POSITIVE PREVENTION THEORY: THE INVESTIGATION OF PARENTING STYLES AS A PREDICTOR OF OPTIMISIM

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO
THE INSTITUE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
OF
ANKARA YILDIRIM BEYAZIT UNIVERSITY

BY

HATİCE SEHER ÖZPEHRİZ

IN PARTIAL FULLFILLMENT OF REQUIREMENTS
FOR
THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF SCIENCE
IN
THE DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY

MAY 2019

Approval of the Institute of Social Sciences

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Seyfullah YILDIRIM

Director

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

Prof. Dr. Cem Şafak ÇUKUR

Head of Department

This is to 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.

Prof. Dr. Bilal SAMBUR

Supervisor

Examining Commitee Members

Prof. Dr. Bilal SAMBUR (AYBU, Psychology) _____

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Hatice DEMİRBAŞ (HBVU, Psychology) _____

Asst. Prof. Dr. Gülten ÜNAL (AYBU, Psychology) _____

PLAGIARISM

I hereby declare that all information in this thesis has been obtained and presented in accordance with academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declare that, as required by these rules and conduct, I have fully cited and referenced all material and results that are not original to this work; otherwise I accept all legal responsibility.

Name, Last name : **Hatice Seher ÖZPEHRİZ**

Signature :

ABSTRACT

POSITIVE PREVENTION THEORY:
THE INVESTIGATION OF PARENTING STYLES
AS A PREDICTOR OF OPTIMISIM

Özpehriz, Hatice Seher
M.Sc., Department of Psychology
Supervisor: Prof. Dr. Bilal Sambur

May 2019, 80 pages

The aim of this study is to investigate the relationship between percieved parenting styles and optimism levels among university students. This study has been conducted with 513 university students from five different universities in Turkey. The results of the research demonstrate that the authouritative/democratic parenting style is a positive predictor of optimism while authoritarian parenting style is a negative predictor of optimism. Protective parenting style is found not to be a predictor of optimism. In addition, the results reveal that male students percieve their parents as more authoritarian and protective and the girl students are found to be more optimist than male students. Furthermore, the mother education level is found not to be a predictor of optimism, however the secondary school graduate father's children are found to be more optimist than university graduate /post-graduate father's children. The current study aims to make a contribution to the future research on parenting styles and optimism levels in Turkey.

Keywords: Parenting styles, optimism, university students.

ÖZET

POZİTİF ÖNLEYİCİ TEORİ:
İYİMSERLİĞİN YORDAYICISI OLARAK
ANNE-BABA TUTUMLARININ İNCELENMESİ

Özpehriz, Hatice Seher
Master, Psikoloji Bölümü
Tez Yöneticisi: Prof. Dr. Bilal Sambur

Mayıs 2019,80 sayfa

Bu araştırmanın amacı, üniversite öğrencilerinin algılanan ebeveyn tutumları ile iyimserlik seviyeleri arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesidir. Bu çalışma, Türkiye'deki beş ayrı üniversitede öğrenim gören 513 üniversite öğrencisinde uygulanmıştır. Araştırmanın sonuçları göstermektedir ki, demokratik ebeveyn tutumu iyimserliği olumlu yönde yordarken otoriter ebeveyn tutumu iyimserliği olumsuz yönde yordamaktadır. Koruyucu ebeveyn tutumun ise iyimserliği yordamadığı görülmüştür. Erkek öğrencilerin ebeveynlerini daha otoriter ve koruyucu algıladıkları; kızların ise erkeklere göre daha iyimser oldukları görülmüştür. Yine sonuçlara göre, anne eğitim durumunun iyimserliği yordamadığı ancak ortaokul mezunu babaların çocuklarının üniversite mezunu veya yüksek öğrenim görmüş babaların çocuklarına göre daha iyimser oldukları görülmüştür. Bu çalışma, Türkiye'de ebeveyn tutumu ve iyimserlik ile ilgili gelecekte yapılacak çalışmalara katkı sunmayı amaçlamaktadır.

Anahtar kelimeler: Ebeveyn tutumu, iyimserlik, üniversite öğrencileri.

To my beloved father, mother and my dear son…

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I would like to thank my supervisor Prof. Dr. Bilal SAMBUR and Assist. Prof. Dr. Gülten ÜNAL for their criticisms and contributions in my thesis writing process.

I owe my special thanks to Prof. Dr. Bülent DİLMAÇ, for his great support and contribution he has made especially in the data entrance and analyses process and to Asst. Prof. Dr. Barbaros YALÇIN for his advices. I am grateful to Prof.Dr. Bilal KUŞPINAR and Dr. Şeyda ERUYAR for their contribution they had made to this thesis with their detailed review and advices.

My deepest gratitude is to my family for their invaluable and endless support. Especially, my dad and my sister for their patience, guidance and unconditional support.
And a special thanks to my husband and my unique, beloved son Ömer Emre. Your patience and your support mean a lot to me…

LIST OF CONTENTS

PLAGIARISM ..... **iii**
ABSTRACT ..... **iv**
ÖZET ..... **v**
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT ..... **vii**
LIST OF CONTENTS ..... **viii**
TABLES LIST ..... **xi**
ABBREVIATION LIST ..... **xii**
CHAPTER 1 ..... **1**
INTRODUCTION **1**
Background of Study 1
Theoretical Framework 3
1. OPTIMISM 4
1.1. Optimism vs. Pessimism 6
1.2. The Benefits and Positive Outcomes of Optimism 7
1.3. Improving Optimism 8
1.4. The Effect of Environment on Optimism 9
2. FAMILY AND PARENTING STYLES 10
2.1. Family Structure and Parenting in the Urban Life 10
2.2. The Role of the Family in the Growth of Child 12
2.3. Factors Effecting Parenting Attitudes 14
2.3.1. First Reaction for Pregnancy 14
2.3.2. Developmental Experiences of Parents 15
2.3.3. Marital Relationships 15
2.3.4. Socio-economic and Socio-cultural Status of Parents 16
2.3.5. Culture 16
2.4. Typologies of Parenting Styles 17
2.4.1. Authoritarian Parenting Style 19
2.4.2. Authoritative/Democratic Parenting Style 21

2.4.3. Protective Parenting Style 24
2.4.4. Permissive/ Indulgent Parenting Style 25
2.4.5. Ignorant/ Neglectful Parenting Style 25
3. Research Aim 26
3.1. Limitations 28
3.2. Research Hypothesis 29
3.3. Problems of Research 29
CHAPTER 2 30
METHOD 30
MODEL OF RESEARCH 30
1. Research Design 30
2. Participants 30
3. Data Collecting Devices 31
3.1. Instruments 31
3.1.1. Parents Attitude Scale 31
3.1.2. Optimism Scale 32
4. Procedure 33
5. Data Analysis 34
CHAPTER 3 35
RESULTS 35
1. Demographic Characteristic of Participants 35
2. Analysis for Gender Variable 36
3. Analysis for Mother Education Level Variable 37
4. Analysis for Father Education Level Variable 38
5. The Correlational Analyses of Percieved Parenting Attitudes and Optimism Scores 40
6. The Regression Analysis of Percieved Parenting Attitudes and Optimism Scores 40
CHAPTER 5 42
DISCUSSION 42
1. Parenting Styles and Optimism 43
2. Gender 46
3. Mother and Father Education Level 47

4. Positive Prevention for the Future 48
Suggestions 50
Conclusion 50
REFERENCES 52
APPENDICES 62
A. INFORMED CONSENT FORM 63
B. DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES FORM 64
C. OPTIMISM SCALE 65
D. PARENTS ATTITUDE SCALE 67
E. AYBU ETHICS COMMITTEE APPROVAL FORM 70
F. AYBU APPROVAL 71
G. NEU APPROVAL 72
H. SELÇUK UNIVERSITY APPROVAL 73
I. KAMU APPROVAL 74
J. İSZU APPROVAL 75
K. OPTIMISM SCALE APPLICATION APPROVAL 76
L. PARENTS ATTITUDE SCALE APPLICATION APPROVAL 77
M. THESIS PHOTOCOPY PERMISSION FORM 78

TABLES LIST

Table 1. Distribution of Students by the University Type **31**

Table 2. The T-test Scores Related to the Parenting Styles Sub-scale points for the Gender Variable **36**

Table 3. The t-test Results for Optimism Scale Points for Gender Variable..... **37**

Table 4. The n, $\overline{X}$, Ss Values of the Point Averages that the University Students Recieved from the Optimism Scale Related to the Mother's Education Level Variable Variable……**38**

Table 5. The ANOVA Results of University Students' Optimism Scale Mean Scores According to Mothers' Education Level Variable……...**38**

Table 6. The n, $\overline{X}$, Ss Values of the Point Averages that the University Students Recieved from the Optimism Scale Related to the Father's Education Level Variable……..**39**

Table 7. The ANOVA Results of University Students' Optimism Scale Mean Scores According to Fathers' Education Level Variable…….**39**

Table 8. The Correlation between University Students' Percieved Parenting Attitudes and Optimism Scores **40**

Table 9. Regression Analysis Results Related to University Students' Percieved Parenting Attitudes and Optimism Scores **41**

ABBREVIATION LIST

ABTÖ	**Anne Baba Tutum Ölçeği (Parents Attitude Scale)**
AYBU	**Ankara Yıldırım Beyazıt University**
İZSU	**İstanbul Sabahattin Zaim University**
KAMU	**Karamanoğlu Mehmet Bey University**
NEU	**Necmettin Erbakan University**
Prep.	**Preparation Class**

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

In this chapter, firstly the background information will be given. Later, a literature review on parenting styles and optimism will be introduced. Finally, the objectives and the assumptions of the present study will be presented.

Background of Study

With the beginning of the industrial revolution, there has become many changes in social life of individuals (Cowan, 1976). From industrialization period up to this century, the massive transformation in family types, education styles, transportation vehicles, communication channels, social relations and economic developments has continued with it's fastest rate (Yılmaz, 2018). With the rapid developments in technology, the shift from man power to mechanisation is now preparing to leave it's place to artificial intelligence (Minsky, 2007). Today, the term artifical intelligence has started to take it's place in our daily lifes (Yılmaz, 2018) and there are many scientific research over this issue (Jiang, Jiang, Zhi, Dong, Li, Ma, ... & Wang, 2017; McArthur, Lewis & Bishary, 2005; Minsky, 2007; Russell & Norvig, 2016). The vagueness of the future has dublicated its obscurity with the new technological developments and these rapid changes related to the future establish stress and anxiety for the new generations (Çelenoğlu, 2018;Yılmaz, 2018).

The definition of optimism is broadly the positive expectancy for the future (Carver, Scheier & Segerstorm, 2010). Optimism is one of the dynamics of positive psychology which is related to constructive cognitions about the future (Seligman, 2002). Studies related to anxiety and stress reveal that optimistic people develop effective coping strategies and they are effective copers (Carver et al., 2010; Nes & Segerstorm, 2006).

Children fall into depression in younger ages and higher rates every year (Shatte, Reivich, Gillham & Seligman, 1999). In order to cope and overcome the stresses of the new developments in the future technologies, the individuals and society need strong optimistic world view in order to tackle with the rapid changes in life. Güleri (1998)'s study demonstrates that the Turkish youth's pessimism levels (%56.0) are higher than optimism levels (%44.0). Seligman (2002) claims that in this new century, the prevention of unwanted outcomes will be established by creating a science of human resilience which its duty will be understanding and learning the ways how to foster these qualities in young people. This explanation opens new paths to the understanding of psychology and it forms a base for our study. In the light of positive prevention theory, we aim to seek the core process of the optimal functioning for optimism.

According to psychoanalytic and psychosocial theory, every adult behaviour and trait roots back to childhood experiences (Freud & Bonaparte,1954; Erikson,1963, 1968). As optimism is a dynamic of positive psychology, our aim is to take precautions and to nourish optimism and examine which parenting style leads to more optimistic individuals.The effects of parenting styles has been investigated in many areas like personality and moral development (Loudová & Lasek 2014), emotion regulation (Manzeske & Stright, 2009), problem behaviour (Aunola,& Nurmi, 2005), academic achievement (Spera,2005), overweight status of child (Rhee, Lumeng, Appugliese, Kaciroti & Bradley, 2006), substance use (Cohen & Rice,1997), anxiety (Van Gastel, Legerstee & Ferdinand 2009; Wolfradt, Hempel & Miles, 2003), addiction (Büyükşahin Çevik & Çelikkaleli, 2010), coping behaviour and depersonalization (Wolfradt et al.,2003), these examples could be widened as the examples are numerous. The results demonstrate the significance of parental effect on future behaviour. Many parents despite the best intentions, unwittingly undermine their children's capacity for optimism and positive thinking by choosing the incorrect attitudes in their parenting. The most effective parenting styles and practices should be known by parents, in order to prepare children for the challenges of the future's world.

Our investigation of which parental style facilitates optimism, is an effort to contribute to the flourishing process. The answer to the question "which parenting style can best nourish the child's optimism potentials?" is sought in this study. Building buffering strengths,

nourishing positive functioning of optimism will lead to happier, healthier individuals and in the broader level to healthier generations (Seligman, 2002).

Theoretical Framework

> Positive psychology is the scientific study of optimal human functioning. At the meta-psychological level, it aims to redress the imbalance in psychological research and practice by calling attention to the positive aspects of human functioning and experience, and integrating them with our understanding of the negative aspects of human functioning and experience. At the pragmatic level, it is about understanding the wellsprings, processes and mechanisms that lead to desirable outcomes (Alex Linley, Joseph, Harrington & Wood, 2006, p.8)

> The field of positive psychology at the subjective level is about valued subjective experiences: well-being, contentment and satisfaction (in the past); hope and optimism (for the future); and flow and happiness (in the present). At the individual level, it is about the positive inidividual traits: the capacity for love and vocation, courage interpersonal skill, aesthetic sensibility, perseverance, forgiveness, orginality, future mindedness, spirituality, high talent, and wisdom. At the group level, it is about the civic virtues and the institutions that move individuals toward better citizenship; responsibility, nurturance, altruism, civility, moderation, tolerance and work ethic (Seligman & Csikszentmihalyi, 2000, p.5).

Seligman (2002) gives the definition of the objectives of positive psychology as prevention and taking precautions of misbehaviour by flourishing positive strenghts and directing the individual to the right behaviour. Until the 90's, the science of psychology concentrated on the negative sides and behaviours of human beings, aiming to find solutions to the problems individuals face; while neglecting the positive emotions of psychology like happiness, well-being and optimism (Alex Linley et al., 2006; Öztürk & Çetinkaya, 2015). In the recent years, the field of psychology has changed its tendency to the positive sides of human being, investigating peace and positive human attitudes rather than negative attitudes like aggression, hatred, hopelessness and depression (Güloğlu, 2015).

Positive psychology's aim is to find the ways to strenghten the positive sides and seek ways to understand the facilitating factors for optimal functioning of human behaviour while preventing the negative outcomes (Seligman, 2002). Consistently, Seligman and Csikszentmihalyi (2000) makes the definition of positive psychology as preventing and taking precautions of misbehaviour by flourishing positive strenghts and directing the individual to the right behaviour.

Positive psychology serves a central role as every individual is interested in factors that are best for their happiness, health and fulfillment and which factors could best fulfill their psychological needs (Alex Linley et al., 2006). According to Positive Prevention Theory (Seligman, 2002), there are human strengths that act as buffers against mental illnesses; these are traits of positive psychology like optimism, interpersonal skill, faith, hope, honesty and perseverance if to name several.

As mentioned earlier, Seligman (2002) claims that the prevention of unwanted outcomes will be established by creating a knowledge of wisdom on human strength with the mission to understand and learn how to nourish these qualities in young people. This explanation opens new paths to the understanding of the science of psychology and it forms a base for our study. In the light of positive prevention theory, we aim to seek the core process of the optimal functioning for optimism. Our investigation of which parental style facilitates optimism, is an effort to contribute to the flourishing process. The answer to the question "which parenting style can best nourish the child's optimism potentials?" is sought in this study. Building buffering strengths, nourishing positive functioning of optimism will lead to happier, healthier individuals and in the broader level to healthier generations (Seligman, 2002)

1. OPTIMISM

Optimism is one of the dynamics of positive psychology which is related to constructive cognitions about the future (Seligman, 2002). The definition of optimism is broadly given as the positive expectancy for the future (Carver et al., 2010). In other words, it is defined as a trait to expect good things to occur in the future (Scheier & Carver, 1993). It is a

thinking attitude that consists of tendencies of expecting positive results and developments (Öztürk & Çetinkaya, 2015). Gillham, Shatté, Reivich and Seligman (2001) defines optimism with an explanatory style and state that it is how an individual explains a bad event in a stable habit.

The difference between optimistic explanatory style and pessimistic explanatory style is that pessimistic explanatory style explains the drawbacks of individuals with helplessness that nothing they do matters; on the other hand, optimistic explanatory style explains the challenges that are faced with capability and self-efficacy that their behaviours do affect the outcome (Peterson & Bossio, 2001).

According to Scheier and Carver (1993) the actions that people take are greatly influenced by their expectations. Expectations become a driving power for the base of act. Optimism has been accepted as a personality characteristic, as it has proven to be stable over time and context even in the times of catastrophe (Scheier & Carver, 1993).

Explanatory style links optimism with self-efficacy. The helplessness and efficacy play an important role in optimism and pessimism.If the indiviual feels herself sufficient and proficient enough to overcome obstacles, the tendency tends towards optimism (Gillham et al., 2001).

