How Decisiveness, Self-Efficacy, Curiosity and Independent/Interdependent Self-Construals Are Related with Future Hopefulness among Senior Students

Remzi Hakan Öztekin

Submitted to the
Institute of Graduate Studies and Research
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Science
in
Developmental Psychology

Eastern Mediterranean University
September 2018
Gazimağusa, North Cyprus

Approval of the Institute of Graduate Studies and Research

_____
Assoc. Prof. Dr. Ali Hakan Ulusoy
Acting Director

I certify that this thesis satisfies all the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Master of Science in Developmental Psychology.

_____
Assoc. Prof. Dr. Şenel Hüsnü Raman
Chair, Department of Psychology

We certify that we have read this thesis and that in our opinion it is fully adequate in scope and quality as a thesis for the degree of Master of Science in Developmental Psychology.

_____
Assoc. Prof. Dr. Fatih Bayraktar
Supervisor

Examining Committee
_____

1. Assoc. Prof. Dr. Fatih Bayraktar   _____

2. Assoc. Prof. Dr. Şenel Hüsnü Raman   _____

3. Asst. Prof. Dr. Doğu Erdener   _____

ABSTRACT

Hope is a future oriented reasoning that influences psychological assets of individuals. A hopeful standing towards future can positively influence individual well-being. Different standings in terms of hopefulness may create variations on psychological assets of persons. In the current study, we examined the associations of decisiveness, self-efficacy, curiosity and self-construals with hopefulness. A total of 278 senior university students were recruited for the study from Eastern Mediterranean University in Famagusta, North Cyprus. Participants filled six questionnaires; Beck Hopelessness Scale, Independent and Interdependent Self-Construals Scale, Multi Domain Decisiveness Scale, Curiosity and Exploration Inventory II, Dispositional Hope Scale and General Self-Efficacy Scale. The data was analyzed by hierarchical multiple regression analysis on SPSS 23 software program. Results indicated that self-efficacy and decisiveness significantly predicted hopefulness, while curiosity did not predict hopefulness and only independent self-construal had the predictive effect on hopefulness. Based on these findings, emerging adulthood nature of study sample was discussed and further recommendations were presented.

Keywords: Hopefulness, Self-Efficacy, Decisiveness, Curiosity, Emerging Adulthood, Self-construals.

ÖZ

Umut insanların gelecekle ilgili akıl yürütmelerini etkileyen psikolojik bir akıl yürütmedir. Geleceğe karşı umutlu bir tutuma sahip olmak kişinin iyilik halini olumlu yönde etkileyebilir. Farklı umutluluk dereceleri kişinin psikolojik durumunda değişkenliklere yol açabilir. Bu çalışmada gelecek yönelimli umudun kararlılık, öz yeterlilik, merak ve ilişkisel/bağımsız benlik yapıları ile olan ilişkisi incelenmiştir. Bu çalışmaya Kuzey Kıbrıs, Mağusa'da bulunan Doğu Akdeniz Üniversitesinden toplam 278 son sınıf öğrencisi çalışmaya dahil olmuştur. Katılımcılara 6 adet ölçek uygulanmıştır; Beck Umutsuzluk Ölçeği, Bağımsız ve İlişkisel Benlik Kurgusu Ölçeği, Çok Alanlı Kararlılık Ölçeği, Merak ve Keşfetme Envanteri II, Sürekli Umut Ölçeği ve Genel Öz-Yeterlilik Ölçeği. Toplanan veriler SPSS 23 programı aracılığıyla hiyerarşik çoklu regresyon analizi ile değerlendirilmiştir. Elde edilen sonuçlara göre, öz yeterlilik ve kararlılık umutlu olmayı yordamıştır. Merak umutluluk için bir yordayıcı role sahip değildir, ve sadece bağımsız ilişkisel benlik umutluluk halini yordamıştır. Bulgulardan yola çıkarak, kurulan bağlantılar ve katılımcıların beliren yetişkinlik dönemine dair özellikleri kapsamında tartışılmış, ilerideki araştırmalar için öneriler sunulmuştur.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Umutluluk, Öz Yeterlilik, Kararlılık, Merak, Beliren Yetişkinlik, Benlik Yapıları.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

The human mind is capable of representing future events in various flexible ways, imagining different possible outcomes and behaving accordingly in response to those representations. Hope is particularly interesting among future oriented reasoning because it is a powerful asset in the face of a challenging environment (Snyder, 2000). People may fear that an undesirable event in the future may happen or may hope that it will not happen. Based on the attitude towards future events, people adjust behavioral sets to approach or avoid. All those behavioral reactions to possible future oriented visualizations may influence goal oriented behavior. Hope can be considered as an important mechanism for survival as well when considering countless destruction in the past history; epidemics, wars and natural disasters. Many definitions about hope have been conceptualized, Averill defined hope as an emotion focused process that based on realistic probability of goal attainment (Averill, Catlin & Chon, 1990). Bruininks and Male (2005) defined hope as "an emotion that occurs when an individual is focused on an important future outcome that allows for little personal control, so the person is unable to take much action to realize the outcome" (cited in Bruininks & Malle, 2005).

1.1 Theoretical Framework of Hope in the Current Study

Many psychological scientists have studied on hope and developed different models which explained the nature of hoping process, origins of hope and the structure of hope. Scioli (2007) explored hope as a social construct and emotion. Scioli's hope

foundation model emphasize integration of spirituality and social context as well as personal traits with biological motives. Dufault and Martocchio (1985) also developed a model of hope called "Spheres and Dimensions of Hope". This model argued hope in relation to help nursing related issues as they quoted "Although most nurses agree that hope is important for healthful living, the literature is sparse about hope or the process of hope as concepts useful in guiding action" (Dufault & Martocchio, 1985). These two models which studied hopefulness have not been used in the current study due to their spiritual assets and health related approach to the hope, respectively. Current study used Snyder's Theory of Hope (Snyder, 1991) as theoretical framework due to its comprehensive, active and multi domain cognitive approach to the hope which will be explained in detail below.

1.1.1 Snyder's Theory of Hope

Perhaps the most influential studies on hope have been conducted by Charles R. Snyder (Du & King, 2013) beginning in 1987 until his death in 2006. He focused on some questions like; Why some people have hope as a personal characteristics and live life hopefully while others perceive their lives more negatively? What characteristics define and differentiate someone as hopeful or hopeless? Can psychological scientists measure hope? Is it an affective process –an affective experience that occurs when all practical ways toward a goal are warned out? In the University of Kansas Hope Laboratory Snyder and his colleagues (1991) conceptualized "hope" as not only a passive emotional process which pops up at the most exhausted or vulnerable moments but a goal seeking process that has been actively pursued, "learned way of thinking about oneself in relation to goals" (Snyder, 1994). According to the Theory of Hope which have been conceptualized by Snyder and his colleagues, hope is a cognitive process, specifically "a cognitive set that is

based on a reciprocally derived sense of successful agency (goal-directed determination) and pathways (planning to meet goals)" (Snyder et al., 1991).

Goals are motives of hope. Hope provides a motivational energy to pursue a goal which is based on perceived probability of achieving the goal as well as perceived value of the goal (Stotland, 1969). A goal can be anything to get, to experience, to create or to do and the scale of goals can vary from small settings (i.e. short term; need little energy or little time to achieve) to large settings (i.e. long term; need determination and constant energy to achieve) (Snyder et al., 2002).

According to Snyder's Theory of Hope goals are targets that trigger activation of mental processes (Snyder, 2000). When someone starts a conscious future oriented action sequence, it has to be pointed toward a specific outcome. Snyder's Theory of Hope suggest that prior to start a goal oriented action sequence, two types of cognitions are taking part in the mind: *pathways thinking* and *agency thinking*. Snyder defined hope process as "the sum of the mental willpower and way power that you have for your goals" (Snyder, 1994, p. 5). Willpower represents agency thinking, the confidence one has to engage and maintain a goal-specific action sequence. Agency cognition is the reasoning that people have about their capability to initiate and maintain actions on the ways to meet goals (Snyder et al., 1999). It has also been articulated as a concept of self-determination to meet goals of the past, present and future (Snyder et al., 1991). Way power represent pathway thinking, referring as the perceived ability to generate ways to achieve goals. Pathway thinking reflects individuals capacity to generate cognitive pathways to goals (Snyder, 1994), which is activated when constructing plans or achieving goals. Because some plans may not be succeeded and some plans may, hopeful thinking refers engaging with many plans in order to deal with possible obstacles on the goal achievement progress.

Both agency thinking and pathway thinking are necessary to maintain progress to goals and functionally indistinguishable. Inefficiency in one component will eventually lead dysfunction in other component (Snyder et al., 1991). Such relationships make sense when pathways are established in the goal achievement progress and if agency thinking is not sufficient enough to actualize those pathways of the goal, one may have issues to maintain hoping process. Likewise, inefficient agency thinking will not generate functional pathways to actualize goals, eventually disrupting hopeful thinking.

As it is mentioned before, goals motivate the process of hope. Goal itself is a moderating factor on hoping procedure as goal oriented hopes lead individuals to label value to desired goal outcomes. Hoped outcome must have reasonably high value to meet continued mental attention (Snyder et al., 2000), referring that individual thoughts and meanings of the outcome value are what initiate and maintain hope process. Snyder's Theory of Hope suggest all behaviors are anchored by goals (Snyder, 1994), referring that individuals who have decent agency thinking and pathway thinking ability should experience more positive life outcomes and become more hopeful.

1.2 Development of Hope

1.2.1 The Roots of Hope: Infancy

According to Snyder's Theory of Hope (Snyder, 2000), development of agency and pathway thinking initiates in infancy by understanding causality around or pathways first. For instance, infants quickly learn the sound of parent's voice and associate them with comfort and care, then they start to link cause and effect relationship as crying means parent's presence and satisfaction of needs. Such anticipations later on form a cognitive understanding of chain events and eventually develop pathway thinking. In time, as sense of self develops infants recognize

themselves as agents or factors in cause-effect relationship chain (Snyder, 2000). This, in turn leads to the development of agency thinking. Since the concept of hope as conceptualized by Snyder and his colleagues (1991) is a reciprocal interaction of *pathway thinking* and *agency thinking*, it is arguable that development of implicit relationship of hopeful cognition and environment may be related to early trust experiences with primary caregivers (Erikson, 1959). Furthermore, because attachment patterns of individuals are also related to hopeful thinking, children with strong bond with their primary caregivers develop strong hopeful thinking (Bowlby, 1980). A subsequent study by Shorey, Lewin and Snyder (2001) looking at the role of attachment suggested that the more hopeful adults were more likely to have secure attachment and had more experience related with better caring and nurturing from their parents. Secure style of attachment generate an empowerment of individuals to pursuit and maintain goal oriented actions (Snyder et al., 1997).

There has been criticism to Snyder's model of hope as the theory does not account socio-emotional processes in early life experiences adequately (Aspinwall & Leaf, 2002). However, the influence of primary caregiver on the development of hope is, in fact, acknowledged by Snyder as when child overcome obstacles positively (i.e. having warm support from caregiver). This positive achievement helps infant to establish the strong beliefs to their ability to pursuit and achieve goals (Snyder, Cheavens & Sympson, 1997).

