IJCEAS

International Journal of Contemporary Economics and Administrative Sciences
ISSN: 1925 – 4423
Volume: XII, Issue: I, Year: 2022, pp. 325-340

Cross Sectional Data Analysis of Young People's Hope Levels in Turkey

Çiğdem DEMİR TOKER [1]
Boran TOKER [2]
Buğra POLAT [3]

Received: 16.04.2022, Accepted: 07.06.2022
DOI Number: 10.5281/zenodo.6947069

Abstract

In the study, the factors affecting the levels of hope for young individuals were examined through cross-sectional data analysis. For this purpose, the data of the Turkish Statistical Institute (TURKSTAT) Life Satisfaction Survey data set for the years 2013-2017 were handled and the hope levels of the youth were accepted as the dependent variable. Young individuals between the ages of 15-29 were selected from the data set, considering the length of presence in education and since it is thought that the individual determines the hope level of young people, the education level, the estimations about their own situation in the next 5 years and the estimations about the economic and social situation of the country in the next 5 years are added to the model as independent variables. Initially, estimates were made using the ordered logit model, but since the education independent variable did not satisfy the parallel lines assumption of the primary education category, generalized ordered logit and partial proportional odds models were used. According to the results obtained from the model, it was seen that the increase in the education level of the young people increased their hope level, and their positive thoughts about the future both about their own situation as well as economic and social situation of the country.

Key words Hope, Generalized Ordered Logit Model, Partial Proportional Odds Model

JEL Code: C31, J13, D90

[1] Assist. Prof., PhD, Akdeniz University, Turkey, demircigdem@akdeniz.edu.tr, http://orcid.org/0000-0003-3291-3085
[2] Assoc. Prof., PhD, Akdeniz University, Turkey, borantoker@akdeniz.edu.tr, http://orcid.org/0000-0002-4658-1934
[3] Res. Assist., İstanbul University, Turkey, bugra.polat@istanbul.edu.tr, http://orcid.org/0000-0003-4216-2633

1. Introduction

Although the studies about hope are generally in psychology and sociology, the concept has a broad use in the field of social sciences. The word hope in everyday language is mostly used to express positive expectations in any field (Akman & Korkut, 1993: 193). Hope can be defined as an emotional belief in the possibility of positive outcomes related to events and situations in an one's personal life. Accordingly, hope is generally the feeling of trust that appear from a good thought or belief in a good thought. Hope usually includes a certain amount of perseverance, that is, believing that something is possible even if there is certain evidence to the contrary (Gülten, 2014: 175).

Hope is one of the concepts that has been effective in the processes that ensure the survival of humanity, strengthen their well-being and support mental health since its being (Tarhan & Bacanlı, 2015: 2). Hope is the power of one's life. As long as the person is hopeful, he makes plans for the future (Deveci, Ulutaşdemir & Açık, 2011: 313). The concept of hope, whose theoretical background dates to the 13th century, has been tried to be explained by different scholars until today (Özer & Tezer, 2008: 82). Frank (1968) considers hope as a feature that gives a sense of well-being and motivates people to take action (as cited in Akman & Korkut, 1993: 139). According to Staats & Stassen (1985), hope is the predominance of expected future positive feelings over future expected negative feelings. Rideout & Montemuro (1986) consider hope as a one's greater than zero expectation of achieving a goal. Snyder (1995), on the other hand, defines hope as the process of thinking about one's goals, as well as the motivation to move toward (agency), and the ways to reach (pathways) these goals.

In the 1970s and 1980s, many researchers from various fields of science developed theories about hope. In this period, there was a disconnection in terms of studies among the branches of science. Many of these theories were on an individual basis and there was not a sufficient level of relationship between the branches of science. In this period, Snyder and his friends put forward their own views on hope (Sarı & Şahin, 2013: 99). However, studies on hope in young people have been carried out within the general theoretical framework of Snyder's hope theory, which is perhaps the most important psychological theory of hope in current theory and practice (Bernardo, 2015: 700). Hope theory has three dimensions: 1) clearly conceptualizing goals, 2) developing specific strategies to achieve these goals (pathways thinking), and 3) initiating and maintaining the motivation to use these strategies (Snyder et al., 2003: 122-123).