Optimism could be a kind of need that people use as a self-defence in order to protect themselves from the difficulties of life. Optimists tend to be combatant personalities (Tarhan, 2015), as they have a hope for the good days will come and they tend to have an active role in the direction of this thought (Scheier & Carver, 1993). A large body of evidence demonstrates that expectations about the future have an influence on wellbeing in the present (Segerstrom, Taylor, Kemeny, & Fahey, 1998). People who are dispositionally optimistic report less distress in a wide range of situations, even in traumatic events (Nes & Segerstorm, 2006). Research concerning positive thinking has proven that it has positive effects on health (Shepperd, Maroto, & Pbert, 1996), psychological and physical well-being (Scheier & Carver, 1993), effective coping and problem solving strategies (Carver et al., 2010), life satisfaction (Emeç & Kümbül Güler,2006), resilience (Segovia, Moore,

Linnville, Hoyt & Hain, 2012), self- regulation (Carver, & Scheier, 2001; Rasmussen, Wrosch, Scheier, & Carver, 2006) and these examples could be multiplied.

In the literature, optimism is mentioned with the notion of pessimism. It is the converse notion of optimism. In the following section, we will give a short definiton of pessimism and state the distinction between the two to better clarify the definition and properties of optimism as our study concentrates on optimism only.

1.1. Optimism vs. Pessimism

"The difference between optimism and pessimism is that; optimism is the expectancy of good things to happen in life and pessimism is the expectancy for bad things to happen" (Carver, Scheier & Segerstrom, 2010, p.879). The two very distinct approach of optimists and pessimists makes a great impact on the individual's life; because these two opposite poles makes a huge difference in lives of individuals (Carver et al., 2010). People who are optimist experience more positive feelings than pessimists do and this results with higher happiness levels and positive attitudes (Bal & Gülcan, 2014). Thus, positive attitudes effect the individual's whole lifestyle. They differ in the way they solve problems, cope with distress, and they also differ in their social and socio-economic relationships (Carver et al., 2010).

Brissette, Scheier and Carver (2002) claim that optimists are more effective copers with their stressors than pessimists are. Optimists show confidence and persistence in period of hard times in life, on the contrary the pessimists show doubt and hesitation in challenging situations effecting the physical and mental health of them (Carver, Scheier & Segerstorm, 2010).

During our research, we came across and observed that optimism is associated with positive and pessimism with negative outcomes. The literature on optimism and pessimism verify that optimism is associated with positive outcomes and the latter with negative outcomes (Carver et al., 2010). There are some researches that claim the opposite, however these are out of our frame as these studies are researches related to the concept of

"optimism bias" and "defensive pessimism" which are not our research domain. Our focus in this study is on "dispositional optimism" only. Below we will reveal the benefits and positive outcomes stated in the related literature.

1.2. The Benefits and Positive Outcomes of Optimism

A great number of study has demonstrated that optimism has positive effects on psychological (Carver, Pozo, Harris, Noriega, Scheier, Robinson, Ketcham, Moffat & Clark, 1993; Segerstrom et al., 1998) and physical well-being (Scheier & Carver, 1985; Shepperd, Maroto, & Pbert, 1996; Buchanan, Gardenswartz, & Seligman, 1999; Rassmussen, Scheier & Greenhouse,2009; Peterson & Bossio, 2001; Mulkana & Hailey, 2001; Carver, Scheier & Segerstorm, 2010); subjective well-being (Öztürk & Çetinkaya, 2015) and it seemed to provide a benefit over and above many other personality characteristics (Scheier & Carver, 1993). Optimism is found to be an indicator of protecting physical and psychological health however pessimism is combined with health-damaging behaviours (Carver et al., 2010). Moreover, optimistic people develop better problem solving skills (Carver et al., 2010), better adjust to stressors (Rasmussen et al., 2006), experience life satisfaction higher (Chang, Maydeu-Olivares, & D'Zurilla, 1997), physical and psychological well-being (Scheier & Carver, 1993), has better health conditions (Shepperd et al., 1996), experience workplace happiness and job satisfaction (Youssef & Luthans, 2007) and more importantly experience happiness and contentment of life (Dember & Brooks, 1989).

Leung, Moneta and McBride-Chang (2005) state that optimism is a key contributor to subjective well being by fostering self-esteem, relationship harmony and positive perceptions of financial conditions. They also state that optimism is an important determinant of life satisfaction in old ages. In addition, Ben-Zur (2003) states that positive adolescent–parent relationship, optimism and mastery has an important contribution to the well-being of adolescents.

Dispositional optimism has been found to be an important indicator of coping efforts of surgical outcomes. Dispositional optimism has been found to be positively correlating with

problem-focused coping and negatively correlating with the use of denial. Dispositional optimism is also linked with a faster rate of physical recovery during hospitalization and relevantly optimists showed a faster rate of return to normal life activities after discharge (Scheier, Matthews, Owens, Magovern, Lefebvre, Abbott & Carver, 1989).

According to Parmaksız and Avşaroğlu (2012) self-esteem and optimism are positive correlated; and they define the correlation between self-esteem and optimism as highly strong. They state that optimist point of view increases level of success and prolificacy while protecting people against aboulia, self-despair or depression and holds them into life.

A longitudinal study carried by Brissette, Scheier and Carver (2002) showed that freshmen in the beginning of first semester with greater optimism levels experienced low amounts of increases in stress and depression. Optimists show improved psychological well-being and better adjustment to stressful life events, this situation could be explained as a sequence of their usage of effective coping strategies and their ability to generate more supportive social networks. Another issue is that, according to Kao and Tienda (1995), immigrant parents' optimism about their children's prospects is a determinant in the educational achievement of first and second generation immigrant youth.

Regarding all the positive outcomes and the parent-child interaction that will be focused in the next sections, the idea that " Is optimism a trait that is improveable?" comes to mind. Researches show that optimism is improvable. The following section will show the results related to implementing the optimistic thinking skills.

1.3. Improving Optimism

A great number of research demonstrates that intervention programs could be effective in developing optimism. In order to teach grade school children to be more optimistic, Gillham, Reivich, Jaycox and Seligman (1995) conducted an intervention program. The results suggested that psychological immunization against depression can be achieved by teaching cognitive and social skills to children.

Balcı Çelik (2008) conducted an experimental research with nurses. The aim was to investigate the effect of the Emotion Strengthening Training Program on nurses' optimism levels. For 10 weeks, the nurses in the experimental group were taken into Emotion Strengthening Training Program. At the end of the program the nurses' optimisim levels increased significantly compared to the control group.

Buchanan, Gardenswartz and Seligman, (1999)'s study also supports the idea that optimism could be encouraged with education and cultivated in early ages. Perhaps a lifetime of positive thinking could be encouraged by the cultivation of optimism in early ages. Self-efficacy could be encouraged in little children in order to boost the optimistic potentials of children in early ages (Peterson & Bossio, 2001).

From the studies above we could infer that optimism could be improved especially in early ages and it could be inferred that one of the major factors which influence optimism is the environment. Therefore, in the next chapter we will have a look at the effects of environment on optimism.

1.4. The Effect of Environment on Optimism

Sambur (2015) states that an individual is a product of the environment where she/he has grown up. He also adds that the social and cultural environment is in an constant influence in order to build up the characteristics of the individual. The properties that genes bring to a human are just tendencies and what kind of personality trait that these tendencies will turn into is determined by the individual- environment connection (Geçtan, 2016). The child's past experiences form a base for the child's optimistic or pessimistic tendencies and they could be acquired with the effect of the family environment and especially by modelling the parents (Scheier, & Carver, 1993).

Peterson (2000) states that optimism is not purely a cognitive process, it also contains emotion. According to Bozdemir & Gündüz (2016) emotions get shaped with the parents' and the close environments' feedbacks. Children get to know their feelings, whether their

feelings are acceptable or unacceptable, according to the reaction recieved from their parents.

People in general have the tendency to choose and use positive memory, judgement, perception and language than negative ones (Matlin & Stang, 1978; Matlin, 2004). However, the environmental factors are effective in diminishing those valuable positive tendencies. Tarhan (2015) claims that feedbacks for joy are determinants for optimism and pessimism. He states that if a person is rewarded for joy, the individual's accumulations will tend to be positive and optimistic; on the other hand, if he/she is punished or excluded for joy, tendency will be towards pessimisim. Another point is, Heinonen et al. (2006) suggest that the early socioeconomic status of the family could be an indicator for the foundation of dispositional optimism and pessimism.

The effects of the family environment is an irrefutable factor in the development of the child. As mentioned earlier, the relationship of parenting styles and optimism is investigated in this study. Thus, we have given place to the concept of optimism so far. In the next parts of our literature review, the familial effects on the child development will be investigated.

2. FAMILY AND PARENTING STYLES

2.1. Family Structure and Parenting in the Urban Life

"Family is a unit which is formed by individuals who have biologic and psychologic link, moreover who have an historical, emotional and also economic collaboration making them feel the same members of the family." (Gladding, 2011; p.5). Although this definition combines many properties in itself, a definite and unique definition for the term family is hard to define as it could change from culture to culture or group to group (Gladding, 2011).

The term family which is a building block that forms the society, has gone through many qualitative changes within centuries. Every period and every society has owned it's exclusive family structure and understanding (Yalçın, 2016). No matter how distinct the family structures are, related to it's cultural and periodical differences, the common properties of a family remained the same in its basic forms. In every period the family has remained a place where the individual finds peace, a structure constructed for the continuation of the healthy growth of generations, guarding them from the dangers of life and at the same time it has remained as a mediator to transfer the cultural heritages to the next generations (Yalçın, 2016)

The phenomenon of urbanisation and modernisation has created many changes in the social structure (Tezel Şahin & Cevher, 2007). Within this period, the biggest change has occured in the family types and relations. The modernization has changed the family structure in a lot of domains subsuming status, roles and parental relations (Bayer, 2013).The families have got smaller and the family has transformed from extended family to nuclear family (Yalçın, 2016).

The extended family used to consist of grandparents, aunts and uncles forming powerful connections within the family members and established a central power within the society in the struggle with the outer world. However the nuclear family has brought many different roles and responsibilities to the parents. The roles of parents have increased and responsibilities of parents have dublicated with the disintegration of the extented family bringing the parents economic, educational, social, and emotional burden. This transformation has made many diversive changes in every area of life of the members. The children's responsibilities, care taking activities, playmates, educational trainers have become their parents. In the extended family structure all these roles used to be shared between the family members forming a powerful association (Yalçın, 2016).

With the industrialization a rapid transition into urbanisation has caused a rapid transition into nuclear structure. This urbanisation process has lead the crowded metroplitan culture to extinguish the extended family and hierarchial order, leaving it's place to small family structures with the basis of individualisation and desire for freedom (Yalçın, 2016). The changes in the family structures have changed the roles and status of parents; establishing

new parenting models. Baumrind (1966) has been the pioneer in this field with her conceptualiztion for parenting; offering three basic parenting styles: Authoritative/democratic, Authoritarian, Permissive. Later researchers have developed many other parenting styles like: Protective, Indulgent, Neglectful (Maccoby & Martin, 1983; Domènech Rodriguez, Donovick & Crowley, 2009). These parenting styles will be investigated in detail in the next sections. But before passing to the parenting styles we will have a look at the importance of the family in the development of the child and the factors effecting parenting styles.

2.2. The Role of the Family in the Growth of Child

Despite the changes related to the family structure, the importance of the role of family in the growth of child conserves its place. The family is the place where psychological, cultural, emotional, physical growth and socialization of a child starts and these are gained with the experiences exercised in the family relations (Yalçın, 2016). The child gets prepared and adjusted to the world in the family. The family's physiological, economic, cultural and social effect starts from pre-birth until the end of life (Gladding, 2011). An appropriate "psychological atmosphere" created by the family is essential for a child's healthy physical and emotional development and this depends on the family members warm, consistent and positive attitudes (Yavuzer, 2014). The first socialization of the child starts within the family. In the first years of life, the face to face interaction with the family is very intense; thereby, the parents become the determinant factor of the child's attitude and behaviours. The people and environment that surrounds the baby and especially the mother's, positive and negative attitudes lead to life-long permanent traces on the baby as the new born baby's whole world is his/her mother (Geçtan, 2016). According to Morris, Silk, Steinberg, Myers and Robinson (2007) the child's experiences with the parents and the child's observations of their parents, their siblings and parents' marital interactions build a foundation for emotional discourse and support the development of the emotion regulatory processes. The relationship between the caregiver and the child is very important in forming or preventing the vulnerability factors for the development of psychopatology (Aka, 2011). Gladding (2011), claims that an individual's problem could not be thought apart from the family environment. A study on schizophrenic patients'

family background demonstrates that these patients had been raised in an unhealthy family and parental environment during their infancy and teenage years (Lidz & Lidz, 1949). Also the results of a study on drug usage show us that children who used drugs were raised in a negative and negatory family environment (Bircan & Erden, 2011).

Flinn and England (1995), measured the children's stress levels by investigating the participants'cortisol levels related to family environments. Analyses of data demonstrated the gravity of household environment. The results indicated that children who had moderate cortisol levels where usually living in households with intensive, stable caretaking; while children who were more likely to have abnormal cortisol levels were exposed to nonintensive, unstable caretaking. Furthermore, traumatic family events led to elevated cortisol levels; in addition most children who experienced caretaking problems during infancy had unusual cortisol profiles.

Another study investigating serotonin levels related to familial environment demonstrated that a stressful early family environment contributed directly and in interaction with the serotonin transporter polymorphism to depressive symptomatology (Taylor, Way, Welch, Hilmert, Lehman & Eisenberger, 2006). More studies on family environment indicate that, the act of postponing, indecision; gaining self-esteem are properties gained within the family environment (Ulukaya & Bilge, 2014; Ferrari & Olivette, 1993; Erikson, 1980, 1984).

Gladding (2011) divides the general family concept into two family kinds. "Healthy" and "Unhealthy" families. He defines healthy families as emotionally attached to each other, care each other and solve their problems together with a right and clear communication. This family type could be flexible with the new problems and have the satiety of sharing the common values and have the serenity of being respectful to each other. On the other hand, the unhealthy family is defined as an environment consisting of harsh, critical, humiliating and inconsistant attitudes. This kind of environment increases the risk of psychological, emotional and behavioural problems of the child. The quality of family relations forms a fundamental base for the child's happiness; it is effective on psychological, social and physical happiness.

Yavuzer (2014) states that, for the families to have a healthy family environment, the family and the children have to choose an effective communication language, improve life skills, solve daily problems effectively by understanding and accepting each other as they are. This is possible by improving solving skills for family problems all together; finding the powerful and poor sides of problem solving act of family members.

Either a family has a healthy or unhealthy environment, every family environment has its own parenting styles. The parenting styles are formed in its own circumstances. There are many factors that effect the choice of parenting style. Below we will look at the effecting factors in depth.

2.3. Factors Effecting Parenting Attitudes

Various factors effect the attitudes of the parents. The underlying reasons may vary from parent to parent. The factors like education, culture, life style, idealization of own parental attitudes, number of children, stressful life events take an active role in parenting attitudes. Parent's personality traits, behaviour and attitudes, successess, hopes and desires, occupation, childhood experiences, spare time activities, language, family structure, award-punishment methods, teaching format, values, social relations, martial relationship, and the child's own interests are all determinants of the parenting style chosen (Yavuzer, 2014). In the related literature the factors effecting parenting styles are categorised as follows:

2.3.1. First Reaction for Pregnancy

Geçtan (2016) states that the first reactions of the mother and father starting with the news of pregnancy has a crucial importance. This is a process that is determinant on how the parents will react or form parental behaviours later on. The emotions that the parents experience at the first period of pregnancy may become permanent to an extent. An ambivalence could occur with pregnancy, it may originate from the situations that the parents are experiencing in that period like economic problems, happiness or unconformity of parents, avoidance of the responsibility of another child, mother's dream of a career

plan, age of parents etc.Yavuzer (2014) claims that imaginary idealization could be a reason for rejective attitudes. He infers that with pregnancy some parents create an imaginary idealization of the expected child and they grow their expectancies according to this figure, however in reality the child may not meet the expectancies and this situation could result with disappointment and rejective attitudes of the parents.

2.3.2. Developmental Experiences of Parents

Yavuzer (2014) claims that the personality characteristics and developmental experiences of parents are closely linked to their childrearing behaviours. He states that the quality of care the parents provide is related to their experiences in their family of origin.

A study conducted by Yalçın and Türnüklü (2011) on young adults' child rearing practices and their percieved parental behaviour showed that controlling parents recieved inconsistent disciplinary attitudes and low support by their family in times needed in their childhood. The parents that exhibit low democratic attitude recieved protective attitudes and high pressure for success. The study has also showed that parents who are mostly more fond of her/his own mother and could not stay long with their children, had recieved less protective attention, psychological punishment and less pressure for success. Also parents that experience spouse fights very often show that they had not recieved very much protective attitudes and survived psychological punishment in their childhood. Moreover, parents that do not apply too much disciplinary regulations had recieved more pressure for success in their childhood.

2.3.3. Marital Relationships

Marriage has a key role in parent-child relationship. The percieved marriage relationship the child observes is very important. An incompatible marriage will effect both the parents and their children in a negative way. While the conformity in the marriage determines the life quality, it also contributes to the child's development in a positive way, which could also establish a positive base for the child's future marriage. The perception of the child

about his/her parents marriage is closely related with his/her self-sense. If the child's perception of the marriage relation is highly positive, then his/her evaluation about him/herself is highly positive as well and if the child percieves a negative and incompatible marriage, then he/she might develop a negative perception about him/herself too (Yılmaz, 2001 as cited in Çelik & Öziş, 2016).

