Children Friendship: The Role of Hope in Attributions, Emotions and Expectations
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This research aimed to examine 1) children’s attributions and emotions for their subjectively perceived friendships with their best friends as positive or negative, 2) the role of children’s hope (pathways thinking, agency thinking) in the generation of their perception of their friendships as positive or negative, in the formulation of the subsequent attributions and emotions, and in the impact of attributions on emotions, and 3) the effects of hope in the interactive impact of attributions and emotions on friendship expectations. The participants were 322 children, both gender, 5th and 6th grades, representing various parental socioeconomic levels. The results showed that the perceived satisfactory friendships were mainly attributed to internal, and self-friend interactive internal and controllable factors, while the estimated as non satisfactory friendships were predominately attributed to stable, friend’s controllable and internal, and self-friend interactive internal factors. The children experienced intense positive and negative emotions for their perceived satisfactory and non satisfactory friendships, respectively. Hope (mostly, agency thinking) positively influenced the generation of the perceived quality of the friendship, the subsequent attributions (particularly, stability) and emotions, and the impact of attributions on emotions, mainly in the negative friendships group. Also, in the positive friendship group, high-pathway thinking children had higher expectations of positive friendship, whereas, in the non satisfactory friendship group, low-agency thinking children had low expectations of positive friendship. Finally, hope proved formulated of the interactive effect of attributions (mainly, locus of causality) and emotions on friendship expectations. The findings from this study suggest the significant role of good friendship in children’s life, and indicate the importance of examining children friendship along the role of hope in evaluating, attributing causes, experiencing emotions and forming expectations.
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Introduction

Within the broad domain of youth relationships, kinship, cooperation with peers and close friendship are related to enduring happiness and well-being (Argyle, 2001; Berndt, 2004; Carr, 2005; Holder, & Coleman, 2009; Vandell, Nenide, & Van Winkle, 2007). Focusing on children friendships with their best friends, in particular, may contribute into enhancing their happiness and subjective well-being, as positive psychology conceptualizes (Aspinwall & Staudinger, 2003; Diener, Lucas & Oishi, 2005; Myers, 2000; Roberts, Brown, Johnson, & Reinke, 2005; Seligman, 2002, 2005). Furthermore, understanding their perceptions of friendships may help understand their emotional lives and development, since happy young people are those who report fulfilling friendships (Bukowski, 2001, Buss, 2005; Diener, 2000; Diener & Seligman, 2002; Fletcher & Thomas, 1996; Hoglund, Lalonde, & Leadbeater, 2008).

Cognition and cognitive process are significant contributors in the development and quality of a close relationship, and so need to be considered in any comprehensive investigation of friendship (Blas, 2007; Harvey, Pauwels, & Zickmund, 2005; Karney, McNulty, & Bradbury, 2003). Intuitive and attributional appraisals are two such constructs which have been central concepts examining close relationships (Collins, Ford, Guichard, & Allard, 2006; Fincham, 2003; Greitemeyer, & Weiner, 2003; Harvey, 1987; Harvey & Omarzu, 1999; Prager, 1985; Reis, & Patrick, 1996; Stephanou, 2004, 2005; Weiner, 2000). Whether partners perceive their relationship as positive or negative, and which explanations or interpretations they make about the relationship influence their emotions, motivation and behaviour (Blascovich & Mandess, 2000; Flecher, Fitness, & Blampied, 1990; Flecher & Thomas, 2000; Fincham, 2003; Fincham, Beach, Arias, Brody, 1998; Fitness, Fletcher, & Overall, 2005).

Similarly, emotions are inherently and intensely experienced in the context of close relationships, they play important role in future behaviour, and so they are needed to be included in any comprehensive discussion (Baumom, Epstein, Stanton, 2006; Berscheid, & Amsazzalorso, 2003; Forsgas, 2002; Forsgas, & Smith, 2005; Parrott, 2003; Rose, 2007; Siemer, Mauss, & Gross, 2007; Smith, & Kirby, 2000). The attributional appraisal perspective to emotions focuses on how specific emotions such as sadness and anger are elicited, and on the motivational functions they serve in particular relationship (Clere, & Ortony, 2010; Frijda, 1993, 2007; Smith, & Kirby, 2000; Weiner, 2002, 2005). For example, if one believes that the friend’s good behaviour was the significant factor for their good friendship, then she/he may experience admiration or gratitude. Anger combines distress over an undesired event with perceiving the other as responsible for it (Ortony, Clere, & Collins, 1988). Once emotions are experienced, they influence partners’ on-going appraisals, perceptions, information processing with important consequences in relationship judgments and behaviours (see Bless, 2003; Parrott, 2003, Weiner, 2006). For example, happy partners make more optimistic attributions than unhappy (Forgas, 1994; Planalp & Fitness, 1999). Anger pushes individuals to attribute blame and malicious intentions to others (Fitness & Fletcher, 1993; Keltner, Ellsworth, & Edwards, 1993).

As the friendship develops, then, the friends are forming expectations for a series of constructs in the relationship such as...
the friend dispositional behaviour and the content of the friendship. Researches in the person perception and cognition underline that the dispositional attributions an individual makes to the partner reflects an expectations of how he/she will behave in various situations (see Berscheid, & Ammazzalorso, 2003; Karney et al., 2003; Trope, & Gaunt, 2005). The expectations we hold about our friend and the friendship are partly constructed through the cognitive appraisals we make, and the emotions we experience in the friendship (Bigelow, 1997; Forgas, & Smith, 2005; Stephanou, & Balkanou, 2010). Similar are the findings from research in achievement behaviour showing the high expectations for success are related to task engagement, persistence in carrying out tasks, effective use of cognitive and metacognitive strategies, and successful performance (see Eccles, & Wigfield, 2002; Eklides, 2001; Stephanou, 2008).