Snyder (2002) stated that human actions are goal-oriented and therefore goal is the cognitive component of hope theory. Goals can be small or large and include short-term or very distant future goals. However, regardless of their size or time, goals will continue to attract attention only when they have sufficient importance and value to people (Snyder, 2005: 73).

IJCEAS

International Journal of Contemporary Economics and Administrative Sciences
ISSN: 1925 – 4423
Volume: XII, Issue: I, Year: 2022, pp. 325-340

Pathways thinking, the second component of hope theory, is the capacity to find viable ways to achieve one's most desired goals. Therefore, pathways thinking reflects the perception of producing successful ways towards desired goals (Cheavens et al., 2006: 137).

Agency thinking, which is the last component of hope theory, is the perceived capacity of the individual to use alternative ways to achieve desired goals. Agency thinking expresses a successful sense of determination in achieving past, present, and future goals (Snyder, 2002: 251; Snyder et al., 1991: 570).

It is possible for individuals to trust their power to realize their goals and thoughts in life and to be hopeful. Hope, in general, is waiting for something desired to happen. Desire and hope form the degree of one's energy. This energy motivates the individual; in other words, hope is a motivating factor (Sürücü & Mutlu, 2006: 117). In this context, individuals with high hope levels have more life goals and can produce more strategies to achieve these goals (Tarhan & Bacanlı, 2015: 2). Thus, hope can also be defined as a kind of motivation for an individual's future forecast. Although the individual will be affected by many social, economic and psychological factors while obtaining this motivation, the intensity of the expectation that the individual desires will have an important place.

Hope is a feeling that expresses positive expectations for the future, as well as a general expectation of individuals about the future. On the other hand, we can say that most of the expectations that will shape the future belong to today's youth. While the high level of hope of the youth can provide the individual desire necessary to make these expectations accessible with the increase of positive expectations; a low level of hope may create the perception that it has no effect on the future and cannot make a difference.

In today's conditions, hope, which represents confidence in the future, is more important especially for young people than for other individuals. From this point of view, the lack of a study in the literature that reveals what determines the hope levels of the youth, who are the hope of the country, with econometric analyzes has been the driving force in this study.

2. Literature

Studies on hope have generally been carried out in the fields of education, psychology, and sociology, and primarily the definition of the concept and its dimensions have been emphasized. If we examine the studies in the literature; Arı (2016) analyzed the relationship between the hope levels of individuals and their thoughts about the future with the multinomial logistic regression model, using the data of the 2014-Life Satisfaction Questionnaire administered by TURKSTAT to 7984 individuals. Kemer & Atik (2005) investigated 729 high school students studying in rural areas and city centers, whether their hope levels differ according

to the perceived social support level from the family. Özer & Tezer (2008) examined whether there was a difference in positive and negative emotions between men and women with high and low hope levels. The sample of this study consists of 163 students (100 females, 63 males) continuing their postgraduate education in different departments at Middle East Technical University. Şahin et al. (2012) examined the effects of hope and meaning in life on subjective well-being of 285 university students. Sarı & Şahin (2013) aim to determine the role of hope and locus of control in predicting career decision-making self-efficacy of 302 high school seniors. Tarhan & Bacanlı (2015), on the other hand, examined the psychometric properties of the Turkish version of the Hope Scale developed by Snyder et al. Cihangir Çankaya & Meydan (2018), in their study on 506 high school students, aimed to examine the happiness levels of adolescents according to some socio-demographic variables and to determine the role of hope levels in predicting the happiness levels of adolescents. In their study on 559 secondary school students, Candan & Yalçın (2018) examined the relationship between adolescents' social emotional learning skills and social relationship elements and hope level.Van et al.(2021) used the Generalized Ordered Logit Model to examine Financial Failure and Bankruptcy in order to find the elements that caused financial failure and bankruptcy. They estimated Altman-Z scores using financial ratios from 139 industrial companies listed on Turkey's Borsa Istanbul in 2017.