The unsatisfactory marriages could be a determinant in the parenting style chosen. Belsky (1990) claims that parents could develop a compensatory parental involvement by getting enmeshed with the child in order to compensate the negative parenting of their unsatisfactory marriage. He states that this situation is mostly seen in maternal involvement.

2.3.4. Socio-economic and Socio-cultural Status of Parents

Sambur (2015) declares that an environment rich in socio-cultural opportunities nourishes the development of child. The socio-cultural environment could lead parents to develop different type parenting styles. Socio-economic status could also be an factor for the parenting style chosen. For example, in the Turkish society the traditional authoriatarian parenting style is dominant however as the socio-economic level increases and with immigration from rural to the urban areas an increase in democratic parenting has been observed (Boratav, Fişek & Eslen-Ziya (2017) as cited in Saylık & Yalçın, 2018). A study conducted by Ulusoy, Demir and Baran, (2005) demonstrates that the parents who were least effected of the economic crisis were authoritative/democratic parents while the most effected were permissive and authoritarian.

2.3.5. Culture

Culture is also an important factor in the parenting style chosen. Traditions and cultures mostly determine social attitudes and responsibilites. Turkish culture has a patriarchal family structure and as a result, the attitudes of parents in common become shaped in the frame of authoritarian fathers and over-protective mothers (Yalçın & Türnüklü, 2011; Tezel Şahin & Cevher, 2007).

In traditional Turkish family structure, control is percieved as a positive action related with warmth, care and attention; however in Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus maternal control is positively related with psychological disturbances (Direktör & Çakıcı, 2012). Chao (1994) in this sense is critical about the outcomes of authoritarian parenting styles. Baumrind (1966)'s parenting typology for authoritarian parenting style is generally described as showing lack of warm relations and it is also predicted for low school performance outcome. He claims that this is not the case in Chinese culture and other collectivist cultures. The concept of strictness and control is regarded as beneficial for the child; discipline is a sign of affection and caring and the child values obedience to his/her parents; so this situation is not regarded problematic for the neither sides. Also Domènech Rodriguez, Donovick, and Crowley (2009) claim the similar problem for first-generation Latinos as well. They point out that Baumrind's typology for parenting attitudes does not capture Latinos sufficiently and the data show that the majority of the Latino parents are "protective parents".

As we have had an outlook on the factors effective on parenting styles; now the typologies of parenting styles in the literatue are going to be investigated.

2.4. Typologies of Parenting Styles

Starting from birth, parents are the first teachers and the child`s greatest supporters in the orientation to the world. The child learns self-expression and how to become an individual from his/her parents. Parents help the child gain a worldview about the ongoing events in the world (Yavuzer, 2014).

Children form their behaviours and their perception of life as a result of modelling the beloved ones. In the first years of life, the role models are usually their parents and the children tend to imitate and internalise every behaviour of their parents. By the age of adolescence and later on, the effects of parents leave its place to new experiences; however, the influence of parents continues. The adolescents either conciously or unconciously internalize parental attitudes while shaping their own behaviours. The

parents' experiences, behaviours and attitudes effects the childs' behaviours and personality, causing the child to carry these accumulations to his/her future life (Maccoby & Martin, 1983)

Various factors effect the parent-child communication and the child's behaviour. While raising their child, the parents' own personality characteristics and the various methods they use are effective on building the child's own character. The parents' communication style, their values and tastes make a contribuiton to the childs development, either in a negative or positive way (Yalçın &Türnüklü, 2011).

Every parent has their own different parenting style. These styles can be an outcome of the parents' own personality traits, demographic properties, early childhood experiencies, marital influences or the child's characteristics (Belsky, 1990; Yalçın &Türnüklü, 2011). Every parent-child relationship is unique, because it contains many different factors and properties in it (Bozdemir & Gündüz, 2016).

Researchers studying on parenting styles have mostly converged on three parenting styles. Especially Baumrind's studies on parenting styles have made a big contribution to the literature. Baumrind's (1966) theory, offers three characteristic styles of parenting styles which addresses the ways in which parents settle the needs of their children, respond to their demands, establish control, limits and boundaries. These three styles are permissive, authoritarian and authoritative/democratic parenting styles.

According to Maccoby and Martin (1983), responsiveness and demandingness are the two building blocks that form parenting styles. Parental responsiveness could be explained with warmth and demandingness with control (Wolfradt et al., 2003). Maccoby and Martin (1983) categorize parenting in the axis of responsiveness and demandingness, categorising authoritative/democratic (reciprocal) parents as high on both responsiveness and demandingness; authoritarian (autocratic) parents as high on demandingness but showing low responsiveness; indulgent (permissive) parents as high in responsiveness however showing less demandingness and indifferent (uninvolved) parents as showing less responsiveness and less demandingness.

Parental warmth is defined as responding to children's emotional and behavioral needs as well as expressing positive attitudes toward the child. The main difference between parental acceptance and parental rejection is the parental warmth. The parents who show parental acceptance exhibit their love, care, support and help any time; on the other hand, parents that show rejection act harsh, neglectful and offensive (Rohner, Khaleque & Cournoyer, 2012).

The individuals who recieve parental warmth establish general successful relationships with others. The understanding, acceptance and freedom to express their feelings with the parents create a model for the child in establishing strong social relationships. However, parental overprotection and rejection may set negative impressions in the concious of the child while creating an inappropraite role model in establishing relationships (Aka, 2011). Safrancı (2015) states that mother's rejection is especially associated with depression; on the other hand, father rejection and mother overprotection are significant indicators of psychological problems.

The researches on parenting styles generally use the categorization of Maccoby and Martin (1983). However this categorization does not comprise all the parenting categories that dominate in Turkey. In the related literature of psychology, parenting styles are investigated under 5 categories. These are authoritarian, authoritative/democratic, protective, permissive and neglectful parenting styles (Maccoby & Martin, 1983; Domènech Rodriguez et al., 2009).

2.4.1. Authoritarian Parenting Style

Baumrind (1966) defines authoritarian parents as rigid and authocratic. Parents who fit this classification seek obeidience to their demands. They demand everything done exactly as they have said so and no explanation is made to the child about the reason for the demands. Authoritarian parents attempt to shape the child's behaviours in strict standarts. These parents' parental control is high. The parent is accepted as the boss and punishments can take place. The authoritarian parents show lack of warmth and low parental support.

"Parents Attitude Scale" (Kuzgun & Eldeleklioğlu, 2005) defines authoritarian parenting style with the following statements:

- He/She always critisizes me and sees the mistakes rather than concentrating on the positive sides of the work I have done.
- Our relationship is very formal to express myself freely.
- He/She compares me with other children around us and tells that they are better than me.
- He/She tries to rule and dominate me.
- Always expects higher success which is over my power.
- In times that I want to be physically and emotionally close, he/she behaves cold and repellant.
- Forced me to choose the profession that he/she wants.
- He/she forces me to eat food that I do not like, with the thought that it is beneficial.
- Always wants me to overachieve in exams.
- I think that he/she feels unlucky that he/she has a child like me.
- Always forces me to be successful at school and punishes me when I get low grades.
- Uses me as a tool for her/his deeds.
- Forces me to do more than my best.
- Expects me to be perfect.
- Talks to me with a harsh and hectoring style.
- Gives more importance and acts politely to others.

When the related literature is reviewed, we could see that the outcomes of authoritarian parenting are mostly negative (Sümer, Aktürk & Helvacı, 2010). Demir, Baran and Ulusoy (2005)'s study results indicate us that the teenagers with authoritarian parents feel that they are not understood by their family, experience problems with their friends in interacting and communicating. They express that not being understood by the family could form a base for an unhealthy and psychopathological environment which teenagers even think of suicide. According to Rhee, Lumeng, Appugliese, Kaciroti & Bradley (2006) ,

authoritarian parenting has the increased the risk of having overweight young children compared to authoritative/democratic parenting style.

Wolfradt et al. (2003) state that the children raised with authoritarian parenting style recieved higher scores on depersonalisation and anxiety. Ferrari and Olivette (1993), found that authoritarian parenting characterized by inflexibility and overcontrol leads to indecisiveness. Related to this, Griess (2010) claims that with so much control and dependency, without the sufficient confidence and experience given to the child, the child could not have the opportunity to make her/his own decisions, impact outcomes and hence would not have a reason to expect positive outcomes from situations as they seem more out of their control.

Fear of negative evaluation and social avoidance and distress is found to be the highest among children who are treated with protective-demanding and authoritarian parenting style (Erkan, Güçray & Sabahattin, 2002). A positive correlation has been found between physical and relational agressiveness with authoritarian parenting style (İkiz,2015). According to Fearon, Copeland and Saxon (2013), the authoritarian parenting style has an opposite relationship with creativity in that an increased authoritarian parenting may lead to lower levels of creativity in children.

It must be pointed out that, as the education level of the parents increases the over-controlling attitudes of parents decreases (Dursun,2010). According to Hanımoğlu &İnanç (2011), as the percieved mother acception and care levels increases, the total exam anxiety points decreases. Rapee (1997) states that the potential role of childrearing practices in the development of anxiety and depression strongly supports the conclusion that anxiety and depression are linked with percieved parental rejection and control.

2.4.2. Authoritative/Democratic Parenting Style

Baumrind (1966) describes authoritative/democratic parents to tend to be neither too over indulgent nor too rigid. This parenting style is balanced version of the two other edges of parenting styles. The authoritative/democratic parents are democratic, enabling and

flexible; however, they have guidelines that control the child in a rational and permissive way. These parents take into account the child's needs and interests when requiring a demand. They use reasonable explanations for their demands. They do not force; yet they supervise the child and have clear, logical expectancies to raise socially responsible, organized and cooperative individuals for the future.

According to Yavuzer (2010), democratic parenting style is the best parenting attitude that supports the child's emotional and personality development. The child feels the unconditional love, respect and affection and knows that he/she is controlled and protected and their needs are fullfilled with love. The parents attitudes are consistent, harmonious, decisive and trustful. Authoritative/democratic parents make more emphasis on their child's good and positive sides and they make positive evaluations about them (Pratt, Norris, vande Hoef & Arnold (2001) as cited in Jackson, Pratt, Hunsberger, & Pancer, (2005)). In Wolfradt, Hempel and Miles (2003)'s study, children of authoritative/democratic and permissive parents showed the highest score on active problem coping. According to Çeçen (2008), children who have been raised with democratic parenting style feels themselves less lonely than other children raised with other parenting style.

Authoritative/democratic parenting could have an important impact on the off-springs' self-respect. Jackson et al. (2005) states that authoritative/democratic parenting is a predictor of higher self-esteem, lower depression, and better adjustment to university. A study conducted by Erbil, Divan & Önder (2006) lists the self-respectful children's family properties and their rights as follows;

- Family spends enough and effiencient time with teenager
- They attribute to the desicion making process in the family;
- They can make their own friends
- They are made an explanation in problematic situations by their family members in their families;
- Their private life thoughts and emotions are respected by their families;
- A suitable environment is settled for them to express their feelings by their families
- They could talk every subject with their family

- No daughter-son discrimination is made in their family
- Their parents could freely express their feelings

All these family properties are features of authoritative/democratic parents which are open and free to their children's ideas. The "Parents Attitude Scale" (Kuzgun & Eldeklioğlu, 2005) used in this research measures the authoritative/democratic style with the some of the following statements:

- My parents do their best to ask my opinion
- They allow me to invite my friends home, and they act nice to them
- I could easily talk my problems with them.
- Our relationship is very friendly when we are together
- They used to spend enough time with me by going to parks and cinema when I was little
- They helped me gain studying and reading habits since my childhood.

Generally the outcomes of authoritative/democratic parenting is positive. According to the study conducted by Bozdemir and Gündüz (2016), it has been found that democratic parenting style has positive effects on developing emotional intelligence. Spera (2005) states that authoritative/democratic parenting is linked with academic achievement. Moreover Hasan and Power (2002) states that mothers who control their children moderately had the most optimist children, whereas those who permit little autonomy to their children in problem solving had children with the highest depressive symptoms. In Wolfradt et al. (2003)'s study, the offspring of authoritative/democratic parents showed the highest score on active problem coping. Kanak & Pekdoğan (2015), stated that, the shyness levels of the children of democratic parents were low. A study conducted by Özyürek and Özkan (2015) showed that the adolescents who perceived their parents as democratic and permissive/tolerant express their anger in a more socially acceptable way than the adolescents who perceived their parents as permissive/neglectful and authoritarian. In addition, the parents of superior intelligence children espouse "democratic parenting style" while they stay away from using permissive and authoritarian parenting style (Afat, 2013).

2.4.3. Protective Parenting Style

In this parenting style the child is under excessive protection. The protective parents do not demand any responsibilities from the child as they show great endeavour not to upset, dissappoint nor tire their children. The protective parents are also in a constant follow-up with the thought that their children are not capable enough to deal with the daily problems and dangers of life (İkiz, 2015). Dursun (2010) states that children who are in a constant protection by their parents tend to be defenceless, compatible, docile and timid, at the same time these children could develop a cheeky, irresponsible personality as they have not been demanded any kind of responsibility thouroughout their childhood. The problem-solving skills of children raised with this parenting attitude are not developed either.

In Turkish culture, the high control of parents is generally positively percieved (Sümer, Aktürk, Helvacı, 2010), however if the high control accompanies with low acceptance, interest and care the child's psychology may be negatively affected (Ulukaya & Bilge, 2014). According to Van Gastel et al. (2009), maternal and paternal 'overprotection' is negatively associated with child anxiety. Overprotective mother attitudes' points were significantly high for depressed adolescents compared with adolescents that has no depression (Yavuz, Yeser, Karamustafalıoğlu, Bakım & Gündoğar, 2005). Moreover, fear of negative evaluation and social avoidance and distress was found to be the highest among children who are treated with protective-demanding and authoritarian parenting style (Erkan et al., 2002). The over-controlling attitudes of parents decreased as the education level of the parents increases (Dursun,2010). Father's rejection and mother's overprotection were significantly linked to difficulties in emotion regulation and psychological findings such as depression, trait anxiety, and worry (Safrancı, 2015). According to Kanak & Pekdoğan (2015), the highest shyness was observed in children of protective families. However, beside the general negative outcomes of protective parenting style, the highest predictor for superior intelligence was found to be "over-protective parenting style". Also, Afat (2013) has also found overprotective parenting style as the most powerful predictor for giftedness in children. These two results could be linked with the findings of Aydoğdu and Dilekmen (2016)'s study as they have found that as the education level increases the protective attitudes increase as well.

The "Parents Attitude Scale" (Kuzgun & Eldeleklioğlu, 2005) used in this research measures the protective style with some of the following statements:

- They are always curious about where I am and what I am doing.
- Even in the ages that I could lead myself, he/she used to take me to all the places he/she went and was anxious about me staying at home alone
- Even today he/she wants to come with me to shopping with the idea that I will be decieved
- Always guides and protects me as if something bad is going to happen.

2.4.4. Permissive/ Indulgent Parenting Style

The parents that fit this style tend to be non-punitive, excessive in indulgence and have little control on the child's behaviour and actions. These parents set no boundaries around the child and the child is free to behave as he/she wishes. These parents are heavily involved with the child and on the other hand, they demand less household responsibilities. Over-permission is shown by the permissive parents to the child's demands. The parental authourity is low and the child is not limited by outside authourity control and is less effected from the outcomes of his/her carelessness or irresponsibility because support of the parent is high (Baumrind, 1966). According to Wolfradt et al. (2003), permissive style of both parents is linked to highest scores on active problem coping. However, Cohen & Rice (1997) indicate that child's perception of lower authoritativeness and higher permissiveness is associated with the child tobacco and alcohol use.

2.4.5. Ignorant/ Neglectful Parenting Style

Ignorant parents show both low warmth and low control (Maccoby & Martin, 1983). Dubowitz, Black, Starr Jr & Zuravin(1993) define neglectful parenting as maltreatment of a child while the basic needs of the child is not met. Zuravin and Taylor (1987) (as cited in Crouch & Milner, 1993) describes neglectful parents in 8 categories: lack of medical health care, lack of physical health care, child abandonment, insufficient supervision, security problems, lack of household sanitation, lack of nutrition and lack of hygiene. Crouch and

Milner (1993) adds emotional and educational neglect to these categories. However, the frequency and chronicity of neglect is an important criteria to name a parent as neglectful (Dubowitz, Black, Starr Jr & Zuravin, 1993).

Brown, Cohen, Johnson, and Salzinger (1998) has detected some significant risk factors for neglectful parenting, which could be large family size, maternal sociopathy poverty, maternal youth, poor marital quality, low maternal education, low paternal involvement, early separation from mother, low paternal warmth, maternal dissatisfaction with the child, maternal external locus of control, serious maternal illness, single parent, and welfare.

Crittenden (1993) lists the reasons behind the act of neglectful parents as, the parent may be unable to perceive the signal of the child, the parent may have a wrong interpretation of the signal as not requiring a parental response, the parent may know that a response is needed but does not have an available response for the situation, or the parent may select a response but fail to implement it. Crittenden(1993) proposes that every stage represents a different type of neglect.

In the related literature, the neglectful parenting is generally associated with negative outcomes like friend addiction and internet addiction (Büyükşahin Çevik & Çelikkaleli, 2010), Attention Deficit Disorder and psychological disorders, (Çengel-Kültür, Çuhadaroglu-Çetin & Gökler, 2007).