1.2.2 Emerging Adulthood

Emerging adulthood term describes the age period roughly around 18-25 (Arnett, 2000). It draws the changes and role transitions between adolescence and adulthood. At that period of time, in most industrialized countries, emerging adults obtain education or training that create the foundation of their future life (Chisholm &

Hurrelmann, 1995). Emerging adulthood period is important due to its nature to let individuals go for identity exploration (Arnett, 2000). Personal relationships, future plans, financial preparations, career achievements etc. are some of the developmental tasks during emerging adulthood (Arnett, 2000). Emerging adulthood can also be characterized with unsettlement, excitement, *high hopes*, struggle, dreams, uncertainty, confusion, possibilities and anxiety (Arnett, 2006). Before individuals made important life decisions and settle up their life, emerging adulthood has important chances and possibilities (Arnett, 2005).

Due to its higher opportunity nature and energetic biological foundation than adulthood (Arnett, 2005), emerging adults views and maintain their personal future with high hopes (Arnett, 2000). Emerging adults have more choices than previous cohorts and there choices lead to greater opportunities and higher levels of future hopefulness (Arnett, 2006). Since still there are open door for many future possibilities, optimistic and hopeful feelings toward future is suitable for the emerging adulthood period (Arnett, 2006).

Whether all university students can be counted as emerging adults or not, Cavanaugh (2016) discussed that majority of university students that have taken traditional education within industrialized countries are in the emerging adulthood period of development. According to the National Center for Education Statistics (2014), college students represent major and distinct portion of emerging adulthood population. Years before Arnett (2000) and his acknowledged concept of "Emerging Adulthood", Chickering (1969) studied identity development of college students and established six vector that involved personal development during university education. Those vectors are "developing competence", "managing emotions", "moving through autonomy toward interdependence", "developing mature interpersonal relationships",

"establishing identity" and "developing purpose". Such components that play role during university life was characteristically similar with definitions of emerging adulthood.

1.3 Predictors of Hopefulness

According to Snyder (2002), hope can be related with various psychological assets such as optimism, self-esteem or personality traits. However, this study will focus on the other assets of psychological well-being as predictors of hopefulness; self-efficacy, curiosity, decision making and self-construals. Importance of investigating hopefulness for senior university students is due to the fact that a role transition occur after graduation (Bayram & Bilgel, 2008). Changes in social roles as well as locational changes can create distress or adaptation issues (Zhou et al., 2008). Understanding the dynamic behind this process is valuable to increase psychological well-being of students.

1.3.1 Self-Efficacy and Hopefulness

Although many practices and studies that had been done in relation with self-efficacy, majority of literature over the topic is relied on Bandura's Self-Efficacy Model (Sherer & Maddux, 1982; Pajares, 1996; Anderson & Betz, 2001). His influential model has been used and practiced among many researchers. Thereby current study has used Bandura's model due to its comprehensive and deep understanding over self-efficacy and its applications.

1.3.1.1 Bandura's Self-Efficacy Model

Adaptation to the various environmental and mental circumstances is perhaps one of the most unique aspects of humans. Bandura (1986) conceived self-reflection as the most unique human capability which refers to people's self-evaluation and alteration of their thoughts and behaviors. Self-efficacy is one of the self-evaluation

mechanisms which includes beliefs in one's capabilities to produce designated levels of performance that exert influence over events that affect lives (Bandura, 1994). Self-efficacy determines how to think, feel and motivate self and eventually behave.

High self-efficacy indicates the perception of challenging tasks as opportunities to be mastered instead of issues that have to be avoided (Bandura, 1990). Such manner of thinking emerges from the assurance of one's own capability. High self-efficacy sets individual's commitment and maintenance of necessary energies to accomplish a challenge, as well as stability of progress toward the goal (Bandura, 1990). Obstacles or failures are coped by sustained efforts and ensuring quick recovery is possible when an individual has high self-efficacy. Efficacious perception generates personal accomplishment and reduce stress while maintaining the progress. In contrast, individuals who are doubtful and negative about their capabilities demonstrate low aspirations and less commitment to goals or they facilitate less stable effort to maintenance of goal seeking progress (Bandura, 1994). Self-efficacy helps to determine the level of energy or effort that is required to achieve/complete an activity and how much progress an individual can achieve, how much perseverance individual can commit while encountering the problems and failures on the progress and how much resilience can he or she put on while facing adversities (Pajares, 1996). Low self-efficacy can cause pessimist perception on issues as they seem tougher than real challenge. Such beliefs may increase stress and depression and may reduce problem solving abilities. High self-efficacy, on the other hand help to generate clarity and comfort on the difficult tasks and issues. In sum, higher self-efficacy enhances determination and predict commitment, accomplishment and attainment of individuals (Bandura, 1990).

Bandura's (1977) self-efficacy model has parallel suggestions with agency thinking asset of Snyder's Theory of Hope. Snyder (1991) also acknowledged that agency thinking refers efficacious thinking in goal-orientation. But according to him, conceptualization of hope depended on both agency thinking and pathway thinking combined. Furthermore, Bandura (1977) suggested that higher levels of self-efficacy, in other words, confidence in one's own abilities in goal-oriented actions can fuel the effort and perseverance needed to fulfill hoped goals and achievements. This suggestion also strengths the parallel features between Bandura's self-efficacy and Snyder's agency thinking.

Philips and Gully (1997) studied self-efficacy in goal orientation process with 405 undergraduate students. According to their findings, students who have high self-efficacy tend to set higher and more successful future goals. Furthermore high self-efficacy was positively associated with higher goal orientation and higher performance to meet the desired goals. Bandura and his colleagues (2001) conducted a multiple cohort design study on 272 students to see influence of self-efficacy on future aspiration and career trajectory. According to their results, perceived higher self-efficacy was found to be positively associated with positive and successful future expectations –which indicates the hope- on various areas including social construct and successful career. Bell and Kozlowski (2002) studied self-efficacy on its effects on goal orientation and performance orientation to meet the goals. According to their findings, people with high self-efficacy set more performance to meet goals. Furthermore, due to their perceived high self-efficacy, settings of the desired goals tend to be more challenging and fruitful. Luszczynska and her colleagues (2005) conducted an extensive study to explore effects of self-efficacy over various domains of human functioning including personality features. They sampled 8796 participants

from Costa Rica, Germany, Poland, Turkey and U.S.A. According to their findings, high self-efficacy and positive future orientation were significantly associated.

1.3.2 Curiosity and Hopefulness

Curiosity can be described as the willingness to know, to experience, to see or understand that motivates exploratory actions toward something novel (Berlyne, 1949). It is an intrinsic desire to experience or find knowledge that enables individuals to actively search the world, explore their environment and acquire knowledge about unknown or uncertain things (Mikulincer, 1997). Gibson (1988) referred to information seeking as universal, evolutionary phenomenon and it is rooted to motivation to explore. This motivation enriches the knowledge and experience, thereby helps to cope with complex, changing environment. Maw and Maw (1970) described curiosity as a desire to know a novel stimulus that engages people in information seeking. Approach orientation and reward experience are also associated with curiosity. It is referred with positive affectivity, initiating exploration, promotion of knowledge gathering, inspiration for information search and competence (Berlyne, 1960; Kashdan & Steger, 2007).

Mutual point of curiosity literature is that curiosity is an approach-oriented motivation associated with exploration. Its immediate functions are learning, exploring and getting into interesting events and behavioral facets of curiosity which can be counted as asking questions, environmental manipulation, examination and persistence to challenging tasks (Peters, 1978; Reeve & Nix, 1997; Schiefele, 1999; Silvia, 2005; Sansone & Smith, 2000). Being curious about new or uncertain things in environment also involves tolerance to differences (Silvia, 2005). Openness to new experiences, uncertainty and preference of complexity over simplicity are typical for curious people (Litman, 2005).

The state of curiosity depends on two cognitive evaluation (Silvia, 2008): the level of novelty of the object of attention and level of competence due to the novel object. In other words, individuals evaluate the presence of new information recognized in their surrounding and how s/he manage to acquire this new information. People with high curiosity tend to discover novel information and they are likely to have motivation to comprehend this new information (Silvia, 2008). Curiosity increases by having more experience and knowledge, when an individual knows more about a topic. It is easier to be aware of information gaps, further desire to close those information gaps emerges via exploration and discovery (Loewenstein, 1994).

Encountering with interesting and curious things commonly shares multiple positive feelings such as enjoyment but curiosity and enjoyment has distinctions as different predictors and outcomes to exploratory behaviors. For instance, enjoyable things are frequently familiar while interesting things are novel that offer brand new information and opportunities hardwired with self-expansion (Silvia, 2005; 2008). Self-expansion referred to expansion of social context, knowledge, mentality, perspective and so on that cumulate self-identity. Self-expansion may also be referred to as a by-product of curiosity, which deepen the identity resources.

Kashdan et al. (2004) conducted a study to develop curiosity and exploration inventory. Their study consisted 5 different participant samples. According to their results, curiosity was positively correlated with hopefulness and other positive psychological constructs such as optimism, positive affect, well-being etc. In another study, Proyer et al. (2013) investigated the factors associated with life satisfaction. After sampling 178 participants, they found that hope and curiosity were positively correlated and together predicted well-being. Similar results had been found by Brdar

and Kashdan (2010) and their findings indicated that hope and curiosity were positively associated in a sample of 881 university students.

As Litman (2005) suggested, being comfortable with uncertainty is one of the features of curious individuals. Weary et al. (1996) found that people with feeling of uncertainty in cause and effect relationship about social environment experience deficits in social, cognitive and emotional areas. This leads to the feeling of losing control and eventually interfere with the expectations of individual, which is negatively related to future oriented hopes. Furthermore, features of curiosity and Snyder's (1991) Theory of Hope are conceptually similar as curiosity can help to generate pathway thinking and may help to maintain agency behaviors (Snyder, 1994).

1.3.3 Decision Making and Hopefulness

Decision making is a mandatory and ordinary part of our daily life. We make decisions to determine what to eat for lunch, which university to go or what to do after graduation. Since it is a regular way of thinking, decision making is seemingly to be a simple task. However, understanding it and creating a relationship pattern while making decision would help individuals to generate better decisions (Harris, 2012). Harris (2012) defined decision making as the process of identifying and selecting alternatives based on characteristics of the one who makes decisions. Decisions are not only generated by basing them on as many alternatives as possible but the notion of the highest probability of success, suitability for personal goals, values, lifestyle etc. Sinangil (1992) suggested that decision making is the process of choosing the most suitable option out of many available. Decision making also has a role to reduce uncertainty and doubt on the alternatives via information gathering and includes defining the objective, collecting relevant information, generating feasible options, making a final decision, implementing it and evaluate the outcomes (Adair, 2007).

Accordingly, Moser (1990) studied decision making as choosing the most beneficial, optimal and logical option among all available alternatives.

McKenney and Keen (1974) studied decision making from a cognitive vantage point, and they suggest that there were individual differences on organization of gathering information before making a decision. Individuals gather information before making decisions and that information is assimilated into the already constructed cognitive styles, and information organization is used accordingly to the personal cognitions. McKenney and Keen (1974) also talked about two different ways of making decision. Firstly, people who collect *systematic information* before making decisions rely their decisions n the *evaluations* about the information. In contrast, in the second way of decision making, people who collect *intuitive information* before making decision rely on their emotions.