In this study, the hope levels of young individuals and the factors affecting it were examined by cross-sectional data analysis, using the observations of the TURKSTAT Life Satisfaction Survey data set between 2013 and 2017. In this context, it is also aimed to contribute to the literature, through the findings to be obtained about the hope levels of young individuals in this study.

In the following parts of the study, first of all, the methodology related to the generalized ordered logit and partial proportional odds model is introduced, then the data used in the study and the results of the analysis are given, and finally the estimation results of the models are evaluated.

3. Generalized Ordered Logit Model and Partial Proportional Odds Model

In social science studies, variables are mostly measured by using ordinal scale. (Fullerton & Xu, 2018: 170). Accordingly, ordinal dependent variable is widely used in social science researches. The most common model designed for the ordinal dependent variable is the ordered logit (proportional odds) model. (Fullerton & Xu, 2012: 182).

The basic assumption of ordered logit models is the proportional odds assumption. In these models, the dependent variable is based on the cumulative probabilities of the options, and it is assumed that the regression functions for different options are parallel to the logit scale (Timur & Çağlayan Akay, 2017: 94), therefore, this assumption is also known as the parallel lines assumption. Although this model is widely used, since it has a very restrictive basic assumption, there is a

tendency to develop models that stretch this assumption in recent years. When the proportional odds (parallel lines) assumption is invalid for one or more variables in the model, models such as the partial proportional odds or the generalized ordered logit are used to stretch the assumption. (Fullerton & Xu, 2012: 182: 183).

The generalized ordered logit model is a model that stretches the proportional odds assumption for each independent variable in the model. (Fullerton & Xu, 2012: 184). Generalized ordered logit model for ordinal dependent variable with M category (Williams, 2006: 59; Williams, 2016: 11):

$$P(Y_i > j) = g(X\beta_j) = \frac{\exp(\alpha_j + X_i\beta_j)}{1+\{\exp(\alpha_j + X_i\beta_j)\}} \quad j = 1,2,\dots,M-1. \qquad (1)$$

For instance, in case dependent variable has four possible values, 3 groups of coefficients will be obtained from the simultaneous estimation of three different equations with the generalized ordered logit model (gologit). The unconstrained logit model gives results similar to those of the binary logit regression / cumulative logit model series. The ordered logit model can be defined as a special case of the gologit model where the β's are the same for every j (Williams, 2016: 11)

Between these two extreme cases, there is a partial proportional odds model. (Williams,2016:11) Peterson and Harrel (1990) propose the partial proportional odds model and evaluate this model in two ways as constrained and unconstrained. The partial proportional odds model stretches the proportional odds assumption for some independent variables. This model takes into account the variables that provide the proportional odds assumption empirically, and therefore it can be considered as a more effective alternative to the generalized ordered logit model (Fullerton and Xu, 2012: 184; Fullerton and Xu, 2018: 180).

Based on the theoretical and empirical basis, it can be decided that the proportional odds assumption in the partial proportional odds model is valid for one group of variables and not for another group of variables (Fullerton and Xu, 2012: 184). In other words, in this model, while some of the β's are the same for all j values, other β's may vary. For example, in the partial proportional odds model below, there is a constraint that the β coefficients of the X_1 and X_2 variables do not change for all j values, while this constraint does not exist for the β_3 coefficients of the X_3 variable: (Williams, 2006: 60)

$$P(Y_i < j) = \frac{\exp(\alpha_j + X1_i\beta 1 + X2_i\beta 2 + X3_i\beta 3_j}{1+[\exp(\alpha_j + X1_i\beta 1 + X2_i\beta 2 + X3_i\beta 3_j)]} \qquad j=1,2,\dots,M-1 \qquad (2)$$

The unconstrained gologit model and the multinomial logit model both contain many more parameters than the ordered logit model. This is because in these models all variables are independent of the proportional odds constraint. However,

in the partial proportional odds model, it is possible to stretch the parallel lines / parallel proportional odds assumption only for the variables that do not satisfy this assumption. (Williams, 2016: 11).

