

ANALYSIS OF HOPELESSNESS LEVELS OF THE STUDENTS STUDYING IN THE FACULTY OF SPORTS SCIENCES IN TERMS OF NUMEROUS VARIABLES¹

Levent BAYRAM¹

Deniz Özge
YÜCELOĞLU KESKİN¹

Deniz Günay
DEREBAŞI¹

ABSTRACT

This study aims to determine the hopelessness levels of the students receiving education in the Faculty of Sports Sciences, to find out whether there is a significant difference in the hopelessness levels of the students in terms of gender, age, number of siblings, income levels, togetherness of the parents and variables of communication with the family, and to analyze the relationship between the parental attitudes and the hopelessness levels. The research was carried out on 395 students (267 female students and 128 male students) receiving education in the Faculty of Sports Sciences at Ondokuz Mayıs University.

In this research, "Personal Information Form" prepared by the researchers was used in order to specify certain demographic features of the subjects; Beck Hopelessness Scale developed by Beck et al. (1974) and consisting of 20 items in total was utilized for gathering the data related to the hopelessness levels of the students, and "Parental Attitude Scale" developed by Kuzgun and Eldeleklioğlu (1993) was used in order to evaluate the attitudes of the parents of adolescents and adults.

The assumptions of normality of the data obtained in this study were tested by means of Kolmogorov-Smirnov test in SPSS Release 17.00 package program, and it was observed that they did not demonstrate a normal distribution. In the study, paired comparison was made with Mann Whitney U test while the groups of three or more were analyzed by means of Kruskal Wallis test and by using Spearman's Rho Correlation Analysis. Arithmetic average, standard deviation and minimum-maximum values were also analyzed.

In our study, it was found out that the average scores of all participating students were in the score interval of 4-8 (4.77±3.65), which was interpreted as a mild level of hopelessness. In accordance with these results, it can be suggested that the students receiving education in the Faculty of Sports Sciences are not hopeless for the future.

Keywords: Parental Attitude, Sports Sciences, Hopelessness

SPOR BİLİMLERİ FAKÜLTESİNDE ÖĞRENİM GÖREN ÖĞRENCİLERİN UMUTSUZLUK DÜZEYLERİNİN ÇEŞİTLİ DEĞİŞKENLER BAKIMINDAN İNCELENMESİ

ÖZ

Bu çalışmanın amacı Spor Bilimleri Fakültesinde öğrenim gören öğrencilerin umutsuzluk düzeyini belirlemek; cinsiyet, yaş, kardeş sayısı, gelir düzeyi, anne babanın birlikte olup olmama durumu ve aile ile iletişim değişkenleri açısından öğrencilerin umutsuzluk düzeylerinde anlamlı bir farklılık olup olmadığını araştırmak ve anne baba tutumları ile umutsuzluk düzeyleri arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesidir. Araştırma Ondokuz Mayıs Üniversitesi Spor Bilimleri Fakültesinde öğrenim gören 267 kız, 128 erkek öğrenci olmak üzere toplam 395 öğrenciye uygulanmıştır.

Araştırmada katılımcıların bazı demografik özelliklerine bakmak için araştırmacılar tarafından hazırlanan "Kişisel Bilgi Formu", öğrencilerin umutsuzluk düzeylerine yönelik verilerin toplanmasında Beck ve ark. (1974) tarafından geliştirilen toplam 20 maddeden oluşan Beck Umutsuzluk Ölçeği, ergenlerin ve yetişkinlerin anne babalarının tutumlarını ölçmek amacıyla Kuzgun ve Eldeleklioğlu (1993) tarafından geliştirilen "Anne Baba Tutum Ölçeği" kullanılmıştır.

Elde edilen verilerin normallik varsayımı gösterip göstermediği SPSS Release 17.00 paket programında Kolmogorov-Smirnov testi ile test edilmiş ve normal dağılım göstermedikleri görülmüştür. Çalışmada ikili karşılaştırmalara Mann Whitney U testi ile üç veya daha yukarıdaki gruplarda ise Kruskal Wallis testi ile bakılmış olup, Spearman's Rho Korelasyon analizi kullanılmıştır. Ayrıca aritmetik ortalama, standart sapma ve minimum, maksimum değerlerine de bakılmıştır.