Gelatt (1989) proposed a decision making model and suggested that rational decision making is not obsolete but incomplete and developed a term called "positive uncertainty". Positive uncertainty is a decision making philosophy when people do not know what the future will be. Successful decision making requires uncertainty as well as maintaining hope. That state starts with two attitudes: Firstly, an individual should accept the uncertainty of the future because future is real and inevitable and yet unknown for the very nature of it. Secondly, while accepting the uncertainty of future, an individual should also be *hopeful* about this uncertainty. Decision making via positive uncertainty has three steps: information, processing and decision. In order to make an effective decision, adaptive reconfiguration of information gathering is required because of flexible and changing environment. Even a reasonably evaluated decision can be invalidated in time due to changing conditions. In that case, an individual should adapt to the uncertainty and make a new decision. Decision maker

also should take into account the conditions that are special for the time of decision and should maintain positive attitude towards -changing circumstances in order to make an effective decision.

According to Eliot and Olver (2002), people may maintain a glimmer of hope until the last moments and that hope can increase resilience and perseverance while facing with the end of life decisions such as decisions about medical conditions. That glimmer of hope may not be related with a medical opinion or expectation, but in this sense, decision making is influenced by hope. The term of "positive uncertainty" (Gelatt, 1989) that was mentioned before is also conceptually linked to being a senior student in university. Because the uncertain nature of changing life conditions after graduation are important and stressful for students. Accordingly, Bayram and Bilgel (2008) found higher levels of stress for senior year university students than first and second years. Thus, having positive and hopeful attitude toward life is related with the decision making process itself (Gelatt, 1989). Hopfensitz and Winden (2008) conducted an experimental study to investigate the factors that influence risk attitude and decision making. According to their findings, hope had a positive effect on risk attitude during decision making process for investment planning within the experiment settings. Another study on decision making and future hopefulness is conducted by, Chew and Joanna (1994) and they found that hope was helpful to resolve future uncertainty during decision making process.

1.3.4 Self-Construals and Hopefulness

Markus and Kitayama (1991) developed a self-construal model to explore the nature of individual experience including cognition, emotion and motivation. Self can be construed, organized or conceptually represented in various ways. Construal of self in social context is related to the implicit effect of culture that moderate individual

reasoning and behaviors to progress accordingly to what should be done. According to this model, the content of self may radically vary by culture. Some cultures perceive the individual in a sense of inner attributions of that person. In contrast other cultures perceive the individual in a sense of belongingness to the social context and significant others. Authors suggested the relationship between self and others in terms of self-construals which are so powerful and differences can be compared between cultures. By saying so, Markus and Kitayama (1991) developed "independent" and "interdependent" self-construals that represent, basically self-representations of Western cultures and Eastern cultures, or individualistic cultures and collectivistic cultures. According to the model, psychological process will explicitly or implicitly implicate self to the construals, and the nature of cognition, emotion, motivation or socialization will vary according to the form of self that are inherent in the construal.

As an example of the variation of psychological processes according to the given construal of self, interdependent self-construal shapes the expression of emotions and motivations by the consideration of others, or consideration of self in relation to others, while independent self-construal shapes emotions and motivations by consideration of self-centered interests and personal values rather than social context interests and values. For instance the expression of anger in independent self-construal may be considered as an independent view of an individual and can be promoted as a way of reflecting personal attitude while within the interdependent self-construal the consideration of others may suppress the anger expression due to its properness for others. Marcus and Kitayama (1991) argued that self-construals have important role in regulating psychological processes.

Essential aspects of independent self-construal include autonomous and independent individual, who has a faith in separateness from others and organized the

behaviors based on one's own internal thoughts, feelings and actions rather than reference of other's thoughts, feelings and actions (Marcus & Kitayama, 1991). Independent self is not totally separate from social context as well, at some extent, responsiveness to the social context is essential. However, independent self manages social responsiveness to express internal attributes of self. Interdependent self-construal on the other hand evaluates individual as a part of encompassing social relationships and acknowledge one's behavior according to the perception, thoughts, feelings and actions of others. The self becomes meaningful and complete by the appropriate casting within the social relationships. In the interdependent self-construal, person is not separated from social context, rather s/he is highly connected and less differentiated to the others. Motivation of self serves to find best way to fit in within the relationships, and to complete self via presence of connectedness with others. Public aspect of self is more central for interdependent self-construal, validation of others and social comparison are critical compounds. Expression of self and internal attributes are based on situational conditions as overt expression whichs are determined by significant others. Personal opinions, values and characteristics are secondary, while interdependent attributions with others are primary. Within the interdependent self-construal, deliberate control of inner attributes and their expressions are acknowledged as mature and culturally ideal (Marcus & Kitayama, 1991).

Independent and interdependent construals of self are conceptually part of self-relevant schemata or self-system (Markus and Wurf, 1987; cited in Markus and Kitayama, 1991) that used to evaluate, organize and regulate experiences and actions of individual. Self-relevant tasks, events or situations and their process and consequence are influenced by nature of self-systems. Information processes,

16

emotional regulation and motivation are also influenced by self-systems as well as perception of individual, social comparison and regulating social interaction (Cantor & Kihlstrom, 1987; Greenwald & Pratkanis, 1984; Markus & Wurf, 1987; cited in Markus and Kitayama, 1991). Markus and Kitayama (1991) argue that independent and interdependent self-construals are among the most broad and generally encompassing schemata of self-systems. They suggested that organization of self-relevant processes and their consequences were importantly related with, whether the roots of those processes and consequences were based on independent or interdependent self-construals. For instance, general tendency of showing increased sensitivity to self-relevant stimuli perceptually differ between independent and interdependent construal of self, such as people with independent view of self, perceive self-relevant stimuli when it is about self-defining attributes, while people with interdependent view of self, perception of self-relevant stimuli would be about significant others. Moreover, information seeking behavior also differ between two different self-construals as people who have independent view of self, seek information that confirm or improve their internal attributes while people who have interdependent view of self, seek information that succeeding their interdependent relationships.

At this point, it is critical to link the concepts of independent/interdependent self-construals to the studies which have been conducted in Turkish speaking samples. Imamoglu and her colleagues (1993) discussed Turkish culture in collectivistic way. According to their study, socio-cultural relatedness has important part in Turkish culture, especially interdependency with family, relatives, neighbors and social groups are considered as closely related. In the same study, they also found that Turkish

17

sample -as collectivistic group of the study- had larger social networks and more frequently interacted within this network than Swedish sample as individualist group.

Kağıtçıbaşı (2010) also stated that valuing social interdependency is considered as an obligation for Turkish culture. Expectations of others within the social context can influence individual's behaviors accordingly. Karasar and Ogulmus (2016) discussed similar results in their study. They found that interpersonal harmony and coherence is important among individuals who live in Turkey. Furthermore they stated that Turkish speaking individuals consider needs and wishes of significant others more important than their own needs and wishes. Also, due to the importance of social harmony and coherence, acceptance of others become valuable. Those researches on Turkish cultural framework were mostly associated with interdependent self-construal of Markus and Kitayama's model (1991).

Du and King (2013) explored hope and its association with self-construals with 196 university students. According to their findings, people who have interdependent self-construal possessed external locus of hope, which referred hopeful thinking based on presence of significant others. In contrast, people who have independent self-construal possess internal locus of hope, which referred hopeful thinking relied on personal agency during goal attainment. Furthermore, there is a conceptual link between hopefulness and self-construals that is having independent or interdependent self-construal effects cognition. As explained above, self-construals are part of self-schematas that have influence over information processing, emotional regulation and perception of self and environment (Markus & Kitayama, 1991). Snyder (1991) also discussed hopeful thinking as a complex cognitive process. Having independent or interdependent construct of self and/or social network can have an association with future oriented reasoning. In other words, perception of self and others may create

variations on future oriented expectations. Current study will try to test this relationship.

1.4 Aim of the Study

Due to changing and uncertain life conditions after graduation including changes in social roles and status (Bayram & Bilgel, 2008), differentiations among senior university students are expected when it comes to future oriented feelings in senior year of university life. Characteristics of emerging adulthood period of development and senior year of university life has similar features in nature, therefore considered as a discussion matter in the current study. Similar suggestions of self-efficacy and agency thinking of Snyder's Theory of Hope (Snyder et al., 1991) generated first hypothesis of the study. In a same manner, structural similarities of decision making process and pathways thinking of Snyder's Theory of Hope (Snyder et al., 1991) generated second hypothesis to explore in current study. Furthermore, uncertainty of life course after graduation (Bayram & Bilgel, 2008) was also be considered to be related with curiosity which refers to being tolerated to the uncertainty (Silvia, 2005) and preferring new and uncertain experiences (Litman, 2005). Therefore this was considered as worth to explore and generated third hypothesis. Also, cultural differentiation as macro influence on hopefulness was explored by evaluating self-construals. Despite the study sample consisted of Turkish speaking participants, and Turkish culture is known to be close to interdependent social context, fourth hypothesis stated that independent self-construal will predict hopefulness, due to its individual promoting efficacious nature.

In sum, current study aims to investigate the hopefulness of senior year university students in relation with self-efficacy, curiosity, decision making and independent/interdependent self construals. Based on that aim, four hypothesizes were

extracted: Firstly, it is hypothesized that participants who have high levels of self-efficacy will have high levels of future hopefulness. Secondly, it is hypothesized that participants who are more decisive will have high levels of future hopefulness. Thirdly, it is hypothesized that participants who have high levels of curiosity will have high levels of future hopefulness. Lastly, it is also hypothesized that participants who have independent view of self will have high levels of future hopefulness than participants who have interdependent view of self.

Chapter 2

METHOD

2.1 Participants

A total of 278 senior university students of Eastern Mediterranean University in Famagusta, North Cyprus, were recruited for the study. All participants were Turkish speaking. Eighty nine point seven percentage of participants were between 20 to 25 ages (M= 22.13, SD= 1.92), 3.7% of participants were below the age of 20 and 6.6% of participants were above the age of 25. One hundred and one participants (36.3%) were male, 150 participant (54%) were female, and 27 participants (9.7%) did not specify their gender. 81 psychology students (29.1%), 85 law students (30.6%), 8 fine arts students (2.9%), 18 psychological counselling and guidance students (6.5%), 29 business and economics students (10.4%) and 6 educational sciences students (2.2%) specified their department and 51 (18.3%) participants did not specify their department.