4. Application

Used Data and Variables

In the study, it was aimed to analyze the level of hope for young individuals and for this purpose, the data sets of the Life Satisfaction Survey (YMA) obtained from the Turkish Statistical Institute (TURKSTAT) for the years 2013-2017 were combined and used. Young individuals between the ages of 15-29 were selected from these datasets and the factors affecting the hope levels of these individuals have been examined.

The hope levels of young people have been determined due to the answers given to Likert scale composed of questions “How hopeful is you for your own future? "I am very hopeful, hopeful, not hopeful, not hopeful at all" Due to the ordered structure of hope levels, which is the dependent variable of the model, estimations were made with the ordered logit model. For the analyzes made with the ordered logit model to be successful, the assumption of parallel lines must be met. In this study, it was seen that assumption of parallel lines was not met according to Brant's Wald test and likelihood ratio test (see Table 2), and modeling studies continued with generalized ordered logit and partial proportional odds models, which stretched this limiting assumption. Using the aforementioned models, 36462 data were analyzed. The dependent and independent variables used in the analyzes are given in Table 1. As can be seen in Table 1, the answer "I have no idea" was not included in the categories of independent variables, and young individuals who gave this answer were excluded from the data set.

Table 1. Descriptions of variables

Dependent Variable	**Dependent Variable Levels**			
Hope	0: not hopeful at all	1: not hopeful	2: hopeful	3: very hopeful
Independent Variable	**Independent Variable Levels**			
Education Level	0: Nondegree	1: Primary Education	2: High School	3: University
Comparison Future	**0: Will go back**	**1: Will stay the same**	**2: Will develop**	
When you think about the next 5 years, what is your predictions about your				

situation generally?				
Economically	**0: Negatively**	**1: Will not change**	**2: Positively**	
How do you think our country will change economically in the next 5 years?				
For Social Rights	**0: Negatively**	**1: Will not change**	**2: Positively**	
How do you think our country will change in the next 5 years in terms of social rights and freedom?				

Source: Authors' calculations

Empirical Findings

In the study, firstly, the ordered logit model was estimated and it was examined whether there was a model specification error. Since the probability value (p=0.673) of the link test statistic is above the 0.05 significance level, it can be said that the model does not contain specification errors.

The parallel lines assumption of the ordered logit model has been tested with the likelihood ratio test and the Brant test, and the results of these tests are given in Table 2.

Table 2. Results of parallelism assumption test

	Chi-Square statistics degrees of freedom p-values	**degrees of freedom**	**p-values**
Likelihood ratio test	202.80	18	0.000
Brant test	221.11	18	0.000

Source: Authors' calculations

According to the results in Table 2, it is understood that the null hypothesis, which states that the assumption of parallel lines at the 0.05 significance level is

met, was rejected, in other words, it is understood that the ordered logit model cannot be applied. The results of the Brant test and Wald test, which tests whether all the variables individually satisfy the parallelism assumption, are given in the Table 3.

Table 3. Brant and Wald test results

	Brant Testi		**Wald Test**
Independent Variables	**Ki-Kare**	**Prob.**	**Prob.**
Education Level			
Primary	2.73	0.256	0.259
High school	4.80	0.091	0.042
University	4.84	0.089	0.000
Comparison Future			
Will stay the same	56.07	0.000	0.000
Will develop	39.63	0.000	0.000
Regarding Economy			
Will not change	7.76	0.021	0.033
Positively	11.47	0.003	0.004
Regarding social rights			
Will not change	13.87	0.001	0.001
Positively	15.24	0.000	0.000

Source: Authors' calculations

The inability to verify the parallel lines assumption requires the use of alternative models. Therefore, the model was re-estimated with the generalized ordered logit and partial proportional odds models, where the transition probabilities between the categories of the dependent variable are different.

The generalized ordered logit estimation results obtained in this study are given in Table 4 and the partial proportional odds estimation results are given in Table 5. Although the coefficients and odds ratios of the primary education category of the education variable verifying the parallel lines assumption are the same for all three models, it is indicated in Table 4 that the coefficients and odds ratios of the other independent variables differ from model to model. According to model 1, model 2 and model 3, the probability of having a higher level of hope for an individual who graduated from primary school is 1.22 times more than those who did not complete school. When the odds ratios for high school graduates are evaluated according to their hope levels, the probability of a high school graduate to be hopeful at a higher level is 1.60 times higher in model 1, 1.54 times in model 2, and 1.73 times in model 3 compared to non-school graduates. The probability of university graduates to be at a higher level of hope is 1.66 times higher in model 1, 1.32 times in model 2, and 1.47 times in model 3 compared to non-school graduates.

