

Analysis of Self Efficacy-Sufficiency Levels of Individuals with Visual Impairment According to Some Variables

İbrahim Dalbudak¹ & Mihriay Musa²

¹ Atabey Vocational School, Isparta University of Applied Sciences, Isparta, Turkey

² Uşak University, Faculty of Sport Sciences, Uşak, Turkey

Correspondence: İbrahim Dalbudak, Atabey Vocational School, Isparta University of Applied Sciences, Isparta, Turkey.

Received: May 25, 2019

Accepted: July 11, 2019

Online Published: September 29, 2019

doi:10.5539/ies.v12n10p75

URL: <https://doi.org/10.5539/ies.v12n10p75>

Abstract

This study was conducted with the aim of determining self efficacy-sufficiency levels of visually impaired individuals according to some variables. Bandura (1994) states that self-sufficiency, defined as an individual's belief on operating a specific job, is an important factor for the athletes. Self-sufficiency results in choosing a field of study voluntarily, feeling a high motivation for accomplishing that job, endeavoring and spending time on the study. Self-sufficiency is about the individual's specific area or behavior group (Akkoyunlu & Orhan, 2003). The study was conducted on 127 male and 60 female visually-impaired individuals, a total of 187, with different visual acuity in different visually-handicapped clubs. The voluntary basis was taken into consideration in participation. As the data collection tool, "Personal Information Form" and "Self-Efficacy-Sufficiency Scale" which was developed by Sherer et al. (1982), and adopted into Turkish by Gözüm and Aksayan (1999). The data set was analyzed in SPSS 20.0 packaged programme. The data was purified from loss and wrong coding, and the normality hypothesis was done with kurtosis and skewness values. In the analysis of the data, frequency, the average standard deviation was used; besides, T-Test (in paired comparisons) gender, disability status, marital status and branches of sports; one-way variance (ANOVA) test in age, level of education, level of income and visual acuity were used. When one-way ANOVA results of self-sufficiency scores according to gender, age, disability status, level of education, level of income, and visual acuity were analyzed, it was stated that there was a significant difference ($p < 0,05$), and there is no significant difference in Self-Sufficiency scores of visually-impaired individuals who are doing team and individual sports ($p > 0,05$). When evaluated the information above, it can be said that like self efficacy-sufficiency concept can be in different levels and different dimension in different areas of life; it is effective on visually-impaired individuals. In this respect, it is considered that this study will open a new window to this area and contribute to the visually-impaired athletes. Besides, it is suggested that a new study on how self efficacy-sufficiency concept is in the visually-impaired athletes and other individuals, and evaluation of how they are affected. In this concept, the general aim of this study is to analyze the levels of self efficacy-sufficiency of visually-impaired athletes.

Keywords: visually-impaired athlete, self efficacy-sufficiency, behaviour

1. Introduction

The concept of Self-Efficacy-Sufficiency was first introduced by the famous psychologist Albert Bandura in 1977 within the context of "Cognitive Behavior Change" (Yiğitbaş & Yetkin, 2003). The concept of self-sufficiency is the subject of research in many processes related to education such as learning and performance. In other words, it is the belief that it has the capacity to organize and complete the necessary activities in order to perform a certain performance (Yılmaz, Gürcay, & Ekici, 2007). Bandura (1986) defined self-efficacy beliefs as judgments about the ability of organizing and presenting actions that enable people to reach a certain performance. Self-sufficiency is the personal belief that an individual can achieve a certain task. Self-sufficiency is a belief. Sufficiency means the degree of having the necessary knowledge, skills and attitudes to play a role, the employee's realizing the expected roles in the expected quantity and quality means having the knowledge and skills to perform a behavior (Üstüner et al., 2009). Self-efficacy; is an important point that determines how a person thinks, how he feels, and how he acts. Low self-sufficiency feeling results in depression and helplessness feeling. Besides, such people have low self-confidence. Self-sufficiency level may prevent or accelerate the instincts. The ones with high

self-sufficiency can choose harder and riskier jobs. They aim for the sky and they covetously work for reaching it (Schwarzer & Fuchs, 1995). High self-sufficiency belief causes high desire to succeed, low self-sufficiency belief causes to low desire succeed; on the other hand, it is seen that high desire to succeed causes high self-sufficiency and low desire to succeed causes low self-sufficiency (Chase, 1998). Self-sufficiency is about individual's only one area or behavior group. In other words, for example, the individual has a high self-efficacy belief in any field, for example, second language learning; while in another field he may have developed a low self-efficacy belief in, for example, soccer playing (Akkoyunlu & Orhan, 2003).

Self-efficacy beliefs, defined as the individual's belief in the capacity to perform a certain job, are an important factor for athletes (Bandura, 1994). As self-efficacy is a strong determinant of the performance and success level of athletes, it is also of great importance for competitions and rivals, which is the most important process for athletes due to the realization of the desired behaviors through the skills acquired (Türedi, 2015). The method of improving individual's self-efficacy perception is to provide physical development, to reduce stress level, to minimize negative emotional tendency, and to correct misinterpretations for body condition (Bandura, 1997). Among athletes with high or low self-efficacy, it can be stated that working discipline and using new methods strongly affect sporting success (Cengiz, Korucu-Aytan, & Abakay, 2012). Another factor affecting the expectation of sufficiency is the positive and negative turns (messages) that an individual receives from the interaction. For example, when a person is eloquently defended that he has the skills required for the task; self-efficacy expectations may increase (Eysenck, 2000). In this respect, the level of performance of individuals or groups with high self-efficacy belief is high. Individuals with high self-efficacy beliefs set higher goals for themselves, thus their motivation levels increase and perform better (Bandura, 1997; Bray, 2004; Gibson, 1999; Gibson, Randel, & Early, 2000; Guzzo et al., 1993; Myers et al., 2004; Sbea & Guzzo, 1987).

There are 1.3 billion visually-impaired people in the world. Among these people, 188.5 million people have mild vision, 217 million have moderate to severe visual impairment, and 36 million are blind (WHO, 2013). According to Turkey Disability Survey (Turkey Disability Survey, 2002), "visually impaired" people constitute 0.60's% of the population. Visually-impaired: It is expressed as one or two eyes' loss of ability to see as a whole or in part. Low vision; after the standard refractive corrections, whose visual impairment is continuing and visual acuity is less than 6/18 (20/60), but it is the person who can use it to plan and perform a job (Akı and Kayihan, 2003). Visually impaired athletes are divided into B1, B2, B3 according to the IBSA rules. B1 has no visual acuity, individuals with B2 and B3 visual acuity have low sight.