2.2 Measurement Tools

2.2.1 Beck Hopelessness Scale

Beck Hopelessness Scale was used to measure future oriented hope level of participants. The scale consists of 20 items. Some of the items are "I look forward to the future with hope and enthusiasm" (1st item), "all I can see ahead of me is unpleasantness rather than pleasantness" (11th item), "the future seems vague and uncertain to me" (18th item). Participants filled the questionnaire by stating yes or no to the items. The "yes" answer represented the 1 point, the "no" answer represented 0

point. 1st, 3rd, 5th, 6th, 8th, 10th, 13th, 15th and 19th items were reverse items. Original Scale was developed by Beck (1974) to assess future hopelessness levels of individuals. Than Seber (1991) translated and adopted this scale into Turkish speaking population and conducted a reliability analysis. Cronbach Alpha of the scale was found as .86, and test-retest reliability coefficient as .74. Durak and Palabıyıkoğlu (1994) conducted another reliability analysis to the scale. They found Cronbach Alpha as .85, and correlation with beck depression inventory of the scale was .69. Scale has three subscales; expectations about future, loss of motivation and hope (Beck, 1974). Durak and Palabıyıkoğlu (1994) found Cronbach Alpha levels of subscales as .72 for the motivation loss, .78 for the expectations about future and .72 for the hope. In the current study, hopelessness was decided to be evaluated as overall score of the scale due to general measurement validity of Beck Hopelessness Scale upon the topic, referring that higher scores indicate higher *hopelessness*, in contrast, lower scores indicate higher hopefulness. For current study's sample, Cronbach Alpha of the Beck Hopelessness Scale was found as .86 (See Appendix A)

2.2.2 Independent and Interdependent Self-Construal Scale

Independent and Interdependent Self-Construal Scale was developed by Lu and Gilmour (2007) to measure independent and interdependent self-construals. This is a 7 point likert scale with 42 items. Some of the items are "I believe people should have their own ideals and try hard to achieve them" (item 3), "I believe that people should be unique and different from others" (item14), "Once you become a member of the group, you should try hard to adjust to the group's demands" (item 25). The scale has two subscales; independent self construal (first 21 item) and interdependent self construal (from item 22 to item 42). Lu and Gilmour (2007) found that Cronbach Alpha of independent and interdependent self construals were .86 and .89,

respectively. Bayraktar et al. (2015) translated and adapted this scale into Turkish language. According to their findings, confirmatory factor analysis showed that the two-factor model had an adequate fit to the data which means that independent and interdependent self subscales could be used in Turkish speaking populations (Cronbach Alphas for independent subscale was .89 and interdependent subscale was .87). In the current study, Cronbach alphas for independent self-construal subscale and interdependent self construal subscale were found as .83 and.89 respectively, and for overall scale internal consistency coefficient was .87. Basically higher points in a subscale means more tendency to have this specific subscale's self construal (See Appendix B)

2.2.3 Multi Domain Decisiveness Scale

Multi Domain Decisiveness Scale was developed by Haraburda (1998) to assess general and personal decision making ability of individuals. It is a 6 point likert questionnaire. Some of the items are "I am good at making decisions" (item 1), "when handling conflicts with others, I put off deciding what to do" (item 9). Sarı (2010) conducted an adaptation study to the original 22 item scale for Turkish speaking population. According to his findings, internal consistency coefficient was .86 for overall scale, .64 for general decisiveness subscale, .62 for conflict solving subscale, .73 for certainty choice of social relations subscale and .56 for easiness choice of social relations subscale. 2nd, 3rd, 8th, 9th, 13th, 14th, 15th, 19th, and 20th items are reverse coded. In the current study, overall score of the scale is decided to evaluate general decisiveness because of the measurement validity of the scale is consistent with the research hypothesis. Overall Cronbach Alpha was found as .80 for current sample of study. Higher points indicate higher decisiveness (See Appendix C).

2.2.4 Curiosity and Exploration Inventory II

Curiosity and Exploration Inventory II was developed by Kashdan et al. (2009). This is a five point Likert scale with 10 items. Some of the items are "I actively seek as much information as I can in new situations" (item 1), "I am always looking for experiences that challenge how I think about myself and the world" (item 7). Kashdan et al. (2009) conducted three different psychometric studies while developing the scale and Cronbach Alpha levels ranged between .75 and .86 in those studies. Scale has two subscales; stretching (motivation to seek out new knowledge and experience; items of 1, 3, 4, 5, 7, 9) and embracing (willingness to embrace the novelty and uncertainty; items of 2, 6, 8, 10). Acun, Kapıkıran and Kabasakal (2013) translated and adapted the scale into Turkish language. Their analysis showed that, two subscales were highly related (r=.85), and Cronbach Alpha of overall scale was .81, also internal consistencies were .81 and .68 for stretching subscale and embrace subscales, respectively. In the current study, we decided to use overall score of the scale for evaluation due to close nature of subscales and general validity of scale on curiosity. Overall Cronbach Alpha of the scale was .70. There was no reverse items in the scale and higher points indicate higher curiosity (See Appendix D).

2.2.5 Dispositional Hope Scale

Dispositional Hope Scale was developed by Snyder et al. (1991) to assess hopefulness levels of individuals. It is a 8 point likert scale with 12 items. Some of the items are "there are lots of ways around any problem" (item 4), "I meet the goals that I set for myself" (item 12). The scale has two subscales, alternative ways thinking and actual thinking. According to the psychometric study of Snyder and his colleagues (1991), Cronbach Alpha for alternative ways thinking subscale was between .64 and .80, for actual thinking subscale was between .71 and .76, for overall scale was

between .74 and .84. Tarhan and Balcalı (2015) translated and adapted this scale into Turkish speaking population. According to their findings, Cronbach Alpha for the overall scale was .83. They also did a test-retest reliability analysis and found that for alternative ways thinking and actual thinking subscales, relationship between first and last analysis of scale was acceptable (r= .81; p<.001 for actual thinking, r=.78; p<.001 for alternative ways thinking, r=.86; p<.001 for the overall scale). We decided to use overall score of the scale as a final hopefulness measurement due to its general validity to measure hopefulness. In our study, Cronbach Alpha of overall scale was found as .85. There was no reverse item in the scale, and 3rd, 5th, 7th and 11th items were not scored (scored as zero). Higher scores indicated higher hopefulness (See Appendix E)

2.2.6 General Self-Efficacy Scale

General Self-Efficacy Scale was developed by Schwarzer and Jerussalem (1979) to assess self-efficacy levels of individuals. Originally it was developed as a 20-item-scale. However, Schwarzer and Jerussalem reduced the item number to 10 in 1992. It is a 5 point likert scale with 10 items. Some of the items are "I can always manage to solve difficult problems if I try hard enough" (item1), "I can solve most problems if I invest in the necessary effort" (item 6). Reliability studies of the scale is conducted in three different countries (Germany, Spain and China) and Cronbach Alphas of the scale were found between .78 and .91 (Schwarzer et al., 1997). The scale was translated and adapted into Turkish language by Aypay (2010). According to the results of this study, Cronbach Alpha of the scale was found as .83, and test-retest reliability was found acceptable (r=.80, p<.001). There was no reverse item in the scale and higher points indicate higher self-efficacy. In the current study, Cronbach Alpha of the scale was found as .86 (See Appendix F).

2.3 Procedure

After obtaining approval from Research Ethics Committee of Eastern Mediterranean University, official rectorship approval paper of the study that announces departments to cooperate with the data collection procedure was distributed to the faculties. By doing so, secretaries and heads of departments were informed and collaborated for data collection. After contacting secretaries and heads of departments, classes for senior year university students were detected and researched participated classrooms. Data was collected in classroom settings at class times. Researcher and the teacher of the class were present during data collection. First, students were informed about the study and voluntary students signed the informed consent. Students took the scales and filled individually in the classroom. Participants were also asked to write down their demographic information (age, gender, department) on first page of the scales. After finishing the surveys, students took a debriefing form. All data were collected in Arts and Science Faculty, Law Faculty, Business and Economics Faculty and Education Faculty of Eastern Mediterranean University. Data collection procedure took three weeks. Scales were filled in single session and each session took around 20 minutes.

Chapter 3

RESULTS

3.1 Data Analysis

In the current study, SPSS 23 software was used for analyses. First, a Pearson Correlation Coefficient was used to see the relationship among the variables. Then a hierarchical multiple regression analysis was conducted to see the predictor roles of independent variables on hopefulness. Age is entered in the first step of regression analyses as a control variable, then hopelessness scale introduced to the second model to increase validity of hopefulness measurement. Third step consisted of individual related variables: self-efficacy, decisiveness and curiosity due to their positive psychology background. In the last model of regression analyses, culture related variables − independent and interdependent self-construals entered to assess culture related variations within the study population.

3.2 Correlations among Continuous Variables

As seen in Table 1, there were positive correlations between hopefulness and age, decisiveness, self-efficacy, curiosity, and independent self-construals. Hopelessness (measured by Beck Hopelessness Scale) was negatively correlated with hopefulness (measured by Dispositional Hope Scale). Self-efficacy had the strongest correlation coefficient with hopefulness.

Table 1: Correlations among Hopefulness, Age, Hopelessness, Decisiveness, Self-Efficacy, Curiosity and Self-Construal's

Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1. Hopefulness	-							
2. Age	.07	-						
3. Hopelessness	-.50**	.02	-					
4. Decisiveness	.45**	.15*	-.36**	-				
5. Self-Efficacy	.72**	.19*	-.30**	.42**	-			
6. Curiosity	.37**	.09*	-.21*	.23**	.40	-		
7. Independent Self-Construal	.40**	.06*	-.29**	.20*	.32	.22**	-	
8. Interdependent Self-Construal	.14*	.11*	.01	-.08	.18	.08	.09	-

*p<.01, **p<.0001

3.3 Regression Analysis

3.3.1 Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis Findings for Variables Predicting Hopefulness

In the present study, Hierarchical Multiple Regression was conducted to examine the predictor role of age, hopelessness, curiosity, decisiveness, self-efficacy and self-construal types on hopefulness (See Table 2). Preliminary analyses were conducted to ensure no violations of the assumptions of normality, linearity, multicollinearity and homoscedasticity. Examination of the data indicated significance and assumption were met for VIF and Tolerance. Highest VIF for all variables was 1.370 for decisiveness. Lowest tolerance to hopefulness was .646 for self-efficacy.

In the first step of regression analysis, age was entered as control variable. Model was insignificant (F (1,241) = 1.239, p=.267), and explained .005% of the variation in hopefulness. Hopelessness variable as a validation measure for

hopefulness was entered at the second model while controlling age. New model (F (2,241) = 42.299, p<.0001) explained 26.1% of the variation in hopefulness (β=-506, p<.001). Individual related variables; curiosity, self-efficacy and decisiveness were entered in the third step while controlling previous variables (F (5,241) = 77.683, p<.001). Third model explained 62.2% of the variation in hopefulness with decisiveness (β=.100, p=.031) and self-efficacy (β= .581, p<.001) and hopelessness (β=-279, p<.001). Self-construals as culture related variables were introduced in the last step (F (7,241)=58.610, p<.001). Fourth model explained 63.7% of the variation in hopefulness with independent self-construal (β= .122, p=.005), self-efficacy (β= .544, p<.001), decisiveness (β= .106, p= .022) and hopelessness (β= -.255, p<.001). Age, curiosity and interdependent self-construal were not significant predictors in the fourth step.

Table 2: Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis Findings for Variables Predicting Hopefulness

Predictors	Hopefulness		
	B	*SEb*	*β*
	Model 1		
Age	.036	.032	.072
	$R^2 = .005$		
	Model 2		
Hopelessness	-2.262	.248	-.506**
	$R^2 = .261$		
	Model 3		
Decisiveness	.150	.069	.100*
Self-Efficacy	.998	.082	.581**
Curiosity	.109	.083	.058
	$R^2 = .622$		
	Model 4		
Independent Self Construal	.199	.070	.122*
Interdependent Self Construal	.044	.042	.043
	$R^2 = .637$		

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .0001$.