When the odds ratios of the "future comparison" independent variable created in line with the answers given to the question "What do you think about your general situation for the next 5 years?" were examined; it was determined that the probability of having a higher level of hope for youngs who predicts that their general conditions will remain the same in the next 5 years is 2.87 times higher in model 1, 2.36 times higher in model 2, and 1.34 times in model 3 compared to those who predict that their general conditions will decline. Likewise, the probability of having a higher level of hope for youngs who predicts that their general situation will improve in the next 5 years is 5.45 times higher in model 1, 5.62 times higher in model 2 and 3.36 times in model 3 compared to those who predict that their general conditions will decline. From this, it is understood that the hope levels of those who think positively about the future are quite high.

When the odds ratios of independent variable "economically" that was created within frame of answers for the question of "How do you think our country will change economically in the next 5 years?" and the odds ratios of independent variable "socially" that was created within frame of answers for the question "How do you think our country will change in the next 5 years in terms of social rights and freedoms?" were examined; it has been observed that those who think that it will change for the better have higher hopes than those who think that our country will not change economically and socially. In other words, it is noteworthy that the hope of those who believe that the country will be better in the future, both economically and socially, is at a high level.

Table 4. Generalized Ordered Logit Estimation Results

	Model 1: Not Hopeful at All			**Model 2: Basic level: Not at all hopeful + not hopeful**			**Model 3: Basic level: Not at all hopeful+not hopeful+hopeful**		
Variables	**Coefficients**	**Odds ratios**	**P-values**	**Coefficients**	**Odds ratios**	**P-values**	**Coefficients**	**Odds ratios**	**P-values**
Education level[1]									
Primary	0.199	1.220	0.000	0.199	1.220	0.000	0.199	1.220	0.000
High school	0.475	1.608	0.000	0.433	1.543	0.000	0.548	1.731	0.000
University	0.511	1.667	0.000	0.283	1.327	0.000	0.390	1.477	0.000
Future Comparison[2]									
Will stay the same	1.057	2.879	0.000	0.860	2.364	0.000	0.295	1.343	0.001
Will develop	1.696	5.453	0.000	1.726	5.620	0.000	1.212	3.362	0.000
Regarding Economy[3]									
Will not change	0.268	1.308	0.001	0.244	1.276	0.000	0.041	1.041	0.558
Positively	0.385	1.470	0.000	0.351	1.421	0.000	0.096	1.100	0.158
Regarding social rights[4]									
Will not change	0.184602	1.202	0.018	0.255	1.290	0.000	-0.026	0.973	0.705
Positively	0.412481	1.510	0.000	0.441	1.513	0.000	0.108	1.114	0.114

Note: Reference categories; [1]Nondegree, [2]Will go back,[3] Negatively**,**[4]Negatively

Source: Authors' calculations

International Journal of Contemporary Economics and Administrative Sciences
ISSN: 1925 – 4423
Volume: XII, Issue: I, Year: 2022, pp. 325-340

The estimation results of the partial proportional odds model are given in Table 5. As can be seen in Table 5, this model has γ parameters along with β parameters. This parameter shows how much deviation is from proportionality. Since only primary category of education variable provides the assumption of parallelism, this variable does not have gamma2 and gamma3 parameter estimates. Gamma 2; the difference between the β parameter estimates of model 2 and the β parameter estimates of model 1 was found. Similarly, Gamma 3 was found by taking the difference between the β parameter estimates of model 3 and the β parameter estimates of model 1.

When the gamma 2 predictions are examined; It is seen that the probability of hopelessness (not at all hopeful + not hopeful) increases for those who are university graduates and think that their situation will be the same in the future. Looking at the Gamma 3 estimations, the probability of being not hopeful at all + not hopeful + hopeful (basic level) increases for those who think that their situation will remain the same and develop in the future, and those who think that there will be no change in terms of economic and social rights in our country and that there will be a positive change.