The visually impaired individuals, by means of sports and education, can accept the obstacle of sight, and in this life, we can say that they have increased their strong belief, continuity and effort. The high level of self-sufficiency may be shown as a proof of success in sports. In education; We can say that self-sufficiency is important for her to continue her education, for how much effort she will undertake and how much continuity she has achieved in this endeavor.

Considering the information above; it can be said that the concept of self-efficacy-sufficiency can be effective on different dimensions and levels of life in different areas of life and it may be effective on visually impaired individuals. In this respect, it is thought that this study will contribute to the visually impaired athletes and will bring a different perspective to this field. In this context, the general aim of the study is to examine the self efficacy-sufficiency level of the visually impaired athletes according to some variables.

In this study, self-efficacy-sufficiency concept was performed with 187 visually impaired athletes with different visual impairments. The principle of voluntary basis was taken into consideration. In this context, the problems of this study are:

- What is self efficacy-sufficiency level of the visually-impaired athletes according to their gender?
- What is self efficacy-sufficiency level of the visually-impaired athletes according to their disability status?
- What is self efficacy-sufficiency level of the visually-impaired athletes according to their branches of sports?
- What is self efficacy-sufficiency level of the visually-impaired athletes according to their age groups?
- What is self efficacy-sufficiency level of the visually-impaired athletes according to their education status?
- What is self efficacy-sufficiency level of the visually-impaired athletes according to their level of income?
- What is self efficacy-sufficiency level of the visually-impaired athletes according to their visual acuity?

2. Materials and Methods

Study Group: The study group was conducted on 127 male and 60 females visually-impaired individuals, a total of 187, with different visual acuity in different visually-handicapped clubs. Voluntary basis was taken into

consideration in participation.

2.1 Data Collection Tools

In obtaining the data; “Personal Information Form”, which consists of two parts, prepared by the researcher related to demographic characteristics and “Self Efficacy-Sufficiency Scale” are used. In the first part, students’ personal information form (age, gender, educational status, sports branch, obstacle situation, the degree of vision, income level) are available.

In the second part, self-efficacy sufficiency scale which was developed by Sherer et al. (1982), and adopted into Turkish by Gözüm and Aksayan (1999) was used and for validity and reliability of the same sample; Cronbach Alpha coefficient .81, test-re-test reliability was found as .92 The Self-Efficacy-Sufficiency Scale (SESS) is a 5-point Likert-type self-assessment scale. The participants were asked to choose one of the options for each item on a scale of 23 items; 1-doesn’t define me at all, 2-“defines me a little”, 3-“I’m indecisive”, 4-defines me little “, 5-“defines me well”. The score given for each item is based on. However, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 10, 11, 12, 14, 16, 17, 18, 20, 22 items are scored in the opposite direction. Thus, at least 23, maximum of 115 points can be taken from the scale. The high total score obtained from the scale indicates that the individual’s perception of is SES at a good level. The scale has four sub-factors. These are; 1) Starting behavior: 2, 11, 12, 14, 17, 18, 20, 22. 2) Maintaining the behavior: 4, 5, 6, 7, 10, 16, 19. 3) Behavior completion: 3, 8, 9, 15, 23. 4) Struggle against obstacles: 1, 13, 21. (Gözüm & Aksayan, 1999). The total Cronbach Alpha value of the scale was 0.690.

2.2 Analysis of the Data

Before assuming data analysis, analysis assumptions were examined. The data from the lost and incorrect codings were purged and the normality assumption was tested with the skewness and kurtosis values. Then, in the analysis of the data, frequency, the average standard deviation is used; One-way variance (ANOVA) test was used for the analysis according to gender, disability, marital status and branches of sports.

In variance analysis, the Bonferroni method is widely used multiple comparison tests and does not require the principle of the equal number of samples (Miller, 1969; cited in Kayri, 2009). Therefore, in the case of significant differences, the variance analysis results were compared using the Bonferroni test. The analyzes were tested with SPSS 22.00 at .05 significance level.

Within the concept of normality tests, table 1 presents descriptive statistics on participants’ self-efficacy scores. It is seen that the kurtosis and skewness values of the variable are 1.325 and -1.384 and these values are seen to be between -2 and +2. George and Mallery (2010) stated that these data are normally distributed at an acceptable rate if the kurtosis and skewness values are between -2 and +2. Therefore, it can be said that the variable has a normal distribution.

3. Findings

Table 1. Descripted statistics on self-sufficiency scores

Variable	N	Average	Standard Deviation	Kurtosis	Skewness
Self Sufficiency	187	41.932	0.42774	1.325	-1.384

The sample of the study was conducted on visually-impaired individuals with different visual acuity in different visually-handicapped clubs. A total of 187 individuals with different visual acuity in different visually-handicapped clubs voluntarily participated in the study. In this part of the study, the scores that athletes got and their answers were revealed and interpreted.

Table 2. Visually-impaired individuals’ distribution according to their age, disability status, gender, education status, branches of sports, level of income, and visual acuity

		n	%
Gender	Male	127	67,9
	Female	60	32,1
Age	Under 18	38	15,6
	18-30	102	54,2
	30+	47	30,2
Disability Status	Congenital	161	86,1

	Afterward	26	13,9
	Primary	20	10,7
Education Status	High Schol	86	46
	University	81	43,3
Branches of Sports	Individual S.	144	77
	Team S.	43	23
Level of Income	1000	30	16
	1001-2000	154	82,4
	3000	3	1,6
Visual Acuity	B1	61	32,6
	B2	74	39,6
	B3	52	27,8

Table 3 shows the t-test findings for independent samples of participants' self-efficacy scores according to gender.

Table 3. Findings on self-sufficiency scores of the participants according to gender

	Gender	N	Average	Std. D.	t	Std. D.	P
Starting Behavior	Male	127	93.7156	7.54798	5.109	185	.000
	Female	60	84.9288	16.01182			
Maintaining the Behavior	Male	127	95.5482	10.05048	5.931	185	.000
	Female	60	84.5438	14.97452			
Completion of the Behavior	Male	127	100.7842	7.86764	2.490	185	.014
	Female	60	96.2126	17.27			
Struggle Against Obstacles	Male	127	86.4996	18.8518	1.850	185	.066
	Female	60	80.6674	22.59268			
Average	Male	127	94.8684	5.03624	6.041	185	.000
	Female	60	86.7086	13.37952			

When findings on self-sufficiency scores of the participants according to gender are analyzed, it is stated that there is a significant difference in participants' scores, and males have higher self-sufficiency scores than the females ($t(185) = 6,041, p < .05$). When looked at the sub-factors of self-efficacy scores; there is a significant difference in favor of the males according to gender in sub-factors of Starting Behavior ($t(185) = 5,109, p < .05$), Maintaining Behavior ($t(185) = 5,931, p < .05$), Completion of the Behavior ($t(185) = 2,490, p < .05$); in Struggle against Obstacles sub-scale ($t(185) = 1,850, p > .05$), it was determined that there was no significant difference according to gender.