3. Research Aim

The fact that optimistic people develop better problem solving skills(Carver et al., 2010), better adjustment to stressors(Rasmussen et al.,2006), experience higher life satisfaction (Chang, Maydeu-Olivares,& D'Zurilla, 1997), experience psychological and physical well-being (Scheier & Carver, 1993), has better health conditions (Shepperd et al., 1996) experience job satisfaction and workplace happiness (Youssef & Luthans, 2007) and more importantly experience happiness and contentment of life (Dember & Brooks, 1989); these positive outcomes of optimism make us think if optimism is an essential trait for a happy and satisfying life what are the sources and bases that form this positive thinking skill.

How can optimism be nourished? According to Seligman (2006), to be more optimistic, it is possible to change your "explanatory style".

The effect of parenting styles have been investigated in many areas like personality(Huver, Otten, De Vries & Engels, 2010), emotion regulation (Manzeske & Stright, 2009), problem behaviour (Aunola & Nurmi, 2005), academic achievement (Spera,2005), overweight status of child (Rhee et al., 2006), substance use (Cohen & Rice,1997), anxiety (Van Gastel, Legerstee & Ferdinand, 2009; Wolfradt et al., 2003), addiction (Büyükşahin Çevik & Çelikkaleli, 2010), coping behaviour and depersonalization (Wolfradt et al.,2003), the examples could be widened as the examples are numerous. And the results demonstrate the significance of parental effect on future behaviour. Although there are a broad range of studies related to parenting styles; there is relatively a very small number of research related to parenting style and optimism in the literature and these researches' samples are either children or adolecsents (Hasan & Power, 2002; Weber, Brandenburg & Viezzer, 2003). Despite the number of studies conducted with children and adolesence, there is limited knowledge as to the impact of parenting on the optimism levels among college students'. Greiss's (2010) and Baldwin, McIntyre & Hardaway's (2007) study population samples consist of college students. However, we consider that these are outdated as there has become many diversive changes and developments in 10 years. A need for a new research has been detected which could make a contribution to the literature.

In this sense, the present study aims to investigate the relationship of parenting styles on the optimism levels of university students. The answer to the question of which parenting style is associated with higher optimism levels is sought in this study. The present research focuses on university students as we think that the age profile of university students have a cruical importance. The age range of the period of university gives cues about teenage and adulthood. The age range of university students is thought to be the best period of time to recieve the right and objective information of percieved parenting attitudes. The individual has partially stepped into adulthood forming her/his personality and identity; at the same time, the effect of parents' influence continues. The ages 18-30 are the ideal ages to evalute the attitudes of parents and to be conscious about self- characteristics (Rindfuss, 1991).

Although five parenting styles have been introduced in the literature, we will investigate the three: authoritative/democratic, authoritarian and protective parenting styles in the present study, due to it's popularity and prevalence in Turkey (Yıldız, 2017). The main purpose of this research is to put forward the relationship of authoritative/democratic parenting style, protective parenting style and authoritarian parenting style with optimisim levels. The present study aims to reveal which parenting style predicts higher optimism levels. The effects of gender, mother and father education level is going to be examined as well. The study expects to be beneficial and make a contribution for raising individuals with high optimism levels and high goals in the next generations. The study hopes to be beneficial for stakeholders in this field.

3.1. Limitations

A few limitations has been noticed in this research. The scale related to parenting styles, does not involve a discrimination between mother attitudes and father attitudes. It evaluates parents as a whole. However, each parent's attitude or style may differentiate from each other. For example, mothers tend to be more authoritative in general (Aydoğdu & Dilekmen, 2016). It is suggested that a scale that evaluates each parent separately might give better chance to evaluate.

Another point about "Parents Attitude Scale" is that, the scale evaluates three parenting styles only. However, there exists five different parenting styles in the related literature. It is suggested that a scale that includes and evaluates every kind of parenting style might have given a clearer picture of the influence of every parenting style.

One other limitation of the study is that the gender of our participants were not equal. %68,6 of the participants were females. This could effect the optimism results as the representability of the male students were low. The parents might not have behaved equally to their different gender siblings and the fact that females could be more optimistic (Orejudo, Puyuelo, Fernandez-Turrado & Ramos, 2012) is another possibility.

In this research, we have investigated the optimism, perhaps it would have been better if we had added other traits of positive psychology like hope and happiness. Because these traits are linked to each other.

3.2. Research Hypothesis

In the light of the literature review and the limitations of research the assumption of the current study are as follows:

H.1. It is assumed that the individuals raised with democratic/authoritative parenting styles predict higher optimism levels compared to other parenting styles.

H.2. It is assumed that the individuals raised with protective parenting styles predict low optimism levels compared to other parenting styles.

H.3. It is assumed that the individuals raised with authoritarian parenting styles predict the lowest optimism levels compared to other parenting styles.

H.4. It is assumed that optimism levels differentiates with gender variable.

H.5. It is assumed that parenting styles differentiate with gender variable.

H.6. It is assumed that optimism levels differentiates with mother education level.

H.7. It is assumed that optimism levels differentiates with father education level.

3.3. Problems of Research

In the light of our aim, the answers to the following questions will be sought:

- Is there a significant relationship with authoritative/democratic parenting styles and optimism levels?
- Is there a significant relationship with authoritarian parenting styles and optimism levels?
- Is there a significant relationship with protective parenting styles and optimism levels?
- Does the optimism levels differentiate by the gender variable?
- Does the parenting styles differentiate by the gender variable?
- Does the optimism levels differentiate by the mother's education level variable?
- Does the optimism levels differentiate by the father's education level variable?

CHAPTER 2

METHOD

MODEL OF RESEARCH

1. Research Design

The purpose of the current study is to examine the relationship among university students' percieved parenting styles and their optimisim levels. Our study is a quantitative study and a non-experimental design is used. In this study, relational survey model which is a subtype of general survey model has been applied. Relational survey is a research model that is conducted in order to define the relationship between two or more variables, and to obtain clues related to cause and effect relationships (Büyüköztürk, Kılıç-Çakmak, Akgün, Karadeniz & Demirel, 2008).

2. Participants

The sample of this study is university students in Turkey. 513 college students from five different universities in Turkey have been participated in the present study. These universities are Istanbul Sebahattin Zaim University, Ankara Yıldırım Beyazıt University (AYBU), Konya Necmettin Erbakan University, Konya Selçuk University and Karamanoğlu Mehmet Bey University. The students that have participated in the study are students of School of Foreign Languages, Faculty of Political Sciences, English

Preparation Department, Faculty of Engineering, Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences, Faculty of Law, Faculty of Social Sciences, Faculty of Education, Faculty of Health Sciences. The grades vary from English preparation class to 4th grade and post-graduate students. The students have been chosen by cluster random sampling technique.

Table 1. *Distribution of Students by the University Type*

Name of University	N	Percent
Necmettin Erbakan	106	20,7
Selçuk	112	21,8
Karaman Mehmet Bey	100	19,5
İstanbul Sabahattin Zaim	105	20,5
Yıldırım Beyazıt	90	17,5
Total	513	100,0

3. Data Collecting Devices

3.1.Instruments

In order to measure percieved parenting styles and optimisim levels, two different pencil-and paper tests has been conducted. In addition, the students have been asked to fill in a informed consent form and also a form that demands demografic variables. "Parents' Attitude Scale" has been used in order to measure perceived parenting styles and "Optimism Scale" to measure optimism.

3.1.1. Parents Attitude Scale

To measure students' percieved parenting styles "Parents Attitude Scale" (Anne Baba Tutum Ölçeği- ABTÖ) has been conducted. "Parents Attitude Scale" is a scale developed

by Kuzgun & Eldeleklioğlu (2005) in order to evaluate university students' percieved parenting attitudes.

The test consists of 40 statements which contains three sub-scales: 15 of the statements evaluates authoritative/democratic parenting attitude and the other 15 evaluates protective/demanding parenting attitude and 10 of the statements evaluate authoritarian parenting attitudes. The scale is a 5-point Likert type scale, which is graded as: 1=nonrelevant; 2=slightly relevant; 3=partially relevant; 4=very relevant; 5=totally relevant.

For determining reliability of the scale, Cronbach alpha coefficients were calculated for each subscale. The internal consistency reliabilities were .90 for authoritative/democratic, .84 for protective-demanding and .77 for authoritarian parenting styles. For the validity of the scale, Confirmatory Factor Analysis has been conducted. The results show that the structure has been confirmed. It has been seen that the factor loads obtained from the Confirmatory Factor Analysis varies between .30 and .77. The factor loads being greater than .30 shows the sufficiency of the factor loads of the statements (Seçer, 2015).The analysis reveal the following results: X 2 /sd =2.45, RMSEA= 0.07, SRMR=0.06, NFI =0.90, CFI= 0.95, GFI=0.92, AGFI=0.89, TLI = 0.91. We see that the results has the desired level of fit criteria, in general. All the paths in the tested model are significant in the 0.001 level.

3.1.2. Optimism Scale

To measure students' optimisim levels, "Optimism Scale" has been conducted to the students. The scale was developed by Balcı and Yılmaz in 2002 to evaluate university students' optimism levels. The scale is a 4-point Likert type scale which has 24 statements at total.

The students have been asked to choose one of the four statements: (1) Definitely not like me, (2) Not like me (3) Sometimes like me (4) Definitely like me. The lowest point

recieved from the scale could be 24 and the highest 96 points. High points refer to individual's optimism. The 1st, 6th, 8th, 9th and 11th statements have been reverse-coded.

In order to measure the scale's reliability Cronbach Alpha coefficients has been calculated. The results of Cronbach Alpha coefficients are . 84. For the validity of the scale, Confirmatory Factor Analysis has been conducted. The results show that the structure has been confirmed. It has been seen that the factor loads obtained from the Confirmatory Factor Analysis varies between .292 and .713. The analysis reveal the following results: X 2 /sd =3.17, RMSEA= 0.06, SRMR=0.05, NFI =0.94, CFI= 0.96, GFI=0.92, AGFI=0.90, TLI = 0.92. It has been seen that the results has the desired level of fit criteria, in general. All the paths in the tested model are significant in the 0.001 level.

4. Procedure

After obtaining the AYBU ethics committee's approval (see Appendix E), permission from Mrs. Eldeleklioğlu and Mrs. Balcı has been obtained to use their scale in our study (see Appendix K and Appendix L). Later, a petition has been written to the rectorates of the universities to obtain permission to administer the instruments to the students and the approval has been recieved from the universities (see Appendix F; Appendix G; Appendix H; Appendix I; Appendix J). To measure students'percieved parenting styles "Parents Attitude Scale" and to measure students' optimism levels "Optimism Scale" has been applied to the students. In addition, the students filled in an informed consent form and a demographic variables form. The survey forms were conducted in their regular class hour by either their lecturer or the researcher. The approximate time of the survey took about 5-10 minutes.

5. Data Analysis

The data were analyzed with the help of SPSS18. To make a general evaluation about the items in the demographic variables form, the descriptive statistics (e.g. frequency, percentages etc.) were calculated. To examine the correlational relationship between percieved parenting styles and optimism levels correlational analyses have been applied. To understand the predictors of optimism, multiple regression analysis has been utilized. To learn the significance of the differences in gender variable t-tests have been applied.

The n, $\overline{X}$, Ss values of the point averages of the university students' optimism levels have been calculated related to the variable of mother and father education level. Also ANOVA and Schefee test has been applied in order to reveal the significance of differentiation of optimism and mother-father education level variable.

CHAPTER 3

RESULTS

Data was investigated. A total of 513 participants were examined. In this chapter, first of all, the demographic information has been given. Later, the t-test results of the gender variable, the $\overline{X}$ scores and the ANOVA results related to mother/father education level, the correlational relationship and regression results have been analysed.

1. Demographic Characteristic of Participants

Based on the demographic form, university type, faculty type, socio-economic status, mother-father education level, residential status and birth order were determined. Regarding the age of the participants (N= 513), the mean age was 20.5 (range=18-42). Regarding the gender, 161 participants were males (%31.4), 352 participants were females (%68,6). A high majority of the participants (%78,2) defined their socioeconomic status as medium. The %71,7 of the participants (N= 513) reported that the longest place they have dwelt had been Cities/Metropolis, %20,3 county/towns and %7,8 villages. We could see that the participants show almost an equal distribution in their university types (see Table.1). The highest participation is from Faculty of Education (% 39,8), the Faculty of Social Sciences (%27,5) follows next.

When the family related factors are examined, the findings demonstrate that 250 of the participants' mothers were elementary school graduate mothers (%48,7) which has the highest rate, with 98 participant having secondary school graduate mothers (%19,1) following next. However in the case of fathers, the highest rate is of elementary school graduate fathers (%31,2), the following highest rate belongs to university or post-graduate fathers (%26,9). The participants are mainly the first (%39,2) or second (%29,6) child of their family.

As our study's main focus is the relationship of parenting style and optimism, only the percentages of demographic and family related factors' are given. Their effects on parenting styles and optimism are not included into this study.

2. Analysis for Gender Variable

First of all, the analyses of gender variable related to parenting styles has been calculated. The table below gives information about the data:

Table 2. *The T-test Scores Related to the Parenting Styles Sub-scale points for the Gender Variable*

	Gender	N	$\overline{X}$	S.S	T	P
Democratic	Male	137	53.54	12.45	-1.768	.078
Attitude	Female	352	55.75	12.33		
Protective Attitude	Male	137	38.29	10.77	3.042	.002*
	Female	352	35.02	10.66		
Authoritarian	Male	137	24.29	7.98	3.924	.000*
Attitude	Female	352	21.41	7.02		

* P < .05

When Table-2 is examined, it has been seen that there is no significant differentiation between male and female students' percieved democratic attitude. However, for percieved protective attitude sub-scale points a signficant differentiation has been encountered (p<

.05). The male students' percieved protective attitude sub-scale points (X=38.29) are higher than the female students' points (X= 35.02). Similarly, a significant differentiation has been encountered for authoritarian attitude sub-scale as well (p< .05). The average points (X= 24.29) male students recieved from the authoritarian attitude sub-scale are higher than the female students' points(X= 21.41).

Table.3 gives information about the optimism scores related to gender. The analyses are as follows:

Table 3. *The t-test Results for Optimism Scale Points for Gender Variable*

	Gender	**N**	$\overline{X}$	**S.S**	**T**	**P**
Optimism Scale	Male	137	73.91	11.36	-2.466	**.**017*
	Female	352	76,34	9.09		

* P < .05

In Table.3, a signficant differentiation has been found between male and female university students' optimisim scale scores (p<.05). The female students' average optimism scale points (X=76,43), are higher than male students' average optimism scale points.

3. Analysis for Mother Education Level Variable

Below the analyses of $\overline{X}$ values and the the ANOVA results related to mother education level are investigated. The tables show the differentiation of the variables.

Table 4. *The n, $\overline{X}$, Ss Values of the Point Averages that the University Students Recieved from the Optimism Scale Related to the Mother's Education Level Variable Variable*

	Education Status	n	$\overline{X}$	Ss
Optimisim	Illiterate	25	75.36	8.67
	Elementary	250	76.53	8.99
	Secondary	99	75.53	9.79
	High School	71	75.39	9.43
	University +	67	73.05	12.05

In Table 4., when the university students' optimism scale average points are considered, the highest mean belongs to students whose mothers are elementary school graduate ($\overline{X}$ =76.53) Mothers who are secondary school graduate ($\overline{X}$ = 75.53) , mothers who are high school graduate ($\overline{X}$ =75.39), mothers who are illiterate ($\overline{X}$ =75.36) ,mothers who have graduated from university or who are post-graduate($\overline{X}$=73.05) follow the rank respectively.

Table 5. *The ANOVA Results of University Students' Optimism Scale Mean Scores According to Mothers' Education Level Variable*

		Source	SS	df	F	P
Optimism	Inter-group	653.704	4	163.426	1.730	.142
	In-group	47797.06	506	94.461		
	Total	48450.77	510			

When Table 5. is examined, it could be determined that there is no significant difference between optimism level and mothers'education level variable

4. Analysis for Father Education Level Variable

The following analyses demonstrate the $\overline{X}$ values and the the ANOVA results related to mother education level. The tables show the differentiation of the variables.

Table 6. *The n, $\bar{X}$, Ss Values of the Point Averages that the University Students Recieved from the Optimism Scale Related to the Father's Education Level Variable*

	Education Status	n	$\bar{X}$	Ss
Optimism	Illiterate	11	69.54	10.81
	Elementary	160	75.81	8.61
	Secondary	89	78.28	7.95
	High School	109	76.02	8.59
	University +	138	73.91	11.90

When the Table 6. is examined, we could see that the highest optimism score mean was recieved by secondary school graduate fathers($\bar{X}$ =78.28). Fathers who are high school graduate ($\bar{X}$ = 76.02), fathers who are elementary school graduate($\bar{X}$ =75.81), fathers who have graduated from university or who are post-graduate ($\bar{X}$ =73.91) and fathers who are illiterate($\bar{X}$=69.54) followed next.

Table 7. *The ANOVA Results of University Students' Optimism Scale Mean Scores According to Fathers' Education Level Variable*

	Source	KT	Sd	KO	F	P	Significant Difference
Optimism	Inter-group	1406.204	4	365.498	3.993	.003*	Sec.School Graduate > Univ./Post-Graduate
	In-group	45946.95	502	91.528			
	Total	47408.95	506				

* P < .05

When the Table 7. is examined, the results reveal that the university students' optimism points have a significant relationship with the fathers' education level variable. The Schefee test has been conducted in order to look at the source of the differentiation. As a result, the test revealed that secondary school graduate fathers (X= 78.28) have recieved

significantly higher optimism points than the fathers who have graduated from university or who are post-graduate (X= 73.91).