Table 5. Results of Partial Proportional Odds Model Estimation

	BETA			**GAMA2**				**GAMA3**			
Variables	**Coefficient**	**Odds O.**	**P**	**Variables**	**Coefficient**	**Odds O.**	**P**	**Variables**	**Coefficient**	**Odds O.**	**P**
Education level				**Education level**				**Education level**			
Primary	0.199	1.220	0.000								
High school	0.475	1.608	0.000	High school	-0.041	0.959	0.392	High school	0.073	1.076	0.258
University	0.511	1.667	0.000	University	-0.227	0.796	0.000	University	-0.120	0.886	0.108
Future				**Future**				**Future**			
Will stay same	1.057	2.879	0.000	Will stay same	-0.197	0.820	0.000	Will stay same	-0.762	0.466	0.000
Will develop	1.696	5.453	0.000	Will develop	0.030	1.030	0.585	Will develop	-0.483	0.616	0.000
Regarding Economy				**Regarding Economy**				**Regarding Economy**			
Will not change	0.268	1.308	0.001	Will not change	-0.024	0.975	0.724	Will not change	-0.227	0.796	0.024
Positively	0.385	1.470	0.000	Positively	-0.034	0.966	0.643	Positively	-0.289	0.748	0.005
Social rights				**Social rights**				**Social rights**			
Will not change	0.184	1.202	0.018	Will not change	0.070	1.073	0.306	Will not change	-0.211	0.809	0.037
Positively	0.412	1.510	0.000	Positively	0.001	1.001	0.982	Positively	-0.303	0.738	0.004

Source: Authors' calculations

IJCEAS

International Journal of Contemporary Economics and Administrative Sciences
ISSN: 1925 – 4423
Volume: XII, Issue: I, Year: 2022, pp. 325-340

5. Conclusions and Discussion

In this study, in which the hopes of young people, who are the future of Turkey, are evaluated through econometric analysis, the generalized ordered logit model and the partial proportional odds model are used and the factors that affect the hope levels are investigated. As a result of the analysis, it has been determined that the education level of young individuals, their estimations about their future situation and their expectations about the future economic and social situation of Turkey significantly affect the levels of hope.

According to the findings, an increase in the level of education causes an increase in the level of hope. However, it was observed that the probability of university graduates to be highly hopeful were less in models 2 and 3 comparing with high school graduates. The estimated coefficient for primary school graduates is the same according to the categories of hope level. Considering that the country will not change economically in the next 5 years or that it will be better increases the possibility of increasing the level of hope. Same situation is valid for also social rights and freedoms. Probability to be hopeful of young individuals who expect that the country will change for the better regarding social rights and freedoms are more than those who expect it to change for the worse. Last but not the least, the probability contribution of young individuals' positive thoughts about their future was found to be higher than the probability contribution of all other variables. This shows that young people's self-belief provides the most significant contribution to the increase in their level of hope.

In the relevant literature, only Arı's (2014) study was found as the study in which individuals' hope levels were modeled. When compared to Arı's (2014) study, which analyzes the relationship between individuals' hope levels and their thoughts about the future; similarly, the level of hope was taken as the dependent variable in our study. In both studies, future comparison, economic and social variables were taken as independent variables. While Arı (2014) took the delivery of public services variable in addition to these variables, the education level variable was additionally taken in our study. In addition, while the generalized ordinal logit model and partial proportional odds model were used in our study, the multinomial logit model was used for modeling in Arı's (2014) study. Since different models were used in both studies, a comparison could not be made in terms of the findings, but it was determined that the hope levels of those who had positive thoughts for the three common independent variables were higher.