On the other hand, as mentioned by Siegel (1992), ‘individual differences factors can influence both a child’s responses to stress and his or her use of coping strategies’ (p. 4). Further, as was indicated by Siegel and supported by respective research, children tend to respond to daily life stimuli by using the same mechanism of responding to stress (see for a review Roberts et al., 2005). Additionally, there is an increasing recognition that a comprehensive conceptualization of coping mechanisms views them as normal developmental components (Carr, 2005; Dryfoos, 1998; Jaycox, Reivich, Gilhan, & Seligman, 1994). Hope, as it is conceptualized in Snyder’s (1994, 2005) hope theory, is a significant construct in understanding how children deal in friendships (Smith & Kirby, 2000; Snyder, Cheavens, & Symponson, 1997). Researches (e.g., Snyder, Hoza, Pelham, Rapoff, Ware, Danovsky, Highbarger, Rubinstein, & Stahl, 1997; Snyder, McDermott, Cook, & Rapoff, 1997; Stephanou, 2010) have shown that the majority of children are able to use hopeful, goal-directing thought. In middle childhood and preadolescence, in particular, there is a growth in logical rather than intuitive thinking skills, which contributes to increasing hopeful planning and pursuing pathways towards value-goals and doing so within a social context of mindful of the wishes of significant others, including peers and friends (Carr, 2005; Snyder, 2000).

Hope influences how children interpret and feel in close relationships (Roberts et al., 2005; Stephanou, 2010). Specifically, although in hope theory the focus is on reaching desired future goal-related outcomes, hope is related to attributions for past behaviour, since both theories elaborate pursuit goals and important outcomes (see Seligman, 1991; Snyder, Rand, & Sigmon, 2005; Weiner, 2002). Hope is related to emotions in a given close relationship, since goal-pursuit cognitions, such as avoiding or alleviating harm or maximizing benefits in it cause emotions (Smith & Ellsworth, 1987; Snyder et al., 2005).

Moreover, ‘the goal of connecting with other people is fundamental because the seeking of one’s goals almost always occurs within the context of social commerce’ (Snyder et al., 2005, p. 266). People with high hope enjoy high social desirability, perceive social support, are not characterized by loneliness, enjoy their interactions with others, and are socially competent (Barnum, Snyder, Rapoff, Mani, & Thompson, 1998; Snyder, Hoza et al., 1997; Symponson, 1999). Generally, individuals with high dispositional hope enjoy life, and use positive reappraisal for a variety of stressor situation, and they not use avoidance and denial behaviour (Gilham, 2000; Snyder, 2000; Snyder, Cheavens, & Michael, 1999).

However, only a limited number of studies have focused on children’s friendships (see Bukowski, 2001; Gifford-Smith & Brownell, 2003; Hoglund et al., 2008; Rose, 2007; Stephanou & Balkanou, 2010; Vandell et al., 2007), on children’s hope, attributions and emotions for their friendships, and on how these concepts interactively influence friendship expectations (see Bowker, Rubin, Burgess, Booth-LaForce, & Rose-Krasnor, 2006; Fincham, 2003; Jenkins, & Ball, 2000; Lewis, & Kliwever, 1996; Overwalle, Heylighen, Cesaer, & Daniels, 1992; Rockhill, Fan, Katen, McCauley, Crick, & Pleck, 2007; Stephanou, 2010; Underwood, & Hurley, 1999).

Accordingly, this study is based on the connection between friendships and emotional experience from a socio-cognitive perspective. Specifically, Weiner’s (1992, 2001, 2002) attribution theory was involved, which, incorporating cognitive appraisals and emotions, is helpful in understanding interpersonal relationships, (see Argyle, 2001; Fincham, 2003; Fitness et al., 2005; Fletcher, & Clark, 2003; Hewstone, & Antaki, 2001). Snyder’s (2000) hope theory was also used, which, incorporating waypower and willing power, offers an important construct in understanding how children deal and interact with others (Roberts et al., 2005).

**Attributions and Emotions for Interpersonal Relationships**

Individuals appraise an interpersonal relationship by evaluating and by attributing causes (Leary, 2000; Smith, & Lazarus, 1990; Trope, & Gaunt, 2005). The appraisals reflect what the stimulus-relationship means to the individual and whether it is good or bad (Fincham, 2003; Fitness et al., 2005).

Although, an interpersonal relationship could be attributed to infinite number of attributions, self, other person, situation, environment, self-other person interaction, and relationship itself are the most prominent causes in describing positive and negative relationships (Argyle, 2001; Erber, & Gilmour, 1995; Planalp, & Rivers, 1996). Attributions are categorized into dimensions of locus of causality (internal/external to the person), stability (stable/ unstable over time) and controllability (personal and external controllable/uncontrollable), which have psychological and behavioral consequences (Argyle, 2001; Berscheid, & Ammazzalorso, 2003; Fletcher & Thomas, 2000; McAuley, Duncan, & Russell, 1992; Stephanou, 2005, 2007; Weiner, 2002, 2005).

The perceived quality of the relationship differentiates the attributional pattern (Fiedler, Semin, Finkenauer, & Berkel, 1995; Fincham, 2003). Specifically, individuals tend to attribute the positive interpersonal relationships to themselves (internal, stable, personal controllable, and external uncontrollable), and the negative relationships to the other person and situational factors (Fitness et al., 2005; Stephanou, 2005, 2007; Weiner, 2001, 2002; Ybarra & Stephanou, 1999). Furthermore, the more negative the interpersonal relationship the more the attributions to the other person’s constant negative properties (Argyle, 2001; Gilbert & Malone, 1995; Hewstone & Antaki, 2001; Williams & Gilmore, 2008).

Previous researches show that both intuitive appraisal and the attributional appraisal are major source of experienced emotions in interpersonal relationships (Clark, Fitness, & Brissette, 2003; Fletcher, 2002; Smith, & Lazarus, 1990; Trope & Guant, 2005; Weiner, 2002). According to Weiner’s (2002) attribution theory, in particular, there are ‘outcome-dependent’ (e.g., happiness, pleasure, sadness) emotions, that are the initial and strongest response to the valence of the relationship. For example, if it is positive, a person feels happy, whereas if it is negative, he/she feels sad. The ‘attribute-dependent’ (e.g., anger, encouragement) emotions are influenced by the causal explanation for the relationship (Outley, & Jenkins, 1998; Stephanou,
2007; Weiner, 2002). For example a child may experience anger if believes that the friend could and should have behaved differently. In contrast, a child may feel confidence if she/he considers the friend’s positive dispositional factors as causes for the positive friendship.

Although all causal dimensions are related to emotions for the partner’s (friend) behavior and the relationship itself, their prevalence differs across the various emotions. Locus of causality, stability and controllability mainly influences the self-esteem (pride)- expectancy (confidence)- and social (shame, the partner’s (friend) behavior and the relationship itself, their goal-directed energy) and pathways (planning to meet goals) based on an interactively derived sense of successful agency or power. It is ‘a positive motivational state that is initiate and sustain movement towards those goals (willing power or pathways thinking) and beliefs in his/her ability to focus on important outcomes which are related to the goal (Carver, 2000).