Çalışmamıza katılan tüm öğrencilerin umutsuzluk düzeyi puan ortalamalarının (4.77±3.65) 4-8 puan aralığı, hafif umutsuzluk düzeyinde olduğu görülmektedir. Bu sonuçlar doğrultusunda Spor Bilimleri Fakültesinde öğrenim gören öğrencilerin gelecekte umutsuz olmadığı söylenebilir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Anne Baba Tutumu, Spor Bilimleri, Umutsuzluk

¹ Ondokuz Mayıs University, Yaşar East Sports Sciences Faculty

INTRODUCTION

Along with university education, certain issues to be dealt with such as social, personal, cognitive, professional, and family problems become a part of adolescent lives. Some of these problems may occur in a way that the adolescent has never experienced before. Individuals can find themselves within a state of confusion and trauma when they face a problem that they are not emotionally ready for, and not aware of how to deal with. Due to these confusions, university life poses highly emotional intensities in the life of an adolescent. One of these emotional spirals is hopelessness. Hopelessness is the feeling of not expecting any positive developments during any time period of life. While this can be a feeling that affects all aspects of life, it can also be limited with certain issues.

NANDA (North American Nursing Diagnosis Association) accepted hopelessness as a nursing diagnosis in 1986, and defined it as “a state in which the individual can see only limited or no alternatives, or cannot find personal options and make effort for his/her own benefit” (Öz, 2010).

Hope and hopelessness are represented with opposite expectations. While hope predicts the success of the plans to reach the aim; hopelessness holds the impression of failure. These two extreme expectations can differ based on the individual, situation, when the expected situation occurs, and how it occurs. These plans and expectations also affect the quality of the aim, and how the individual has set his/her plans towards it (as cited in Okumuş et al., 2013).

What lies beneath the feeling of hopelessness is anxiety about the future. After graduating from university, students

find themselves in business life or unemployed. Job preference, plans for their role in real life, friends, the fear of being unemployed, and responsibilities are some of the factors that cause anxiety for an individual (Çakmak and Hevedanlı, 2004).

It is almost impossible to isolate university students from their concerns about the future. Although hopelessness is caused by the current negative conditions and limitations, it can increase or decrease based on certain factors such as personality traits, upbringing, the socioeconomic status of the individual or their family, and family communication. Every behavior and approach that the child is exposed to in a family plays an important role in the formation of personality, and in how the individual will react to future situations.

Parents are the first teachers of their children. From the minute their child is born, they protect them from the outside world and teach them life. The upbringing styles of a family during the childhood and teenage years of an individual have a significant effect on psychosocial development (Alpoğuz Umucu, 2014). These styles have a great influence on forming personality traits, and raising self-confident and successful individuals. In this regard, a lot of research in the area of social psychology has been done based on parenting styles and their effects, and different perspectives have been developed (Nimsi, 2006). “The “instable and irresolute” approach of parents has a negative effect on the education and development of a child. While instability and inconsistency can be caused by divergence between parents, it can also be due to their changeable behavior (Yavuzer, 2004).” “Parents who take all responsibility, and leave none for their child raise individuals who are not

capable of forming their own life, and need to be directed by others. People who are raised in these types of families usually consider others responsible for the things that happen in their life rather than taking responsibility themselves (Cüceoğlu, 2005).” A child who has been raised with this style will never find the courage to do something alone, and will always need the help of his/her parents. This will damage the personality of the child, and hinder the maturing process (Ertuğrul, 2005). Displaying excessive tolerance, love and affection will prevent the formation of some values that a child needs to gain. When the child is raised in an overprotected environment and shown too much love, affection and attention, the capability of being autonomous will decline, and the child will chose to step back from individual involvement (Altinköprü, 2003). “Since parents with a judgmental approach constantly evaluate the behavior of their child as “good”, “bad”, “shameful”, this approach embeds

into the child at a very young age. While this judgmental approach is not effective for changing the negative behavior of a child, it may cause the child to embrace the feeling of hopelessness (Cüceoğlu, 1996).” If parents want to raise self-confident and mentally healthy individuals, they need to give their children the opportunity to express their feelings (Kaya and Uzunoğlu, 2003). It is important that parents form a good relationship with their child, and become aware of what problems the child is facing, how the child identifies these problems, and what kind of solutions that he/she suggests (Cüceoğlu, 2006).