Apart from this single econometric study on the hope levels of young people in Turkey, if we look at the findings of studies in other fields: Özer and Tezer (2008) used multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) and this analysis indicated that gender main effect and interaction effect of gender with hope level were not significant in graduate students. Similarly, they revealed that univariate analysis

yielded a significant difference only in positive affect, indicating that those who were in high hope group received higher scores in positive affect than those in low hope group. Kemer and Atik (2005) revealed that there is a significant difference in high school students' hope levels in terms of their perceived social support from parents and the area they live; however, there is no gender difference found out. Şahin et al. (2012) investigated that the hope and the dimensions of meaning in life namely "existence of the meaning" and "pursuit of meaning" were significant predictors of the subjective well-being in university students. Also, subjective well-being did not vary in terms of the students' gender, on the other hand there were significant differences by class-level. Cihangir Çankaya and Meydan (2018), revealed that there were no significant differences among happiness levels of adolescents according to gender, education level of mothers, and education level of fathers. Nonetheless, they were found that adolescents' hope was a significant predictor of their happiness. In their study, subscales of Dispositional Hope Scale explained 42 % of the total variance of happiness scores of adolescents. Candan and Yalçın (2018) examined the correlation between social emotional learning skills (SELS) of adolescents and provision for social relations (PSR), and level of hope with Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient. Also, they analyzed whether PSR and level of hope and support from friend predicted SELS by regression analysis. In their study, it was found moderate and low positive correlations between SELS sub-dimensions of adolescents and PSR support from family and friend sub-dimensions and moderate positive significant correlations between the levels of hope. They also determined that adolescents' PSR support from family predicted the problem solving and self-worth sub-dimensions, and the PSR support friend sub-dimension and level of hope predicted SELS sub-dimensions and that it has been descriptive.

According to these results, it is important to reveal youth policies aimed at increasing the hopes of educated young people, and to develop youth strategies that will enable the country to improve economically and socially, and especially to increase their belief in themselves. Therefore, it is seen that the development of Turkey, which has a high rate of young population, depends on increasing the hopes of this young and dynamic population.

REFERENCES

Akman, Y. & Korkut, F. (1993). Umut ölçeği üzerine bir çalışma. [A study on the hope scale]. *Hacettepe University Journal of Education*, 9, 193-202.

Arı, E. (2016). Bireylerin umut düzeyleri ile gelecek hakkındaki düşünceleri arasındaki ilişkinin multinominal lojistik regresyon analizi ile incelenmesi. [Investigating the relationship between individuals' level of hope and their thoughts about future by multinominal logistic regression analyses]. *Dumlupınar University Journal of Social Sciences*, (47), 184-194.

Bernardo, A. B. (2015). Hope in early adolescence: Measuring internal and external locus-of-hope. *Child Indicators Research*, 8(3), 699-715.

Candan, K. & Yalçın, A. F. (2018). Ergenlerin sosyal duygusal öğrenme becerilerinin sosyal ilişki unsurları ve umut düzeyi ile ilişkisinin

incelenmesi. [Examination of adolescent's social education learning skills with provision of social relationship and level of hope]. OPUS *International Journal of Society Researches,* 9(16), 319-348.

Cheavens, J. S., Feldman, D. B., Woodward, J. T., & Snyder, C. R. (2006). Hope in cognitive psychotherapies: On working with client strengths. *Journal of Cognitive Psychotherapy: An International Quarterly*, 20(2), 135-145.

Cihangir Çankaya, Z. & Meydan, B. (2018). Ergenlik döneminde mutluluk ve umut. [happiness and hope in adolescence]. *Electronic Journal of Social Sciences*, 17(65), 207-222.

Timur, B. & Çağlayan Akay, E. (2017). Kadın ve erkeklerin mutluluğunu etkileyen faktörlerin genelleştirilmiş sıralı logit modeli ile analizi. [Analysis of the factors affecting the happiness of women and men using the generalized ordered logit model]. *Social Sciences Research Journal*, 6(3), 88-105

Deveci, S. E., Ulutaşdemir, N., & Açık, Y. (2011). Bir mesleki eğitim merkezi öğrencilerinde umutsuzluk düzeyi ve etkileyen faktörler. [The level of hopelessness in the students of an occupational education center and affecting factors]. *Dicle Medical Journal*, 38(3), 312-317.

Frank J. (1968). The role of hope in psychotherapy. *International Journal of Psychiatry*, 5(5), 383.395.