Attributing successful relationship to stable factors enhances relationship expectations, and facilitates relationship engagement, while attributing negative friendship to unstable is likely to improve friendship and minimizes the feeling of hopelessness. In contrast, attributing negative relationship to stable factors reduces positive expectations, produces the feeling of hopelessness and can lead to learned helplessness, a sense that none effort can lead to good friendship (see Fitness et al., 2005; Peterson and Steen, 2005; Seligman, 2002; Weiner, 2001).

Guilt and anger are elicited by controllable causes, but guilt emerges from internal, whereas anger is elicited by external factors (Stephanou, 2007, 2010; Weiner, 1992). Hate resulted from appraisals of relative powerlessness and a perceived lack of control (see Fitness et al., 2005). Also, stable causes maximize feelings of pity, given uncontrollable causes, and feelings of anger, given controllable causes (Graham, & Hoehn, 1995).

Overall, the belief that a person has about the causes of his/her friendship have effects on his/her feelings for the friend, and his/her expectations for the quality of the friendship in the future (Clark et al., 2003; Fletcher, 2002; Siemer et al., 2007; Stephanou & Balkamou, 2010; Weiner, 2001). Then, emotions and expectations influence the individual’s actual behavior toward the partner, and the friendship itself (see Fincham, 2003; Fletcher, & Clark, 2002; Fletcher, & Thomas, 2000; Weiner, 2001).

The association of Hope with Attributions, Emotions and Expectations

According to Snyder’s (see Snyder et al., 2005) hope theory, hope is a cognitive set including an individual’s beliefs in his/her capacity to create effective routes to achieve goals (way power or pathways thinking) and beliefs in his/her ability to initiate and sustain movement towards those goals (willing power or agency). It is ‘a positive motivational state that is based on an interactively derived sense of successful agency (goal-directed energy) and pathways (planning to meet goals)’ (Snyder, Irving, & Anderson, 1991, p. 287). Agency thinking is the motivational component in hope theory, and it is particularly crucial in the case of impediments (Snyder, 1994).

Within this perceptive, hope is a critical construct to understand how children deal with others and work towards goals, such as developing a good friendship, in an adaptive, effective manner (see Roberts et al., 2005). Measures of children’s hope are positively related with self reported competence and feeling about themselves, and it is predictor of self-esteem (Snyder, McDermott et al., 1997; Snyder, Feldman, Taylor, Schroeder, & Adams, 2000). Also, the Lewis and Kliwerer’s (1996) study, focusing on pediatric population, showed that hope was negatively associated with anxiety, but this association was moderated by coping strategies. A research by Barmum et al. (1998) revealed that high-hope had protective function in children to allow them to be effective in their lives in spite of the obstacles. Hopeful people, like optimistic people, expect positive outcomes even when they face difficulties, in which they insist in pursuing their goals and regulate themselves, using effective coping strategies, so they enhance the chances to achieve their goals (Carver, & Scheier, 2005; Scheier, Carver, & Bridges, 2000; Peterson, 2000; Seligman, 1991). Hopeful people, additionally, focus not only on future goals but also on goals they believe they can achieve (see Nolen-Hoeksema, & Davis, 2005, Snyder, 2000). That means that hopeful individuals are looking for something positive in a variety of conditions.

Accordingly, a high hope child may use optimistic attribution pattern in explaining positive or negative friendships. Probably, a high- hope child, as an optimistic child does, attribute failure to external, unstable and specific factors instead of internal, stable and global factors (see Scheier, & Carven, 1985; Snyder et al., 2005; Seligman, 2002).

In Snyder’s hope theory, emphasizing the thinking processes, ‘goal-pursuit cognitions cause emotions’ (Snyder et al. 2005, p. 258). Specifically, positive emotions result from perception of successful goal pursuit which reflects unimpeded movement toward the goal or effective overcoming the obstacles. In contrast, negative emotions are formulated by the perception of unsuccessful goal pursuit which may result from insufficient agency thinking and/or pathway thinking or the ineffective ability to overcome the problem. These points were supported by respective researches (e.g., Snyder et al., 1996; Stephanou, 2010), and are in agreement with findings for reported lessened well-being stem from perceived difficulties in pursuit of important goals (Diener, 1984; Ruehlman, & Wolchik, 1988).

Summarizing, hope influences thought, feelings, expectations and behavior in close relationships.

Aim and Hypotheses of the Study

This study aimed to examine 1) children’s attributions and emotions for their subjectively perceived positive and negative friendships with their best friend, 2) the role of children’s hope (pathways thinking, agency thinking) in the generation of their perceptions of the friendships as positive or negative, in the formulation of the subsequent attributions and emotions, and in the impact of attributions on emotions, and 3) the effects of hope (pathways thinking, agency thinking) in the formulation of expectations of the quality of the friendship in the future, and in the interactive impact of attributions and emotions on the friendship expectations.

The hypotheses of the study were the following: The perceived positive or negative friendships will be attributed to self-related and other-related factors, respectively (Hypothesis 1a). Locus of causality will be the most powerful attributional dimension in discriminating the group of children who will perceive their friendship as positive from the group of children who will perceive their friendship as negative (Hypothesis 1b). The children will experience various emotions for their perceived positive or negative friendships (Hypothesis 2a). The
perceived positive and negative friendships will produce positive and negative emotions, respectively (Hypothesis 2b), particularly outcome-dependent emotions (Hypothesis 2c).

The perceived positive friendship group, compared to perceived negative friendship group, will have higher hope (Hypothesis 3a). Hope, mainly agency thinking, will have positive effects on the generation of perceiving the friendship as positive and, mainly, as negative (Hypothesis 3b).

Hope will have positive effects (particularly in negative friendships) on the formulation of attributional dimensions, mainly, stability (Hypothesis 4a), emotions, mainly expectancy-related emotions (Hypothesis 4b), and on the impact of attributions on emotions (Hypothesis 4c).

Hope will positively influence the generation of expectations of the quality of the friendship in the future (Hypothesis 5a), and the interactive effect of attributions and emotions on friendship expectations (Hypothesis 5b), mainly in the case of negative friendships (Hypothesis 5c).

### Method

#### Participants

A total of 322 children, of both genders (girls = 173, and boys = 149), of Grades 5 and 6 participated in this study. Their age ranged from 10 to 12 years (M = 11.15 years, SD = .74). They came from schools of various towns of Greece, representing various parental socioeconomic levels. Of the participants, 233 and 89 children perceived their friendship as positive and negative, respectively (see measurements below).

#### Measurements

The consistency of the scales was based on previous relevant to the topic literature (e.g., Bowker et al., 2006; Fletcher, 2002; Fincham, 2003; Holder, & Coleman, 2009; Stephanou, 2005, 2007; Stephanou, & Balkamou, 2010; Snyder et al., 2005, 2007; Weiner, 2001, 2006), and on findings from a pilot research. The feedback was positive for the Greek version of the scale. Cronbach’s alphas were .85 and .82 for the positive and negative friendship, respectively.

**Perceptions of friendship.** Children’s perceptions of the quality of their friendships with their best friends were estimated by responding to a five-point four items scale (“How good is this friendship?”, “How much satisfied are you with this friendship?”). Responses ranged from 1 = not at all to 5 = very much. Children themselves defined their friendships as positive or negative by completing the friendship scale twice. More precisely, they, first, filled it for the current quality of their friendship, and, then, mentioned the lowest value in each item over which the friendship would be positive. Children whom the friendship was lower than the indicated as positive formed the group of negative friendship, while those whose friendship was equal or higher than the indicated one formed the group of positive friendship. Cronbach’s alphas were .85 and .82 for the positive and negative friendship, respectively.

**Attributions for friendship.** Children’s attributions for the perceived quality of their friendships were examined via the slightly modified Causal Dimension Scale II (CDSII, McAuley, Duncan, & Russell, 1992), which is a reliable and valid research instrument in examining attributions for intimate interpersonal relationships in Greek population (see Stephanou, 2005, 2007, 2010). The children indicated the most important factor which, according to their opinion, influenced the quality of their friendship, how much this factor contributed to the given friendship, and classified that cause along the causal dimensions of locus of causality (internal/external causes to him/herself), stability (stable/unstable causes over time), personal controllability (controllable/uncontrollable causes by their own), external controllability (controllable/uncontrollable causes by others), friend’s locus of causality (internal/external causes to their friend), friend’s controllability (controllable/uncontrollable causes by their friend), self-friend interactive locus of causality (internal/external causes to interaction self-friend) and self-friend interactive controllability (controllable/uncontrollable causes by interactive self-friend). Each subscale consists of three items, ranging form the negative pole 1 = not at all stable to the positive pole 7 = totally stable. Cronbach’s alphas were .82 for locus of causality, .85 for stability, .75 for personal controllability, .72 for external controllability, .76 for friend’s locus of causality, .72 for friend’s controllability, .71 for self-friend locus of causality, and .70 for self-friend controllability.

**Emotions for friendship.** Children’s emotions for their friendships with their best friend were assessed by mentioning the extent to which they experienced twelve emotions: happiness, pleasure, pride, encouragement, love, not angry-angry, cheerfulness, confidence, calmness, not anxiety-anxiety, enthusiasm and excitement. The emotions had the form of adjectives with two opposite poles, with the positive pole having the high score of 7 and the negative one having the low score of 1 (e.g., happy 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 unhappy). The consistency of the scale was based on previous research (see Stephanou, 2004, 2007; Weiner, 1992, 2001).

**Friendship expectations.** Children’s friendship expectations were examined via the scale of the perceived current quality of the friendship. The wording of the questions for the two scales was the same except for the verb tense (“How good will this friendship be in the future”, “How much satisfied will you be with this friendship in the future?”). Cronbach’s alphas were .84 and .80 for the positive and negative friendship, respectively.

**Hope.** Children’s dispositional hope was examined via the Children’s Hope Scale for ages 8 to 16 (Snyder, Hoza, et al., 1997) which comprises three agency thinking (e.g., “I think I am doing pretty well”) and three pathways thinking (e.g., “I can think of many ways to get the things in life that are most important to me”) items. Responses ranged from 1 = None of the time to 6 = All of the time. The scale was independently translated from English into Greek by two familiar to the topic researchers, and, then, there was a backward translation by a native English speaker. The feedback was positive for the Greek version of the scale. Cronbach’s alphas were .89 and .86 for agency thinking and pathways thinking, respectively.

**Personal factors.** Children’s personal information scale consisted of a set of questions relevant to personal factors, such as age, grade and gender.

#### Procedure

The children initially completed the hope scale. After one week, the participants were asked, first, to write down the name of their best friend, and, then, to fill out the scales that refer to this specific friendship. The children individually completed the scales in front of the researcher in quite classrooms in their schools. In order to ensure that any relationship among the examined variables was not due to procedure used, the participants completed first the emotions scale and then the scales of the perceived quality of their friendship and the attributions. To match the questionnaires that were responded by the same child, children were asked to choose a code name and use it on the questionnaires. The children were assured of anonymity and confidentiality.
Results

Attributions and Emotions for the Perceived Positive and Negative Friendship

The results from the repeated measures MANOVAs (using the Wilks’s lambda estimate) with the eight attributional dimensions as within-subjects factor and the perceived friendship (positive/negative) as between-subjects factor revealed significant effect of the attributional dimensions, $F(7, 314) = 53.80$, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .54$, significant effect of the perceived friendship $F(1, 320) = 93.00$, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .22$, and significant multivariate effect, $F(7, 314) = 31.80$, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .41$. The results from subsequent repeated measures ANOVAs, examining differences between attributions within each group (positive/negative) of friendship, post hoc pairwise comparisons and the mean scores (Table 1) indicated that the children made internal, personal controllable, external uncontrollable, stable, controllable by their friends, internal to their friends and, mainly, self-friend interactive internal and controllable attributions for the perceived positive friendships. In contrast, they made external, external controllable, personal uncontrollable, and, predominately, stable, friend’s controllable and internal, and self-friend interactive internal attributions for the perceived negative friendships.

The above results partly confirmed Hypotheses 1a and 1b. The results from the two repeated measures ANOVAs, one for each group of friendship (positive/negative), in which emotions was the within-subjects factor, showed that the participants experienced various emotions and a variety of intensity of emotions for their perceived positive friendships, $F(11, 222) = 12.52$, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .40$, and negative friendships, $F(11, 78) = 4.60$, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .41$. Inspection of the scores (Table 2) and the post hoc pairwise comparisons indicated that the children experienced intense positive emotions, mainly enthusiasm, happiness, cheerfulness, pleasure and confidence, for their perceived positive friendships. In contrary, the children felt intense negative emotions, predominately non confidence, not excitement, sadness and anxiety, for their perceived negative friendships. Discriminant analysis, with stepwise method, was confirmed the univariate effects and, in addition, showed that personal controllability, discriminating power $= .84$, $d = 1.32$, followed by locus of causality, discriminating power $= .60$, $d = 1.12$, self-friend interactive controllability, discriminating power $= .59$, $d = 1.08$, was the most powerful factor in discriminating the group of children who perceived their friendship as positive from the group of children who perceived their friendship as negative. Furthermore, friend’s controllability had no significant contribution in discriminating the two groups of children.

Table 1. Descriptive statistics and results from Discriminant analysis for children’s attribution for their perceived positive and negative friendships.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attributional dimensions</th>
<th>Positive friendship</th>
<th>Negative friendship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Locus of causality</td>
<td>Mean: 5.78, SD: 1.09</td>
<td>Mean: 4.42, SD: .74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal controllability</td>
<td>Mean: 5.62, SD: 1.08</td>
<td>Mean: 3.86, SD: 1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stability</td>
<td>Mean: 5.66, SD: 1.21</td>
<td>Mean: 5.07, SD: .80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External controllability</td>
<td>Mean: 3.18, SD: 1.63</td>
<td>Mean: 4.47, SD: .80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friend’s locus of causality</td>
<td>Mean: 5.73, SD: 1.16</td>
<td>Mean: 4.96, SD: .70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friend’s personal controllability</td>
<td>Mean: 5.44, SD: 1.15</td>
<td>Mean: 5.01, SD: .53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-friend interactive locus causality</td>
<td>Mean: 5.92, SD: 1.02</td>
<td>Mean: 4.99, SD: 1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-friend interactive controllability</td>
<td>Mean: 6.01, SD: 1.04</td>
<td>Mean: 4.84, SD: .63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: All $F(1, 320)$ values $p < .01$; -- Attributional dimensions did not to further differentiate the one group from the other group of children.

Table 2. Descriptive statistics and findings from Discriminant analysis for children’s emotions for their perceived positive and negative friendships.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emotions</th>
<th>Positive friendship</th>
<th>Negative friendship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Happiness</td>
<td>Mean: 4.48, SD: .65</td>
<td>Mean: 1.89, SD: 1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasure</td>
<td>Mean: 4.50, SD: .63</td>
<td>Mean: 2.17, SD: 1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pride</td>
<td>Mean: 4.14, SD: .84</td>
<td>Mean: 2.30, SD: 1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Love</td>
<td>Mean: 4.28, SD: .76</td>
<td>Mean: 2.01, SD: 1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouragement</td>
<td>Mean: 4.36, SD: .70</td>
<td>Mean: 2.25, SD: 1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No anger-angry</td>
<td>Mean: 4.21, SD: .96</td>
<td>Mean: 2.00, SD: 1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheerfulness</td>
<td>Mean: 4.55, SD: .71</td>
<td>Mean: 1.80, SD: 1.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excitement</td>
<td>Mean: 4.09, SD: .84</td>
<td>Mean: 1.70, SD: 1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidence</td>
<td>Mean: 4.40, SD: .71</td>
<td>Mean: 1.74, SD: 1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calmness</td>
<td>Mean: 4.04, SD: 1.01</td>
<td>Mean: 1.88, SD: 1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non anxiety-anxiety</td>
<td>Mean: 4.08, SD: .95</td>
<td>Mean: 1.84, SD: 1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enthusiasm</td>
<td>Mean: 4.57, SD: .76</td>
<td>Mean: 1.89, SD: 1.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: All $F(1, 320)$ values are significant at the .01 level of significance; The nature of the emotions is positive and negative in the positive and negative friendships group, respectively; --: Emotions did not further differentiate the one group from the other group of children.
ducted to determine the set of emotions that best discriminated the two groups of children. The results from this analysis (Table 2) confirmed the univariate findings, and, in addition, revealed that: 1) the children, who estimated their friendships as positive, compared to children, who estimated their friendship as negative, felt better; 2) the emotion of cheerfulness, discriminating power = .84, d = 1.75, followed by the emotions of confidence, discriminating power = .83, d = 1.75, enthusiasm, discriminating power = .81, d = 1.73, and pleasure, discriminating power = .76, d = 1.70, was the most powerful factor in discriminating the group of students with the positive friendships from the group of students with the negative friendships and 3) the emotions of happiness, love, no angry-angry, excitement, calmness, no anxiety—anxiety were found not to further differentiate the one group from the other group of children.

The above results partly confirmed Hypotheses 2a, 2b and 2c.

**The role of Hope in the Perceived Positive and Negative Friendships**

The results from Anovas, with the perceived (positive/negative) friendship as between subjects factor, and examination of the mean scores revealed that the children who estimated their friendships as positive, as compared to children, who perceived their friendships as negative, had higher agency thinking and higher pathway thinking. The results from Discriminant analysis (Table 3) with stepwise method confirmed these findings and, in addition, showed that agency thinking, discriminating power = .95, d = 1.42, discriminated the one from the other group of children, while path thinking did not to further differentiate the two groups of children.

Because we were also interested in the role of hope within positive/negative friendship, correlations coefficients and regression analyses within each group of friendships were conducted. The results from these analyses showed that the higher levels of hope (mainly, agency thinking) were associated with higher perceived positive friendships and with lower perceived negative friendships. More precisely, in the positive friendships group, agency thoughts and pathways thoughts, together, influenced the students’ perceptions of their friendships, R² = .12, F(2, 230) = 19.35, p < .01, agency thoughts, b = .35, t = 4.25, p < .01, had unique effect on it, while pathways thoughts had not significant effect, b = .02, t = 1.00, p > .05. In the negative friendships group, pathways thoughts and agency thoughts, as a group, influenced the generation of the perceived friendships, R² = .69, F(2, 86) = 97.45, p < .01, agency thoughts, b = .70, t = 3.55, p < .01, contributed into it, while pathway thinking was not significant contributor, b = .13, t = .67, p > .05.

Thus, Hypotheses 3a and 3b were partly confirmed.

**Effects of Hope on Attributions for the Perceived Positive and Negative Friendships**

Correlations coefficients, and a series of regression analysis (Table 4), with agency thinking and pathway thinking as predictive variables and each of the attributional dimensions as predicted variable, within each group (positive/negative friendship) of children revealed the following.

Agency thoughts and pathways thoughts, together, positively influenced the formulation of the attributional dimensions, explaining an amount of variance from 3% (external controllability) to 18% (stability) in the positive friendships group, and...
from 30% (self-friend interactive controllability) to 51% (personal controllability) in the negative friendships group. Thus, hope was a better predictor of the attributional dimensions for the perceived negative friendships than for the perceived positive friendships. Higher-hope children, as compared to lower-hope children, made more internal, personal controllable, stable, external uncontrollable and self-friend interactive internal attributions for their perceived positive friendships, and more external, personal uncontrollable, external controllable, and self-friend interactive uncontrollable attributions their perceived negative friendships.

Pathways thoughts accounted for significant variability only in self-friend interactive locus of causality and self-friend interactive controllability in the positive and negative friendships group, respectively. In contrast, agency thoughts evidenced unique contribution in the generation of all of the attributional dimensions.

Thus, Hypotheses 4a was mainly confirmed.

Effects of Hope on Emotions for the Perceived Positive and Negative Friendships

The results from correlations coefficients and a series of regression analyses, with agency thinking and pathway thinking as predictive variables and each of the emotions as predicted variable, within each group (perceived positive/negative friendships) (Table 5) showed that 1) agency thoughts and pathways thoughts, as a group, was a significant formula for the children’s emotions for their positive friendships, $R^2$ ranged from .03 (pride) to .11 (confidence), and, mainly, of their emotions for their negative friendships, $R^2$ ranged from .30 (calmness) to .80 (encouragement), 2) higher-hope children, in comparison to lower-hope children, experienced more intense positive emotions (mainly, encouragement and confidence) for their positive friendships, while they felt less negative emotions (particularly, discouragement, hate, and shame) for their negative friendships, 3) the relative power of pathway thinking and agency thinking in formulating emotional experience varied across emotions and between the two groups of friendships, and 4) pathway thinking, compared to agency thinking, was a better predictor of most of the emotions in the positive friendships group, while in the negative friendships group the reverse was the case.

The above findings partly confirmed the hypothesis 4b.

Effects of Hope on the Impact of Attributions on Emotions for the Perceived Friendship

Because we were also interested in the mediate role of hope in the impact of the attributions on the emotions for the perceived positive and negative friendship, a series of hierarchical regression analysis were conducted. Each of the emotions was the predicted variable, and attributional dimensions were entered at the first step, and agency thoughts and pathway thoughts were entered at the second step of the analysis1.

The results from the analyses (Table 6) revealed that 1) hope and attributions, in combination, accounted for a significant variance in the emotions for the perceived positive friendships, $R^2$ ranged from .08 (encouragement) to .18 (happiness), and, mainly, for perceived negative friendships, $R^2$ ranged from .57 (nervousness) to .88 (displeasure), 2) hope (agency thinking and pathways thinking, together) enhanced the impact of the attributions on the emotions for the perceived positive friendships, $R^2$ch ranged from .032 to .057, and, mostly, for the perceived negative friendships, $R^2$ch ranged from .034 to .65. That means that the children with higher hope (mainly, agency thinking) were more likely to use the specific attributional pattern and enjoy their friendships more than the children with lower hope. Also, 3) agency thinking had unique effect on most of the emotions, whereas pathway thinking had unique effect on confidence and encouragement. Finally, 4) locus of causality, personal controllability, and self-friend interactive controllability, compared to the other attributional dimensions, were better predictors of most of the emotions.

The above findings partly confirmed Hypotheses 4c.

Effects of Hope on the Interactive Impact of Attributions and Emotions on Friendship Expectations

In order to examine the role of hope on the effects of the attributions and emotions for the perceived quality of the friendship on the friendship expectations, correlation coefficients and two hierarchical regression analyses were performed. The findings revealed that, in the positive friendships group, high-pathway thinking children expected that their friendship will continue to be good in the future. In contrast, in the negative friendships group, low-agency thinking children had low expectations of positive friendship. In addition, the main results from the two hierarchical regression analyses (Table 7), with friendship expectations as predicted factor, and emotions entering into first step, attributions entering into second step and hope entering into third step of the analysis, were the following: a) the three sets of predictors, together, had significant and positive effect on friendship expectations in the positive friendships group, $R^2 = .47$, and in the negative friendship group, $R^2 = .96$, b) pathways thoughts and agency thoughts, together, influenced the interactive impact of attributions and emotions on friendship expectations in both groups of friendships, positive, $R^2ch = .029$, and negative, $R^2ch = .052$, c) pathways thoughts and agency thoughts enhanced the impact of attributions and emotions on friendship expectations in the positive friendships group and negative friendships group, respectively, d) pleasure, encouragement, cheerfulness, confidence, calmness, stability, external controllability, self-friend interactive locus of causality, and pathway thoughts uniquely contributed into friendship expectations in the positive friendships group, and e) displeasure, discouragement, hate, sadness, no excitement, no enthusiasm, personal controllability, external controllability, self-friend interactive controllability and agency thoughts were significant predictors of friendship expectations in the negative friendships group. Hypotheses 5a, 5b and 5c were in the main confirmed by these findings.

Discussion

The main aim of this study was to investigate a) possible differences between the children who perceive their friendship with their best friend either as positive or negative with respect to subsequent attributions and emotions, and hope (pathways thinking, agency thinking, and b) the role of hope in the generation of attributions, emotions and friendship expectations.

The attributional pattern for the friendships was in the main as expected. The children attributed their friendships with their best friends to various causes, reflecting the high importance of such relationships in their life (Argyle, 2001; Berndt, 2004; Bukowski, 2001; Holder & Coleman, 2009; Stephanou, 2010;
Table 5. 
Findings from regression analyses for the effects of children’s hope (agency thinking, path thinking) on their emotions for their perceived positive and negative friendships.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Positive friendships</th>
<th></th>
<th>Negative friendships</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R²</td>
<td>F(2, 230)</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happiness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency thinking</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>7.90</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>2.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Path thinking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency thinking</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Path thinking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pride</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency thinking</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>2.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Path thinking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Love</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency thinking</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Path thinking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouragement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency thinking</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>9.23</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>3.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Path thinking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not angry-angry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency thinking</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>3.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Path thinking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheerfulness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency thinking</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Path thinking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excitement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency thinking</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>11.30</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>4.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Path thinking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency thinking</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>15.60</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Path thinking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calmness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency thinking</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Path thinking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No anxiety-anxiety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency thinking</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Path thinking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enthusiasm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency thinking</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>6.30</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>2.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Path thinking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: F > 4.00, p < .01; F ≤ 4.00, p ≤ .05; F--; p > .05; t > 2.80, p < .01; t ≤ 2.80, p < .05; t--, p > .05; The nature of the emotions is positive and negative in the positive and negative friendships group, respectively.

Stephanou, & Balkamou, (2010). In addition, the attributional pattern within-and between positive and negative friendships group appears to be related to desirable good friendship (see Gifford-Smith & Brownell, 2003; Harvey et al., 2005; Hoglund et al., 2008; Weiner, 2002, 2005). Also, by attributing the positive friendships to personal properties, along with friend related factors, self-friend interactive internal and controllable causes, the participants enhanced themselves, multiplied the chances of good relationship in the future, and, simultaneously, indicated the crucial role of the friend in forming a satisfactory friendship (Fiedler et al., 1995; Fincham, 2003; Rusbult, Arriaga, & Agnew, 2003; Weiner, 2001). By attributing the negative friendships to external, personal uncontrollable and friend’s internal and controllable bad factors, the children protected themselves (see Stephanou, 2005, 2007; Weiner, 2001). However, considering the friend as responsible for the negative friendship does not facilitate future positive relationship (Karney et al., 2003; Mason, 2001; Weiner, 1995). Similarly, attributing the non satisfactory friendship to constant and external controllable negative factors minimizes the chances for future positive friendship (Fletcher, 2002; Fincham et al., 1998; Planalp, & Rivers, 1996).

The findings regarding the emotions were mainly in consistency with our hypotheses and previous research evidence. Perhaps, it was very important for the children to have positive friendships, since they reacted affectively in high intense (Forgas, 2002; Forgas, & Smith, 2005; Frijda, 1993, 2009). Also, the children, being at the specific age, might have expected positive friendships, and confirmation of them produced intense positive emotions (see Bless, 2003; Trope, & Gaunt, 2005), while, the friends’ unexpected bad behavior contributed into intense negative emotions. This argument is related to the Berscheid (1983) emotion-in-relationships model suggesting the greater the interruption when one partner does something unexpected, or fails to do something expected, the higher the intensity of the experienced emotions. Additionally, it seems that the children’ negative friendships with their best friends were against their desires, since under such conditions persons experience intense negative emotions (Berscheid, & Ammazzolari, 2003; Carver, & Scheier, 2000; Forgas, 2002; Frijda, 2007, 2009; Parrott, 2003). The fact that the group of children with the positive friendships was discriminated from the group of children with the negative friendships predominately by the outcome-dependent affects (cheerfulness, pleasure), followed by the expectancy-related affects (confidence, enthusiasm), and self-esteem related affects (pride) is also in line with these speculations and Weiner’s (2002, 2005) theory.

Children also experienced discrete emotions by cognitively appraised their friendships along the attributional dimensions. This finding is in agreement with other researches (e.g., Bradbury, & Fincham, 1987; Fitness & Fletcher, 1993; Planalp & Fitness, 1999; Stephanou, & Balkamou, 2010) in intimate relationships. The fact that attributions were more powerful contributor in the generation of the emotions in negative than positive friendships is consistent with the notion that individuals search for explanations of their negative than positive experiences (Weiner, 2002). Locus of causality and personal controllability were found to be the most significant predictors of most of the emotions, contrarily to the notion that each
Table 6.
Results from hierarchical regression analyses for the impact of hope (agency thinking, path thinking) on the effects of attributions on emotions for the perceived friendships (positive/negative).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emotions</th>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>Steps</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>R²ch</th>
<th>Fch</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>beta</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happiness</td>
<td>Attributions</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td></td>
<td>14.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S: .39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hope</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>7.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pride</td>
<td>Attributions</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>.096</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EC: .22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hope</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouragement</td>
<td>Attributions</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td></td>
<td>9.55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ILC: .19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hope</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not angry-angry</td>
<td>Attributions</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HA: .27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hope</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidence</td>
<td>Attributions</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PC: .19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hope</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>8.55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unhappiness</td>
<td>Attributions</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td></td>
<td>56.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PC: .55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hope</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>47.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Displeasure</td>
<td>Attributions</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td></td>
<td>58.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PC: .62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hope</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>55.97</td>
<td>55.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shame</td>
<td>Attributions</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td></td>
<td>20.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LC: .46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hope</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>69.85</td>
<td>58.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No love</td>
<td>Attributions</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td></td>
<td>26.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PC: .34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hope</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>47.70</td>
<td>52.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discouragement</td>
<td>Attributions</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td></td>
<td>29.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PC: .39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hope</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>68.30</td>
<td>68.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger</td>
<td>Attributions</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td></td>
<td>49.35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LC: .23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hope</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>34.30</td>
<td>70.55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sadness</td>
<td>Attributions</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td></td>
<td>37.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IC: .15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hope</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.083</td>
<td>15.20</td>
<td>39.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No excitement</td>
<td>Attributions</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td></td>
<td>68.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PC: .25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hope</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>8.40</td>
<td>59.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pessimism</td>
<td>Attributions</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td></td>
<td>28.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IC: .20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hope</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>7.80</td>
<td>25.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nervousness</td>
<td>Attributions</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td></td>
<td>36.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PC: .63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hope</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>22.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety</td>
<td>Attributions</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td></td>
<td>32.55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IC: .24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hope</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.086</td>
<td>11.60</td>
<td>31.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No enthusiasm</td>
<td>Attributions</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td></td>
<td>39.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PC: .43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hope</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>11.68</td>
<td>11.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: LC = Locus of causality; PC = Personal controllability; S = Stability; EC = External controllability; ILC = Self-friend interactive locus of causality; IC = Self-friend interactive controllability; Fch- and F-values, p < .01; --: No significant at the .05 level; t > 2.60, p < .01; t ≤ 2.60, p < .05; t ---: p > .05.
attributional dimension is related to specific kind of emotions. Self-friend interactive controllability played a significant role in emotions, particularly for negative relationships, underlying the interactive nature of friendship (Carr, 2005; Rose, 2007).

Interestingly, it also seems that the children considered the development of their friendship, since, based on Seligman’s (2002) view of classification of emotions, they experienced emotions which are related to the past (e.g., pride/shame), the present (e.g., pleasure/displeasure) and the future (e.g., confidence/non confidence).

It should be mentioned, however, that the experience of some certain negative emotions does not facilitate future good friendship. For example, previous research evidence suggests that anger is positively related to attribute malicious intentions to other, anxiety enhances the belief that threatening events are about to occur, and sadness shapes malicious attributions for conflicts in close relationships (Fitness et al., 2005; Forgas, 1994, 1995; Planalp, & Fitness, 1999).

To summarize, the findings regarding hope were mainly consistent with our expectations. More precisely, in accordance to previous studies (see Roberts, 2005; Snyder et al., 2005), and Snyder’s (2000) hope theory, the children with high hope enjoyed their friendship with their best friend, and used positive appraisal for their good friendship. In a similar way, the high hope children, as compared to low hope children, suffered less and used effective appraisal of the no satisfactory friendships. These findings indicate that the high hope children, not the low hope children, searched for something positive, a consistent finding with previous empirical evidence (see Carver, & Scheier, 2005). Hope was also a more powerful contributor into the generation of emotions and of the appraisals of the negative friendship than the positive friendship, complementarily to previous research evidence, which suggests that high hope people use positive reappraisal for a variety of stressor situation (see Gilham, 2000; Snyder et al., 1999).

The differential contribution of pathway thinking and agency thinking to emotional experience and cognitive appraisals of the friendships is an indication that hope is interactively constructed by these two elements (see Snyder et al, 2005). Contrarily to our hypothesis and previous literature, pathway thinking played a minor role in emotions, evaluating and attributing causes of the friendships. This may reflect the notion that agency thinking shares similarity with self-efficacy (Bandura, 1997), and, being the motivational component of hope, proved crucial in the case of difficulties, like negative friendship (see Snyder, 1994).

With reference to attributions, in addition, hope predominately influenced stability than the other attributional dimensions for the positive friendship, while, unexpectedly, it mainly influenced locus of causality and personal controllability for the negative friendship, reflecting, probably, the children’s desire and assurance only for the former friendship. These findings may also support other findings which reported that high-hope as compared with low-hope individuals tend to present themselves more positively and social desirable (Snyder, Hoza, et al., 1997; Taylor, 1989). However, research needs to examine this speculation.

The pattern of the effects of hope on emotions is consistent with empirical evidence (see Roberts et al., 2005; Seligman, 2005; Stephanou, 2010) showing the important role of hope in expectancy (encouragement/discouragement, confidence/non confidence, enthusiasm/non enthusiasm), goal pursuit (pleasure/displeasure, cheerfulness/sadness, love/hate), self (pride/shame)-related affects. Furthermore, hope had direct and indirect, through attributions, effect on the emotions for the perceived positive friendships and, mainly, negative friendships.

The results from the present study also, confirming in the main our hypotheses, reveal that hope, attributions and emotions had unique and complimentarily effect on friendship expectations. Specifically, the three sets of concepts, in combination, proved a more powerful predictor of the expectations in negative than positive friendship group, lending further support to the earlier findings (see Fitness et al., 2005; Forgas, & Smith, 2005; Greitemeyer, & Weiner, 2003; Harvey et al., 2005; Stephanou, 2007; Weiner, 2002, 2005). Also, in agreement with Weiner’s (2002) model the future (encouragement, confidence/ discouragement, no enthusiasm)- desirable friendship (pleasure, cheerfulness, calmness/displeasure, hate, sadness, no excitement)-related emotions contributed in friendship expectations. Stability, as expected, was a significant factor of the formation of friendship expectation in the positive friendship group, while, unexpectedly, it had no effect in negative friendship group, reflecting, probably, children’s beliefs that the negative friendship can become positive only if they can control situation and interact effectively with their friends. The effect of external controllability and self-friend interactive locus of causality is another indication of the perception of the significant role of the friend in forming a future positive friendship. However, these need to be further investigated.

Also, in line with Snyder’s (2000) theory and previous research evidence (e.g., Peterson, 2000; Scheier et al., 2000; Stephanou, 2010), hope had direct and indirect (via the interac-
tion of attributions and emotions) effect on friendship expecta-
tions in both groups of children. That means that the children 
with higher pathway thinking were more likely to use the spe-
cific attributional pattern, enjoy their friendships more and have 
higher expectations of positive friendship than the children with 
lower pathway thinking. In contrast, in the negative friendship 
group, the higher agency thinking compared with lower agency 
thinking, were more likely to apply the specific attributional 
pattern, suffer in the friendship less, and expect future positive 
friendship. Interestingly, pathway thinking and agency thinking 
proved predictor of friendship expectation in the positive and 
negative friendships, respectively. Research needs to verify 
their relative role in children’s friendship-related procedures.

Implications of the Findings in Children and 
Research

Good friendship proved important for the children. Children 
should be helped develop the capacity to make and maintain 
stable and satisfying friendships. This capacity is acquired 
through personal, historical and environmental factors (Blas, 
2007; Buss, 2000; Carr, 2005). Regarding environmental fac-
tors, children should be encouraged by school, the family and 
the community to meet peers, at least some of whom have simi-
lar skills, attributes and values. With respect to personal factors, 
in the present study, hope appears to play a significant role in it. 
More precisely, children had certain hope level that influenced 
their perceptions of friendship as positive or negative, the sub-
sequent attributions and emotions, and their friendship expecta-
tions, particularly in negative friendships group. Hence, chil-
dren are needed to be helped maximize hopeful thinking, which 
is inculcated through interactions with their caretakers, teachers 
and peers (McDermott & Hastings, 2000; Snyder et al., 1997). 
Children should be encouraged to formulate clear goals, pro-
duce many and various pathways to these, pursue the goals and 
reframe obstacles as challenge to be overcome (Snyder, 2000).

The present findings also support that the participants were 
involved in their friendships cognitively and emotionally, and 
these processes had significant effect on friendship expectations. 
Attributional retraining (Seligman, 2002) helps children to 
change maladaptive attributional pattern of friendships, and 
understanding the nature and function of emotions within posi-
tive/negative friendship is essential. Yet, emotional expression 
influences partners’ behaviour (Clark, Pataki, & Carver, 1996), 
and children are needed to be aware of it.

Overall, the findings from this study indicate the importance 
of examining children friendship along the role of hope in 
forming expectations. Research is needed to examine the role of 
children’s past experience, beliefs and expectancies about the 
ideal friendship on the observed associations, and on the con-
sequences of the present emotional and cognitive pattern on 
friendship development. Finally, research needs to investigate 
the role of parents’ and teachers’ support in children’s hope 
thinking and intimate relationships.
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