This research is based on considering the different aspects of the factors that affect the hopelessness level of university students; forming a frame for measures to be taken in order to use their time in a more effective way during this important period of their lives; and understanding the effects of parenting styles on the individual during their university years.

MATERIAL AND METHOD

The research was conducted with a total of 395 students (267 female, 128 male) studying in Ondokuz Mayıs University Faculty of Sport Sciences. A “Personal Information Form” prepared by the researchers and some demographic features of the participants were used to collect data. The Beck Hopelessness Scale, which consists of 20 items and was developed by Beck et al. (1974), was used to measure the hopelessness level of students. The detected parenting styles were measured with the “Parenting Style Scale”.

The future hopelessness level of the students was determined with the Beck Hopelessness Scale; which consists of 20

items, was developed by Beck et al. (1974), and tested for validity and reliability by Seber (1991) and Durak (1994). The Cronbach Alpha internal consistency coefficient of the scale was found $\alpha=.86$ by Seber (1991) and $\alpha=.85$ by Durak (1994). The items are graded as 0 and 1. One point is given to each “no” for questions 1, 3, 5, 6, 8, 10, 13,15 ,19; and to each “yes” for questions 2, 4, 7, 9, 11, 12, 14, 16, 17, 18, 20. The highest score that can be received is 20. It is believed that the increase in the score is directly proportional with a high level of hopelessness (Deveci et al., 2011).

Beck and Steer (1988) categorized participants into four groups based on their answers. According to this, the hopelessness level is scored as: 0 –3

none, 4 – 8 mild hopelessness, 9 – 14 moderate hopelessness, 15 – 20 severe hopelessness.

The “Parenting Style Scale” used in the research was developed by Kuzgun and Eldeleklioğlu (1993) in order to measure the parenting styles chosen by the parents of adolescents and adults. The scale consists of 40 items; 15 measuring the democratic style, 15 measuring the protective style, 10 measuring the authoritarian style. Participants chose the most suitable one for themselves among the options: “Strongly disagree”, “Disagree”, “Neither disagree nor agree”, “Agree”, “Strongly agree”. “Strongly disagree” was scored as 1 point, “Disagree” as 2 points, “Neither disagree nor agree” as 3 points, “Agree” as 4 points, “Strongly agree” as 5 points (as cited in Gönen, 2014). For the democratic style and protective style subscales, the highest and lowest scores are respectively 75, 15. The highest and

lowest scores for the authoritarian style subscale are respectively 50, 10.

The democratic style is measured with the items: 1, 2, 6, 7, 13, 14, 15, 20, 21, 22, 29, 30, 36, 37, 39;

The protective style with the items: 4, 9, 10, 11, 17, 18, 19, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 32, 33, 34;

The authoritarian style with the items: 3, 5, 8, 12, 16, 23, 31, 35, 38, 40 (as cited in Aktaş, 2011).

The Kolmogorov-Smirnov test in the SPSS Release 17.00 packet program was used to test the normality hypothesis of the collected results, and it was seen that they did not show a normal distribution. The Mann Whitney U test was used for paired comparisons, the Kruskal Wallis test for three and higher groups, and the Spearman’s Rho Correlation analysis was used in the research. Also, arithmetic mean, standard deviation and minimum, maximum values were considered.

RESULTS

Table 1. The Hopelessness Level Scores of the Students in the Faculty of Sport Sciences

Parameter	N	Minimum	Maximum	\bar{x}	SD
Hopelessness	395	0	18	4.759	3.655

According to Table 1, the point average of the hopelessness level was determined as 4.76, and the standard deviation was determined as 3.655. The hopelessness level point average of the students that took place in our study (4.76 ± 3.66)

indicated a mild hopelessness level according to the categorization of Beck and Steer (1988). Based on these results, it can be said that the students in the Faculty of Sport Sciences are slightly hopeless.