Table 4 shows the t-test findings for independent samples of participants' attitudes towards self-sufficiency according to their disability status.

Table 4. Findings on self-sufficiency scores of the participants according to disability status

	Disability Status	N	Average	Std D.	t	Std. D.	p
Starting Behavior	Congenital	161	90.3738	12.07536	-1.526	185	.129
	Afterward	26	94.1336	8.49596			
Maintaining Behavior	Congenital	161	90.9282	13.30208	-2.933	185	.004
	Afterward	26	98.758	6.95266			
Completion of the Behavior	Congenital	161	98.5754	12.28238	-2.144	185	.033
	Afterward	26	103.9082	7.67932			
Struggle Against Obstacles	Congenital	161	84.447	20.93696	-.302	185	.763
	Afterward	26	85.7428	15.62792			
Average	Congenital	161	91.553	9.63336	-2.561	185	.011
	Afterward	26	96.5712	6.50716			

When findings on self-sufficiency scores of the participants according to disability status are analyzed, it was

found that there was a significant difference in individuals with congenital and afterward disability ($t(185) = -2.561, p < .05$). When looked at the sub-factors of self-efficacy scores; there is a significant difference in favor of the individuals with afterward disability in sub-factors of Maintaining Behavior ($t(185) = -2.933, p < .05$), Completion of the Behavior ($t(185) = -2.144, p < .05$); in Starting Behavior ($t(185) = -1.526, p > .05$) and Struggle Against Obstacles sub-scales ($t(185) = -.302, p > .05$), it was determined that there was no significant difference in individuals with congenital and afterward disability.

Table 5 shows the t-test findings for independent samples of participants' attitudes towards self-sufficiency according to their branches of sports.

Table 5. Findings on self-sufficiency scores of the participants according to branches of sports

	Branches of Sports	N	Average	Std. D.	t	Std. D.	p
Starting Behavior	Individual S.	144	91.553	12.22452	1.405	185	.162
	Team S.	43	88.704	9.52798			
Maintaining Behavior	Individual S.	144	91.9292	13.25874	-.171	185	.865
	Team S.	43	92.312	11.69982			
Completion of the Behavior	Individual S.	144	98.3884	12.82666	-1.972	185	.050
	Team S.	43	102.4276	7.2061			
Struggle Against Obstacles	Individual S.	144	82.1942	20.28114	-3.074	185	.002
	Team S.	43	92.7762	18.09676			
Average	Individual S.	144	91.9314	9.78032	-.846	185	.399
	Team S.	43	93.3174	8.06058			

When findings on self-sufficiency scores of the participants according to branches of sports were analyzed, it was found that there was no significant difference in individuals doing team sports and individual sports ($t(185) = -.846, p > .05$). When looked at the sub-factors of self-efficacy scores; there was no significant difference in sub-factors of Starting Behavior ($t(185) = 1.405, p > .05$), Maintaining Behavior ($t(185) = -.171, p > .05$) and Completion of the Behavior ($t(185) = -1.972, p > .05$) according to branches of sports; in Struggle Against Obstacles sub-scales ($t(185) = -3.074, p < .05$), it was determined that there was a significant difference in favor of individuals doing team sports.

Table 6 shows the one-way ANOVA findings for independent samples of participants' attitudes towards self-sufficiency according to their age groups.

Table 6. Findings on self-sufficiency scores of the participants according to age groups

		Sum of Squares	Std. D.	Average of Squares	F	P
Starting Behavior	Inter-Groups	5.253	2	2.626	10.209	.000
	Intra-Group	47.333	184	.257		
	Total	52.585	186			
Maintaining Behavior	Inter-Groups	5.702	2	2.851	9.025	.000
	Intra-Group	58.125	184	.316		
	Total	63.827	186			
Completion of the Behavior	Inter-Groups	1.398	2	.699	2.435	.090
	Intra-Group	52.833	184	.287		
	Total	54.231	186			
Struggle Against Obstacles	Inter-Groups	10.147	2	5.073	6.330	.002
	Intra-Group	147.459	184	.801		
	Total	157.605	186			
Average	Inter-Groups	2.831	2	1.415	8.348	.000
	Intra-Group	31.200	184	.170		
	Total	34.031	186			

When one-way ANOVA results related to Self-Sufficiency scores according to age groups were examined, it was determined that there was a significant differentiation of Self-Sufficiency scores of the participants in terms of age groups ($F(2, 184) = 8.348, p < .05$). When sub-factors were analyzed according to age groups, it was found that

there was differentiation in sub-factors of Starting Behavior ($F(2, 184) = 10.209, p < .05$), Maintaining Behavior ($F(2, 184) = 9.025, p < .05$) and Struggle Against Obstacles ($F(2, 184) = 6.330, p < .05$); but in sub-factor of Completion of the Behavior ($F(2, 184) = 2.435, p > .05$), it was determined that there was no significant difference according to age groups. As a result of Post Hoc tests to determine in which of these three sub-factors the differentiation occurred; it was stated that there was difference between under 18 years and 18-30 years, under 18 years and over 30 years in Starting Behavior; under 18 years and 18-30 years, and 18-30 years and over 30 years in Maintaining Behavior; under 18 years and over 30 years in Struggle against Obstacles. In terms of self-efficacy scores, it was determined that there were differences between the ages of under 18 and 18-30, under 18 years and over 30 years.

One-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) results for the Self-Efficacy scores according to the education status of the participants is given in Table 7.

Table 7. Findings on self-sufficiency scores of the participants according to education status

		Sum of Squares	Std. D.	Average of Squares	F	P
Starting Behavior	Inter-Groups	6.132	2	3.066	12.145	.000
	Intra-Group	46.453	184	.252		
	Total	52.585	186			
Maintaining Behavior	Inter-Groups	4.584	2	2.292	7.118	.001
	Intra-Group	59.244	184	.322		
	Total	63.827	186			
Completion of the Behavior	Inter-Groups	.784	2	.392	1.349	.262
	Intra-Group	53.447	184	.290		
	Total	54.231	186			
Struggle Against Obstacles	Inter-Groups	22.518	2	11.259	15.336	.000
	Intra-Group	135.087	184	.734		
	Total	157.605	186			
Average	Inter-Groups	4.676	2	2.338	14.655	.000
	Intra-Group	29.355	184	.160		
	Total	34.031	186			

When one-way ANOVA results related to Self-Sufficiency scores according to education status were examined, it was found that there was a differentiation in self-sufficiency scores of the participants according to education status ($F(2, 184) = 14.655, p < .05$). When sub-factors were analyzed according to education status; it was found that there was difference in sub-factors of Starting Behavior ($F(2, 184) = 12.145, p < .05$), Maintaining Behavior ($F(2, 184) = 7.118, p < .05$), and Struggle against Obstacles ($F(2, 184) = 15.336, p < .05$); but in Completion of the Behavior ($F(2, 184) = 1.349, p > .05$), it was found that there was no difference. As a result of Post Hoc tests to determine in which of these three sub-factors the differentiation occurred; it was stated that there was difference; it was found that there was difference among all groups in Starting Behavior scores; between primary school and high school graduates, and primary school and university graduates in Maintaining the Behavior; between primary school and university graduates, and high school and university graduates in Struggle against Obstacles. In general average, it was found that there was significant differentiation among groups.