5. The Correlational Analyses of Percieved Parenting Attitudes and Optimism Scores

The main focus of this study was to investigate the relationship of percieved parenting styles and optimism. The following table demonstrates the relationship of these variables.

Table 8.*The Correlation between University Students' Percieved Parenting Attitudes and Optimism Scores*

	1	**2**	**3**	**4**
1.Authoritative/democratic	-	-.69**	-.31**	.43**
2.Protective		-	.32**	-.26**
3.Authoritarian			-	-.23**
4.Optimism				-

When the correlation table is examined, there is a significant and positive relationship ($p < .01$) between university students' optimism scale points and authoritative/democratic attitude sub-scale points. On the other hand, there is a significant but negative relationship ($p < .01$) between university students' optimism scale points and protective and authoritarian attitude sub-scale points.

6. The Regression Analysis of Percieved Parenting Attitudes and Optimism Scores

To understand the predictors of optimism, multiple regression analysis has been conducted. The table below reveals the predictors of optimism:

Table 9. *Regression Analysis Results Related to University Students' Percieved Parenting Attitudes and Optimism Scores*

Variable	B	SH_B	β	T	p
Democratic Attitude	.186	.042	.235	4.418	.00
Protective Attitude	-.044	-.048	-.048	-.901	.368
Authoritarian Attitude	-.192	.084	-.144	-2.268	.024
R **=.372** R^2 **= .13**					
F**= 27.167** p **= .00*** **					

When multiple regression analysis results are examined related to predict university students' optimism scores, it has been seen that democratic attitude and authoriarian attitude sub-scales significantly predict the optimism levels. When the t-tests scores related to the significance of the regression coefficients are examined, it has been seen that democratic attitude sub-scale is a significant predictor.

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION

The significance of childraising attitudes and parenting styles has been emphasized in the present study. The literature indicates that childhood is an important period of life. It is the period which the caregivers/parents' feedbacks are essential, as they are stored in the subconcious and which these accumulations shape behaviour by time (Yavuzer, 2014). While children are growing up, they are only under the shelter of their caregivers and they have not encountered nor faced the difficulties of life yet. The thing that directs their thoughts and feelings is the feedback that they recieve from their parents (Tarhan, 2015).

The outcomes of parenting mostly shows itself in the age of university period. University life is a time of great transition, where young adults have the chance to explore their independence and begin to individuate from their parents' influence. However, the effect of one's reared parenting style continues even after the child has left home (Yalım,2007). That influence can affect the overall development of a student's ability, emotion, perception, worldview and lifestyle (Griess, 2010). Ben-Zur (2003) suggests that optimism in adolescents is established early in life.

The literature on the effects of parenting styles on future behaviour has showen that parents attitudes are an important predictor for forming personality characteristics and personality traits. Positive prevention theory is the starting point of this study as we aimed to reveal the predicting parental factors for nourishing optimism and ways to prevent pessimistic perspective. This study could indicate us that democratic parenting style is an appropraite parenting style for gaining an optimistic worldview. As mentioned earlier, what matters for an optimistic outlook is the explanatory style chosen. The way individuals define and explain problems forms the individuals' optimstic or pessimistic worldview. These

explanations are formed with the entity of self- efficacy or the lack of it. The preliminary efficacy experiences of a child is centered in the family. According to Bandura (1994), responsive parents create opportunities for efficacious actions by providing an enriched physical environment and allow freedom of movement for exploration; they encourage their children about their capabilities, thus, expand their child's self-knowledge of what they can and cannot do. The child who codes the self-perceptions related to self-efficacy, creates her/his optimistic or pessimistic explanatory style upon unpleasant events.

1. Parenting Styles and Optimism

The main purpose of this study was to put forward which parenting style is a predictor of higher optimism. The results indicate that the authoritative/democratic parenting style is a significant predictor of high optimism levels. The authoritarian parenting style is a significant predictor however it has a negative relationship with optimism. In other words, as the parents' authoritarian attitude increases, the offsprings' optimism level decreases. The results indicate that the protective parenting style is not a significant predictor of optimism. From the correlation and regression analysis results we could see that our H1 and H3 hypotheses have been supported; while H2 has been rejected.

Results indicated that when students perceive that they are parented under the authoritative/democratic parenting style, they are more likely to develop high levels of optimism than students who perceive they are raised through an authoritarian parenting style. Griess's (2010) findings supports our research. Although Greiss's (2010) study measures authoritative, authoritarian, permissive parenting style; her results show consistency with our study as she has found that perceived authoritative/democratic parenting style contributes to higher levels of optimism than the authoritarian parenting style. Another study which shows similarity to our study is Weber, Brandenburg and Viezzer (2003)'s study. Although their study sample are children, their study supports our study as well. Weber et al.(2003) measured the relationship ofauthoritative, authoritarian, indulgent and neglectful parenting style on optimism levels. Weber et al.(2003)'s study showed that authoritative/democratic parents were associated to higher optimism scores

and to lower hopelessness scores. Weber et al. (2003) stated that children reared by authoritative/democratic parenting styles are more prepared to face adversities in an optimistic way and that parents have an important role on the learning processes of children's optimism. Baldwin et al. (2007) has found that perceived authoritative/democratic parenting style by mother or father was associated with greater optimism in late adolescence whereas authoritarian parenting style was not found as a predictor. Also Cenk & Demir (2016)'s study shows consistency with the related research. Cenk & Demir (2016)'s study revealed that the adolescents who characterised their parents' parenting style as authoritative/democratic or permissive had higher levels of optimism than adolescents who percieved their parents as neglectful and authoritarian. Moreover, Jackson et al. (2005) associated authoritative/democratic parenting with higher self-esteem and lower depression, indicating that optimism may be a central mechanism by which authoritative/democratic parenting facilitates self-esteem, and it may be one of the several mechanisms by which it prevents depression.

As mentioned earlier authoritative/democratic parenting offers moderate control and high autonomy in parenting and authoritarian parenting offers high control and low autonomy; relatedly Hasan and Power (2002)'s results shows that mothers who controlled their children moderately had the most optimistic children, however those who allowed their children little autonomy in problem solving had the highest levels of depressive symptoms in their children. These findings are consistent with Baumrind (1966) theory that authoritative/democratic parenting is the convenient parenting style for raising children with positive attitudes. Baumrind's (1966) authoritative parenting style creates a psychologically positive environment to flourish the child's potentials and talents by the parents' warm and welcoming attitudes. The sustained democratic environment enables the child to express himself freely. The child that feels him/herself important has the tendency to think and behave positively and thus open to new and innovative ideas.

As it could be seen from the results, parenting is an important factor for raising optimist children. Warmth of the parents and moderate control helps children to expect good things to happen in the future. When the appropriate and healthy emotional environment is supplied by the parents, the children have the chance to reveal their positive potentials. As mentioned in the literature review, Maccoby and Martin (1983) define

authoritative/democratic parenting with high responsiveness and high demandingness; authoritarian parenting with low responsiveness and high demandingness. This indicates that, high control is acceptable and beneficial when it is accompanied with high warmth for the development of optimism. The high control and demands could be tolerated by the child when he/she feels he/she is welcomed and accepted by her/his parents. The child could be developing welcoming attitudes to the adversities of the daily life when he/she recieves welcoming attitudes from her/his parents. The child that has experienced warm and democratic attitudes could gain resilience and efficacy for the difficulties of life.

Baumrind (1966) defines the authoritative/democratic parents as enabling and flexible; using reasonable explanations for their demands, not forcing but supervising the child and having clear, logical expectancies for their demands. Related to this definition, we could infer that the parent's logical and reasonable expectancies and positive attitudes could be forming an atmosphere for the child to develop positive and reasonable expectancies for the future. Contrarily, Baumrind (1966) defines authoritarian parents as rigid, authocratic and as obeidience-seekers. They demand everything done exactly as they have said so and no explanation is made to the child about the reason for their demands, they try to shape the child's behaviours in strict standarts with high parental control. The authoritarian parents show lack of warmth and low parental support and conduct punishments. In this circumstances, the low responsiveness and high demandingness of the authoritarian parents form a base for developing helplessness of the child. The child who faces low warmth could be feeling supressed and worthless thinking that nothing he/she do matters thus this high pressure could be effecting future expectancies as he/she could not be effective in the future outcome.

Gillham et al. (2001) relates optimism with self-efficacy and they state that self-efficacy is a central mediator in developing optimism. In the authoritarian style, the child is scolded, rejected and high obeidence is sought for the parents' demands. In an environment like this it may not be possible to develop self-efficacy and thus the development of optimism could be destroyed. The same case is valid for protective style. Our results reveal that protective parenting style is not a predictor of optimism. The oppressive, over-powering and over-whelming attitudes of the parents may not be giving the opportunity to the child to develop self-efficacy and thus resulting in negative outcomes for optimism.

In order for the child to be optimist about his/her future, he/she should be confident about his/her potentials. The child should be supported to make him/her become aware about his/her efficiency in effecting the outcomes.

2. Gender

The study indicates that a differentiation has been observed between optimism and gender. We see that girls' average optimism scale points are higher than male students' average optimism scale points. When we investigate the results related to gender and parenting styles, we see a significant differentiation for authoritarian and protective parenting style. The male students' percieved protective parenting style sub-scale points and percieved authoritarian parenting style sub-scale points are higher than the female students' points. From these results, we conclude that both H4 and H5 have been supported

According to our study, results indicate that male students percieve their parents more protective and authoritarian. This could be explained with the males desire for freedom. They could be percieving their parents' normal level of control and protection as "protective and authoritarian". Also Talib, Mohamad & Mamat (2011)'s study show that parents conduct authoritarian parenting to boys and authoritative/democratic parenting to girls. Radziszewska, Richardson, Dent, and Flay (1996) state that girls are more likely have authoritative parents than boys. However İnci and Deniz (2015) has not found a statistical significance between father attitudes and gender. Moreover, our results demonstrate differences between females and males regarding optimism. Although our study results might be effected from the outnumber of girls in this study, our results show that females' optimism scores are higher than males optimism scores. Orejudo et al. (2012)'s study shows consistency with our study and they state that girls tend to be more optimistic, showing greater communication between peers and mothers. However Gençoğlu, Alkan and Koçyiğit (2014)'s study shows that there is no differentiation between gender related to optimism levels. Also Bostancı, Oda, Şebin and Erail (2017) state that gender is not a predictive factor for optimism. In addition, an important point must be emphasized regarding the results related to gender; that is: the study results

demonstrate that male students percieve their parents more protective and authoritarian consistently males optimism scores are found to be lower than female scores. This relation is an important point to be emphasized because the results related to gender verify that authoritarian and protective parenting are negative predictors of optimism.

The gender's predictive role for both parenting styles and optimism could also be explained with the parents discriminating approach to their different sex children. The parents may tend to accept girls as obeident and more easy-going so the parents might be approaching their daughters in a more democratic and enabling way; on the other hand the parents may accept boys to be more active, out-going, rebellent and invulnerable so their approach might be tending towards more strict and harsh attitudes . As a result, the gender discriminations in the application of parenting styles might be the influencing factor for the girls to be more optimistic.

3. Mother and Father Education Level

The study results indicate that there is no differentiation regarding mother education level and optimism; however, there is a differentiation regarding father education level.
The study shows that the mother education level is not a predictor of optimism. On the other hand, the results reveal that secondary school graduate father's children are more optimist than university/post graduate fathers' children. According to these results, we could conclude that H6 has been rejected and H7 has been supported.

Although high education level is an important factor in raising children (Bostancı, Oda, Şebin & Erail, 2017). Our data shows that mother's education level is not a significant predictor of optimism. Bostancı et al. (2017)'s study results support our study. They have also found that mother education level is not a predictor. This indicates that no matter what the status of the mother is, it does not effect the child's optimism levels. Moreover, the data shows that father education level is a significant predictor of optimism pointing that secondary school graduate father's children are more optimist than university/post graduate fathers' children. Bostancı et al. (2017)'s study does not support our study as their

results demonstrate that as the father's education level increases the optimism levels increases as well.

Our results signify that individual's optimism could not be linked with high education levels. A possibility for high optimism of children of low-educated fathers could be the father's hope and desires for the future. The low-educated father could be attributing his own positive future expectencies to his children. The father's dreams and desires which has not been actualised in the father's own life could be influencing the child about the future. The child could be directed and supported by the father to achieve the goals and dreams of his father. Especially, one of the low-educated father's main goals and desire could be giving his child high education and a high life standard. The children of the fathers who have recieved low education could be optimist about the future that his child could achieve these goals and expect that good things will happen. It could also be inferred that the parents who have low education levels have the opportunity to spend more and effective time with their children, however the high-educated parents might not have the time and chance to get involved with their children because of their workload thus the child might have to spend long hours away from the interaction with their father perhaps spending long hours in educational institutions or in the influence of TV/social media for excessive hours. Another possibility could be that the highly educated fathers' conciousness levels may not be the same with the low educated fathers. The high educated father could be more aware of the difficulties that await the child in the future and thus might make more realistic inferences and assumptions whilst reflecting these worries to his child.

4. Positive Prevention for the Future

From all the literature review we see that optimism is an important criteria for coping with ditress. A great number of research has demonstrated that optimists are good-copers with stressors, they show acceptance and quick adjustment to the stressful situations by searching for paths to deal, cope and overcome the distress. They are combatant personalities, not thinking of giving up and searching for ways to deal with problems.

In todays world, stress is showing its prevalence day by day. Depending on the developments which showed up with the industrial revolution, the industrialization process starting with the manpower has changed its route to machinization which is a more economic and more systematic working power and now it is revolving into a new transformation which is robot revolution. The new robotic productions has established a new frame which effects the human's optimistic viewpoint while making us question the place of human in life because of the new problems starting with the employment of robots replacing human's place systematically. The artificial intelligence and the new technologies redesignates the humans' optimistic or pessimistic outlook because of the risk of loosing the job guarentee as well as the anxiety of not being employed to the departments despite high education levels. This state effects all the layers of society, no matter what the individuals' background or education level is, either illiterate or a high level manager, all the social layers in a society have anxiety for the future. It is assumed that there will be many jobs that will occur in the near future which has not been invented yet and many would disappear. The risk of future life does not make it possible to be a long term optimist. Perhaps there are many domains of life that will go through an diversive change. We have earlier mentioned about the optimism- self-efficacy link. Individuals who do not know what to come across in the future and who do not know their capabilities, limits and self-efficacies for the new circumstances of life will have difficulties in developing positive expectancies for the future. Positive Prevention Theory aims to nourish the positive sides of individuals in order to prevent negative outcomes. For this reason, this study has concentrated on parenting styles which will be buffers for negative future expectancies and nourish the positive thinking of individuals in order to prevent pessimism.

So from the results we could infer that the high warmth and high control of the parents is an essential necessity for the children to know their limits, capabilities, and their efficacies in order to develop optimistic thinking skills. Like many other studies, our study also shows that low warmth and high control is the approach which parents should avoid from, as authoritarian parenting increases the optimism levels decreases. And we see that protective parenting is not a predictor of optimism.

Suggestions

This study offers insight into how percieved parenting styles can influence and contribute to the development of the offspring's optimistic tendencies.

From our research we have inferred that parents have an important role on their child's optimism. Understanding the needs of children and foreseeing the problems beforehand is important for prevention of problems. In order to avoid psychological problems, parents should be informed on how to react to their children's positive and negative emotions, and they should be asked to reflect their warmth, avoid negative parental behaviors like rejection and overprotection while keeping in mind the importance of choosing the appropraite time and strategy in different situations.

It is important to inform parents on how to approach to their children. In a broader level, parent training centers could be established as a state policy by governments. Community health centers could distribute books or booklets informing about the practices of authoritative/democratic parenting in order to teach the conscious of these practices. Pregnant mothers as well as their spouses could be directed by the government to take training programs within the pregnancy period. Moreover, public service ads on TV could be prepared to influence parents for a parenting that fulfills the emotional, psychological and physical needs of their children.

For a positive future and for a positive outlook, we hope that this study will make a contribution for the literature related to both parenting and optimism.

Conclusion

In this thesis, the relationship of parenting styles on optimism levels has been investigated. The differentiation of gender and mother-father education level variable related to parenting styles and optimism has been examined as well. Consistent with the previous

studies, the results demonstrate that the authoritative/democratic parenting style is more likely to lead to higher optimism levels in children.

The starting point of this research was to answer the question of "Could pessimism about the future could be prevented with nourishing optimism in childhood in order for the youth to better tackle with the adversities of the future?". From the literature and our results we could assume that parents have an important role on nourishing their children's optimism (Weber et al., 2003). Parents should try to better understand their children and foresee the problems beforehand by investigating their parenting style (Yavuz, Yeser, Karamustafalıoğlu, Bakım, & Gündoğar, 2005). These findings have important implications for child-rearing practices, as well as for the prevention of negative expectations of future in the general population. Using positive attitudes; giving autonomy to children, and the communication between parent-child is essential in the childraising process. In the light of these findings, if today's parents could learn the best parenting styles in child raising, children could be able to grow up with right parenting styles, thus they could become better copers with stress, they could develop self-efficacy thus they could expect good things to happen in the future and be happier individuals.