Table 2. The Comparison of University Students Hopelessness Scale Points Based on the Some Variables

	Parameter	N	Median	Minimum	Range	P
Gender	Female	267	3,50	0-18	18	0.072
	Male	128	4	0-18	18	
Age	Between 18-20	154	3	0-17	17	0.069
	Between 21-24	205	4	0-18	18	
	25 and above	36	4	0-14	14	
Family Income Level	500-800	74	3	0-17	17	0.070
	801-1500	157	4	0-18	18	
	1501-2000	92	4	0-17	17	
	2001 and above	72	3	0-18	18	
Parent Togetherness	Together	340	4	0-18	18	0.590
	Separate	55	4	0-17	17	
	Dead	25	4	1-14	13	
Communication with Family	None	9	8 ^a	2-13	11	0.015
	Weekly 1-2	100	4 ^{ab}	0-17	17	
	Weekly 3-5	105	4 ^{ab}	0-14	14	
	Weekly 6-7	181	3 ^b	0-18	18	
Mother Education	Illiterate	39	4	0-13	13	0.527
	Elementary	231	4	0-18	18	
	Middle School	54	4	1-17	16	
	High School	40	3	0-18	18	
	University and higher	30	3.50	1-17	16	
Father Education	Illiterate	26	4	0-11	11	0.520
	Elementary	140	4	0-16	16	
	Middle School	75	4	0-17	17	
	High School	97	3	0-18	18	
	University and higher	56	3.50	0-18	18	

As a result of the test conducted in order to determine whether the Beck Hopelessness Scale Scores differed based on gender, there was no statistical difference found among the median points of the groups ($p>0.05$), according to Table 2.

According to the analysis conducted in order to determine whether the hopelessness scores of the students differed based on age, there was no a statistically significant difference among the median points ($p>0.05$).

When the Hopelessness Scale scores of the students were examined based on income level, it was seen that there was no statistically significant difference among the groups ($p>0.05$).

When the Hopelessness Scale scores of the students were examined based on togetherness of parents, a statistically significant difference was not determined among the groups ($p>0.05$). When the Beck Hopelessness Scale scores were analyzed according to the parameter Family Communication, a statistically significant difference was determined

between the group that had no weekly communication with family and the group that communicated with family 6-7 times a week ($p < 0.05$).

Based on the parameters Mother Education and Father Education, the Hopelessness Scale scores show no statistically significant difference among the groups ($p > 0.05$).

Table 3. The Parenting Style Scale Sub-Dimension Scores of Students in the Faculty of Sport Sciences

Parameter	N	Min	Max	\bar{x}	SD
Democratic	395	18	83	57.110	11.570
Authoritarian	395	12	61	23.886	7.157
Protective	395	14	86	37.205	10.469

The Parenting Style Scale Sub-Dimension Scores of Students in the Faculty of Sport Sciences can be seen in Table 3. According to this; the point average of the democratic style sub-dimension was determined as 57.22, the authoritarian style sub-dimension as 23.82, the protective style sub-dimension as 37.2051. For the democratic style and protective style sub-dimensions, the highest and lowest points that can be scored are respectively 75, 15. The highest and lowest points that can be scored for the authoritarian style sub-dimension is respectively 50, 10 (as cited in Aktaş, 2011).

Table 4. The Relation between the Parenting Style Scale Sub-Dimension Scores and the Hopelessness Scale Scores of the Students in the Faculty of Sport Sciences

Parameter		Protective	Authoritarian	Hopelessness
Democratic	r	-.236**	-.468**	-.197**
	p	0	0	0
Protective	r	1	.496**	.188**
	p	.	0	0
Authoritarian	r	.496**	1	.283**
	p	0	.	0
Hopelessness	r	.188**	.283**	1
	p	0	0	.

According to Table 4, there is a negatively significant relation between the democratic parenting style levels and the protective parenting style levels; between the democratic parenting style levels and the authoritarian parenting style levels; and between the democratic parenting style levels and hopelessness levels.