Chapter 4

DISCUSSION

The present study explored the effects of self-efficacy, decisiveness, curiosity and independent/interdependent self construals on hopefulness of senior year university students. It was found that self-efficacy and decisiveness were significantly predicted hopefulness of senior students, however curiosity was found to have absence of prediction role on hopefulness. Furthermore, only independent self-construal predicted hopefulness. However, age did not have prediction role on hopefulness.

Findings of the study supported first hypothesis that participants who have high levels of self-efficacy will have high levels of future hopefulness. It was found that hopefulness significantly predicted by self-efficacy, and this finding is supported by the literature (Philips & Gully, 1997; Bandura et al., 2001; Bell & Kozlowski, 2002; Luszczynska et al., 2005) Such finding can be linked to the literature on hopefulness consistently in two ways. Firstly, Bandura stated the importance of self-efficacy over future oriented expectations in multiple occasions. According to Bandura (1990), efficacious way of thinking help individuals to expect hopeful future results. He further explained self-efficacy as enhanced self-determination level and ability to predict commitment necessary to fulfill accomplishment. Furthermore, positive predictions are tend to be thought in self-efficacious way (Bandura, 1990). Bandura (1993) mentioned functional effect of self-efficacy over individuals; positive progress against uncertain nature of future requires high self-efficacy in a way to balance obstacles and goal orientation positively. He (1993) also stated that visualizing positive ways to

successful outcomes or positive progress to meet goals are parallel to high self-efficacy beliefs.

Current study findings are parallel with Bandura's self-efficacy model and its consideration about future oriented expectations that is high self-efficacy enable individuals to think hopeful about future. An indirect link also can be established between high self-efficacy and hopeful thinking about future. According to Bandura (1993), mastery experiences escalate the level of self-efficacy, meaning that positively achieved challenges create an elevated confidence over self-perception. Perceiving oneself as capable to challenge obstacles and achieve them positively develops a perception of efficacious self. Such perception takes place when a long term challenge is confronted. Based on past mastery experiences, one can believe that s/he is able to resolve challenges, and perceive outcome of the challenge positively. Such positive expectation over challenges is the characteristic of efficacious individuals and can be linked to hopeful thinking as well.

Second link between high self-efficacy and hopefulness could be related with Snyder's Theory of Hope itself. Parallel suggestions of Bandura's self-efficacy model and agency thinking of Snyder may highlights the compactness of two model. The way Snyder articulated agency thinking and Bandura's self-efficacy definitions have common aspects. Snyder and his colleagues (Snyder et al., 1999) articulated agency thinking as a reasoning that people have about their capability and efficacy to initiate and maintain actions on selected pathways to meet desired goals. Similarly, Bandura (1994) described self-efficacy as belief in one's capabilities to execute necessary performance that implement influence over events that affect life. Understandingly, Snyder's agency thinking refers efficacious reasoning during hoping process. Such mutuality already have been recognized by Snyder as well (1991), as he stated that

agency thinking represent efficacious thinking, however, according to his model, both agency thinking and pathways thinking are necessary for hoping process. Agency thinking and pathways thinking are indistinguishable for maintaining hopeful thinking, inefficiency in one component will eventually lead dysfunction in other component and eventually lead issues in hoping process. Despite binary dynamic of Snyder's model, current study findings may indicate that efficiency in self-efficacy can escalate hopeful thinking due to its natural link with agency thinking. Further researches are recommended to investigate how much role agency thinking play during hopeful thinking process while controlling pathways thinking. Extending researches to investigate dynamics of hopeful thinking may enlighten our understanding over the role of self-efficacy during hoping process.

Developmental stage of current study's sample was also worth to indicate importance of self-efficacy on future hopefulness. Emerging adulthood consists of important chances and possibilities that can influence adulthood life (Arnett, 2005). Emerging adults obtain high education or training, prepare plans and qualifications and make decisions that create foundation of their future life (Chisholm & Hurrelmann, 1995). Bandura (1993) mentioned the effect of self-efficacy on evaluating situational demands and maintaining perseverance for future preparations. Low self-efficacy lead failure predictions and negative visualizations of future, and may impair the progress of positive development. Whereas high self-efficacy lead expectation of positive outcomes, eventually supports performance on the progress. Such role of self-efficacy is important to accomplish developmental tasks of emerging adulthood and prepare future adequately. According to Arnett (2006), emerging adults are tend to be hopeful and efficacious due to the energetic nature of this period and future possibilities. Opportunistic nature of emerging adulthood period of

development and characteristically hopeful, excited, optimistic features of emerging adults are important factors for future hopefulness preparation to future life. Findings of the current study supports the link of efficacious characteristics of emerging adult participants and its predictive association with hopefulness.

The findings of the study also supported the second hypothesis that participants who were more decisive would have high levels of future hopefulness. Decisiveness predicted hopefulness significantly in the current study and other researches within the literature supported our finding (Gelatt, 1989; Chew and Joanna, 1994; Hopfensitz & Winden, 2008). This finding may be linked with pathways thinking component of Snyder's Theory of Hope due to particular similarities. Snyder and his colleagues (1994) described pathways thinking as perceived ability to generate ways to achieve goals. Similarly, literature defined decision making process as generating alternative ways to achieve the goal (pathways to the outcome) and choosing most appropriate and optimal way to reach the desired goal (Sinangil, 1992; Harris, 2012; Adair, 2007; Moser; 1990). Important asset of decision making process; generating suitable alternative ways to achieve desired outcome is similar with Snyder's pathway thinking concept. Furthermore, Snyder (1994) mentioned that facing with obstacles and challenges trigger the hoping process. However, engaging flexible and various plans to deal with negative issues during goal achievement and being able to initiate new plans on the way of goals are the important assets for a hopeful thinker (Snyder, 1994). That ability of generating new plans on goal oriented approach is referred as decent decision making ability (Adair, 2007).

Linking decision making ability with pathways thinking of Snyder's Theory of Hope have another compatibility in the current study. As discussed before, self-efficacy is linked with agency thinking. When decision making ability is explained by

links with pathways thinking, binary dynamic of Snyder's Theory of Hope become apparent and efficient hopeful thinking process is completed. Snyder (1994) explained hopeful thinking process as indistinguishable presence of agency thinking and pathways thinking. Self-efficacy and decisiveness may support this hopefulness dynamic respectively. Furthermore, prediction role of self-efficacy and decisiveness on hopefulness may not be a coincidence, since curiosity as third individual variable of the study found to have absence of prediction effect on hopefulness.

Furthermore, Gelatt (1989) stated that being uncertain and hopeful at the same time is needed to be successful decision maker. This statement also seen to be related with the emerging adulthood characteristics of our sample that has been discussed before. Gelatt (1989) combined decision making and hopeful thinking as two essential ingredients of "positive uncertainty" concept. According to him, facing with unknown future firstly requires accepting the uncertainty and being hopeful about it. While being positive about uncertain future, individuals must gather information to be adaptive in changing conditions on the way of future. Staying positive during this adaptation is essential to be hopeful decision maker. This concept is linked with uncertain nature of future in emerging adulthood (Arnett, 2006) and highlights the importance of being hopeful during decision making about future. Findings of the current study supports the literature that decisiveness and hopefulness was positively related (Gelatt, 1989; Adair, 2007; Arnett; 2006).

Current study did not support the third hypothesis that is participants who have high levels of curiosity will have high levels of future hopefulness. Results indicated that there was not significant prediction role of curiosity on hopeful thinking. Nevertheless, significant positive correlation coefficient between curiosity and hopefulness was found. This finding indicates that individual relationship between

curiosity and hopefulness exist, however together with other variables of the current study; curiosity does not predict hopefulness. This insignificance may be due to the cluster of individual related variables in current study. As discussed before, self-efficacy and decisiveness had predictive role on hopefulness as their links with agency thinking and pathways thinking of Snyder's Theory of Hope. When considering those links, curiosity may stay out of the picture conceptually, in other words, self-efficacy and decisiveness variables may carry a negative suppression effect over curiosity variable in our multiple regression analysis. Negative suppression effect refers a variable or cluster of variables that reduce the weight of another particular variable in multiple regression statistics (Darlington, 1968; Horst, 1941; cited in Conger, 1974). Moreover, despite Silvia (2008) studied curiosity in cognitive fashion, many other researchers considered it as a motivation, an instinctual desire of personality structure (Berlyne, 1949; Berlyne, 1960; Day, 1971; Gibson, 1988; Kashdan & Steger, 2007; Maw and Maw, 1970; Mikulincer, 1997). In contrast, Snyder's Theory of Hope had cognitive approach to explore hopefulness. Such natural differentiations of two concepts might be responsible for insignificant finding of the current study. Also, curiosity is a phenomenon that occurs in the face of novelty, (Peters, 1978; Reeve & Nix, 1997; Sansone & Smith, 2000; Schiefele, 1999) whereas hopefulness occurs when an uncertain future oriented chain of events experienced (Snyder, 1991). Such different aspects of two phenomenon might create disassociation in our study. Further specific researches which investigate these two variables are needed to increase understanding the relationship between curiosity and hopefulness.

Findings of the current study also supported the fourth hypothesis that is participants who have independent view of self will have high levels of future hopefulness. Independent self-construal had predictive role on hopefulness according

to our findings. This result can be discussed by Bernardo's extension to the hope literature. He (2010) extended hope theory of Snyder and added two new dimensions, internal locus of hope and external locus of hope. According to him, internal locus of hope indicates hopeful thinking that had been construed based on the person centered attributions. In contrast, external locus of hope indicates hopeful thinking that relied on significant others. Du and King (2013) also demonstrated that independent view of self is tend to possess internal locus of hope, while interdependent view of self is tend to enjoy external locus of hope. This extension is particularly important because of Bernardo's discussion while developing this extension for hope literature. According to him (2010), dimensions of hope require further researches to understand comprehensively. Hope is not only a personality trait or a learned way about future but external agents (i.e. family, friends) or spiritual beliefs can play role during hopeful thinking process. Based on his suggestions, results of the current study need to be further studied to examine interdependent view of self and its association with hopefulness more deeply. This limitation of the study indicates that future researches must be conducted to investigate association between hopefulness and both of self-construals.

Furthermore, despite the findings of current study demonstrated that the independent view of self predicts hopefulness, many past research discussed Turkish culture as interdependent in nature (Imamoğlu et al., 1993; Kağıtçıbaşı, 2010; Karasar & Ogulmus, 2016) and having a communal self that promote sense of belongingness in supportive way which may indicate more hopeful thinking (Kağıtçıbaşı, 2010). In interdependent self-construal, person is not a separate part of social context, rather highly connected. Plus, reciprocal expectations and responsibility are already shared (Markus & Kitayama, 1991). If sense of self is construed in interdependency to a social

context such as family and relatives, person may face issues with socio-emotional support and expectation of such support would persist life-long (Kağıtçıbaşı, 1993). Such expectation can lead hopeful thinking about future. Those past researches on Turkish socio-cultural context further highlights the necessity of future researches to ensure clear understanding over self-construals and their relationship with hopefulness.

Hopelessness measure of the study was found to be negatively predicting hopefulness. Measuring hopelessness with hopefulness had a validator benefit for research results. Dependent variable of hopefulness was expected to be negatively correlated with hopelessness to ensure validity of hopefulness measure. Results confirmed that hopefulness measure was valid.