Further research on this issue could be carried out in an experimental and longitudinal research so as to observe the effects in a long term period and reveal the cause-effect relationship.

REFERENCES

Afat, N. (2013). Çocuklarda üstün zekânın yordayıcı olarak ebeveyn tutumları. *Hasan Ali Yücel Egitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, *10*(1), 155.

Aka, B. T. (2011). *Perceived parenting styles, emotion recognition, and emotion regulation in relation to psychological well-being: Symptoms of depression, obsessive-compulsive disorder, and social anxiety.* Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Orta Doğu Teknik University, Social Sciences Institute, Ankara.

Alex Linley, P., Joseph, S., Harrington, S., & Wood, A. M. (2006). Positive psychology: Past, present, and (possible) future. *The Journal of Positive Psychology*, *1*(1), 3-16.

Aunola, K.,& Nurmi, J. E. (2005). The role of parenting styles in children's problem behavior. *Child Development*, *76* (6), 1144-1159.

Aydoğdu, F.,& Dilekmen, M. (2016). Ebeveyn tutumlarının çeşitli değişkenler açısından değerlendirilmesi. *Bayburt Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, *11*(2), 569-585.

Bal, P. N.,& Gülcan, A. (2014). Genç yetişkinlerde iyimserliğin mutluluk ve yaşam doyumu üzerindeki etkisinin incelenmesi. *Asya Öğretim Dergisi*, *2*(1), 41-52.

Balcı Çelik, S. (2008). The Effects of an Emotion Strengthening Training Program on the Optimism Level of Nurses. *Educational Sciences: Theory and Practice*, *8*(3), 793-804.

Balcı, S.,& Yılmaz, M. (2002). İyimserlik ölçeğinin geliştirilmesi: geçerlik ve güvenirlik çalışması. *OMÜ Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, *14*, 54-60.

Baldwin, D. R., McIntyre, A., & Hardaway, E. (2007). Perceived parenting styles on college students' optimism. *College Student Journal*, *41*(3), 550-558.

Bandura, A. (1994). Self-efficacy. In V. S. Ramachaudran (Ed.), Encyclopedia of human behavior (Vol. 4, pp. 71-81). New York: Academic Press. (Reprinted in H. Friedman [Ed.], Encyclopedia of mental health. San Diego: Academic Press, 1998).

Baumrind, D. (1966). Effects of authoritative parental control on child behavior. *Child development*, 37(4), 887-907.

Bayer, A. (2013). Değişen toplumsal yapıda aile.*İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi, 4(8),* 101-129.

Belsky, J. (1990). Parental and nonparental child care and children's socioemotional development: A decade in review. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 885-903.

Ben-Zur, H. (2003). Happy adolescents: The link between subjective well-being, internal resources, and parental factors. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 32*(2), 67-79.

Bircan, S. & Erden, G. (2011).Madde Bağımlılığı: Aile İle İlgili Olası Risk Faktörleri Algılanan Ebeveyn Kabul-Reddi Ve Çocuk Yetiştirme Stilleri [Substance Abuse: The Family Related Risk Factors, Percieved Parental Acceptance-Rejection and Parenting Styles]*,Çocuk ve Gençlik Ruh Sağlığı Dergisi*,18(3),211-222.

Boratav, H. B., Fişek, G. O., & Eslen-Ziya, H. (2017). *Erkekliğin Türkiye halleri*. İstanbul: Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları.

Bostancı, Ö., Oda, B., Şebin, K., & Erail, S. (2017). 11–13 yaş öğrencilerin spor yapma durumlarına göre iyimserlik ile saldırganlık düzeylerinin incelenmesi. Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Bilimleri Dergisi, 19(4), 205-217.

Bozdemir, F.,& Gündüz, B. (2016). The relationships of attachment styles, parental attidues and traumatic childhood experiences with emotional intelligence. *Journal of Human Sciences, 13*(1), 1797-1814.

Brissette, I., Scheier, M. F., & Carver, C. S. (2002). The role of optimism in social network development, coping, and psychological adjustment during a life transition. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *82*(1), 101-111.

Brown J., Cohen P., Johnson J. G. & Salzinger S. (1998) A longitudinal analysis of risk factors for child maltreatment: findings of a 17-year prospective study of officially recorded and self-reported child abuse and neglect. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 22(11), 1065-1078.

Buchanan, G. M., Gardenswartz, C. A. R., & Seligman, M. E. (1999). Physical health following a cognitive–behavioral intervention. *Prevention & Treatment*, *2*(1), 10.

Büyüköztürk, Ş., Çakmak, E. K., Akgün, Ö. E., Karadeniz, Ş., & Demirel, F. (2008). Bilimsel araştırma yöntemleri [Scientific research methods]. *Ankara: PegemA.*

Büyükşahin Çevik, G.,& Çelikkaleli, Ö.(2010), Ergenlerin ArkadaşBağlılığı ve İnternet Bağımlılığının Cinsiyet, Ebeveyn Tutumu ve Anne Baba Eğitim Düzeylerine Göre İncelenmesi,*Çukurova Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*,19(3), 225-240.

Carver, C.S.,Pozo, C., Harris, S. D., Noriega, V., Scheier, M. F.,Robinson, D. S., Ketcham, A. S., Moffat Jr., F. L. & Clark, K. C. (1993) How coping mediates the effect of optimism on distress: a study of women with early stage breast cancer. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *65*(2), 375.

Carver, C. S.,& Scheier, M. F. (2001). Optimism, pessimism and self-regulation. Chang, E. C. (Ed.).In *Optimism & pessimism: Implications for theory, research, and practice.Optimism, pessimism, and self-regulation* (p. *31*-51). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association

Carver, C. S., Scheier, M.F., & Segerstrom, S.C. (2010). Optimism. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 30 (2010), 879-889.

.

Cenk, D. S.,& Demir, A. (2016). The relationship between parenting style, gender and academic achievement with optimism among Turkish adolescents. *Current Psychology, 35*(4), 720-728.

Chao, R. K. (1994). Beyond parental control and authoritarian parenting style: Understanding Chinese parenting through the cultural notion of training. *Child development, 65*(4), 1111-1119.

Chang, E. C., Maydeu-Olivares, A., & D'Zurilla, T. J. (1997). Optimism and pessimism as partially independent constructs: Relationship to positive and negative affectivity and psychological well-being. *Personality and individual Differences, 23*(3), 433-440.

Cohen, D. A.,& Rice, J. (1997). Parenting styles, adolescent substance use, and academic achievement. *Journal of Drug Education, 27*(2), 199-211.

Cowan, R. S. (1976). The "Industrial Revolution" in the home: household technology and social change in the twentieth century. *Technology and Culture*, 17(1), 1-23.

Crittenden, P. M. (1993). An information-processing perspective on the behavior of neglectful parents. *Criminal justice and Behavior, 20*(1), 27-48.

Crouch, J. L.,& Milner, J. S. (1993). Effects of child neglect on children. *Criminal justice and behavior, 20*(1), 49-65.

Çeçen, A.R. (2008). Öğrencilerinin Cinsiyetlerine ve Anababa Tutum Algılarına Göre Yalnızlık ve Sosyal Destek Düzeylerinin İncelenmesi [University Students' Loneliness and Perceived Social Support Levels According to Gender and Perceived Parents Attitudes]**.***Türk Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi, 6(*3), 415-431.

Çelenoğlu, G. K. (2018). Yapay Zeka Devrimi (AI): artificial intelligence revolution. Retrieved from https://books.google.com.tr/books/

Çelik, E. & Öziş, G. (2016).Algılanan Ebeveyn İlişkisi Ölçeğinin Geliştirilmesi Ve Psikometrik Özelliklerinin İncelenmesi, *Cumhuriyet International Journal of Education,* 5 (2), 2016, 50 - 66, e–ISSN: 2147-1606.

Çengel-Kültür, E., Çuhadaroglu-Çetin, F., & Gökler, B. (2007). Demographic and clinical features of child abuse and neglect cases. *Turkish journal of pediatrics, 49*(3), 256.

Dember, W. N.,& Brooks, J. (1989). A new instrument for measuring optimism and pessimism: Test-retest reliability and relations with happiness and religious commitment. *Bulletin of the Psychonomic Society, 27*(4), 365-366.

Demir, N. Ö., Baran, A. G., & Ulusoy, D. (2005). Türkiye'de ergenlerin arkadaş-akran grupları ile ilişkileri ve sapmış davranışlar: Ankara örneklemi. *Bilig*, (32), 83-108.

Direktör, C.,& Çakıcı, M. (2012),Ergenlerde Algılanan Ebeveyn Kabul Ve Reddin Psikolojik Sorunlar Üzerine Etkisi[The Effects of Percieved Parental Acceptance

And Rejection on Psychological Problems in Adolescents], *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi [H. U. Journal of Education]*, Special Ed.(1), 132-144.

Domènech Rodriguez, M. M., Donovick, M. R., & Crowley, S. L. (2009). Parenting styles in a cultural context: Observations of "protective parenting" in first-generation Latinos. *Family process*, *48*(2), 195-210.

Dubowitz, H., Black, M., Starr Jr, R. H., & Zuravin, S. (1993). A conceptual definition of child neglect. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, *20*(1), 8-26.

Dursun, A. (2010). *Okul öncesi dönemdeki çocukların davranış problemleriyle anne-baba tutumları arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi*. Doctoral dissertation, DEÜ Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, İzmir.

Emeç, H. & Kümbül Güler, B. (2006). Yaşam Memnuniyeti Ve Akademik Başarıda İyimserlik Etkisi [The Effect of Optimism on Life Satisfaction and Academic Success] *Journal of Dokuz Eylül University Faculty of Financial and Administrative Sciences.*21(2), 129-149.

Erbil,N., Divan,Z., & Önder, P. (2006), Ergenlerin Benlik Saygısına Ailelerinin Tutum ve Davranışlarının Etkisi (Effect of Attitudes and Behaviors of Families on Self-Esteem of Adolescents), *Aile ve Toplum Eğitim,Kültür veAraştırma Dergisi*,3 (10). ISSN: 1303-0256.

Erikson, E. H. (1963). Childhood and Society, 2nd ed. New York: Norton.

Erikson, E.H. (1968). Identity: Youth and Crisis, New York: W.W. Norton&Company,Inc.

Erikson, E.H. (1980). Identity and Life Cycle. New York: W. W. Norton&Company,Inc.

Erikson, E.H. (1984). İnsanın Sekiz Çağı (Çevirenler:T.B. Üstün ve V. ar). Ankara: Birey ve Toplum Yayıncılık.

Erikson, E. H. (1984). Reflections on the last stage-and the first. *The psychoanalytic study of the child*, *39*(1), 155-165.

Erkan, Z., Güçray, S., & Sabahattin, Ç. (2002). Ergenlerin sosyal kaygı düzeylerinin ana baba tutumları ve cinsiyet açısından incelenmesi. *Çukurova Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, *10*(10).

Fearon, D. D., Copeland, D., & Saxon, T. F. (2013). The relationship between parenting styles and creativity in a sample of Jamaican children. *Creativity research journal*, *25*(1), 119-128.

Ferrari, J. R.,& Olivette, M. J. (1993). Perceptions of parental control and the development of indecision among late adolescent females. *Adolescence*, *28*(112), 963-970.

Flinn, M. V.,& England, B. G. (1995). Childhood stress and family environment. *Current Anthropology*, *36*(5), 854-866.

Freud, S.,& Bonaparte, P. M. (1954). *The origins of psychoanalysis* (Vol. 216). London: Imago.

Geçtan, E. (2016). *İnsan Olmak* [Being a Human]. (14th Ed.). Istanbul: Metis Publication.

Gençoğlu, C., Alkan, E., & Koçyiğit, M. (2014). Bir mit olarak iyimserlik; Kızlar mı yoksa erkekler mi daha iyimser? *Elektronik Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi, 13*(50), 129-138.

Gillham, J. E., Reivich, K. J., Jaycox, L. H., & Seligman, M. E. (1995). Prevention of depressive symptoms in schoolchildren: Two-year follow-up. *Psychological science, 6*(6), 343-351.

Gillham, J. E., Shatté, A. J., Reivich, K. J., & Seligman, M. E. (2001). Optimism, pessimism, and explanatory style. In Chang E. C. (Ed.), *Optimism and pessimism: Implications for theory, research, and practice*, (53-75). Washington: American Psychological Association.

Gladding, S.T. (2011). *Aile Terapisi Tarihi, Kuram ve Uygulamaları (Family Therapy: History, theory and practices)5th edition,*New Jersey: Pearson Education.

Griess, S. (2010). *Perceived parenting style and its relationship to hopefulness, happiness, and optimism in a college student sample.* (142).Doctoral Dissertation. Retrieved from www.digscholarship.unco.edu

Güleri, M. (1998). Üniversiteli ve işçi gençliğin gelecek beklentileri ve kötümserlik-iyimserlik düzeyleri. *Kriz dergisi, 6*(1), 55-65.

Güloğlu, B. (2015). Öğrenilmiş İyimserlik. Tekinalp, B.E. & Terzi, Ş.I. (Eds.) *Eğitimde pozitif psikoloji uygulamaları* (pp.191-220). Ankara: Pegem.

Hanımoğlu, E. & İnanç, B. Y. (2011). Seviye Belirleme Sınavına Girecek Olan İlkögretim İkinci Kademe Öğrencilerinde Sınav Kaygısı, Mükemmeliyetçilik ve Anne-Baba Tutumu Arasındaki İlişkinin İncelenmesi, *Ç.Ü. Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi,20(1),351-366.*

Hasan, N.,& Power, T. G. (2002). Optimism and pessimism in children: A study of parenting correlates. *International Journal of Behavioral Development, 26*(2), 185-191.

Heinonen, K., Räikkönen, K., Matthews, K. A., Scheier, M. F., Raitakari, O. T., Pulkki, L., & Keltikangas-Järvinen, L. (2006). Socioeconomic status in childhood and adulthood: Associations with dispositional optimism and pessimism over a 21-year follow-up. *Journal of personality, 74*(4), 1111-1126.

Huver, R. M., Otten, R., De Vries, H., & Engels, R. C. (2010). Personality and parenting style in parents of adolescents. *Journal of Adolescence, 33*(3), 395-402.

İkiz, S. (2015). *Okul öncesi dönem çocuklarında fiziksel ve ilişkisel saldırganlığın ebeveyn tutumları açısından incelenmesi.* Master's Thesis, Adnan Menderes Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Aydın.

İnci, M. A., & Deniz, Ü. (2015). Baba tutumları ile çocuğun yaşı, cinsiyeti, doğum sırası ve kardeş sayısı değişkenleri arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi. *Karadeniz Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, *7*(02).

Jackson, L. M., Pratt, M. W., Hunsberger, B., & Pancer, S. M. (2005). Optimism as a mediator of the relation between perceived parental authoritativeness and adjustment among adolescents: Finding the sunny side of the street. *Social Development*, *14*(2), 273-304.

Jiang, F., Jiang, Y., Zhi, H., Dong, Y., Li, H., Ma, S., Wang Y., Dong Q., Shen H. & Wang, Y. (2017). Artificial intelligence in healthcare: past, present and future. *Stroke and vascular neurology*, *2*(4), 230-243.

Kanak, M. & Pekdoğan, S.(2015). Ergenlerin Utangaçlık Düzeylerinin Anne-Baba Tutumları ve Bazı Değişkenler Açısından İncelenmesi [An Investıgatıon Of Adolescents Shyness Levels in terms of Parents' Attitudes and Some Other Variables]. *The Journal of Academic Social Science Studies*,32,513-525. doi:number:http://dx.doi.org/10.9761/JASSS2748

Kao, G.,& Tienda, M. (1995). Optimism and achievement: The educational performance of immigrant youth. *Social science quarterly*, 76(1), 1-19.

Kuzgun, Y., & Eldeleklioğlu, J. (2005). Anne Baba Tutumları Ölçeği. *Editör: Yıldız Kuzgun ve Feride Bacanlı: Pdr'de Kullanılan Ölçekler.* Ankara: Nobel Yayın Dağıtım.

Leung, B. W. C., Moneta, G. B., & McBride-Chang, C. (2005). Think positively and feel positively: Optimism and life satisfaction in late life. *The International Journal of Aging and Human Development*, *61*(4), 335-365.

Lidz, R. W. & Lidz, T. (1949). The family environment of schizophrenic patients. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, *106*(5), 332-345.

Maccoby, E. E.,& Martin, J. A. (1983). *Socialization in the context of the family. Handbook of child psychology*: Vol 4 (pp. 1-102). Canada: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Manzeske, D. P.,& Stright, A. D. (2009). Parenting styles and emotion regulation: The role of behavioral and psychological control during young adulthood. *Journal of Adult Development*, *16*(4), 223.

Matlin, M. W.,& Stang, D. J. (1978). *The Pollyanna principle: Selectivity in language, memory, and thought*. Schenkman Pub. Co..

Matlin, M. W. (2004). *Pollyanna principle*. Hove: Psychology Press.

McArthur, D., Lewis, M., & Bishary, M. (2005). The roles of artificial intelligence in education: Current progress and future prospects. *Journal of Educational Technology*, *1*(4), 42-80.

Minsky, M. (2007). *The emotion machine: Commonsense thinking, artificial intelligence, and the future of the human mind*. Simon and Schuster.

Morris, A. S., Silk, J. S., Steinberg, L., Myers, S. S., & Robinson, L. R. (2007). The role of the family context in the development of emotion regulation. *Social development*, *16*(2), 361-388.