There is a positively significant connection between the protective parenting style and hopelessness levels; between the protective parenting style and authoritarian parenting style; and between the authoritarian parenting style and hopelessness levels (Table 4).

DISCUSSION

The aim of this study is determine the hopelessness level of students studying in Ondokuz Mayıs University Faculty of

Sport Sciences; and to research whether variables such as gender, age, number of siblings, income level, parent togetherness and family communication

affect the hopelessness level of the student. The research was conducted with the participation of 395 students studying in the Faculty of Sport Sciences.

In our study, it was discovered that the hopelessness level of students is at a mild level which is a 4 – 8 score range (4.76 ± 3.66). Based on this, it can be stated that the students studying in the Faculty of Sport Sciences are slightly hopeless. Şahin (2009) studied hopelessness levels based on several variables, and discovered that the scores of the students in the Faculty of Education indicated that their hopelessness level was between mild hopeless and moderate hopelessness. Ulucan et al. (2011) found that the hopelessness of students studying in Physical Education and Sport Schools were at a moderate level.

In our study, a significant difference was not found among hopelessness levels based on gender.

Doğan (2012) conducted a study on art teacher candidates, and discovered that there was not a significant difference between the hopelessness levels of female and male students ($p > 0.05$).

Based on a study done by Dursun and Aytaç (2012), it was detected the hopelessness level of female university students was statistically higher than the hopelessness level of male students. The expectation of being exposed to gender discrimination when stepping into the business world can negatively influence the anxiety and hopelessness level of female students. In addition, it can also be considered that the emotional approach of females towards life and situations may cause an increase in their level of future anxiety (Karagün and Çolak, 2009).

Tekin and Filiz (2008) conducted a study on students studying in the Department Coaching Education and Sport Management at Physical Education and Sport Schools. According to this study, the hopelessness level of students showed a great difference based on the father education variable while a significant difference was not detected among this level when based on gender. The hopelessness level of students whose fathers were illiterate was found to be higher when compared to those whose fathers were elementary, high school graduates.

In our study, a significant difference was not detected among student hopelessness levels based on gender.

Üstün et al. (2014) found that based on age, there was a statistically great difference among the total hopelessness scores of senior students. It was determined that the total hopelessness scores of the individuals in the 20-age group were lower than the scores of those in the 22, 23, 24 and above age groups; the total hopelessness scores of the individuals in the 21-age group were lower than the scores of those in the 23, 24 and above age groups; and the hopelessness scores of the individuals in the 22-age group were lower than the scores of those in the 23-age group ($p < 0.05$).

According to our research; based on the number of siblings, monthly income, mother education and father education, there was not a significant difference among the total hopelessness scores of students in the Faculty of Sport Sciences.

Based on the mother and father education variable, a significant difference was not found among the average hopelessness scores of the university students. This can be explained

by the fact that university students are not really under the influence of family anymore. University students are in a state of constant development, in which they develop self-efficiency and become a part of different friendship environments. All of these affect their personal perspective on perceiving and reacting to events.

Şahin (2009) found that based on the mother and father education variable, there was not a statistically significant difference among the hopelessness scores of the students studying in the faculty of education.

As a result of the conducted statistical analysis, it was determined that there was a great difference between the hopelessness scores of male and female students.

In the same study, Şahin (2009) found that the hopelessness score averages of female students were lower compared to the opposite gender when based on the gender variable.

The hopelessness level scores of students with a low income ($7,07\pm 4,43$) showed to be higher when compared to those with a middle ($5,15\pm 4,23$) and high ($5,60\pm 2,96$) income level. It is possible that students feel hopeless about the future because they believe their low income might hinder their future plans or have a negative effect on their education.

Kodan (2013) did not come across a meaningful difference among the hopelessness score averages based on socioeconomic level.

In our study, a statistically important difference was identified among the hopelessness scores based on family communication ($p<0.05$). There was a significant difference between the group

that had no weekly communication with family and the group that communicated with family 6-7 times a week. It was seen that the hopelessness level of students who communicated with their family was low while this level was high for students who did not communicate with their family.