Results of the current study can be implied to individual well-being services of universities. Some universities around the world such as University of Bologna, University of Glasgow and Eastern Mediterranean University have psychological counselling centers that provide psychological support to the students. Having an understanding of self-efficacy and decisiveness increases the future hopefulness of university students may increase the efficiency of professionals in those centers to help students. Strongest association of hopefulness was found with self-efficacy in the current study. Bandura (1990) stated that mastery experiences and positively achieved challenges are one of the main resources of high self-efficacy. This statement can be linked to the lecturer attitudes during university education. Being positive, helpful and understanding lecturer can help students to develop healthy self-efficacy and lead better future oriented standing. Lecturers in universities should consider how university education can be challenging and how it can affect student's self-efficacy, and must behave accordingly. Bandura (1990) also stated the importance of social role

models and social persuasion on self-efficacy, as well as the importance of parents on the development of self-efficacy (Bandura, 2001). Parents –as first role models (Bowlby, 1980) should support self-efficacy development from early ages. This may ensure healthy and functional future hopefulness for children at their emerging adulthood stage of development. Also, similar studies should be conducted in Turkey and other countries to see if there is a difference based on socio-geographic factors related with hopefulness.

Current study had particular methodological limitations. Data collection procedure was conducted inside a social environment; classroom settings. Presence of others can influence individual way of thinking including self-efficacy (Gecas, 1989) and being classmates may create an in-group perception, eventually may lead to confounding effect during data collection. All data were collected via self-report questionnaires. A qualitative methodology could expand our understanding of hopefulness and its correlates further. Moreover, different departments of universities may have different future pathways due to various nature of jobs and opportunities. Departmental differences may carry variations on hopefulness of university students. However, current study did not investigate it adequately. Future research could open new research topics on departments and their perceived future expectations. Such researches may provide re-evaluations of occupational policies for organizations and government.

In conclusion, hopefulness was found to be significantly predicted by self-efficacy, decisiveness and interdependent self-construal. Curiosity did not have significant prediction role when accompanied with other variables of the study. Study sample were mostly within the emerging adulthood phase of development, nature of emerging adulthood was also discussed and linked to the results of the study.

Future is inevitable and valuable. Trainings and education, economical investment, personal aims, experiences and etc. They all have an influence over individuals and mutually exclusive to the future. Hopefulness as a positive psychology topic is particularly worth to study for the sake of individual well-being while preparing for future. As Jean-Baptiste Andre Godin once said, "the quality of our expectations determines the quality of our actions".

REFERENCES

Acun, N., Kapikiran, S., & Kabasakal, Z. (2013). Merak ve Kesfetme Ölçegi II: Açimlayici ve Dogrulayici Faktör Analizleri ve Güvenirlik Çalismasi. *Türk Psikoloji Yazıları*, *16*(31), p. 74-91

Adair, J. E. (2007). *Decision making and problem solving strategies* (Vol. 9). Kogan Page Publishers. London, U.K

Aypay, A. (2010). Genel Öz Yeterlik Ölçeği'nin Türkçe'ye Uyarlama Çalışması. *İnönü Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, *11*(2). doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.17679/iuefd.33205

Arnett, J. J. (2000). Emerging adulthood: A theory of development from the late teens through the twenties. *American Psychologist*, *55*(5), p. 469-480. doi:10.1037/0003-066x.55.5.469

Arnett, J. J. (2005). The Developmental context of substance use in emerging adulthood. *Journal of Drug Issues*, *35*(2), p. 235–254. doi: 10.1177/002204260503500202

Arnett, J. J. (2006). Emerging Adulthood: Understanding the new way of coming of age. In J. J. Arnett & L. Tanner (Eds.), *Emerging Adults in America: Coming Age in the 21st Century* (pp. 3–120). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association Press. doi: 10.1037/11381-001

Aspinwall, L.G., & Leaf, S.L. (2002). In search of the unique aspects of hope: Pinning our hopes on positive emotions, future-oriented thinking, hard times, and other people. *Psychological Inquiry, 13*(4), p. 276-321. doi: 10.1207/S15327965PLI1304_02

Averill, J.R., Catlin, G., & Chon, K.K. (1990). *Rules of Hope.* New York: Springer-Verlag. doi: 10.1002/smi.2460070416

Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review*, *84*(2), p. 191. doi: 10.1037/0033-295x.84.2.191

Bandura, A. (1986). The explanatory and predictive scope of self-efficacy theory. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, *4*(3), p. 359-373. doi: 10.1521/jscp.1986.4.3.359

Bandura, A. (1990). Perceived self-efficacy in the exercise of personal agency. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*, *2*(2), p. 128-163. doi: 10.1080/10413209008406426

Bandura, A. (1993). Perceived self-efficacy in cognitive development and functioning. *Educational Psychologist*, *28*(2), p. 117-148. Doi: 10.1207/s15326985ep2802_3

Bandura, A. (1994). Self-efficacy. In. VS Ramachaudran. *Encyclopedia of Human Behavior*, *4*(4), p. 71-81. doi: 10.4135/9781412952576.n182

Bandura, A., & Locke, E. A. (2003). Negative self-efficacy and goal effects revisited. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88(1), p. 87–99. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.88.1.87

Bandura, A. (2001). Social cognitive theory: An agentic perspective. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *52*(1), p. 1–26. doi: 10.1146/annurev.psych.52.1.1

Bandura, A., Barbaranelli, C., Caprara, G. V., & Pastorelli, C. (2001). Self-efficacy beliefs as shapers of children's aspirations and career trajectories. *Child Development*, *72*(1), p. 187-206.

Bayraktar, F. (2015). A step toward understanding cross-national and cross-cultural variances in cyberbullying. In L. D. Rosen, N. A. Cheever & L. M. Carrier (Eds), *The Wiley Handbook of Psychology, Technology, and Society* (pp. 158–175). doi: 10.1002/9781118771952.ch9

Bayram, N., & Bilgel, N. (2008). The prevalence and socio-demographic correlations of depression, anxiety and stress among a group of university students. *Social Psychiatry and Psychiatric Epidemiology*, *43*(8), p. 667–672. doi: 10.1007/s00127-008-0345-x

Bell, B. S., & Kozlowski, W. J. (2002). Goal orientation and ability: Interactive effects
on self-efficacy, performance, and knowledge. *Journal of Applied
Psychology*, *87*(3), p. 497.

Berlyne, D. E. (1949). "Interest" As a Psychological Concept. *British Journal of
Psychology*. *39*(4), p. 184–195. doi:10.1111/j.2044-8295.1949.tb00219.x

Berlyne, D. E. (1960). Conflict, arousal, and curiosity. doi: 10.1037/11164-000

Bernardo, A. B. (2010). Extending hope theory: Internal and external locus of trait
hope. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *49*(8), p. 944-949. doi:
10.1016/j.paid.2010.07.036

Brdar, I., & Kashdan, T. B. (2010). Character strengths and well-being in Croatia: An
empirical investigation of structure and correlates. *Journal of Research in
Personality*, *44*(1), p. 151-154. doi: 10.1016/j.jrp.2009.12.001

Weissman, M. M. (1980). Loss: sadness and depression. Attachment and Loss, Vol.
III. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, *137*(11), p. 1478–1478. doi:
10.1176/ajp.137.11.1478

Bruininks, P., & Malle, B. F. (2005). Distinguishing hope from optimism and related
affective states. *Motivation and Emotion*, *29*(4), 324–352. doi:10.1007/s11031-
006-9010-4

Cavanaugh, J. C. (2016). *Essentials of human development: A life-span view*. Cengage Learning.

Chew, S. H., & Ho, J. L. (1994). Hope: An empirical study of attitude toward the timing of uncertainty resolution. *Journal of Risk and Uncertainty*, *8*(3), p. 267-288.

Chickering, A. W. (1969). *Education and identity*. Jossey-Bass.

Chisholm, L., & Hurrelmann, K. (1995). Adolescence in modern Europe. Pluralized transition patterns and their implications for personal and social risks. *Journal of Adolescence*, *18*(2), p. 129–158. doi:10.1006/jado.1995.1010

Du, H., & King, R. B. (2013). Placing hope in self and others: Exploring the relationships among self-construals, locus of hope, and adjustment. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *54*(3), p. 332-337. doi: 10.1016/j.paid.2012.09.015

Dufault, K., & Martocchio, B. C. (1985). Symposium on compassionate care and the dying experience. Hope: its spheres and dimensions. *The Nursing Clinics of North America*, *20*(2), P. 379-391.

Eliott, J., & Olver, I. (2002). The discursive properties of "Hope": A qualitative analysis of cancer patients' speech. *Qualitative Health Research*, *12*(2), p. 173–193. doi:10.1177/104973230201200204

Erikson, E. H. (1959). *Identity and the life cycle* (Vol. 1, p. 1). New York: International Universities Press.

Gecas, V. (1989). The Social psychology of self-efficacy. *Annual Review of Sociology*, *15*(1), p. 291–316. doi:10.1146/annurev.soc.15.1.291

Gelatt, H. B. (1989). Positive uncertainty: A new decision-making framework for counseling. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, *36*(2), 252–256. doi:10.1037/0022-0167.36.2.252

Gibson, E. (1988). Exploratory behavior in the development of perceiving, acting, and the acquiring of knowledge. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *39*(1), p. 1–41. doi:10.1146/annurev.psych.39.1.1

Haraburda, E. M. (1998). *The relationship of indecisiveness to the five factor personality model and psychological symptomology* (Doctoral dissertation, The Ohio State University).

Harris, R. (June 9, 2012). Introduction to decision making. Retrieved from https://www.virtualsalt.com/crebook5.htm

Hopfensitz, A., & Van Winden, F. (2008). Dynamic choice, independence and emotions. *Theory and Decision*, *64*(2-3), p. 249-300. doi: 10.1007/s11238-007-9058-y

Imamoglu, E. O., Küller, R., Imamoglu, V., & Küller, M. (1993). The social psychological worlds of Swedes and Turks in and around retirement. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, *24*(1), p. 26–41. doi:10.1177/0022022193241002

Jerusalem, M., & Schwarzer, R. (1995). General self-efficacy scale, revised english version. *PsycTESTS Dataset*. doi:10.1037/t18916-000

Kağıtçıbaşı, Ç. (1982). Old-age security value of children. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, *13*(1), p. 29–42. doi:10.1177/0022022182131004

Kağıtçıbaşı, Ç. (1993). Türkiye'de Aile Kültürü. *Kadın Araştırmaları Dergisi*, (1).

Kağıtçıbaşı, Ç. (2010). *Günümüzde İnsan ve İnsanlar: Sosyal Psikolojiye Giriş*. Evrim Yayınevi.

