psychological and physical adjustment to breast cancer. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 68, 875-882.
- Wei, M., Shaffer, P. A., Young, S. K., Zakalik, R. A. (2005) Adult Attachment, Shame, Depression, and Loneliness: The Mediation Role of Basic Psychological Needs Satisfaction. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*. 52(4), 591-601.
- Valle, M. F., Huebne, E. S., & Suldo, S. M. (2006). An analysis of hope as a psychological strength. *Journal of School Psychology*, 44, 393-406.