For the students in the Faculty of Sport Sciences, there is a negatively significant relation between the democratic parenting style levels and the protective parenting style levels; between the democratic parenting style levels and the authoritarian parenting style levels; and between the democratic parenting style levels and hopelessness levels.

On the other hand, there is a positively significant relation between the protective parenting style and hopelessness levels; between the protective parenting style and authoritarian parenting style; and between the authoritarian parenting style and hopelessness levels.

CONCLUSION

In this research, the hopelessness level of students in the Faculty of Sport Sciences was examined based on several variables.

According to the collected results, the hopelessness level score average of the students in the Faculty of Sport Sciences was determined as 4.76. Based on this, it can be said that the hopelessness level of the students is at a mild level.

Based on several variables such as age, gender, number of siblings, parent togetherness, and mother and father education level, a significant difference was found among the hopelessness levels of the students studying in the Faculty of Sport Sciences ($p<0.05$). A statistically significant difference was identified between the group that had no weekly communication with family and

the group that communicated with family 6-7 times a week. It was seen that the hopelessness level of students who communicated with their family was low while this level was high for students who

did not communicate with their family. It can be said that frequent communication and strong family bonds decrease the level of future hopelessness.

REFERENCES

1. Aktaş S., "9. Sınıfta Anne Baba Tutumları ve Benlik Saygısı Arasındaki İlişkinin Bazı Değişkenler Açısından İncelenmesi" Yüksek Lisans Tezi. Selçuk Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü Eğitim Bilimleri Anabilim Dalı Psikolojik Danışma Ve Rehberlik Bilim Dalı. Konya, 2011. [In Turkish]
2. Umucu Alpoğuz D., "Algılanan Ana-Baba Tutumlarının İlköğretim Öğrencilerinin Okumaya Yönelik Tutumlarına ve Türkçe Dersi Akademik Başarılarına Etkisi" Yüksek Lisans Tezi. Ahi Evran Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü. Kırşehir, 2014. [In Turkish]
3. Altinköprü T., "Eğitim Açısından Çocuk Psikolojisi Çocuğun Başarısı Nasıl Sağlanır?" Hayat Yayıncılık, 11. Baskı. İstanbul, 2003. [In Turkish]
4. Beck A.T., Steer R.A., "Beck Hopelessness Scale Manual" San Antonio, TX: Psychological Corporation. 1988.
5. Deveci S.E., Ulutaşdemir N. ve Açık Y., "Bir Mesleki Eğitim Merkezi Öğrencilerinde Umutsuzluk Düzeyi ve Etkileyen Faktörler" Dicle Tıp Dergisi. Cilt: 38, Sayı:3.pp.312-317.2011. [In Turkish]
6. Cüceloğlu D., "Yeniden İnsan İnsana" Remzi Kitabevi. 13. Basım. İstanbul, 1996. [In Turkish]
7. Cüceloğlu D., "İçimizdeki Çocuk. Remzi Kitabevi, 36. Basım, İstanbul, 2005. [In Turkish]
8. Cüceloğlu D., "Başarıya Götüren Aile. Sınava Döneminde Anababalık" Remzi Kitabevi, 1. Basım. İstanbul, 2006. [In Turkish]
9. Doğan P., "Resim Öğretmeni Adaylarının Umutsuzluk Düzeylerinin İncelenmesi" M.Ü. Atatürk Eğitim Fakültesi Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi. Sayı: 36.pp.115-127. 2012. [In Turkish]