Karaşar, B., & Öğülmüş, S. (2016). Sosyal onay ihtiyacı ölçeği: Geçerlilik ve güvenilirlik analizi. *Ege Eğitim Dergisi*, *17*(1), p. 84. doi:10.12984/eed.38607

Kashdan, T. B., Rose, P., & Fincham, F. D. (2004). Curiosity and exploration: Facilitating positive subjective experiences and personal growth opportunities. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, *82*(3), p. 291-305. doi: 10.1207/s15327752jpa8203_05

Kashdan, T. B., & Steger, M. F. (2007). Curiosity and pathways to well-being and meaning in life: Traits, states, and everyday behaviors. *Motivation and Emotion*, *31*(3), p. 159–173. doi:10.1007/s11031-007-9068-7

Kashdan, T. B., Gallagher, M. W., Silvia, P. J., Winterstein, B. P., Breen, W. E., Terhar, D., & Steger, M. F. (2009). The curiosity and exploration inventory-II: Development, factor structure, and psychometrics. *Journal of Research in Personality*, *43*(6), p. 987–998. doi:10.1016/j.jrp.2009.04.011

Litman, J. (2005). Curiosity and the pleasures of learning: Wanting and liking new information. *Cognition & Emotion*, *19*(6), p. 793–814. doi:10.1080/02699930541000101

Loewenstein, G. (1994). The psychology of curiosity: A review and reinterpretation. *Psychological Bulletin*, *116*(1), p. 75–98. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.116.1.75

Lu, L., & Gilmour, R. (2007). Developing a new measure of independent and interdependent views of the self. *Journal of Research in Personality*, *41*(1), p. 249–257. doi:10.1016/j.jrp.2006.09.005

Luszczynska, A., Gutiérrez-Doña, B., & Schwarzer, R. (2005). General self-efficacy in various domains of human functioning: Evidence from five countries. *International Journal of Psychology*, *40*(2), p. 80-89. doi: 10.1080/00207590444000041

Markus, H. R., & Kitayama, S. (1991). Culture and the self: Implications for cognition, emotion, and motivation. *Psychological Review*, *98*(2), p. 224–253. doi:10.1037/0033-295x.98.2.224

Maw, W. H., & Maw, E. W. (1970). Self-concepts of high- and low-curiosity boys. *Child Development*, *41*(1), p. 123. doi:10.2307/1127394

McKenney, J. L., & Keen, P. G. (1974). How managers' minds work. *Harvard Business Review*, *52*(3), p. 79-90. Retrieved from: https://hbr.org/1974/05/how-managers-minds-work

Mikulincer, M. (1997). Adult attachment style and information processing: Individual differences in curiosity and cognitive closure. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *72*(5), p. 1217–1230. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.72.5.1217

Moser, P. K. (1990). *Rationality in action: Contemporary approaches*. Cambridge University Press.

National Center for Education Statistics. (2014). The condition of education. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved from www.nces.gov

Pajares, F. (1996). Self-efficacy beliefs in academic settings. *Review of Educational Research*, *66*(4), p. 543–578. doi:10.3102/00346543066004543

Peters, R. A. (1978). Effects of anxiety, curiosity, and perceived instructor threat on student verbal behavior in the college classroom. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *70*(3), p. 388–395. doi:10.1037/0022-0663.70.3.388

Reeve, J., & Nix, G. (1997). Expressing intrinsic motivation through acts of exploration and facial displays of interest. *Motivation and Emotion*, *21*(3), p. 237–250. doi:10.1023/a:1024470213500

Phillips, J. M., & Gully, S. M. (1997). Role of goal orientation, ability, need for achievement, and locus of control in the self-efficacy and goal setting process. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *82*(5), p. 792. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.82.5.792

Proyer, R. T., Ruch, W., & Buschor, C. (2013). Testing strengths-based interventions: A preliminary study on the effectiveness of a program targeting curiosity, gratitude, hope, humor and zest for enhancing life satisfaction. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, *14*(1), p. 275-292. doi: 10.1007/s10902-012-9331-9

Sansone, C., Thoman, D. B., & Smith, J. L. (2000). Interest and self-regulation. *Handbook of Personality and Self-Regulation*, p. 192–217. doi:10.1002/9781444318111.ch9

Schiefele, U. (1999). Interest and learning from text. *Scientific Studies of Reading*, *3*(3), p. 257–279. doi:10.1207/s1532799xssr0303_4

Scioli, A. (2007). Hope and spirituality in the age of anxiety. In *Advancing Quality of Life in a Turbulent World* (pp. 135-150). Springer, Dordrecht. Doi: 10.1007/978-1-4020-5110-4_9

Scott, S. G., & Bruce, R. A. (1995). Decision-making style: The development and assessment of a new measure. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, *55*(5), p. 818–831. doi:10.1177/0013164495055005017

Shorey, H. S., Lewin, M. R., & Snyder, C. R. (2001). Parenting styles, hope, and subjective well-being: The role of secure attachment in hope. *As reported in: Over the Rainbow: Hope Theory Weathers Its First Decade. Shorey, HS, Snyder, CR, Rand, KL, Hockemeyer, JR, & Feldman, DB (2002). Psychological Inquiry*, *13*(4), p. 322-331.

Silvia, P. J. (2005). What is interesting? Exploring the appraisal structure of interest. *Emotion*, 5*(1), p. 89–102. doi:10.1037/1528-3542.5.1.89

Silvia, P. (2008). Appraisal components and emotion traits: Examining the appraisal basis of trait curiosity. *Cognition & Emotion*, *22*(1), p. 94–113. doi:10.1080/02699930701298481

Sinangil, H. K. (1992). Yönetici adaylarında karar verme ile kaygı ilişkileri. *VII. Ulusal Psikoloji Kongresi Bilimsel Çalışmaları, Ankara: Türk Psikologlar Derneği Yayını*, p. 171-177.

Snyder, C. R., Hoza, B., Pelham, W. E., Rapoff, M., Ware, L., Danovsky, M., Stahl, K. J. (1997). Children's Hope Scale. PsycTESTS Dataset. doi:10.1037/t10531-000

Snyder, C. R., Cheavens, J., & Sympson, S. C. (1997). Hope: An individual motive for social commerce. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice*, *1*(2), p. 107–118. doi:10.1037/1089-2699.1.2.107

Snyder, C. R. (2000). *Handbook of hope: Theory, measures, and applications*. *Academic press*. doi:10.1016/b978-0-12-654050-5.x5000-3

Snyder, C. R., Ilardi, S., Michael, S. T., & Cheavens, J. (2000). Hope theory: Updating a common process for psychological change. *Cognitive Therapy and Research*, *24*(6), p. 747–762. doi:10.1023/a:1005547730153

Snyder, C. R., Harris, C., Anderson, J. R., Holleran, S. A., Irving, L. M., Sigmon, S. T., 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), p. 570–585. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.60.4.570

Snyder, C. R. (2002). Hope Theory: Rainbows in the Mind. *Psychological Inquiry*, *13*(4), p. 249–275. doi:10.1207/s15327965pli1304_01

Snyder, C. R. (1994). The psychology of hope: You can get there from here. New York: The Free Press. doi:10.5860/choice.32-5941

Snyder, C. R., Michael, S. T., & Cheavens, J. S. (1999). Hope as a psychotherapeutic foundation of common factors, placebos, and expectancies. *The Heart and Soul of Change: What Works in Therapy*, p. 179–200. doi:10.1037/11132-005

Stotland, E. (1969). *The Psychology of Hope.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc.

Weary, G., & Edwards, J. A. (1996). Causal uncertainty beliefs and related goal structures. In R. M. Sorrentino & E. T. Higgins (Eds.), *Handbook of Motivation and Cognition*, Vol. *3*: The Interpersonal Context (pp. 148–181), New York: Guilford. doi:10.4324/9780203848753.ch5

Weissman, M. M. (1980). Loss: sadness and depression. Attachment and Loss, Vol. III. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, *137*(11), p. 1478–1478. doi: 10.1176/ajp.137.11.1478

Zhou, Y., Jindal-Snape, D., Topping, K., & Todman, J. (2008). Theoretical models of culture shock and adaptation in international students in higher education. *Studies in Higher Education, 33*(1), p. 63–75. doi:10.1080/03075070701794833

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Beck Hopelessness Scale

BECK UMUTSUZLUK ÖLÇEĞİ

Aşağıdaki test 1974 tarihinde geliştirilmiş olup, 1991 yılında Seber tarafından Türkçe'ye çevrilmiştir.Geleceğe yönelik olumsuz beklenti ye da düşünceleri içeren cümlelerden size uygun olanları evet ye da hayır olarak kodlayınız.

___1- Geleceğe umut ve coşku ile bakıyorum

___2- Kendim ile ilgili şeyleri düzeltemediğime göre çabalamayı bıraksam iyi olur.

___3- İşler kötüye giderken bile her şeyin hep böyle kalmayacağını bilmek beni rahatlatıyor.

___4- Gelecek on yıl içinde hayatimin nasıl olacağını hayal bile edemiyorum.

___5- Yapmayı en çok istediğim şeyleri gerçekleştirmek için yeterli zamanım var.

___6- Benim için çok önemli konularda ileride basarili olacağımı umuyorum.

___7- Geleceğimi karanlık görüyorum.

___8- Dünya nimetlerinden sıradan bir insandan daha çok yararlanacağımı umuyorum.

___9- İyi fırsatlar yakalayamıyorum.Gelecekte yakalayacağıma inanmam için de hiç bir neden yok.

___10-Geçmiş deneyimlerim beni geleceğe iyi hazırladı

___11-Gelecek benim için hoş şeylerden çok tatsızlıklarla dolu görünüyor

___12-Gerçekten özlediğim şeylere kavuşabileceğimi ummuyorum

___13-Geleceğe baktığımda şimdikine oranla daha mutlu olacağımı umuyorum.

___14-İşler bir turlu benim istediğim gibi gitmiyor.

___15-Geleceğe büyük inancım var.

___16-Arzu ettiğim şeyleri elde edemediğime göre bir şeyler istemek aptallık olur.

___17-Gelecekte gerçek doyuma ulaşmam olanaksız gibi.

___18-Gelecek bana bulanık ve belirsiz görünüyor.

___19-Kotu günlerden çok , iyi günler bekliyorum.

___20-İstediğim her şeyi elde etmek için caba göstermenin gerçekten yararı yok,nasıl olsa onu elde edemeyeceğim.

Appendix B: Independent and Interdependent Self-Construals Scale

İLİŞKİSEL BENLİK ÖLÇEĞİ

Aşağıdaki ifadelerin size göre ne kadar doğru olup olmadığını düşünüp, sizce en uygun şıkkı işaretleyiniz.	Kesinlikle yanlış	Oldukça yanlış	Biraz yanlış	Ne yanlış ne doğru	Biraz doğru	Oldukça Doğru	Kesinlikle doğru
1. Bence insanlar ilgi duydukları şeyleri gerçekleştirmek için çok çalışmalıdır.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2. Bence insanlar kendi yetenek ve kapasitelerinin farkında olmalıdır	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3. Bence insanların amaçları olmalıdır ve bunları başarmak için çok çalışmalıdırlar.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4. Bence insanlar her koşulda yapabileceklerini ortaya koymalıdırlar.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5. Bence insanlar çevrelerindeki engellere göğüs germelidir.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

6. Bence bir hedefimiz olduğunda, ona ulaşmak için elimizden gelenin en iyisini yapmalıyız.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
7. Bence mutlu bir hayat, insanın kendi gayretinin bir sonucudur.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8. Bence insanlar kendi refahları için uğraşmalıdırlar.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
9. Bence insanlar başkalarıyla ilişkilerinde duygularını ifade etmelidir.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
10. Bence insanlar grup içindeyken kendi bağımsızlıklarını korumalıdırlar.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
11. Bence insanlar kendilerine güvenmeli ve güçlü olmalıdırlar.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
12. Bence kişiler arasındaki iletişim doğrudan ve açık olmalıdır.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
13. Bence insanlar kendi fikirlerini topluluk içinde söyleyebilmelidir.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
14. Bence insan benzersiz ve başkalarından farklı olmalıdır.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