One-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) results for the Self-Efficacy scores according to the level of income of the participants is given in Table 8.

Table 8. Findings on self-sufficiency scores of the participants according to level of income

		Sum of Squares	Std. D.	Average of Squares	F	P
Starting Behavior	Inter-Groups	8.212	2	4.106	17.026	.000
	Intra-Group	44.374	184	.241		
	Total	52.585	186			
Maintaining Behavior	Inter-Groups	4.040	2	2.020	6.217	.002
	Intra-Group	59.787	184	.325		

	Total	63.827	186			
Completion of the Behavior	Inter-Groups	1.367	2	.684	2.380	.095
	Intra-Group	52.864	184	.287		
	Total	54.231	186			
Struggle Against Obstacles	Inter-Groups	10.083	2	5.041	6.288	.002
	Intra-Group	147.523	184	.802		
	Total	157.605	186			
Average	Inter-Groups	3.743	2	1.872	11.370	.000
	Intra-Group	30.287	184	.165		
	Total	34.031	186			

When one-way ANOVA results related to Self-Sufficiency scores according to level of income were examined, it was found that there was a differentiation in self-sufficiency scores of the participants according to level of income ($F(2, 184) = 11.370, p < .05$). When sub-factors were analyzed according to level of income; it was found that there was difference in sub-factors of Starting Behavior ($F(2, 184) = 17.026, p < .05$), Maintaining Behavior ($F(2, 184) = 6.217, p < .05$), and Struggle against Obstacles ($F(2, 184) = 6.288, p < .05$); but in sub-factor of Completion of the Behavior ($F(2, 184) = 2.380, p > .05$), it was found that there was no differentiation. As a result of Post Hoc tests to determine in which of these three sub-factors the differentiation occurred; it was stated that there was difference between 1000 and 3000, and 1001-2000 and 3000 in general average of the self-sufficiency. In sub-factors; it was found that there was significant difference in Starting Behavior scores between 1000 and 3000, and 1001-2000 and 3000; between 1000 and 3000, and 1001-2000 and 3000 in Maintaining Behavior score; between 1000 and 3000, and 1001-2000 and 3000 in Struggle against Obstacles.

One-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) results for the Self-Efficacy scores according to the visual acuity of the participants is given in Table 9.

Table 9. Findings on self-sufficiency scores of the participants according to visual acuity

		Sum of Squares	Std. D.	Average of Squares	F	P
Starting Behavior	Inter-Groups	2.670	2	1.335	4.922	.008
	Intra-Group	49.915	184	.271		
	Total	52.585	186			
Maintaining Behavior	Inter-Groups	6.113	2	3.057	9.745	.000
	Intra-Group	57.714	184	.314		
	Total	63.827	186			
Completion of the Behavior	Inter-Groups	3.163	2	1.582	5.699	.004
	Intra-Group	51.068	184	.278		
	Total	54.231	186			
Struggle Against Obstacles	Inter-Groups	1.120	2	.560	.659	.519
	Intra-Group	156.485	184	.850		
	Total	157.605	186			
Average	Inter-Groups	2.929	2	1.465	8.665	.000
	Intra-Group	31.101	184	.169		
	Total	34.031	186			

When one-way ANOVA results related to Self-Sufficiency scores according to visual acuity were examined, it was found that there was a differentiation in self-sufficiency scores of the participants according to visual acuity ($F(2, 184) = 8.665, p < .05$).

When sub-factors were analyzed according to visual acuity, it was found that there was difference in sub-factors of Starting Behavior ($F(2, 184) = 4.922, p < .05$), Maintaining Behavior ($F(2, 184) = 9.745, p < .05$), and Completion of the Behavior ($F(2, 184) = 5.699, p < .05$) according to visual acuity; but in sub-factor of Struggle against Obstacles, it was found that there was no difference according to visual acuity.

As a result of Post Hoc tests to determine in which of these three sub-factors the differentiation occurred; it was stated that there was difference between B2 and B3 in Starting Behavior; between B1 and B3, B2 and B3 in Maintaining the Behavior; between B1 and B2, and B2 and B3 in Completion of the Behavior. In general average

of the Self-Sufficiency, it was found that there was difference between B2 and B3 while there were no differentiations between visual acuity levels.

3.1 Additional Tables

Table 10. Average scores of the participants according to their age groups

		N	X	Std. D.
Starting Behavior	Under 18 years	38	98.131	8.58044
	18-30 years	102	88.6732	11.99902
	Over 30 years	47	89.8722	11.07612
	Total	187	90.8974	11.69762
Maintaining Behavior	Under 18 years	38	97.1806	6.55116
	18-30 years	102	88.5544	14.0789
	Over 30 years	47	95.3546	11.9097
	Total	187	92.0172	12.8876
Completion of the Behavior	Under 18 years	38	102.7048	7.74202
	18-30 years	102	99.0858	8.59562
	Over 30 years	47	97.0816	18.58648
	Total	187	99.3168	11.87934
Struggle against Obstacles	Under 18 years	38	88.5786	13.1384
	18-30 years	102	87.2102	22.55946
	Over 30 years	47	75.8296	17.1831
	Total	187	84.6274	20.25122
Total	Under 18 years	38	97.5898	3.65068
	18-30 years	102	90.7104	9.83048
	Over 30 years	47	91.2758	10.26476
	Total	187	92.2504	9.41028

Table 11. Average scores of the participants according to their education status

		N	X	Std. D.
Starting Behavior	Primary S.	20	100.1	8.19676
	High School	86	92.2526	7.47076
	University	81	87.186	14.3451
	Total	187	90.8974	11.69762
Maintaining Behavior	Primary S.	20	101.8292	4.82592
	High School	86	91.4342	10.8405
	University	81	90.211	15.1008
	Total	187	92.0172	12.8876
Completion of the Behavior	Primary S.	20	103.4	8.13824
	High School	86	98.6414	14.8863
	University	81	99.0264	8.49574
	Total	187	99.3168	11.87934
Struggle against Obstacles	Primary S.	20	96.0674	13.22574
	High School	86	89.9602	18.66854
	University	81	76.1398	20.1355
	Total	187	84.6274	20.25122
Total	Primary S.	20	100.8172	1.59456
	High School	86	93.093	6.70208
	University	81	89.2408	11.3696
	Total	187	92.2504	9.41028

Table 12. Average scores of the participants according to their level of income

		N	X	Std. D.
Starting Behavior	1000	30	97.075	8.14352
	1001-2000	154	90.2858	11.30492
	3000	3	60.5	0
	Total	187	90.8974	11.69762
Maintaining Behavior	1000	30	93.6562	4.47524
	1001-2000	154	92.1844	13.61228
	3000	3	67.0472	1.81456
	Total	187	92.0172	12.8876
Completion of the Behavior	1000	30	102.52	6.75246
	1001-2000	154	98.5138	12.58972
	3000	3	108.5326	2.54034
	Total	187	99.3168	11.87934
Struggle against Obstacles	1000	30	88.7326	12.969
	1001-2000	154	84.5724	20.8461
	3000	3	46.4442	4.2339
	Total	187	84.6274	20.25122
Total	1000	30	96.1312	3.34906
	1001-2000	154	91.9072	9.6789
	3000	3	71.1018	0.5522
	Total	187	92.2504	9.41028

Table 13. Average scores of the participants according to their disability levels

		N	X	Std. D.
Starting Behavior	B1	61	91.3814	11.70378
	B2	74	88	13.70842
	B3	52	94.4526	6.6
	Total	187	90.8974	11.69762
Maintaining Behavior	B1	61	90.0614	15.41694
	B2	74	89.1462	12.96944
	B3	52	98.395	5.2272
	Total	187	92.0172	12.8876
Completion of the Behavior	B1	61	101.849	9.01142
	B2	74	95.7902	15.23412
	B3	52	101.3694	7.54402
	Total	187	99.3168	11.87934
Struggle against Obstacles	B1	61	85.2346	20.9209
	B2	74	82.6496	19.8451
	B3	52	86.7306	20.16036
	Total	187	84.6274	20.25122
Total	B1	61	92.4528	8.57472
	B2	74	89.3442	11.49346
	B3	52	96.1488	4.42398
	Total	187	92.2504	9.41028

4. Discussion and Result

This study was conducted with the aim of determining self efficacy-sufficiency levels of 60 females, and 127 males, a total of 187, visually impaired individuals.

When the findings of participants' self-sufficiency scores according to gender were analyzed, it was found that there was a significant difference in participants' scores according to gender, and males have higher self-sufficiency scores than females ($t(185) = 6.041, p < .05$). When the literature was reviewed, there are studies suggesting that there is a significant difference in general self-efficacy levels according to gender variable (Brink et al., 2012; Britner & Pajares, 2006; Creed & Patton, 2003; Scholz et al., 2002). This situation may result from the

fact that men are given more responsibility in the society we live in, they can express themselves more in society, they stand out, they are given reassuring responsibilities, they have different mission in the community, they choose the professions where they feel they are sufficient; but females are not given such responsibilities and they are pushed into the background.

When we looked at the sub-factors of the self-sufficiency scores; it was found that there was a significant difference in favor of males according to gender in sub-factors of Starting Behavior ($t(185) = 5.109, p < .05$), Maintaining Behavior ($t(185) = 5.931, p < .05$), Completion of the Behavior ($t(185) = 2.490, p < .05$); but in sub-factor of Struggle against Obstacles ($t(185) = 1.850, p > .05$), it was found that there was no significant difference according to gender. In different studies, it is seen that the general self-efficacy level is significantly different from gender. Looking at the sub-factors of self-efficacy scores; it was found that there was a significant difference according to gender in favor of men in Starting Behavior, Maintaining behavior, Completion of the Behavior. In this respect, we think that women's self-sufficiency scores being different compared to men may be resulted from the fact that women are able to show and express themselves in society. In the struggle against obstacles, there is no meaningful difference according to gender, and we think that women and men cannot struggle and accept the negative ones from outside, they are not different in the struggle against obstacles as a result of the feeling they feel adequate in society.

When the findings of participants' self-sufficiency scores according to disability status were analyzed, it was found that there was a significant difference in attitudes of participants with congenital and afterward disability according to disability status ($t(185) = -2.561, p < .05$). Looking at the sub-factors of the Self-Sufficiency scores, it was found that there was significant difference in favor of individuals with afterward disability in sub-factors of Maintaining Behavior ($t(185) = -2.933, p < .05$), and Completion of the Behavior ($t(185) = -2.144, p < .05$); but in sub-factors of Starting Behavior ($t(185) = -1.526, p > .05$) and Struggle against Obstacles ($t(185) = -3.02, p > .05$), it was found that there was no significant difference between individuals with congenital and afterward disability. According to Luszczynska et al. (2005), self-efficacy determines how individuals feel, think, motivate themselves and act. Visually impaired individuals often feel that it is difficult and complex to maintain a sense of appropriate sufficiency. They often have to establish a good balance between their hopes and unrealistic expectations about the future. If the self-efficacy levels of people with disabilities are high, it is easier for them to provide this balance in the face of their stressful life situations (Özkan & Aki, 2016). It would be more difficult for them to maintain this balance if it is low. When the self-efficacy levels of the visually impaired, both congenital and afterward, are examined, it can be said that they are individuals who can use their own self-efficacy in a different way. We think that the type of disability is effective on self-sufficiency and there is a difference between individuals' having congenital or afterward disability and their self-sufficiency levels. Since there are no similar studies in our study, there are no findings to support.

When the findings of participants' self-sufficiency scores according to branches of sports were analyzed, it was found that there was no significant difference in individual and team sports doing participants scores according to branches of sports ($t(185) = -.846, p > .05$). When looked at sub-factors of the self-sufficiency scores, there was no significant difference according to branches of sports in sub-factors of Starting Behavior ($t(185) = 1.405, p > .05$), Maintaining Behavior ($t(185) = -.171, p > .05$), and Completion of the Behavior ($t(185) = -1.972, p > .05$); but in sub-factors of Struggle against Obstacles ($t(185) = -3.074, p < .05$), there was a significant difference in favor of team sports doers. In the study conducted by Şanlı (2014) on the general self-efficacy of the police academy students, he reported that the sports branch did not affect the general self-sufficiency level. We can say that Self-sufficiency opens wider paths in sports field and sport is a skill, and self-efficacy of individuals with good skill is also high. We think that Self-sufficiency has a positive relationship with the team and individual sports, if individuals can control their feeling, this situation will increase performance in sports in a positive way, and it is resulted from that there is significant difference between self-sufficiency, individual and team sports. Since similar studies were conducted, the finding that supports this idea in our study has been reached.

When one-way ANOVA results of the participants' Self-Sufficiency scores were analyzed according to age groups, it was stated that there was a significant difference in self-sufficiency scores of the participants according to age groups ($F(2, 184) = 8.348, p < .05$). When literature is viewed, it is seen that self-sufficiency level is differentiated according to age (Aypay, 2010; Creed & Patton, 2003; Scholz et al., 2002). Again when sub-factors were analyzed according to age groups, it was stated that there was differentiation in sub-factors of Starting Behavior ($F(2, 184) = 10.209, p < .05$), Maintaining Behavior ($F(2, 184) = 9.025, p < .05$), and Struggle against Obstacles ($F(2, 184) = 6.330, p < .05$); but in sub-factors of Completion of the Behavior ($F(2, 184) = 2.435, p > .05$), it was found that there was no difference according to age groups. In other words, the individual's age, self-sufficiency, and sub-groups are very important in terms of starting behavior, maintaining behavior, and struggle against obstacles.

However, it is thought that the age of the individual is not important in the completion of the behavior. As a result of Post Hoc tests to determine in which of these three sub-factors the differentiation occurred; it was seen that there was difference between under 18 years and 18-30 years, and under 18 years and over 30 years in Starting Behavior; between under 18 years and 18-30 years in Maintaining Behavior; between under 18 years and over 30 years, and 18-30 years and over 30 years in Struggle against Obstacles. In general of self-sufficiency scores, it was stated that there was a difference between under 18 years and 18-30 years, and under 18 years and over 30 years. Besides when the literature is viewed, not many studies analyzing sub-scale of athletes' self-sufficiency according to age group were found. It can be said that it is related to the life experience of athletes from different age groups.

When one-way ANOVA results related to Self-Sufficiency scores according to education status were examined, it was found that there was a differentiation in self-sufficiency scores of the participants according to education status ($F(2, 184) = 14.655, p < .05$). When sub-factor were analyzed according to education status, it was found that there was difference according to education status in sub-factors of Starting Behavior ($F(2, 184) = 12.145, p < .05$), Maintaining Behavior ($F(2, 184) = 7.118, p < .05$), and Struggle against Obstacles ($F(2, 184) = 15.336, p < .05$); but in sub-factors of Completion of the Behavior ($F(2, 184) = 1.349, p > .05$), it was found that there was no difference. As a result of Post Hoc tests to determine in which of these three sub-factors the differentiation occurred; there was a difference among all groups in Starting Behavior scores; between primary school and high school graduates, and high school and university graduates in Maintaining Behavior scores; between primary school and university graduates, and high school and university graduates in Struggle against Obstacles scores. In general average, it was found that there was a significant difference among all groups. In their study, Özkan and Akı (2016) found that there is a significant difference between self-sufficiencies of low vision and visually impaired individuals according to their educational status. Yiğitbaş and Yetkin (2003), and Zengin's (2007) findings show similarity that examined the self-efficacy and sufficiency levels of health high school students. In their study, Sevindik et al. (2007) found that the total and the sub-group mean scores of the 4th-grade students are higher than the first-grade students. Tiler (1995) in his study of the class progression has been determined that the average score of SESS points. The problem-based learning (PBL) model, which aims to provide students with self-managed learning, independent study, questioning, and problem-solving skills, is a method in which people are faced with conditions that may be considered as an analogy to the situations they will face in their lives and they are guided to solve these situations by self-research and learning (Turan & Demirel, 2010). We can say that the level of self-efficacy is different due to the fact that the visually impaired individuals have the qualifications to support or improve their self-efficacy levels as the level of education they receive an increase. These features are the values that the individual have gained in the process of education, knowledge, skills, and habits, thinking, admiration (Demirova, 2008). In fact, education is the most prominent tool for developing societies (Yaşar, 2017).

When one-way ANOVA results related to Self-Sufficiency scores according to the level of income were examined, it was found that there was a significant differentiation in self-sufficiency scores of the participants according to the level of income ($F(2, 184) = 11.370, p < .05$). When sub-factors were analyzed according to level of income; it was found that there was difference in sub-factors of Starting Behavior ($F(2, 184) = 17.026, p < .05$), Maintaining Behavior ($F(2, 184) = 6.217, p < .05$), and Struggle against Obstacles ($F(2, 184) = 6.288, p < .05$); but in sub-factor of Completion of the Behavior ($F(2, 184) = 2.380, p > .05$), it was found that there was no differentiation. As a result of Post-Hoc tests to determine in which of these three sub-factors the differentiation occurred; it was stated that there was a difference between 1000 and 3000, and 1000-2000 and 3000 in general average of the self-sufficiency. It was stated that there was a significant difference between 1000 and 3000, 1000-2000 and 3000 in Starting Behavior scores; between 1000 and 3000, 1000-2000 and 3000 in Maintaining Behavior; between 1000 and 3000, and 1000-2000 and 3000 in Struggle against Obstacles in sub-factors. In a study on the self-sufficiency levels of the individuals with low vision and visually impaired individuals, Özkan and Akı (2016) found that self-sufficiency levels were different in favor of the visually impaired individuals in terms of the level of income. Self-efficacy is defined as being aware of and a belief in their ability to do a job. Bandura (2000) stated that self-sufficiency belief plays a vital role in the success of the individual under different conditions. As it can be understood from the definition, as well as an individual's being successful in a job as a result of the ability of a person to do a job is firstly about his level of income being decent and feeling relaxed; the level of income may be effective on self-sufficiency.

When one-way ANOVA results related to Self-Sufficiency scores according to visual acuity were examined, it was found that there was a differentiation in self-sufficiency scores of the participants according to visual acuity ($F(2, 184) = 8.665, p < .05$). When sub-factors were analyzed according to visual acuity; it was found that there was difference in sub-factors of Starting Behavior ($F(2, 184) = 4.922, p < .05$), Maintaining Behavior ($F(2, 184) = 9.745, p < .05$), and Completion of the Behavior ($F(2, 184) = 5.699, p < .05$); but in sub-factors of Struggle against

Obstacles ($F(2, 184) = .659, p > .05$), no significant difference was found. As a result of Post Hoc tests to determine in which of these three sub-factors the differentiation occurred; it was stated that there was a difference between B2 and B3 in Starting Behavior score; between B1 and B3, and B2 and B3 in Maintaining Behavior; between B1 and B2, and B2 and B3 in Completion of the Behavior. In general average of Self-Sufficiency, it was found that there was a difference between B2 and B3; but there was no differentiation in other visual acuity levels. In their study, Özkan and Akı (2016) found that there was a significant difference between individuals with low visual acuity and visually impaired ones in terms of their self-sufficiency levels. In the study performed with individuals over the age of 55 with hearing disability and chronic disease, it was determined that individuals with the hearing disability had lower self-sufficiency than those with normal hearing (Kramer et al., 2002). In another study on hearing impaired adult individuals, it was found that hearing impaired individuals had lower self-sufficiency for health behaviors than their hearing peers (Jones et al. 2007). In the study of individuals with physical disabilities with chronic pain, Rudy et al. (2003) found that the self-sufficiency level of individuals was highly correlated with their performances. In addition, regardless of the visual acuity level; considering that self-sufficiency may be affected by this obstacle, it is thought that support to increase the self-efficacy of individuals with different vision levels is important. Self efficacy-sufficiency has an effect on the degree of visual acuity; we think that the difference between self-efficacy sufficiency levels was derived from this. As there are similar studies, findings to support our study were found.

There are a certain number of people in the world and in our country who have a visual impairment. It directly affects the life of the individual. This reduces the self-sufficiency level of the individual as a result of affecting the performance of the people. For this reason, it is very important to develop the self-sufficiency of the visually impaired and other individuals with disabilities when they are required to accept the disability and to accept the disabled children in their families and to be accepted by the society. Visually impaired athletes are considered to have high self-sufficiency levels as they trust themselves through sports, prove themselves to handle, and accepted by the society, represent their country in the Paralympic, do any job, and accept his disability.

According to the results of the research; since sports is effective on visually impaired individuals, it is very important to develop strategies to intervene in sports and education for all individuals with disabilities and to improve the self-sufficiency of individuals.

References

- Akı, E., & Kayıhan, H. (2004). Az gören çocuklarda görsel algılama eğitiminin yazma, okuma ve günlük yaşam aktivitelerine etkisi.[Relationship between visual perception training and reading speed on visually impaired children]. *Fizyoterapi ve Rehabilitasyon*, 14(3), 95-100. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s1090-3798\(08\)70239-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/s1090-3798(08)70239-3)
- Akkoyunlu, B., & Orhan, F. (2003). Bilgisayar ve öğretim teknolojileri eğitimi (BÖTE) bölümü öğrencilerinin bilgisayar kullanma öz yeterlik inancı ile demografik özellikleri arasındaki ilişki. *The Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology*, 2(3), 86-93. Retrieved from <http://www.tojet.net/articles/v2i3/2311.pdf>
- Aypay, A. (2010). Genel Öz Yeterlik Ölçeği'nin (GÖYÖ) Türkçe'ye Uyarlama Çalışması.[The Adaptation Study of General Self-Efficacy (GSE) Scale to Turkish]. *İnönü Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 11(2), 113-131. Retrieved from <https://toad.halileksi.net/sites/default/files/pdf/genel-oz-yeterlik-olcegi-toad.pdf>
- Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ.
- Bandura, A. (1994). Self-efficacy. In V. S. Ramachaudran (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of human behavior* (Vol. 4. pp. 71-81). New York: Academic Press. Retrieved from <http://www.uky.edu/~eushe2/Pajares/self-efficacy>
- Bandura, A. (1997). Self-Efficacy in changing societies. In A. Bandura (Ed.), *Exercise of personal and collective efficacy in changing societies*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Bandura, A. (2000). Cultivate self-efficacy for personal and organizational effectiveness. *Handbook of principles of organization behavior*, 2, 11-21.
- Bray, S. R. (2004). Collective efficacy, group goals, and group performance of a muscular endurance task. *Small Group Research*, 35(2), 230-238. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1046496403260531>
- Brink, E., Alsén, P., Herlitz, J., Kjellgren, K., & Cliffordson, C. (2012). General self-efficacy and health-related quality of life after myocardial infarction. *Psychology, Health & Medicine*, 17(3), 346-355. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13548506.2011.608807>
- Britner, S. L., & Pajares, F. (2006). Sources of science self-efficacy beliefs of middle school students. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching: The Official Journal of the National Association for Research in Science Teaching*, 43(5), 485-499. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.20131>

- Cengiz, R., Korucu-Aytan, G., & Abakay, U. (2012). Taekwondo Sporcularının Algıladığı Liderlik Özellikleri İle Öz-Yeterlik Düzeyleri Arasındaki İlişki [The Relationship Between Self-Efficacy Levels and Leadership Qualities That The Taekwondo Athlete Perceive]. *E-Journal of New World Sciences Academy*, 7(4), 69-78. Retrieved from <http://www.newwsa.com>
- Chase, M. A. (1998). Sources of self-efficacy in physical education and sport. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 18(1), 76-89. <https://doi.org/10.1123/jtpe.18.1.76>
- Creed, P. A., & Patton, W. (2003). Predicting two components of career maturity in school based adolescents. *Journal of Career Development*, 29(4), 277-290. <https://doi.org/10.1177/089484530302900405>
- Demirova, G. (2008). *Piyano Eğitiminin İlköğretim Öğrencilerinin Dikkat Toplama Yetisine Etkisi*. Doktora Tezi, Ankara Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü. Retrieved from <http://acikarsiv.ankara.edu.tr/browse/4389/>
- Eysenck, H. J. (1982). The biological basis of cross-cultural differences in personality: Blood group antigens. *Psychological Reports*, 51(2), 531-540. <https://doi.org/10.2466/pr0.1982.51.2.531>
- George, D., & Mallery, P. (1999). *SPSS® for Windows® step by step: A simple guide and reference*. Allyn & Bacon. Retrieved from <https://psycnet.apa.org/record/1998-07683-000>
- Gibson, C. B. (1999). Do they do what they believe they can? Group efficacy and group effectiveness across tasks and cultures. *Academy of Management Journal*, 42(2), 138-152. <https://doi.org/10.5465/257089>
- Gibson, C. B., Randel, A. E., & Earley, P. C. (2000). Understanding group efficacy: An empirical test of multiple assessment methods. *Group & organization management*, 25 (1), 67-97. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1059601100251005>
- Gözüm, S., & Aksayan, S. (1999). Öz-Etkililik-Yeterlik Ölçeğinin Türkçe Formunun Güvenirlilik ve Geçerliliği. *Atatürk Üniversitesi Hemşirelik Yüksekokulu Dergisi*, 2(1), 21-34. Retrieved from <https://toad.halileksi.net/olcek/oz-etkililik-yeterlik-olcegi>
- Guzzo, R. A., Yost, P. R., Campbell, R. J., & Shea, G. P. (1993). Potency in groups: Articulating a construct. *British journal of social psychology*, 32(1), 87-106. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8309.1993.tb00987.x>
- Jones, E. G., Renger, R., & Kang, Y. (2007). Self-efficacy for health-related behaviors among deaf adults. *Research in nursing & health*, 30(2), 185-192. <https://doi.org/10.1002/nur.20196>
- Kayri, M. (2009). Araştırmalarda Gruplar Arası Farkın Belirlenmesine Yönelik Çoklu Karşılaştırma (Post-Hoc) Teknikleri. *Fırat Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi, Fırat University Journal of Social Science*, 19(1), 51-64. Retrieved from <http://web.firat.edu.tr/sosyalbil/dergi/arsiv/cilt19/sayi1/051-064.pdf>
- Kramer, S. E., Kapteyn, T. S., Kuik, D. J., & Deeg, D. J. (2002). The association of hearing impairment and chronic diseases with psychosocial health status in older age. *Journal of aging and health*, 14(1), 122-137. <https://doi.org/10.1177/089826430201400107>
- Luszczynska, A., Gutiérrez-Doña, B., & Schwarzer, R. (2005). General self-efficacy in various domains of human functioning: Evidence from five countries. *International journal of Psychology*, 40(2), 80-89. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00207590444000041>
- Myers, N. D., Feltz, D. L., & Short, S. E. (2004). Collective Efficacy and Team Performance: A Longitudinal Study of Collegiate Football Teams. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice*, 8(2), 126. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1089-2699.8.2.126>
- Özkan, E., & Aki, E. (2016). Az Gören ve Görme Engelli Bireylerin Öz Yeterlilikleri ve Baş Etme Becerileri Arasındaki İlişki. *Ergoterapi ve Rehabilitasyon Dergisi*, 4(2), 81-88. Retrieved from <https://dergipark.org.tr/download/article-file/388720>
- Rudy, T. E., Lieber, S. J., Boston, J. R., Gourley, L. M., & Baysal, E. (2003). Psychosocial predictors of physical performance in disabled individuals with chronic pain. *The Clinical journal of pain*, 19(1), 18-30. <https://doi.org/10.1097/00002508-200301000-00003>
- Sbea, G. P., & Guzzo, R. A. (1987). Group effectiveness: What really matters? *Sloan Management Review (1986-1998)*, 28(3), 25.
- Scholz, U., Doña, B. G., Sud, S., & Schwarzer, R. (2002). Is general self-efficacy a universal construct? Psychometric findings from 25 countries. *European journal of psychological assessment*, 18(3), 242. <https://doi.org/10.1027//1015-5759.18.3.242>
- Schwarzer, R., & Fuchs, R. (1995). *Self-Efficacy and Health Behaviour; to appear in Conner M. Norman, P.*

Predicting Health Behaviour: Research and Practice with Social Cognition Models.

- Sevindik, T., Yeşil, G., Sevindik, F., & Açık, Y. (2007). Üniversite Öğrencilerinde Benlik Saygısı İle Öz-Etkililik Yeterlik Arasındaki İlişki. *e-Journal of New World Sciences Academy*, 2(2), 13-22. Retrieved from <http://www.newwsa.com>
- Sherer, M., Maddux, J. E., Mercandante, B., Prentice-Dunn, S., Jacobs, B., & Rogers, R. W. (1982). The self-efficacy scale: Construction and validation. *Psychological reports*, 51(2), 663-671. <https://doi.org/10.2466/pr0.1982.51.2.663>
- Şanlı, S. (2014). Polis Akademisi Öğrencilerinin Genel Öz Yeterlik İnançları ve Sporda Güdülenme Kaynaklarının İncelenmesi. *Hacettepe Spor Bilimleri Dergisi*, 25(4), 172-183. Retrieved from http://www.sbd.hacettepe.edu.tr/fulltext/2014_4_2.pdf
- Tiler, D. (1995). *Self-efficacy in college students*. Retrieved from <http://www.mwsc.edu/psychology/research/psy302/fall95/tiller.html>.
- Turan, S., & Demirel, Ö. (2010). The Reliability and Validity of the Attitude Scale Towards Problem Based Learning. *Eğitim ve Bilim*, 34(152). Retrieved from <https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org>
- Turkey Disability Survey. (2002). Retrieved from <https://kutuphane.tuik.gov.tr/pdf/0014899.pdf>
- Türedi, E. (2015). *Öz-yeterlik, Benlik Saygısı ve Atılganlık Düzeyi İlişkisi-Cinsiyet ve Deneyim Süresi Açısından Resmi Okul ve Özel Okul Öğretmenleri Üzerine Bir Araştırma*. Psikoloji Yüksek Lisans Tezi, T.C. Toros Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü.
- Üstüner, M., Demirtaş, H., Cömer, M., & Özer, N. (2009). Ortaöğretim Öğretmenlerinin Öz-Yeterlik Algıları. *Mehmet Akif Ersoy Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 9(17), 1-16. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/285376012_Ortaogretim_ogretmenlerinin_oz-yeterlik_algilari
- WHO. (2013). *Visual impairment and blindness*. Erişim tarihi: 11 Aralık 2018. Retrieved from <https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/blindness-and-visual-impairment>
- Yaşar, Ö. (2017). Eğitimsizlik Sarmalının Kısır Döngüsündeki: Roman Çocukların Eğitimi. *Journal Of Social and Humanities Sciences Research*, 4(12), 1241-1253. <https://doi.org/10.26450/jshsr.208>
- Yılmaz, M., Gürçay, D., & Ekici, G. (2007). Akademik özyeterlik ölçeğinin Türkçe'ye uyarlanması. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 33(33), 253-259. Retrieved from <https://toad.halileksi.net/olcek/akademik-ozyeterlik-olcegi>
- Yiğitbaş, Ç., & Yetkin, A. (2003). Sağlık yüksekokulu öğrencilerinin öz-etkililik-yeterlik düzeyinin değerlendirilmesi. *ÇÜ Hemşirelik Yüksek Okulu Dergisi*, 7(1), 6-13. Retrieved from <http://eskidergi.cumhuriyet.edu.tr/makale/617.pdf>
- Zengin, N. (2007). Sağlık Yüksekokulu Öğrencilerinde Öz-Etkililik-Yeterlilik Algısı ve Klinik Uygulamada Yaşanılan Stresle İlişkisinin İncelenmesi. *Anadolu Hemşirelik ve Sağlık Bilimleri Dergisi*, 10(1), 49-57. Retrieved from <https://dergipark.org.tr/ataunihem/issue/2636/33912>

Copyrights

Copyright for this article is retained by the author(s), with first publication rights granted to the journal.

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).