Determination of Basic Needs Satisfaction of Students Studying in the Department of First and Emergency Aid

İlknur YÜCEL

Lecturer, Istanbul Galata University, Istanbul, Turkey, ORCID ID: https://orcid.org/0000-200002-2189-6876

ABSTRACT

The aim of this study; It is the determination of the satisfaction of the basic needs of university students. Research; The research was carried out with the participation of 1st year students studying in the first and emergency aid department of a foundation university and 93 students (Female: 75, Male 18) between 30.11.2022 and 10.04.2023. The "Personal Information Form" prepared by the researchers in the collection of the research data was collected with the "Basic Needs Satisfaction of University Students Scale". Analyses were performed with SPSS 25.0 program. In the analysis, the significance level was determined as 5%. Number, percentage, mean, standard deviation, median, minimum and maximum values were used as descriptive statistics. Histogram graphs were examined to check the normal distribution assumption. In addition, attention was paid to the fact that the skewness and kurtosis coefficients were between -1 and +1. In the comparison of the means of the two independent groups, if the normal distribution assumption is satisfied, the independent samples t-test; When normal distribution could not be achieved, Mann Whitney U test was used. Correlation analyses were performed to determine the relationships between quantitative variables. Since the normal distribution assumption could not be satisfied, Spearman correlation analysis was applied. In this study, the majority of the participants in the study were women, single, did not have children, studied in normal education, whose income was equal to their expenses, lived with their families, did not smoke or drink alcohol, and were able to meet the basic needs of the majority. Within the scope of "competence, autonomy and relationship", which are the scale sub-dimension scores of the participants participating in the study; There was no significant difference between gender, type of education, cohabitation status with family, and smoking and alcohol use. While there was no significant relationship between the ages of the participants and the "competence and autonomy" sub-dimension, a negative, weak and significant relationship was found between the age and the "relationship" sub-dimension, and it was determined that as the age of the participants increased, their satisfaction with their relations with the people at the university decreased. In this study, it was determined that meeting the basic needs satisfaction of the students studying in the first and emergency aid program has an important place.

KEYWORDS: University Students, Basic Needs Satisfaction, Competence, Autonomy, Relationship

INDRODUCTION

University is a tool that individuals use to reach their future [1]. Determining the basic needs of university students is important for students to fulfill their duties and responsibilities [2,3]. Need; It is the state of deprivation that occurs in people as a result of internal or external effects disrupting the hemostatic balance [4]. All human needs constitute basic needs. Human beings have to meet their basic needs in order to maintain their vitality [5]. The basis for success in education and training is to determine the satisfaction of basic needs [6,7]. Three headings are important in determining basic needs. These; "competence, autonomy and relationship". Sufficiency; It refers to the fact that the person can achieve the desired goals [8-10]. Autonomy; It refers to the

fact that a person can choose his actions according to his own will [8,11,12]. Relationship; It is the belief that one depends on and believes in another [10,12].

The aim of this study is to determine the satisfaction of university students with basic needs. Research questions to be answered within the scope of the study:

- Is there a relationship between the sociodemographic characteristics of the students participating in the study and the basic needs satisfaction scale of university students?

METHOD

Place and Time of the Research
The research was conducted between 30.11.2022 and 10.04.2023 with 1st year students studying in the first and emergency aid department of a foundation university.

Purpose and Type of Research
The aim of this descriptive and cross-sectional study is to determine the satisfaction of university students with basic needs.

Universe and Sample of the Research
The first and emergency aid department of the Vocational School of Health Services of a foundation university and the 1st year students studying in primary and secondary education formed the study universe. In this study, the sampling method was not used and students who met the research criteria were included. 93 students (female: 75, male: 18) participated in the study.

The following criteria were taken into account in the inclusion of participants in the sampling:
- To be a student at the relevant university and department,
- Not having a Turkish speaking, communication problem or psychiatric diagnosis made by a physician,
-Volunteering to participate in research.
Participants who did not meet the inclusion criteria were not included in the study.

Data Collection and Data Collection Tools
The data were collected online and face-to-face from individuals who agreed to participate in the study and met the inclusion criteria, and the interview lasted 15-20 minutes for each participant. The data of the study were collected with the "Personal Information Form" prepared by the researchers and the "Basic Needs Satisfaction of University Students Scale".
Personal Information Form: It has been prepared by the researcher in line with the literature. It consists of 10 questions such as socio-demographic characteristics (age, gender, marital status, number of children), can you meet your basic needs.

Basic Needs Satisfaction Scale of University Students : The scale developed by Jenkins Guarnieri et al. in 2015 (Jenkins-Guarnieri et al., 2015) was validated into Turkish by Şimsir et al. in 2020. The scale consists of 3 sub-dimensions and 13 questions. The item loads of the scale ranged from 0.34 to 0.70 and the fit index values were calculated as $\chi2/sd = 2.18$, p<.01, GFI = 0.95, RMSEA = 0.05, CFI = 0.93, NFI = 0.89, SRMR = 0.05, AGFI = 0.93. In this study, Cronbach's alpha of the total scale was 0.79 [13].

Analysis of Data
Analyses were performed with SPSS 25.0 program. In the analysis, the significance level was determined as 5%. Number, percentage, mean, standard deviation, median, minimum and maximum values were used as descriptive statistics. Histogram graphs were examined to check the normal distribution assumption. In addition, attention was paid to the fact that the skewness and kurtosis coefficients were between -1 and +1. In the comparison of the means of the two independent groups, if the normal distribution assumption is satisfied, the independent samples t-test; When normal distribution could not be achieved, Mann Whitney U test was used. Correlation analyses were performed to determine the relationships between quantitative variables. Since the normal distribution assumption could not be satisfied, Spearman correlation analysis was applied.

Limitations of the Study
This study was carried out together with students studying in a single department of the relevant university. It cannot be generalized to all students.

Ethical Dimension of Research
In order to conduct the research, written permission was obtained from the ethics committee of the relevant university (Decision No: 2023-03-87) and the institution where the study was conducted. Necessary permissions were obtained from the authors of the scales to be used in the study before the study. Verbal and written permission and informed voluntary consent were obtained from the students who will participate in the research.

RESULTS
The findings consist of two parts.
Descriptive Statistics
Descriptive statistics are included in this section.
Table-1 shows the distribution of demographic characteristics of the participants (n = 93).

Determination of Basic Needs Satisfaction of Students Studying in the Department of First and Emergency Aid

Table-1: Distribution of demographic characteristics of the participants

Demographic Characteristics		n	%
Gender	Woman	75	80.6
	Male	18	19.4
	Sum	93	100
Marital status	Single	89	95.7
	Married	4	4.3
	Sum	93	100
Status of having a child	Have children	3	3.2
	Doesn't have children	90	96.8
	Sum	93	100
Level of education	Evening Education	31	33.3
	Normal Education	62	66.7
	Sum	93	100
Income level	Income is less than expense	30	32.3
	Income is more than expense	8	8.6
	Income equals expense	55	59.1
	Sum	93	100
Way of life	He lives with his family	63	67.7
	He does not live with his family	30	32.3
	Sum	93	100
Age	Place. ± SS	8.55pm ± 4.81am	
	Median (Min. – Max.)	19 (17 – 54)	

As stated in Table-1, 80.6% (n = 75) of the participants were female. 19.4% (n = 18) were male. 95.7% (n = 89) of the participants were single. 4.3% (n = 4) were married. 96.8% (n = 90) of the participants did not have children. Only 3.2% (n = 3) of the participants had children. 33.3% (n = 31) of the participants receive education in secondary education. 66.7% (n = 62) of the participants are studying in regular education. The income of 32.3% (n = 30) of the participants is less than the expense. The income of 8.6% (n = 8) is more than the expense. The income of 59.1% (n = 55) is equal to the expense. 67.7% (n = 63) of the participants live with their families. 32.3% (n = 30) did not live with their families.

As shown in Table-1, the mean age of the participants was 21 years (Mean = 20.55, SD = 4.81). The median age is 19 years. The ages of the participants ranged from 17 to 54 years.

In Table-2, the distribution of smoking/alcohol use and meeting the basic needs of the participants (n = 93) is given.

Table-2: Distribution of participants' smoking/alcohol use and meeting their basic needs

		n	%
Smoking status	Using	31	33.3
	Doesn't use	62	66.7
	Sum	93	100
Alcohol use	Using	17	18.3
	Doesn't use	76	81.7
	Sum	93	100
Status of meeting their basic needs	He thinks he meets it	65	69.9
	He thinks he can't afford it	28	30.1
	Sum	93	100

Determination of Basic Needs Satisfaction of Students Studying in the Department of First and Emergency Aid

As stated in Table-2, 33.3% (n = 31) of the participants are smokers. 66.7% (n = 62) were non-smokers. 18.3% (n = 17) of the participants used alcohol. 81.7% (n = 76) did not drink alcohol. 69.9% (n = 65) of the participants think that they meet their basic needs. 30.1% of the participants (n = 28) think that they cannot meet their basic needs.

Table-3 shows the averages obtained by the participants from the Satisfaction of Basic Needs of University Students Scale. There are 3 sub-dimensions of the scale. These; Competence, Autonomy and Relationship are its sub-dimensions (Şimşir, Arslan and Dilmaç, 2020).