15. Bence insanlar aile bireyleri arasında bile bağımsızlıklarını korumalıdır.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
16. Bana göre başkaları benim kendi kimliğimi etkilememelidir.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
17. Bence insanlar başkalarına karşı açık olmalıdır.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
18. Bence aile ve arkadaşlar hayatta alınan en önemli kararları etkilememelidir.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
19. Bence insanlar ne pahasına olursa olsun amaçlarını gerçekleştirmeye çalışmalıdır.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
20. Bence insanlar her durumda fikirlerine bağlı kalmalıdır.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
21. Bence insanlar evde de dışarıda da aynı olmalıdır.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
22. Bence aile, benliğimizin temelidir.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
23. Bence grubun başarısı bireyin başarısından daha önemlidir.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
24. Başkalarıyla olan ilişkilerimizde onların mevki ve itibarını göz	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

önünde tutmalıyız.						
25. Bir grubun üyesi olduğunuz zaman, o grubun isteklerine uymak için çok çalışmalısınız.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
26. Bence insanlar bir grup içinde kendi yerlerini edinmelidir.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
27. Bence grubun istekleri bireyin istekleriyle çatıştığında, grubun istekleri önce gelmelidir.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
28. Bence grubun uyumunu sağlamak önemlidir.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
29. Grubun iyiliği için kişisel ilgilerimizden fedakarlık etmemiz gerekir.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
30. Bence yaşamda aile esas olmalı.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
31. Bence ailemin başarısı ve başarısızlığı sonuçta benim kendi benliğim ile ilişkilidir.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
32. Bence insanlar toplumdaki rollerini iyi biçimde yerine getirmelidir.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

33. Bence insanlar ortama uygun davranmalıdır.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
34. Bence bana yakın insanlar benliğimin önemli parçalarıdırlar.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
35. Bence insanlar toplumdaki farklı konumlarına ve rollerine göre davranmalıdır.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
36. Bir gruba ait olmak benim benliğim için önemlidir.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
37. Ortama uygun davranmak benim için önemli bir kuraldır.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
38. Bence bireyin yakın ilişkileri onun kimliğini yansıtabilir.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
39. İnsanlar arasında uyumun olması için, aralarındaki iletişimin çok fazla açık olmaması, dolaylı olması gerekir.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
40. Bence insanlar karar vermeden önce başkalarının fikirlerini ve tepkilerini düşünmelidir.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
41. Bana yakın insanlarla oldukça benzeşirim.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

42. Kimliğim, kim olduğum sosyal konumuma bağlıdır.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Appendix C: Multi Domain Decisiveness Scale

ÇOK ALANLI KARARLILIK ÖLÇEĞİ (MDDS-TR)

Açıklama: Lütfen aşağıdaki ifadeleri dikkatlice okuyunuz. Her ifadeye ne kadar katıldığınıza/ katılmadığınıza aşağıdaki 6'lı ölçeğe göre karar veriniz (Örneğin, bir yargıya "büyük ölçüde katılıyorsanız" cevap kağıdında 5'i işaretleyiniz). Cevabınızı cevap kağıdında uygun yuvarlağın içini doldurarak işaretleyiniz (her soru için yalnızca <u>bir</u> cevabı seçebilirsiniz).

.

Kesinlikle karşıyım 1	Büyük ölçüde karşıyım 2	Biraz karşıyım 3	Biraz katılıyorum 4	Büyük ölçüde katılıyorum 5			Tamamen katılıyorum 6		
			1	*2*	*3*	*4*	*5*	*6*	
1	Beni gerçekten tanıyan insanlar (arkadaşlar, aile gibi) beni kararlı bir kişi olarak tanımlarlar		( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	
2	Bir karar vermeye çalışırken sık sık strese girdiğim olur		( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	
3	Eğer bir karardan dolayı strese girersem karar verme sürecini tam olarak sonlandırmaktan çok hemen karar verme eğilimi gösteririm.		( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	

4	Bir karar aldıktan hemen sonra genellikle onun doğrultusunda hareket ederim	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
5	Biri ile tartıştıktan sonra durumun üstesinden nasıl geleceğim konusunda kendime güvenirim.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
6	Biri ile arkadaş olmayı tercih edersem bu kararımdan sonra da memnun kalacağıma inanırım.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
7	Bir arkadaşta tam olarak ne aradığımı biliyorum	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
8	Başkalarıyla olan çatışmalarımla baş etmeye uğraşırken kararlarımı ertelerim	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
9	Birisi ile arkadaş olup olmamak konusunda karar vermekte güçlük çekerim.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
10	İnsanlarla tartıştığım zaman ne yapacağıma karar vermek bence kolay	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )

11	Seçtiğim arkadaşlarımla genellikle mutluyum.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	
12	Kiminle arkadaş olmak istediğime karar vermek benim için kolay	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	
13	Başkalarıyla aramdaki ayrılıkları halletmeye çalışırken kötü bir karar vermekten çoğunlukla endişe ederim	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	
14	Birinin arkadaşı olmayı seçip sonra bundan pişmanlık duyma olasılığından çoğunlukla endişelenirim	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	
15	Biri ile arkadaş olmayı isteyip istemediğim kararını düşünüp taşınmam biraz zaman alır	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	
16	Biri ile bir anlaşmazlığım olduğunda genellikle bunu nasıl çözeceğimi bilirim	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	
17	Arkadaş seçme yeteneğime güveniyorum	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	
18	Birisiyle ikili iletişime girmeyi isteyip istemediğimi hemen anlarım.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	
19	Kendi isteklerimle başkalarının istekleri arasındaki bir çatışmayı nasıl halledeceğime karar verdiğimde çoğunlukla hata yaptığımı düşünürüm.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	
20	Arkadaşlıktan ne istediğimi anlatmakta zorlanıyorum.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	

MERAK VE KEŞFETME ÖLÇEĞİ II

Aşağıdaki ifadelerin size göre ne kadar doğru olup olmadığını düşünüp, sizce en uygun şıkkı işaretleyiniz.	Hiç katılmıyorum	Katılmıyorum	Kararsızım	Katılıyorum	Tamamen katılıyorum
1. Yeni durumlarda aktif olarak edinebildiğim kadar bilgi ararım.	1	2	3	4	5
2. Günlük yaşamın belirsizliğinden gerçekten hoşlanan bir insanımdır.	1	2	3	4	5
3. Karmaşık ya da mücadele gerektiren şeyler yapmada çok iyiyimdir	1	2	3	4	5
4. Gittiğim her yerde yeni şeyler ya da deneyimler ararım.	1	2	3	4	5
5. Mücadele edilmesi gereken durumları gelişme ve öğrenme fırsatı olarak görürüm.	1	2	3	4	5
6. Biraz korkutucu olan şeyleri	1	2	3	4	5

yapmaktan hoşlanırım.					
7. Daima kendime ve dünyaya ilişkin olabilecek güçlüklerle ilişkili deneyimler ararım.	1	2	3	4	5
8. Kesinlikle kestirilemeyen - tahmin edilemeyen işleri tercih ederim.	1	2	3	4	5
9. Kişi olarak gelişebileceğim ve kendimle mücadele edebileceğim fırsatları sıklıkla ararım.	1	2	3	4	5
10. Aşina olmadığım kişileri, olayları ve yerleri kabul eden bir insanımdır.	1	2	3	4	5

Appendix E: Dispositional Hope Scale

SÜREKLİ UMUT ÖLÇEĞİ

Lütfen aşağıdaki ifadeleri dikkatlice okuyunuz. Her ifadeye ne kadar katıldığınıza/ katılmadığınıza aşağıdaki 8'li ölçeğe göre karar veriniz (Örneğin, bir yargıya "büyük ölçüde katılıyorsanız" cevap kağıdında 8'i işaretleyiniz). Cevabınızı cevap kağıdında uygun karenin içini doldurarak işaretleyiniz (her soru için yalnızca bir cevabı seçebilirsiniz).

Sürekli Umut Ölçeği Türkçe Formu

	Kesinlikle yanlış (1)	Çoğunlukla yanlış (2)	Oldukça yanlış (3)	Biraz yanlış (4)	Biraz doğru (5)	Oldukça doğru (6)	Çoğunlukla doğru (7)	Kesinlikle doğru (8)
1.Sıkıntılı bir durumdan kurtulmak için pek çok yol düşünebilirim.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
2. Enerjik bir biçimde amaçlarıma ulaşmaya çalışırım.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
3. Çoğu zaman kendimi yorgun hissederim.*	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
4. Bir problemin birçok çözüm yolu vardır.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8

5. Tartışmalarda kolayca yenik düşerim.*	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
6. Hayatta önem verdiğim şeylere ulaşmak için pek çok yol düşünebilirim.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
7. Sağlığım için endişelenirim.*	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
8. Başkalarının ümitsizliğe kapıldığı durumlarda bile sorunu çözecek bir yol bulabileceğimi bilirim.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
9. Geçmiş yaşantılarım beni geleceğe iyi hazırladı.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
10. Hayatta oldukça başarılıyım.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
11. Genellikle endişelenecek bir şeyler bulurum.*	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
12. Kendim için koyduğum hedeflere ulaşırım.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8

Appendix F: General Self-Efficacy Scale

GENEL ÖZ YETERLİLİK ÖLÇEĞİ

Aşağıda çeşitli durumlarla karşılaştıklarında insanların neler hissedebileceklerini yansıtan ifadeler sıralanmıştır. Lütfen verilen ölçeği kullanarak, sıralanan ifadelerin sizin düşüncelerinizi veya hissettiklerinizi ne kadar yansıttığını belirtiniz ve uygun rakamı daire içine alınız.

1 = Kesinlikle doğru değil 2= Doğru değil 3= Ne doğru, ne yanlış 4= Daha doğru 5= Tümüyle doğru					
1.	Yeni bir durumla karşılaştığımda ne yapmam gerektiğini bilirim.	1	2	3	4	5
2.	Beklenmedik durumlarda nasıl davranmam gerektiğini her zaman bilirim.	1	2	3	4	5
3.	Bana karşı çıkıldığında kendimi kabul ettirecek çare ve yolları bulurum.	1	2	3	4	5
4.	Ne olursa olsun, sorunların üstesinden gelirim.	1	2	3	4	5
5.	Zor sorunların çözümünü eğer gayret edersem her zaman bulurum.	1	2	3	4	5
6.	Tasarılarımı gerçekleştirmek ve hedeflerime erişmek bana güç gelmez.	1	2	3	4	5

7.	Bir sorunla karşılaştığım zaman onu halledebilmeye yönelik birçok fikirlerim vardır.	1	2	3	4	5
8.	Güçlükleri soğukkanlılıkla karşılarım, çünkü yeteneklerime her zaman güvenebilirim.	1	2	3	4	5
9.	Ani olayların da hakkından geleceğimi sanıyorum.	1	2	3	4	5
10.	Her sorun için bir çözümüm vardır.	1	2	3	4	5