Mulkana, S. S.,& Hailey, B. J. (2001). The role of optimism in health-enhancing behavior. *American Journal of Health Behavior*, *25*(4), 388-395.

Nes, L. S.,& Segerstrom, S. C. (2006). Dispositional optimism and coping: A meta-analytic review. *Personality and social psychology review*, *10*(3), 235-251.

Orejudo, S., Puyuelo, M., Fernández-Turrado, T., & Ramos, T. (2012). Optimism in adolescence: A cross-sectional study of the influence of family and peer group variables on junior high school students. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *52*(7), 812-817.

Öztürk, A. & Çetinkaya, R. S., (2015) Eğitim fakültesi öğrencilerinin öznel iyi oluş düzeyleri ile tinsellik, iyimserlik, kaygı ve olumsuz duygu düzeyleri arasındaki ilişki. *Journal of Educational Sciences*, 42, 335-356 • ISSN: 1300-8889 • doi: 10.15285/ebd.98899

Özyürek, A.,& Özkan, İ. (2015). Ergenlerin Okula Yönelik Öfke Düzeyleri ile Anne Baba Tutumları Arasındaki İlişkinin İncelenmesi. *Abant İzzet Baysal Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 15(2), 280-296.

Parmaksız, İ.,& Avşaroğlu, S. (2012). Examining the Teacher Candidates' Levels of Optimism and Styles of Coping with Stress According to Their Self-Esteem Levels. *Ilkogretim Online*, *11*(2), 543-555.

Peterson, C.,& Bossio, L. M. (2001). Optimism and physical well-being.In Chang E. C. (Ed.), *Optimism and pessimism: Implications for theory, research, and practice*, (127-145). Washington: American Psychological Association.

Pratt, M. W., Norris, J. E., van de Hoef, S., & Arnold, M. L. (2001). Stories of hope: Parental optimism in narratives about adolescent children. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, *18*(5), 603-623.

Radziszewska, B., Richardson, J. L., Dent, C. W., & Flay, B. R. (1996). Parenting style and adolescent depressive symptoms, smoking, and academic achievement: Ethnic, gender, and SES differences. *Journal of Behavioral Medicine*, *19*(3), 289-305.

Rapee, R. M. (1997). Potential role of childrearing practices in the development of anxiety and depression. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 17 (1), 47-67.

Rasmussen, H. N., Wrosch, C., Scheier, M. F., & Carver, C. S. (2006). Self-regulation processes and health: the importance of optimism and goal adjustment. *Journal of personality*, *74*(6), 1721-1748.

Rhee, K. E., Lumeng, J. C., Appugliese, D. P., Kaciroti, N., & Bradley, R. H. (2006). Parenting styles and overweight status in first grade. *Pediatrics*, *117*(6), 2047-2054.

Rindfuss, R. R. (1991). The young adult years: Diversity, structural change, and fertility. *Demography*, *28*(4), 493-512.

Russell, S. J.,& Norvig, P. (2016). *Artificial intelligence: a modern approach*. Malaysia; Pearson Education Limited.

Safrancı, B.,(2015). Emotional Aspects Of Psychological Symptoms: The Roles Of Parenting Attitudes And Emotion Dysregulation. Ankara: Middle East Technical University.

Sambur, B.,(2015). Çocuk Eğitimi Hakkında Herkesin Bilmesi Gerekenler.(Eds.Turan, T.; Cemal, A. N.; Alar, C.) [Interview Transcript] Istanbul: EZR Yayıncılık. 271-272.

Saylık, F. Z.,& Yalçın, M. G. (2018). Otoriter veya Demokratik Ebeveyn Tutumunun ve Ebeveyne Bağlanma Biçiminin Suçluluk ve Utanç Duygularına Etkisinin Yarı-Deneysel Yöntemle İncelenmesi. *Psikoloji Çalışmaları-Studies in Psychology*, *38*(2), 95-128.

Scheier, M. F.,& Carver, C. S. (1985). Optimism, coping, and health: assessment and implications of generalized outcome expectancies. *Health psychology*, *4*(3), 219-247.

Scheier, M. F., & Carver, C. S. (1993). On the power of positive thinking: The benefits of being optimistic. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, *2*(1), 26-30.

Scheier, M. F., Matthews, K. A., Owens, J. F., Magovern, G. J., Lefebvre, R. C., Abbott, R. A., & Carver, C. S. (1989). Dispositional optimism and recovery from coronary artery bypass surgery: the beneficial effects on physical and psychological well-being. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, *57*(6), 1024.

Seçer, İ. (2005). Psikolojik test geliştirme ve uyarlama dyreci: spss ve liderlik uygulamaları. Ankara: Anı Yayıncılık.

Segerstrom, S. C., Taylor, S. E., Kemeny, M. E., & Fahey, J. L. (1998). Optimism is associated with mood, coping, and immune change in response to stress. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, *74*(6), 1646-1655.

Segovia, F., Moore, J. L., Linnville, S. E., Hoyt, R. E., & Hain, R. E. (2012). Optimism predicts resilience in repatriated prisoners of war: A 37-year longitudinal study. *Journal of Traumatic Stress*, *25*(3), 330-336.

Seligman, M. E.,& Csikszentmihalyi, M. (2000). Positive psychology: An introduction *American Psychological Association*, 55(1), 5.

Seligman, M. E. (2002). Positive psychology, positive prevention, and positive therapy. *Handbook Of Positive Psychology*, *2*(2002), 3-12.

Shatte, A. J., Reivich, K., Gillham, J. E., & Seligman, M. E. (1999). Learned optimism in children. *Coping: The Psychology Of What Works*, 165-181. Retrieved from books.google.com

Shepperd, J. A., Maroto, J. J., & Pbert, L. A. (1996). Dispositional optimism as a predictor of health changes among cardiac patients. *Journal Of Research in Personality*, *30*(4), 517-534.

Spera, C. (2005). A review of the relationship among parenting practices, parenting styles, and adolescent school achievement. *Educational Psychology Review*, *17*(2), 125-146.

Sümer, N., Aktürk, E.G.,& Helvacı, E. (2010). Anne-baba tutum ve davranışlarının psikolojik etkileri: Türkiye'de yapılan çalışmalara toplu bakış [The psychological effects of parenting attitudes and behaviors: A total look at the studies conducted in Turkey]. *Türk Psikoloji Yazıları*, *13* (25), 42-59.

Talib, J., Mohamad, Z., & Mamat, M. (2011). Effects of parenting style on children development. *World Journal of Social Sciences*, *1*(2), 14-35.

Tarhan, N. (2015). *Duyguların Psikolojisi*. İstanbul: Timaş Yayınları.

Taylor, S. E., Way, B. M., Welch, W. T., Hilmert, C. J., Lehman, B. J., & Eisenberger, N. I. (2006). Early family environment, current adversity, the serotonin transporter promoter polymorphism, and depressive symptomatology. *Biological Psychiatry*, *60*(7), 671-676.

Tezel Şahin, F. & Cevher, F. N. (2007). Türk toplumunda aile-çocuk ilişkilerine genel bir bakış. Retrieved from http:// ayk.gov.tr

Ulukaya, S. & Bilge, F. (2014), Üniversite öğrencilerinde akademik ertelemenin yordayıcıları olarak aile bağlamında benlik ve ana-baba tutumları [The Self and Parental Attitudes as Predictors of Academic Procrastination], *Türk Psikolojik Danışma ve Rehberlik Dergisi*, 5 (41), 89-106.

Ulusoy, M. D., Demir, N. Ö., & Baran, A. G. (2005). Ebeveynin çocuk yetiştirme biçimi ve ergen problemleri: Ankara ili örneği. *Türk Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, *3*(3), 367-386.

Van Gastel, W., Legerstee, J. S., & Ferdinand, R. F. (2009). The role of perceived parenting in familial aggregation of anxiety disorders in children. *Journal Of Anxiety Disorders*, *23*(1), 46-53.

Weber, L. N. D., Brandenburg, O. J., & Viezzer, A. P. (2003). The relationship between parenting style and child's optimism. *Psico-USF*, *8*(1), 71-79.

Wolfradt, U., Hempel, S., & Miles, J. N. (2003). Perceived parenting styles, depersonalisation, anxiety and coping behaviour in adolescents. *Personality And İndividual Differences*, *34*(3), 521-532.

Yalçın, F. & Türnüklü, A. (2011), The Relation Between Young Adults' Child Rearing Attitudes And Their Perception of Parental Behaviour, *e-Journal of New World Sciences Academy*, 6(1),717-735.

Yalçın, S. B. (2016). Aile içindeki değişmeyen en temel yapı: Aile. In Şeker, M. & Bulduklu, Y. (Eds.), Aile Sağlığı (pp. 2-20). Eskişehir: Anadolu Üniversitesi Yayınları.

Yalim, D. (2007). First year college adjustment: The role of coping, ego-resiliency, optimism and gender. *Unpublished doctoral dissertation.* Middle East Technical University, Ankara

Yavuz, B. G., Erensoy, İ. Y., Karamustafalıoğlu, O., Bakım, B., & Gündoğar, A. (2015). Effects of parental attitudes among a group of high school students in Istanbul. *Nöro Psikiyatri Arşivi*, *52*(1), 19.

Yavuzer, H. (2010). Yaygın anne baba tutumları. In Çocuk ve Ergen Eğitiminde Anne Baba Tutumları. Istanbul: Timaş.

Yavuzer, H. (2014). Çocuk Psikolojisi. 37th ed. Istanbul: Remzi Kitabevi.

Yıldız, K. (2017). *Ailelerde çocuk disiplini ve dindarlık ilişkisi.* Master's thesis, ESOGÜ, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Eskişehir.

Yılmaz A. (2001). Eşler arasındaki uyum: kuramsal yaklaşımlar ve görgül çalışmalar. *Aile ve Toplum Eğitim Kültür ve Araştırma Dergisi,* 1(4), 1-10.

Yılmaz, F. (2018). Robotlar Hayatımızda. *FSM İlmî Araştırmalar İnsan ve Toplum Bilimleri Dergisi*, (12), 109-120.

Youssef, C. M.,& Luthans, F. (2007). Positive organizational behavior in the workplace: The impact of hope, optimism, and resilience. *Journal of Management*, *33*(5), 774-800.

Zuravin, S. J.,& Taylor, R. (1987). The ecology of child maltreatment: identifying and characterizing high-risk neighborhoods. *Child Welfare*, *66*(6). 497-506

APPENDICES

A. INFORMED CONSENT FORM

BİLGİLENDİRİLMİŞ RIZA FORMU

Bu çalışma Yıldırım Beyazıt Üniversitesi Psikoloji Bölümü Yüksek Lisans öğrencisi Hatice Seher Özpehriz tarafından Yüksek Lisans Tezi kapsamında Ebeveyn Tutumları ve İyimserlik üzerine yapılan bir araştırma için yürütülmektedir. Çalışmaya katıldığınız takdirde bilgileriniz kesinlikle gizli kalacak ve başka amaçla kullanılmayacaktır. Eğer çalışmaya katılmayı kabul ediyorsanız lütfen aşağıdaki bölümleri doldurunuz.

Kendi rızam ile bu çalışmaya katılmayı kabul ediyorum.

Tarih:

İmza:

B. DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES FORM

BÖLÜM I

Fakülte: **Yaş :**

Sınıf : 1( ) 2( ) 3( ) 4() **Cinsiyet :** E ( ) K ( )

Annenizin Eğitim Durumu: **Babanızın Eğitim Durumu:**

Okur-yazar değil ( ) Okur-yazar değil ( )

İlkokul ( ) İlkokul ( )

Ortaokul ( ) Ortaokul ( )

Lise ( ) Lise ( )

Yüksek öğretim ( ) Yüksek öğretim ( )

Yaşamınızın çoğunu geçirdiğiniz yer: **Kaç Kardeşsiniz**

Şehir/Büyükşehir ( ) 1( ) 2( ) 3( ) 4( ) 5+( )

İlçe/Kasaba ( ) **Kaçıncı Kardeşsiniz**

Köy ( ) 1( ) 2( ) 3( ) 4( ) 5+( )

Ailenizin Sosyo-Ekonomik Durumu:

Çok Düşük ( )

Düşük ( )

Orta ( )

Yüksek ( )

Çok Yüksek ( )

C. OPTIMISM SCALE

Sayın Katılımcı,

Size, ebeveyn tutumları ilgili düşüncelerinizi temsil eden ve yaşama ait duygularınızı ifade eden cümlelerden oluşan iki farklı ölçek verilmiştir.

Araştırmanın güvenilir olması sizlerin ifadeleri samimi olarak değerlendirmenizebağlıdır. Lütfen her cümle için size en uygun ifadeyi (X) işareti koyarakbelirtiniz. Tüm maddeleri işaretlemeyiunutmayınız. Verdiğiniz bilgilerin gizliliği ve güvenliği araştırmacı tarafından korunacaktır. Yardımlarınız için teşekkür ederim.

BÖLÜM II

YÖNERGE: Aşağıda bazı ifadelere yer verilmiştir. Her bir ifadeyi dikkatlice okuduktan sonra size en uygun seçeneği (Bana göre hiç değil), (Bana göre değil), (Bazen benim gibi), (Tam benim gibi) (X) işaretleyiniz. Bu bir sınav değildir. Doğru veya yanlış cevap yoktur.		Bana göre hiç değil	Bana göre değil	Bazen benim gibi	Tam benim gibi
1	Yaşamaya devam edeceğimi sanmıyorum.	( )	( )	( )	( )
2	Zaman zaman yapamadığım şeyler oluyorsa da bundan dolayı umutsuzluğa kapılmam.	( )	( )	( )	( )
3	Nedense bütün aksilikler beni bulur.	( )	( )	( )	( )
4	Hayatta karşılaştığım her kötü olaydan mutlaka iyi bir sonuç çıkarırım.	( )	( )	( )	( )
5	Hangi yaşta olursam olayım yaşamın ilginç ve güzel yanlarını görmeye çalışırım.	( )	( )	( )	( )
6	Hiçbir şeyden kolay kolay mutlu olamıyorum, genellikle karamsar bir insanım.	( )	( )	( )	( )
7	Bazı konularda başarısız olduğumda, başarılı olacağım alanlar da olacağını düşünüyorum.	( )	( )	( )	( )
8	Bir kez başarısız olduğumda hep başarısız olacağımı düşünürüm.	( )	( )	( )	( )
9	Başıma bir şey geldiğinde kimsenin benimle ilgilenmeyeceğini düşünürüm.	( )	( )	( )	( )
10	Her ne kadar başarısız olsam bile kendimi başarısız bir insan gibi	( )	( )	( )	( )

	görmüyorum.				
11	Başkalarından daha kötü olduğumu düşünüyorum.	( )	( )	( )	( )
12	Zorluklarla karşılaştığımda mutlaka alternatif bir çıkış noktası bulacağıma inanırım.	( )	( )	( )	( )
13	Olumsuz yaşantılarımın ve düşüncelerimin günlük yaşamımı bozmasına izin vermem.	( )	( )	( )	( )
14	Her zaman kendime ikinci bir şans tanırım.	( )	( )	( )	( )
15	Her şeye rağmen hayatın yaşamaya değer olduğuna inanırım.	( )	( )	( )	( )
16	Üzüntülerimi sahip olduğum güzellikleri düşünerek unutmaya çalışırım.	( )	( )	( )	( )
17	Benim için başlayan her şey yeni bir umut demek.	( )	( )	( )	( )
18	Kendimi olduğum gibi kabul ediyorum.	( )	( )	( )	( )
19	Genelde benden daha az imkânı olan insanlara bakarak ne kadar şanslı olduğumu düşünürüm.	( )	( )	( )	( )
20	Her inişin bir çıkısı olduğunu düşünür ve umutsuzluğa kapılmam.	( )	( )	( )	( )
21	Ufak şeylerden bile haz duyarım.	( )	( )	( )	( )
22	Kötü olan her olay karşısında, dilimdeki sussa bile içimdeki umut ışığını söndürmemeye çalışırım.	( )	( )	( )	( )
23	Her acının sonunda mutluluk olduğuna inanırım.	( )	( )	( )	( )
24	Her şeye karşın yaşamaya evet diyebiliyorum.	( )	( )	( )	( )

D. PARENTS ATTITUDE SCALE

BÖLÜM III

ANA-BABA TUTUMU	Hiç uygun değil.	Pek uygun değil.	Biraz uygun.	Çok uygun.	Tamamen uygun
1. Bana her zaman güven duygusu vermiş ve beni sevdiğini hissettirmiştir.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
2. Çok yönlü gelişmem için beni olanakları ölçüsünde desteklemiştir.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
3. Her yaptığım isin olumlu yanlarını değil kusurlarını görmüş ve beni eleştirmiştir.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
4. Her zaman basıma kötü bir şey gelecekmiş gibi beni koruyup kollamaya çalışır.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
5. Aramızdaki ilişki ona içimi açmaya cesaret edemeyeceğim kadar resmidir.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
6. Arkadaşlarımı eve çağırmama izin verir, geldiklerinde onlara iyi davranırdı.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
7. Elinden geldiği kadar, her konuda benim fikrimi almaya özen gösterir.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
8. Çevremizdeki çocuklarla beni karsılaştırır, onların benden daha iyi olduklarını söylerdi.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
9. Bana hükmetmeye çalışır.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
10. Bugün bile alışverişe çıkacağım zaman, kandırılacağımı düşünerek benimle gelmek ister.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
11. Benden her zaman gücümün üstünde basarı beklemiştir.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
12. Fiziksel ve duygusal olarak kendisine yakın olmak istediğim zaman soğuk ve itici davranırdı.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
13. Sorunlarımı onunla rahatlıkla konuşabilirim.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
14. Neden bazı şeyleri yapma ya da yapmamam gerektiğini bana açıklar.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )

15. Birlikte olduğumuz zamanlar iliksimiz çok arkadaşçadır.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
16. Kendi istediği mesleği seçmem konusunda beni zorlamıştır.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
17. Sevmediğim yemekleri, bana yarayacağı düşüncesi ile zorla yedirirdi.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
18. Sınavlarda hep üstün basarı göstermemi istemiştir.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
19. Kendimi yönetebileceğim yaslarda bile gittiği her yere beni de götürür, benim evde yalnız kalmamdan kaygılanırdı.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
20. Evde bir konu tartışılırken görüşlerimi söylemem için beni teşvik eder.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
21. Küçük yasımdan itibaren ders çalımsa ve okuma alışkanlığı kazanmam konusunda bana yardımcı olmuştur.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
22. Küçüklüğümde bana yeterince vakit ayırır; parka, sinemaya götürmeyi ihmal etmezdi.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
23. Benim gibi bir evladı olduğu için kendini bahtsız hissettiğini sanıyorum.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
24. Okulda başarılı olmam konusunda beni zorlar, düşük not aldığımda beni cezalandırırdı.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
25. Beni kendi emellerine ulaştırmak için bir araç olarak kullanırdı.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
26. Beni daima yapabileceğimden fazlasını yapmaya zorlamıştır.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
27. Paramı nerelere harcadığımı ayrıntılı bir biçimde denetler.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
28. Her zaman, her iste kusursuz olmam gerektiği inancındadır.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
29. Ona yakınlaşmak istediğimde daima bana sıcak bir şekilde karşılık verir.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
30. Bana önemli ve değerli bir kişi olduğum inancını aşılamıştır.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
31. Cinsellik konusunda karsılaştığım sorunları kendisine anlatmak istediğimde hep ilgisiz kalmıştır.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
32. Benim iyiliğimi istediğini, benim için neyin iyi olduğunu ancak kendisinin bileceğini söyler.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
33. Her zaman nerede olduğumu ve ne yaptığımı merak eder.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
34. İyi bir is yaptığımda beni övmekten çok daha iyisini yapmam gerektiğini söyler.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
35. Cinsel konularda çok tutucu olduğu için onun yanında bu konulara ilgi gösteremem.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )

36. Aile ile ilgili kararlar alınırken benim de fikrimi öğrenmek ister.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
37. Beni olduğum gibi kabul etmiştir.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
38. Başkalarına benden daha çok önem verir ve onlara daha nazik davranır.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
39. Günlük olaylar hakkında anlattıklarımı ilgi ile dinler ve bana açıklayıcı cevaplar verir.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
40. Benimle genellikle sert bir tonda ve emrederek konuşur.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )

Appendix. E AYBU ETHICS COMMITTEE APPROVAL FORM

ANKARA YILDIRIM BEYAZIT ÜNİVERSİTESİ (AYBÜ) SOSYAL VE BEŞERİ BİLİMLER ETİK KURULU (SBEK) PROJE ONAY BELGESİ

Ankara Yıldırım Beyazıt Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Psikoloji bölümü öğrencilerinden Hatice Seher ÖZPEHRİZ'in, "The Investigation of University Students' Percieved Parenting Styles and their Optimism Levels in Terms of Some Variables" adlı araştırması değerlendirilmiştir.*(Bu kısım başvuru sahibi tarafından doldurulmalıdır)*

Proje etik açısından uygun bulunmuştur. [x]

Proje etik açısından geliştirilmesi gerekmektedir. [ ]

Proje etik açısından uygun bulunmamıştır. [ ]

SOSYAL VE BEŞERİ BİLİMLER ETİK KURULU KARARI (Etik Kurul tarafından doldurulacaktır)	
Araştırma kodu (Yıl – Araştırma sıra no)	544
Başvuru formunun Etik Kurula ulaştığı tarih	20.04.2017
Etik Kurul Karar toplantı tarihi ve karar no	10.09.2017/36
Yer	Yıldırım Beyazıt Üniversitesi, Esenboğa Külliyesi
Katılımcılar	Formda imzası bulunan üyelerimiz toplantıya katılmıştır.

KURUL BAŞKANI, BAŞKAN YARDIMCISI VE ÜYELER:

		İMZA
Prof. Dr. Cem Şafak ÇUKUR	**Başkan**	
Doç. Dr. Musa AYGÜL	**Başkan Yardımcısı**	katılmadı
Prof. Dr. Şükrü ÖZEN	**Üye**	
Prof. Dr. Ergün ERASLAN	**Üye**	katılmadı
Prof. Dr. Metin ÖZDEMİR	**Üye**	
Prof. Dr. Necmiye ÜN YILDIRIM	**Üye**	
Doç. Dr. Tekin AKDEMİR	**Üye**	
Doç. Dr. Rıza GÖKLER	**Üye**	katılmadı

Appendix. F AYBU APPROVAL

T.C.
ANKARA YILDIRIM BEYAZIT ÜNİVERSİTESİ REKTÖRLÜĞÜ
Genel Sekreterlik

Sayı :75265783-044-E.1805 17.01.2019
Konu :Anketler

Sayın Hatice Seher ÖZPEHRİZ
Aşağı Eğlence Mahallesi Martı Sokak Uhut Sitesi A-Blok Daire-3 Keçiören/ANKARA

İlgi : a) Bila tarihli dilekçeniz.
b) Etik Kurul Koordinatörlüğü'nün 14.01.2019 tarihli ve 84892257-044[044]-E.1772 sayılı yazısı.

İlgi (a) dilekçenize istinaden "Üniversite Öğrencilerinin Algılanan Ebeveyn Tutumları ve İyimserlik Düzeylerinin Bazı Değişkenler Açısından İncelenmesi" konulu tez çalışmanız Üniversitemiz Etik Kurul Koordinatörlüğünce incelenmiştir. Çalışma verilerinin Üniversitemizde toplanması konusnda etik açıdan bir sıkıntı olmadığı ilgi (b) yazıda görülmüş olup, anket uygulamanız uygun görülmüştür.

Bilgilerinizi ve gereğini rica ederim.

e-imzalıdır
Suat CİHANGİR
Rektör a.
Genel Sekreter

Huzeyfe KAYNAKCI
Taşınır Kayıt Yetkilisi

Belgenin Aslı 5070 Sayılı Kanuna Göre Elektronik İmzalıdır.
18.01.2019

5070 sayılı Elektronik İmza Yasası gereği bu belge güvenli elektronik imza ile imzalanmıştır.

Adres: Ankara Yıldırım Beyazıt Üniversitesi Esenboğa Külliyesi Dumlupınar Mahallesi Esenboğa/Ankara
Telefon: 0312 906 2000
Faks: 0312 906 2950

Bilgi için:Huzeyfe KAYNAKCI
Hizmetli
Telefon No:(312) 906 10 18

0 - 224500 - 224500 - 224500 - 224500 - 22

Appendix. G NEU APPROVAL

KONYA

T.C.
NECMETTİN ERBAKAN ÜNİVERSİTESİ REKTÖRLÜĞÜ
Öğrenci İşleri Daire Başkanlığı

Sayı : 48178250. 302.15.06 -001
Konu : Uygulama İzni

02 -01- 2017

Sayın: H. Seher ÖZPERHİZ

"Üniversite Öğrencilerinin Algılanan Ebeveyn Tutumları ve İyimserlik Düzeylerinin Bazı Değişkenler Açısından İncelenmesi" konulu tez çalışmanız ile ilgili Pedagojik Formasyon Eğitimi Sertifika Programı ve Ahmet Keleşoğlu Eğitim Fakültesi'nde öğrenim gören öğrencilere uygulama yapma isteğiniz Rektörlüğümüzce uygun görülmüştür.

Bilgilerinizi rica ederim.

Prof. Dr. Önder KUTLU
Rektör a.
Rektör Yardımcısı

Nişantaşı Mah. Dr. Hulusi Baybal Cad. No:12 Kat 18 Selçuklu/KONYA / TÜRKİYE

Telefon: (0 332) 221 06 00 Faks: (0 332) 236 21 85 Elektronik Ağ: www.konya.edu.tr

Evrak Tarih ve Sayısı: 05/12/2018-E.28357

Appendix.H SELÇUK UNIVERSITY APPROVAL

T.C.
SELÇUK ÜNİVERSİTESİ REKTÖRLÜĞÜ
Öğrenci İşleri Daire Başkanlığı

Sayı : 25669789-044/
Konu : Anket İzni (H.Seher ÖZPEHRİZ)

Sayın H.Seher ÖZPEHRİZ

"Üniversite Öğrencilerinin Algılanan Ebeveyn Tutumları ve İyimserlik Düzeylerinin Bazı Değişkenler Açısından İncelenmesi" konulu tez çalışmanız kapsamında Üniversitemiz öğrencilerine anket yapma isteğiniz Rektörlüğümüzce uygun görülmüştür.

Bilgilerinizi rica ederim.

e-imzalıdır
Prof. Dr. Mustafa ŞAHİN
Rektör

BELGENİN ASLI
ELEKTRONİK İMZALIDIR
06/12/2018

Saliha KAYA
Şef

Evrakı Doğrulamak İçin : http://193.255.244.181/enVision-Sorgula/Validate_Doc.aspx?V=BEND52SJ2
Akademi Mah. Yeni İstanbul Cad. No:369 Pk:42130 Selçuklu/KONYA
Bilgi için: Saliha KAYA Tel:03322238026 Faks:0332 223 80 20
e-Posta :ogrisleri@selcuk.edu.tr Elektronik Ağ :www.selcuk.edu.tr selcukuniversitesi@hs01.kep.tr

Appendix.I KAMU APPROVAL

Evrak Tarih ve Sayısı: 06.12.2018-E.33374

T.C.
KARAMANOĞLU MEHMETBEY ÜNİVERSİTESİ REKTÖRLÜĞÜ
Öğrenci İşleri Daire Başkanlığı

BEAC3LMF8

Sayı : 36321956-044-E.33374 06.12.2018
Konu: Anket İzni

Sayın Hatice Seher ÖZPEHRİZ
Alacaatlı Mahallesi Fark Caddesi 3373/2 Sokak Fark Familya Evleri
Çankaya/ANKARA

İlgi: 05.12.2018 tarihli ve 12938 sayılı başvurunuz.

"Üniversite Öğrencilerinin Algılanan Ebeveyn Tutumları ve İyimserlik Düzeylerinin Bazı Değişkenler Açışından İncelenmesi" konulu teziniz ile ilgili hazırladığınız anketinizi, Üniversitemiz öğrencilerine uygulama talebiniz uygun görülmüştür.

Bilgilerinizi rica ederim.

Ahmet TÜFEKCİ
Genel Sekreter

BU BELGE ELEKTRONİK İMZALI
ASLI İLE AYNIDIR
06/12/2018
Öğrenci İşleri Daire Başkanlığı
Nesrin DERİNKUYU
Bilgisayar İşletmeni

Mevcut Elektronik İmzalar

AHMET TÜFEKCİ (Genel Sekreterlik - Genel Sekreter) 06.12.2018 11:53

Evrakı Doğrulamak İçin : https://dogrulama.kmu.edu.tr/enVision-Sorgula/validate_doc.aspx?V=BEAC3LMF8

Yunus Emre Yerleşkesi 70100 / KARAMAN
Tel:0 338 226 2063 Belgegeçer :0 338 226 20 70
E-Posta :ogrenci@kmu.edu.tr Elektronik Ağ :http://kmu.edu.tr/ogris
Ayrıntılı Bilgi için İrtibat: Nesrin Derinkuyu
Bilgisayar İşletmeni
Telefon No: 0 338 226 2066

Bu belge, 5070 sayılı Elektronik İmza Kanununa göre Güvenli Elektronik İmza ile imzalanmıştır.

Appendix.J İSZU APPROVAL

Evrak Tarih ve Sayısı: 06/02/2019-E.611

İstanbul Zaim Üniversitesi

REKTÖRLÜĞÜ

Sayı : 33121373-044
Konu : Anket Uygulama İzni

Sayın Hatice Seher ÖZPEHRİZ

Yıldırım Beyazıt Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Psikoloji Anabilim Dalı'nda öğrenim gördüğünüz yüksek lisans programında "Üniversite Öğrencilerinin Algılanan Ebeveyn Tutumları ve İyimserlik Düzeylerinin Bazı Değişkenler Açısından İncelenmesi" başlıklı tez çalışmanızın anket sorularını, Üniversitemiz öğrencilerine uygulama yapma talebiniz uygun görülmüştür.

Bilgilerinizi rica ederim.

e-imzalıdır
Prof. Dr. Mehmet BULUT
Rektör

Mevcut Elektronik İmzalar

Evrak Doğrulama için : https://ebys.izu.edu.tr/enVision/Dogrula/K46RLA

MEHMET BULUT (Rektörlük - Rektör) 06/02/2019 15:20

Adres :Halkalı Caddesi No: 2 Küçükçekmece/İstanbul
Telefon No : 444 97 98 Faks No: +90 (212) 693 82 29
E-Posta : bilgi@izu.edu.tr İnternet Adresi: www.izu.edu.tr
Kep : izu@hs01.kep.tr

Ayrıntılı Bilgi : Yurdagül TAŞ
Unvan : Uzman
Tel : 2126929642

Bu belge, 5070 sayılı Elektronik İmza Kanununa Göre Güvenli Elektronik İmza ile imzalanmıştır

Appendix.K OPTIMISM SCALE APPLICATION APPROVAL

İyimserlik Ölçeği
3 ileti

Seher Ozpehriz <hsozpehriz@gmail.com> 8 Şub 2017 Çar, 18:16
Alıcı: balseher@yahoo.com, mugesenol@yahoo.com

Değerli Hocam,

Ben Yıldırım Beyazıt Üniversitesi Psikoloji Bölümü Yüksek Lisans Öğrencisi Hatice Seher Özpehriz. Eğer izininiz olursa "Üniversite Öğrencilerinin Algılanan Ebeveyn Tutumları ile İyimserlik Düzeylerinin Bazı Değişkenler Açısından İncelenmesi." konulu tezimde sizlerin geliştirmiş olduğu "İyimserlik Ölçeğini " kullanmak istiyorum. Vereceğiniz katkılardan dolayı şimdiden teşekkür ederim.

Saygılarımla,

Hatice Seher ÖZPEHRİZ

seher balcÿfffffffffffffffffd <balseher@yahoo.com> 10 Şub 2017 Cum, 16:46
Yanıt adresi: seher balcÿfffffffffffffffffd <balseher@yahoo.com>
Alıcı: Seher Ozpehriz <hsozpehriz@gmail.com>

Seher Merhaba
ölçeğimizi tabii ki kullanabilirsiniz anladığım kadarı ile elinizde ölçek mevcut sadece sizden ricamız uygulama sonuçlarını bizimle paylaşırsanız seviniriz
kolay gelsin iyi çalışmalar
Prof. Dr. Seher BALCI ÇELİK

From: Seher Ozpehriz <hsozpehriz@gmail.com>
To: balseher@yahoo.com; mugesenol@yahoo.com
Sent: Wednesday, February 8, 2017 5:16 PM
Subject: İyimserlik Ölçeği
[Alıntılanan metin gizlendi]

Seher Ozpehriz <hsozpehriz@gmail.com> 10 Şub 2017 Cum, 17:30
Alıcı: seher balcÿfffffffffffffffffd <balseher@yahoo.com>

Çok teşekkürler hocam. Evet ölçek elimde mevcut. Sonuçları tabii ki gönderirim inşallah.

Saygılarımla,
H.Seher Özpehriz

10 Şubat 2017 15:43 tarihinde seher balcÿfffffffffffffffffd <balseher@yahoo.com> yazdı:

Appendix.L PARENTS ATTITUDE SCALE APPLICATION APPROVAL

ölçek izni
2 ileti

JALE ELDELEKLİOĞLU <eldelek@uludag.edu.tr> 14 Şub 2017 Sal, 22:55
Alıcı: Seher Ozpehriz <hsozpehriz@gmail.com>

Merhaba Seher,
Ölçeği üniversite öğrencileri için kullanabilirsin teşekkürler.

Seher Ozpehriz <hsozpehriz@gmail.com> 16 Şub 2017 Per, 11:45
Alıcı: JALE ELDELEKLİOĞLU <eldelek@uludag.edu.tr>

Çok teşekkür ederim hocam.

İyi günler diliyorum,
H.Seher Özpehriz

APPENDIX M. THESIS PHOTOCOPY PERMISSION

TEZ FOTOKOPİSİ İZİN FORMU

ENSTİTÜ

Fen Bilimleri Enstitüsü ☐

Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü ☐

YAZARIN

Soyadı :
Adı :
Bölümü :

TEZİN ADI:

TEZİN TÜRÜ : Yüksek Lisans ☐ Doktora ☐

1. Tezimin tamamından kaynak gösterilmek şartıyla fotokopi alınabilir. ☐
2. Tezimin içindekiler sayfası, özet, indeks sayfalarından ve/veya bir bölümünden kaynak gösterilmek şartıyla fotokopi alınabilir. ☐
3. Tezimden bir (1) yıl süreyle fotokopi alınamaz. ☐

TEZİN KÜTÜPHANEYE TESLİM TARİHİ: