

## ANALYSIS OF RESILIENCY LEVELS OF DISABLED INDIVIDUALS DOING SPORTS ACCORDING TO SOME VARIABLES

Fikret SOYER<sup>1</sup>

Mahmut GÜLLE<sup>2</sup>

Orcan MIZRAK<sup>3</sup>

Serkan ZENGİN<sup>1</sup>

Erdi KAYA<sup>1</sup>

### ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study is to examine if resiliency levels of disabled individuals doing sports varies according to some variables or not.

143 disabled individual (115 male and 28 female) living in the provinces of Konya and Karaman constitutes the study's population. Personal information form and "Resiliency Scale" developed by Gürkan (2006a) were used to evaluate the researchers in this study. Resiliency levels of disabled people were examined in terms of age, gender, marital status and educational level.

SPSS 19 statistical software package was used for the evaluation of the obtained data. Test of normality of data was performed with One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov test and it was seen that data has not shown a normal distribution. For this reason, non-parametric tests, Mann-Whitney U Test and Kruskal-Wallis test batteries were used in testing of these data. The error performance parameter was accepted as 0,05 in this study.

As a result, it is found that disabled individuals doing sports show significant difference according to age and educational level in terms of their resiliency levels. It wasn't found any significant difference in terms of marital status and gender.

**Keyword:** Resiliency, Resiliency for disabled individuals.

### SPOR YAPAN BEDENSEL ENGELLİ BİREYLERİN ÇEŞİTLİ DEĞİŞKENLERE GÖRE YILMAZ DÜZEYLERİNİN İNCELENMESİ

#### ÖZET

Bu araştırmanın amacı; spor yapan bedensel engelli bireylerin yılmazlık düzeylerinin bazı değişkenler açısından farklılaşıp farklılaşmadığının incelenmesidir.

Araştırmanın evrenini Konya ilinde yaşayan 143 (115 erkek 28kadın) bedensel engelli birey oluşturmaktadır. Araştırmada, araştırmacılara yönelik kişisel bilgi formu ve Gürkan (2006a) tarafından geliştirilen "Yılmazlık Ölçeği" kullanılmıştır. Engellilerin yılmazlık düzeyleri; yaş, cinsiyet, medeni durum ve eğitim düzeyleri açısından incelenmiştir.

Elde edilen verilerin hesaplanmasında ise SPSS 19 istatistik paket programı kullanılmıştır. Verilerin normallik sınaması One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov test ile yapılmış olup verilerin normal dağılım göstermediği görülmüştür. Bu nedenle veriler test edilmesinde non-parametrik testlerden, Mann-Whitney U Testi ile Kruskal-Wallis test bataryaları kullanılmıştır. Bu çalışmada hata düzeyi 0,05 olarak kabul edilmiştir.

Sonuç olarak; spor yapan bedensel engelli bireylerin, yaş ve eğitim değişkenine göre yılmazlık düzeyleri bakımından anlamlılık gösterdiği bulgulanmıştır. Medeni durum, cinsiyet düzeyleri açısından ise herhangi bir anlamlık bulgulanamamıştır.

Anahtar kelime: Yılmazlık, Engellilerde yılmazlık.

<sup>1</sup>School of Physical Education and Sports, Sakarya University, TURKEY

<sup>2</sup>School of Physical Education and Sports, Mustafa Kemal University, TURKEY

<sup>3</sup>School of Physical Education and Sports, Atatürk University, TURKEY

## INTRODUCTION

Although it is not found an exact compromise to define resilience term, below mentioned definitions can make a contribution to gain a clear understanding.

Resilience term is derived from Latin "resiliens" (dauntless/ steady) and this term defines a material is resilience and can be reverted to his type(Greene, 2002).

According to Webster's New Twentieth Century English Dictionary (1958), resilience means "to revert/ return its former shape after being compacted and to obtain power, energy, and courage." According to The Random House Dictionary (1967), the resilience is defined as "the ability to return the original position or form after being compressed or stretched out". This can be interpreted as the capacity of flexibility. Also, according to The American Heritage Dictionary (1973), the resilience means "alteration, get rid of disease and ill-fate quickly, improvement". In addition the mean of the word "resilience" is provided in The Redhouse English Dictionary (2002) as "resistance, fast improvement power, the strength to overcome challenges, and flexibility".

It is known that personality and combativity spirit of individuals who brave the difficulties of life and overcome these problems are high. However, it is also known that individuals with disabilities make more negative start to life due to their disabilities than normal individuals. On the other hand, it can be concluded that individuals with disabilities need to show more commitment and resistance against the life due to various problems and they should highly demonstrate this behavior. One of the most important ways to hold onto life is a healthy life and to feel energetic. In short, one of the most important factors that keeps the individuals with disabilities alive and helps them to forge tirelessly despite the challenges of life and increases the fighting spirit is seen as sports activities.

Indeed, in the literature; it has been suggested that having a "indomitable" personality nature requires a combination of characteristic features such as being aware of their own strength, skills and capacity, achieving a high self-esteem, and inner motivation (Gordon, 1996; Miller, 2002; Margalit, 2003; Gürgân, (2006b)). Furthermore, Öğülmüş (2001) mentions that many of the characteristics of "indomitable" individuals may be obtained by normal individuals. also, Öğülmüş (2006) specifies "the need of focusing on schooling individuals with indomitable personality characteristics in order to prevent the violence in schools".

One of the most comprehensive longitudinal researches on resilience began in 1955 and this research in which 698 infants were examined in Kauai lasted nearly 40 years (Werner and Smith 1992, s.1). Initially, these children are considered to be at high risk in term of low school performance, school dropout and drug abuse. This research is continued till these subjects are 30s. Almost half of these children grew up in poverty, 1/6 of these were diagnosed as mentally retarded and it was observed a serious learning difficulty in the first decade of phases in 2/3 of these subjects.

When the international studies on resilience was examined, it is reported that individuals having the structure of "indomitable personality" have high ability of problem-solving and communication, prefer effective coping strategies in solving the problems, have a structure that can move independently (Rak and Patterson, 1996; Benard, 1996; Vance and Sanchez, 1998; Howard & Johnson, 2000).

Resilience is a complex structure that incorporates many concepts such as durability and combativity. Therefore, in resilience studies the selection and use of appropriate scale are very important. In recent years, it has been observed that many measurement tools of resilience towards individuals with different

developmental characteristics and functions was developed in the foreign literature. However, we cannot say that an agreement has been reached about which of these scales describes and evaluates the resilience the most effective way (Hoge, Austin and Pollack, 2007).

Masten and Reed (2002) claims that the resilience may be described "only when the individual has a risk or difficulties". Individuals living in conditions without a significant risk status could be called as "enough (qualified / competent)", "good-compliant (well adjusted)" or just "normal", but for these children, or adolescents, it cannot be talked about the fact of "resilience".

In this case, "high risk" environment or conditions which are discussed in resilience researches and which has significant negative effects on individuals, and individuals adapted their roles healthily under "high risk" should be clearly identified. The term "risk" means difficulty, distress and disaster (adversity). In general, the term "risk" is used to identify the particular groups instead of individuals. Risk factors are defined as "effects that will increase the likelihood of a negative situation or will result in the perpetuation of a possible problem". (Kirby and Fraser, 1997). In other words, the term "risk factors" is used to define the characteristics of a particular human entourage, especially kids or adolescents that increase the increase the likelihood of having negative and unintended consequences such as perpetration, school dropout. While several risk factors are the reason of negative consequences, there is only a relationship between other several risk factors and negative consequences. Risk factors may include genetic, biological, socio-cultural and demographic conditions or characteristic (Masten and al., 1990).

## METHOD

At this study general survey model, which is a method of the descriptive research and descriptive statistic model is

used. Karasar (2005) defines survey model as a research method aims to describe existing case as it is.

## The Population of Study

143 disabled athletes doing sports in various sports branches (amputee, basketball) in provinces of Konya and Karaman in 2013 constitute the population of the study. 143 disabled athletes including 28 female and 115 male constitute the sample of the study. The "resiliency" levels of disabled athletes were examined in terms of gender, age, marital status and educational level.

## Data collection tool

Personal information form developed by the researchers as data collection tool is used as at the study and resilience scale developed by Gürgen (2006a) is used in order to determine resilience levels of the attendants.

Resilience scale is developed by Gürgen (2006a) in order to determine resilience levels of the students. Resilience scale is a five point likert scale consisting of 50 articles. Points between 50 and 250 can be taken in this scale. Raise of the points shows level of the resilience level.

At the reliability work of the scale is calculated Cronbach alpha inner coefficient of consistence with the test-retest reliability. Scale is applied a month break in order to check test-retest reliability. After the analyze of this application correlation between the taken points of the first and second applications is found as  $89(p < .001)$ . At the work made for the Cronbach alpha inner coefficient of consistence, Cronbach Alpha value is found as 78 and 87 in sequence which are separately calculated for first and second applications in same group. Cronbach Alpha value(.80)calculated for the validity group work is quite similar to the above mentioned values.

In the validity work of the scale, validity of the scale and validity of the structure is

considered. In the validity work of the scale, resilience notional relation of the scale is examined the correlations to the some variances shown in the previous studies. Those variances are focus of control, problem solving ability, learned helplessness, hopelessness which are approved experts. In the consequence of the factor analyze made for structure validity of the scale is seen that 50 articles which are described 57.56% of the total variance are gathered in 8 factors. Those factors are respectively “being powerful”, “being entrepreneur”, “being optimist/conduct of life”, “communication /communicating”, “prudence”, “goal

attainment”, “being leader”, “being researcher” (Gürgân, 2006a).

### Analyzing of the data

SPSS 19,0 statistical packet program is used at the calculation and evaluation of the observed. The data are summarized by using percentage (%) and frequency table.

Test of normality of the data is made by One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov test and it is provided that data has shown normal distribution. The data have been analyzed by the parametric tests, independent sample-t test and One Way ANOVA. At this study error level is accepted as 0,05.

## FINDINGS

**Table 1. Mann Whitney U Test that is performed to determine if resiliency levels of disabled athletes differ according to the variable of "Gender" or not.**

	GENDER	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks	U	P
BEING A STRONG LEADER	Male	115	74,53	8571,50	1318,500	0,138
	Female	28	61,59	1724,50		
	Total	143				
ENTREPRENEURSHIP	Male	115	72,96	8390,50	1499,500	0,573
	Female	28	68,05	1905,50		
	Total	143				
BEING OPTIMISTIC	Male	115	74,19	8531,50	1358,500	0,198
	Female	28	63,02	1764,50		
	Total	143				
COMMUNICATION	Male	115	71,46	8218,00	1548,000	0,751
	Female	28	74,21	2078,00		
	Total	143				
FORECASTING	Male	115	74,66	8586,00	1304,000	0,115
	Female	28	61,07	1710,00		
	Total	143				
GOAL ATTAINMENT	Male	115	73,23	8422,00	1468,000	0,466
	Female	28	66,93	1874,00		
	Total	143				
BEING LEADER	Male	115	69,92	8041,00	1371,000	0,221
	Female	28	80,54	2255,00		
	Total	143				
BEING A RESEARCHER	Male	115	73,28	8427,50	1462,500	0,443
	Female	28	66,73	1868,50		
	Total	143				

As can be seen and understood from Table 1, it cannot be found a significant difference at the level of  $p < 0.05$  statistically in terms of variable of gender as a result of Mann Whitney-U test

performed in order to determine if points of participants from resiliency subscale differs in a meaningful way according to the variable of gender or not.

**Table 2. Mann Whitney U Test that is performed to determine if resiliency levels of disabled athletes differ according to the variable of "Marital Status" or not.**

	MARITAL STATUS	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks	U	P
BEING A STRONG LEADER	Married	86	68,44	5886,00	2145,000	0,206
	Single	57	77,37	4410,00		
	Total	143				
ENTREPRENEURSHIP	Married	86	67,12	5772,50	2031,500	0,083
	Single	57	79,36	4523,50		
	Total	143				
BEING OPTIMISTIC	Married	86	68,08	5855,00	2114,000	0,162
	Single	57	77,91	4441,00		
	Total	143				
COMMUNICATION	Married	86	69,95	6015,50	2274,500	0,464
	Single	57	75,10	4280,50		
	Total	143				
FORECASTING	Married	86	73,32	6305,50	2337,500	0,636
	Single	57	70,01	3990,50		
	Total	143				
GOAL ATTAINMENT	Married	86	68,34	5877,50	2136,500	0,190
	Single	57	77,52	4418,50		
	Total	143				
BEING LEADER	Married	86	70,41	6055,00	2314,000	0,570
	Single	57	74,40	4241,00		
	Total	143				
BEING A RESEARCHER	Married	86	69,02	5936,00	2195,000	0,281
	Single	57	76,49	4360,00		
	Total	143	68,44	5886,00		

As can be seen and understood from Table 2, it cannot be found a significant difference at the level of  $p < 0.05$  statistically in terms of variable of marital status as a result of Mann Whitney-U test

performed in order to determine if points of participants from resiliency subscale differs in a meaningful way according to the variable of Marital Status or not.

**Table 3. Kruskal Wallis-H Test that is performed to determine if resiliency levels of disabled athletes differ according to the variable of "Educational Status" or not.**

	EDUCATIONAL STATUS	N	Mean Rank	Chi-Square	Asymp. Sig
<b>BEING A STRONG LEADER</b>	Primary	33	67,95	,496	,920
	Secondary	65	73,70		
	High School	32	71,52		
	University	13	74,96		
	Total	143			
<b>ENTREPRENEURSHIP</b>	Primary	33	65,32	4,989	,173
	Secondary	65	78,12		
	High School	32	74,00		
	University	13	53,42		
	Total	143			
<b>BEING OPTIMISTIC</b>	Primary	33	62,35	5,509	,138
	Secondary	65	73,46		
	High School	32	83,70		
	University	13	60,38		
	Total	143			
<b>COMMUNICATION</b>	Primary	33	54,11	12,188	,007**
	Secondary	65	74,27		
	High School	32	88,80		
	University	13	64,73		
	Total	143			
<b>FORECASTING</b>	Primary	33	75,39	,436	,933
	Secondary	65	71,79		
	High School	32	70,91		
	University	13	67,12		
	Total	143			
<b>GOAL ATTAINMENT</b>	Primary	33	60,24	5,694	,128
	Secondary	65	80,32		
	High School	32	68,56		
	University	13	68,69		
	Total	143			
<b>BEING LEADER</b>	Primary	33	67,74	3,316	,345
	Secondary	65	75,62		
	High School	32	75,89		
	University	13	55,15		
	Total	143			
<b>BEING A RESEARCHER</b>	Primary	33	66,17	1,698	,637
	Secondary	65	71,54		
	High School	32	74,70		
	University	13	82,46		
	Total	143			

According to the findings that can be seen on Table 3, as a result of Kruskal Wallis-H test which was performed to determine if there is a significant difference in points which disabled athletes got from the resiliency subscale in terms of variable of educational status; it is found that

disabled individuals who have primary level of education have a low-level resiliency when compared to disabled individuals with secondary and high school level of education in terms of sub-dimension of communication ( $p < 0.05$ ).

**Table 3. Kruskal Wallis-H Test that is performed to determine if resiliency levels of disabled athletes differ according to the variable of "Age" or not.**

AGE	N	Mean Rank	Chi-Square	Asymp. Sig.	
<b>BEING A STRONG LEADER</b>	15-20	13	87,92	7,935	,094
	21-26	41	58,22		
	27-32	58	74,59		
	33-38	14	73,39		
	39 and over	17	83,06		
<b>ENTREPRENEURSHIP</b>	15-20	13	75,92	4,539	,338
	21-26	41	70,24		
	27-32	58	65,78		
	33-38	14	88,64		
	39 and over	17	80,76		
<b>BEING OPTIMISTIC</b>	15-20	13	73,73	1,096	,895
	21-26	41	75,55		
	27-32	58	68,66		
	33-38	14	77,82		
	39 and over	17	68,74		
<b>COMMUNICATION</b>	15-20	13	67,04	1,331	,856
	21-26	41	70,57		
	27-32	58	70,80		
	33-38	14	82,93		
	39 and over	17	74,32		
<b>FORECASTING</b>	15-20	13	75,42	10,008	,040**
	21-26	41	56,68		
	27-32	58	75,72		
	33-38	14	75,36		
	39 and over	17	90,85		
<b>GOAL ATTAINMENT</b>	15-20	13	87,08	14,697	,005**
	21-26	41	60,09		
	27-32	58	67,94		
	33-38	14	73,68		
	39 and over	17	101,68		
<b>BEING LEADER</b>	15-20	13	75,92	,267	,992
	21-26	41	70,51		
	27-32	58	73,03		
	33-38	14	69,46		
	39 and over	17	71,18		
<b>BEING A RESEARCHER</b>	15-20	13	54,69	15,594	,004**
	21-26	41	66,33		
	27-32	58	76,46		
	33-38	14	51,86		
	39 and over	17	100,29		
<b>Total</b>		143			

According to the findings that can be seen on Table 4, as a result of Kruskal

Wallis-H test which was performed to determine if there is a significant difference

in points which disabled athletes got from the resiliency subscale in terms of variable of age; it is found that there is a significant difference in terms of sub-dimensions of forecasting, goal attainment and being a researcher ( $p<0.05$ ).

It was found that disabled individuals between the ages of 21 and 26 showed a lower resiliency level when compared to the others between the ages of 15 and 20, 27 and 30 and 39 and over in terms of forecasting which is one of the sub-dimensions of resiliency ( $p<0.05$ ).

It was found that disabled individuals in the category of the ages of 21 and 26, 27 and 32 and 33 and 38 showed a lower resiliency level when compared to the

## DISCUSSION – CONCLUSION

The findings obtained from this study which was conducted to examine if "resiliency" levels of disabled individuals doing sports differ in terms of some variables or not and the results of the research will be shared.

According to the findings of research, it was determined that there is a statistically significant difference in terms of sub-dimension of "resiliency" according to the variables of age and educational status when the sub-dimensions of "resiliency" (being a strong leader, entrepreneurship, being optimistic/conduct of life, communication / establishing relationships, forecasting, goal attainment, being leader, being a researcher) of disabled athletes participated in this study in the comparison in terms of age, gender, marital status and educational status ( $p>0,05$ ). The fact that there are no previous studies in terms of resiliency level of disabled athletes that this study may shed light on further studies.

According to the findings of this research, it was founded that disabled athletes who have primary level of education have a low-level resiliency when compared to disabled individuals with secondary and high school level of education in terms of communication which

others in the age of 39 and over in terms of goal attainment which is one of the sub-dimensions of resiliency ( $p<0.05$ ).

It was found that disabled individuals in the category of the ages of 15 and 20, 21 and 26 and 27 and 32 and 33 and 38 showed a lower resiliency level when compared to the others in the age of 39 and over in terms of being a researcher and the disabled individuals in the ages between 33 and 38 when compared to the others between the ages of 27 and 32 in terms of being a researcher which is one of the sub-dimensions of resiliency ( $p<0.05$ ).

is one of the sub-dimensions of resiliency level. Communication skills are known as a process which is very important for disabled people. It has been known that the process of understanding a person or making him/herself understood may sometimes become a vicious cycle during the tendency of a disabled individual to communicate with the others. It is thought and believed that explaining and telling things is not a part of communication and the errors and mistakes in applied gestures and facial expressions or sentences which may arise in accurate understanding may lead the closure of communication for individuals with disabilities. In this sense, the feature and characteristic of communication is a different form of expression for each individual, so we are seeing that the feature and characteristic of communication skills differ regardless of educational level as we founded during our research. As Baltaş and Baltaş (2002) expressed before, the communication is a whole process and features of way or mode of communication and communication process are inseparable parts of each other. They expressed that the communication cannot be evaluated with only words or just the hands or eyes etc. but the content of verbal communication, non-verbal communication signals, the current environment, and the



resources used during the process must be dealt as a whole and communication may differ according to individual differences. (Baltaş and Baltaş, 2002). Sarı (2004) stated that some of university students with disabilities (70%) can communicate easily with their friends, but this does not apply all of them in his study. However, he stated that they could not know how to approach to their friends at first but they could establish a better communication after introducing themselves. The rest of the students which he had interviewed (30%) told that their friends have a prejudgment sourced from their families and they have difficulty in establishing communication with them depending on this reason (Sarı, 2004)

It was founded that there is a significant difference in terms of forecasting, goal attainment and being a researcher which are sub-dimensions of resiliency of disabled athletes according to the age factor which is an another variable of the research. It was found that disabled individuals between the ages of 21 and 26 showed a lower resiliency level when compared to the others between the ages of 15 and 20, 27 and 30 and 39 and over in terms of forecasting which is one of the sub-dimensions of resiliency. It is thought and believed that the individuals between the ages of 21 and 26 have requirements of having a job, marriage and holding on to life within the framework of thoughts sourced because of their ages that they could not forecast. In short, it was expressed and stated that the individuals between the aforementioned ages do not give so much importance to forecasting due to the Erikson's Psychosocial Development Theory. Human being can be thought as a structure which is a part of development process and who do not take much chance on forecasting and thinks that a considered and designed thought to be operationalized immediately. Because, individuals who came puberty do not have enough time to dream or forecast and they often get the wrong end of the stick that it can be thought that it is a very normal situation for the

individuals between these ages to accept any kind of position which they will obtain as an important development in terms of the forecasting of individuals between these ages.

According to another finding of the research; it was found that disabled individuals in the category of the ages of 21 and 26, 27 and 32 and 33 and 38 showed a lower resiliency level when compared to the others in the age of 39 and over in terms of goal attainment which is one of the sub-dimensions of resiliency. It can be said that the disabilities (handicaps) of the individuals with disabilities may be an important factor in state of occurrence of such a conclusion. The belief or thought of an individual with disabilities to become unsuccessful in a work or business because of his/her disability may be thought to constitute an impediment in reaching the peak point of the target. Therefore, it can be thought that this may lead to a difficulty for disabled individuals to reach their goals. According to our finding, the older and younger disabled individuals have not got any difficulties in reaching their goals when compared to the others in the middle age group. The main reasons for this conclusion may be explained as that older disabled individuals have life experience due to their age of maturity. For young disabled individuals, the reason may cause of imagination and inexperience of them in life because they may think and perceive that it is not hard to reach goals. In short, the main reason for disabled individuals to have difficulties in reaching their goals may cause and source of their disabilities (handicaps).

According to another finding of the research; it was found that disabled individuals in the category of the ages of 15 and 20, 21 and 26 and 27 and 32 and 33 and 38 showed a lower resiliency level when compared to the others in the age of 39 and over in terms of being a researcher and the disabled individuals in the ages between 33 and 38 when compared to the others between the ages of 27 and 32 in

terms of being a researcher which is one of the sub-dimensions of resiliency. When our finding is considered, it was found that the individuals in the age of 39 and over are being more researchers when compared to the other age groups. This conclusion may express that individuals in the age of maturity think that they can find the answers of questions of life where they live may be founded more easily by researching. Because, it can be thought that mature individuals may reach and acquire information about the issues related to their lives and general life with the help of their life experiences and maturity.

When the findings of our research are considered; it is found that gender and marital status of individuals do not show any significant difference in terms of resiliency level. It is seen that there is no significant difference in resiliency levels of disabled individuals in terms of gender in any significance level. The reason for this may be seen for disabled individuals to be in any gender group does not constitute any obstacle in achieving their goals. So, it can be expressed that victimization because of the disability does not create any significant difference for these individuals in terms of gender. According to the findings, the fact that there is no significant difference to be male or female or married or single in terms of resiliency may be expressed as they are aware of the fact that the disability that they have is not the end of their life and does not constitute an obstacle to achieve their goals. Garmezy et al. (1985) expressed that

resiliency is a changing and multi-dimensional feature according to the living conditions of each individual in terms of location, time, age, gender and cultural situation.

As it can be seen in this study; the resiliency level may be sourced of difficulties in perception of individual because these difficulties may have left a lasting impact on the individual. So, it can be said that positive changes may be seen in resiliency level of an individual as well as the hard situations in his/her past may come as a normal situation after each step which he/she can survive the hardship. In short, it can be said that the hard life circumstances may lead an individual to resiliency and in time, being accustomed to these challenges may increase his/her resiliency level positively. However, it can also be said that today's conditions are unable to take up so many opportunities for individuals with disabilities that they will have challenges in keeping up with life and conditions and so, they would be forced to have breaks in their relations and consequently, their resiliency levels will be affected negatively.

In conclusion; it is found that disabled individuals who participated in this study;

- 1- Have got significant difference in their resiliency levels in terms of variables of age and educational level,
- 2- But have not got any significant difference in their resiliency levels in terms of variables of gender and marital status.

## REFERENCES

1. Baltaş, A. ve Baltaş, Z. *Stres ve başa çıkma yolları*. İstanbul: Remzi Yayınevi. (2002). [in Turkish]
2. Benard, B., The foundations of the resiliency paradigm. Premier Issue. 1996.
3. Garmezy, N., Rutter, M. Stress, coping and development in children. New York, Mc Graw-Hill(1985).
4. Gordon, K., "Resilient Hispanic Youths' Self-Concept and Motivational Patterns." *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, 18, 1, 63, 1996.
5. Gürgân, U., "Resilience scale (YÖ):Scale development, reliability and validity work ," Ankara University , Faculty of educational sciences journal, 32 (2);45-74, 2006. [in Turkish with English Abstract]
6. Gürgân, U., Effect of the psychological counselor in the group to the resilience level of the students, doctoral thesis, Ankara University, Institute of education sciences, Department of education sciences , Program of psychological counseling and guidance, Ankara, 2006. [in Turkish]
7. Hoge, E. A., Austin, E. D. & Pollack, M. H. (2007). Resilience: Research evidence and conceptual considerations for posttraumatic stress disorder.

- Depression and Anxiety, 24, 139–152.  
doi:10.1002/da.20175(2007).
8. Howard, S., & Johnson, B., What Makes The Difference? Children and Teachers Talk About Resilient Outcomes For Children "At Risk". Educational Studies, 26 (3), 2000.
  9. Jew, C. L., Green, K. E., Kroger, J. Development and validation of a measure of resiliency. Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development, 32, 75-89. (1999).
  10. Jew, C. L., Green, K. E., Kroger, J. (1999). Development and validation of a measure of resiliency. Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development, 32, 75-89(1999).
  11. Kirby, L.D., Fraser, M. W. Risk and resilience in childhood. In M. Fraser (Ed.), Risk and resilience in childhood (pp. 10-33). Washington, DC: NASW Press. (1997).
  12. Margalit, M., Resilience model among individuals with learning disabilities: proximal and distal influences. Learning Disabilities Research Practice, 18, 2, 82-87. 2003.
  13. Masten, A. S. Reed, M. J. Resilience in development. In C. R. Snyder S. J. Lopez (Eds.), The handbook of positive psychology (pp. 74- 88). Oxford University Press. (2002).
  14. Masten, A. S., Morison, P., Pellegrini, D. Teliegen, A. (1990). Competence under stress: risk and protective factors. In J. Rolf, A. S. (1990).
  15. Masten, D. Cicchetti, K. H. Nuechterlein S. Weintraub (1998), Risk and protective factors in the development of psychopathology (pp. 236-256). New York: Cambridge University Press. (1998),
  16. Miller, M., "Resilience Elements in Students With Learning Disabilities." Journal of Clinical Psychology, 58, 2002
  17. Ögülmüş, S., "Resilience as a personality trait." I. National child and crime symposium: Reasons and preventions Works, 29-30 March 2001. [in Turkish with English Abstract]
  18. Rak, C. F., & Patterson, L. E., "Promoting Resilience in At-Risk Children," Journal Of Counseling & Development, 74 (4), 368–374. 1996.
  19. Sarı, O. T. Kaynaştırma Eğitimi ve Rehberlik. Psikolojik Danışma ve Rehberlik. Birsen Yayınevi (sf 331-341). İstanbul. (2004). [in Turkish]
  20. Vance, E., & Sanchez, H., Creating A service System That Builds Resiliency. NC Department Of Health And Human Services. 1998.
  21. Werner, E. E., Smith, R. S. Overcoming the odds: High-risk children from birth to adulthood. New York: Cornell University Pres. (ED 344979) (1992).