Fullerton, A. S. & Xu, J. (2012). The proportional odds with partial proportionality constraints model for ordinal response variables. *Social Science Research*,41, 182-198.

Fullerton, A. S. & Xu, J. (2018). Constrained and unconstrained partial adjacent category logit models for ordinal response variables, *Sociological Methods & Research*, 47(2), 169-206.

Gülten, N. (2014). Kierkegaard'ta umutsuzluk, iman ve umut. [Kierkegaard's despair, faith and hope]. Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis. Gazi University, Ankara, Turkey.

Kemer, G. & Atik, G. (2005). Kırsal ve il merkezinde yaşayan lise öğrencilerinin umut düzeylerinin aileden algılanan sosyal destek düzeyine göre karşılaştırılması. [Comparison of hope levels of high school students living in rural and city center according to perceived social support level from family]. *Journal of Educational Sciences,* 21, 161-168.

Özer, B. U., ve Tezer, E. (2008). Umut ve olumlu-olumsuz duygular arasındaki ilişkiler. [Relationship between hope and positive-negative affect]. *Journal of Buca Faculty of Education*, (23), 81-86.

Rideout, E. & Montemuro, M. (1986). Hope, morale and adaptation in patients with chronic heart failure. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 11(4), 429-438.

Sarı, S. V. & Şahin, M. (2013). Lise son sınıf öğrencilerinin mesleğe karar verme öz-yeterliliklerini yordamada umut ve kontrol odağının rolü. [the role of hope and locus of control predicting career decision making self-efficacy on senior students]. *Kastamonu Education Journal*, 21(1), 97-110.

Snyder, C. R., Harris, C., Anderson, J. R., Holleran, S. A., Irving, L. M., Sigmon, S. T., Yoshinobu, L., Gibb, J., Langelle, C., & Harney, P. (1991). The will and the ways: Development and validation of an individual-differences

measure of hope. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 60(4), 570–585.

Snyder, C. R. (1995). Conceptualizing, measuring, and nurturing hope. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, 73(3), 355-360.

Snyder, C. R. (2002). Hope Theory: Rainbows in the mind. *Psychological Inquiry*, 13(4), 249-275.

Snyder, C. R., Lopez, S. J., Shorey, H. S., Rand, K. L., & Feldman, D. B. (2003). Hope theory, measurements, and applications to school psychology. *School psychology quarterly*, 18(2), 122-139.

Snyder, C. R. (2005). Teaching: The lessons of hope. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 24(1), 72-84.

Staats, S. & Stassen, M. A. (1985). Hope: An affective cognition. *Social Indicators Research*, 17, 235-242.

Sürücü, A. & Mutlu, D. (2016). Bireyin yaşamında umut. Sargın, N., Avşaroğlu, S. ve Ünal, A. (Ed.), *Eğitim ve Psikolojiden Yansımalar*. Konya, Turkey: Çizgi Kitabevi.

Şahin, M., Aydın, B., Sarı, S. V., Kaya, S., & Pala, H. (2012). Öznel iyi oluşu açıklamada umut ve yaşamda anlamın rolü. [The role of hope and the meaning in life in explaining subjective well-being]. *Kastamonu Education Journal,* 20(3), 827-836.

Tarhan, S. & Bacanlı, H. (2015). Sürekli Umut Ölçeği'nin Türkçe'ye uyarlanması: Geçerlik ve güvenirlik çalışması. [Adaptation of Dispositional Hope Scale into Turkish: Validity and reliability study]. *The Journal of Happiness & Well-Being*, 3(1), 1-14.

Van, M. G.,Şehribanoğlu , S.,& Van, M. H. (2021). Analysis of The Factors Which Affect Financial Failure and Bankruptcy with Generalized Ordered Logit Model. *Uluslararası Yönetim, İktisat ve İşletme Dergisi*, 17(1), 63-78

Williams, R. A. (2006). Generalized ordered logit/ partial proportional odds models for ordinal dependent variables. *Stata Journal*, 6(1), 58-82.

Williams, R. A. (2016). Understanding and interpreting generalized ordered logit models. *The Journal of Mathematical Sociology*, 40(1), 7-20.