10. Durak A., "Beck Umutsuzluk Ölçeğinin Geçerlik ve Güvenirlik Çalışması" Türk Psikoloji Dergisi. Cilt: 9, Sayı: 31.pp.1-11. 1994. [In Turkish]
11. Dursun S., Aytaç S., "Üniversite Öğrencilerinin İşgücü Piyasasına Yönelik Beklentileri Ve İş Deneyimleri İle Umutsuzluk ve Kaygı Düzeyleri Arasındaki İlişki Üzerine Bir Araştırma" Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi. Cilt:10, Sayı:1. Doç. Dr. Mustafa Aksoy Armağan Sayısı. Mart 2012. [In Turkish]
12. Erdem A.R., "İlköğretimimizin Gelişimi ve Bugün Gelinek Nokta" Üniversite-Toplum Dergisi. Cilt 5, Sayı:2. 2005. [In Turkish]
13. Gönen G., "Algılanan Anne Baba Tutumunun Üniversite Öğrencilerin Bilişsel Çarpıtmaları Ve Kişilik Yapıları İle İlişkisi" Yüksek Lisans Tezi. Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü. 2014. [In Turkish]
14. Karagün E., Çolak, S., "KPSS Sınavına Hazırlanan Beden Eğitimi Ve Spor Öğretmenliği Bölümü Son Sınıf Öğrencilerinin Kaygı Düzeylerinin İncelenmesi" 6. Ulusal Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Öğretmenliği Sempozyumu Bildiri Kitabı. s.350-361. 2009. [In Turkish]
15. Kaya C., Uzunoğlu S., "Anne Baba ve Öğretmenlere Özel Çocuklar Ne İster?" Kariyer Yayınları, İstanbul, 2003. [In Turkish]
16. Kodan S., "Üniversite Öğrencilerinde Umutsuzluk Ve Akılcı Olmayan İnanışlar Arasındaki İlişkinin Çeşitli Değişkenler Açısından İncelenmesi" CBÜ Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi, Cilt:11, Sayı:2. 2013. [In Turkish]
17. Okumuş F., Mete M., Bakiyev E., Kaçire İ., "Umutsuzluk, Tükenmişlik ve İş memnuniyeti Kavramları Arasındaki İlişkinin Analizi: Eğitim Sektöründe Bir Uygulama" Elektronik Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi. Cilt:12, Sayı:47.pp.191-202,2013. [In Turkish]
18. Nimsi E., "İlköğretim İkinci Sınıf Öğrencilerinin Ana-Baba Tutumları İle Okul Başarıları ve Sınıf İçi Etkinlik Düzeylerinin Karşılaştırılması" Uludağ Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Yüksek Lisans Tezi. Bursa, 2006. [In Turkish]
19. Seber G., "Beck Umutsuzluk Ölçeğinin Geçerlik ve Güvenirliği Üzerine Bir Çalışma" Doktora Tezi, Eskişehir: Anadolu Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü. 1991. [In Turkish]
20. Şahin C., "Eğitim Fakültesinde Öğrenim Gören Öğrencilerin Umutsuzluk Düzeyleri" Selçuk Üniversitesi Ahmet Keleşoğlu Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi. Sayı: 27.pp. 271 -286. 2009. [In Turkish]
21. Tekin M., Filiz K., "Beden Eğitimi Ve Spor Yükseköğrencilerinin Antrenörlük Eğitimi ve Spor Yöneticiliği Bölümlerinde Öğrenim Gören Öğrencilerin Umutsuzluk Ve Boyun Eğici Davranış Düzeylerinin Çeşitli Değişkenlere Göre İncelenmesi" Spormetre Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Bilimleri Dergisi., Cilt:6, Sayı:1.pp.27-37.2008. [In Turkish]
22. Thomas F., Fogarty M.D., "The Therapy Of Hopelessness" 1979.
23. Tüfekçiyaşar T., "Lise 10. ve 11. Sınıf Öğrencilerinde Kaygı, Umutsuzluk ve Benlik Düzeylerinin Değerlendirilmesi" Yüksek Lisans Tezi. Haliç Üniversitesi, İstanbul. 2014. [In Turkish]
24. Üstün G., Dedekoç Ş., Kavalalı T., Öztürk F., Sapcı Y., Can S., "Üniversite Son Sınıf Öğrencilerinin İş Bulmaya İlişkin Umutsuzluk Düzeylerinin İncelenmesi" Amasya Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi. Cilt: 3, Sayı: 2.pp.200-221. 2014. [In Turkish]
25. Yavuzer H., "Ana-Baba ve Çocuk" Remzi Kitabevi, Onyedinci Basım. İstanbul, 2004. [In Turkish]