Table-3: Satisfaction with the Basic Needs of University Students Scale (ÜÖTİDÖ)

Satisfaction of Basic Needs of University Students Scale		Avg. ± SS
Sufficiency	2. I don't feel very competent in college-related jobs.*	3.00 ± 1.19
	3. People in college say I'm good at what I do in school.	3.55 ± 0.84
	7. I'm able to pick up a variety of new skills in college.	3.48 ± 1.02
	8. I feel successful most of the time in attending college and in university studies.	3.96 ± 0.74
	9. I don't have the opportunity to show my talents much at university*	3.01 ± 1.12
	Sub-Dimension Average	**3.40 ± 0.54**
Autonomy	5. I am free to express my thoughts and opinions in college.	4.29 ± 0.77
	11. In college, I feel like I'm able to be more like myself.	3.60 ± 1.00
	12. I understand the purpose of the tasks I need to do in order to succeed in classes.	4.39 ± 0.69
	13. I am encouraged by the lecturers at the university to attend my classes.	3.88 ± 1.04
	Sub-Dimension Average	**4.04 ± 0.64**
Relation	1. I really like the people I went to college with.	3.40 ± 1.01
	4. I get along well with people at the university.	3.96 ± 0.87
	6. I consider the people I went to college with as my friends.	3.99 ± 1.02
	10. I don't have a lot of people I'm close to in college.*	2.80 ± 1.18
	Sub-Dimension Average	**3.53 ± 0.75**

*Items 2, 9 and 10 were scored backwards.

As shown in Table-3, the mean of the proficiency sub-dimension of the participants (n = 93) was 3.40 ± 0.54. The mean autonomy sub-dimension of the participants was 4.04 ± 0.64. The mean of the participants' relationship sub-dimension was 3.53 ± 0.75.

Hypothesis Testing
In this section, the scores obtained by the participants from the Satisfaction of Basic Needs of University Students Scale (ÜÖTİDÖ) were compared according to various variables.

Comparison of ÜTİDS Scores by Gender
The scores obtained from the Competence, Autonomy and Relationship sub-dimension were compared according to gender. Competence and Autonomy sub-dimension scores show a distribution characteristic close to normal in men and women. Therefore, independent samples t-test was used for the Competence and Autonomy sub-dimensions. Since the scores of women were not normally distributed in the relationship sub-dimension, the Mann Whitney U test was used in this sub-dimension. In Table-4, the mean scores of the sub-dimension of the UTSS were compared according to gender.

Table-4: Comparison of the mean scores of the sub-dimension of the ÖTİDS by gender

ÜÖTİDÖ	Gender	n	Place.	SS	Significance
Sufficiency	Woman	75	3.41	0.57	$t(91) = 0.484$
	Male	18	3.34	0.42	$p = .629$
Autonomy	Woman	75	4.06	0.63	$t(91) = 0.607$
	Male	18	3.96	0.68	$p = .545$
Relation	Woman	75	3.58	0.76	$Z = -1.314$
	Male	18	3.36	0.67	$p = .189$

t: Independent samples t-test
Z: Mann Whitney U testi

As shown in Table-4, there was no statistically significant difference between the competence, autonomy and relationship sub-dimension scores of men and women ($p > .05$).

As shown in Table-4, the mean of women's proficiency sub-dimension is 3.41. The mean proficiency sub-dimension of men was 3.34. There was no statistically significant difference between the two means according to the independent samples t-test results ($t(91) = 0.484$, $p > .05$).

As shown in Table-4, the mean autonomy sub-dimension of women is 4.06. The mean autonomy sub-dimension of men is 3.96. There was no statistically significant difference between the two means according to the independent samples t-test result ($t(91) = 0.607$, $p > .05$).

As shown in Table-4, the mean relationship sub-dimension of women is 3.58. The mean relationship sub-dimension of men

was 3.36. According to the results of the Mann Whitney U test, there was no statistically significant difference between the relationship sub-dimension scores of men and women ($Z = -1.314$, $p > .05$).

Comparison of ÜTİDÖ Scores by Education Level

The scores obtained from the Competence, Autonomy and Relationship sub-dimension were compared according to their education levels. Since the Competence and Autonomy sub-dimension scores showed a distribution feature close to normal in the compared groups, independent samples t-test was used in these sub-dimensions. Since the normal distribution could not be achieved in the relationship sub-dimension, the Mann Whitney U test was used.

In Table-5, the mean scores of the sub-dimension of the ÜTİDS were compared according to the level of education.

Table-5: Comparison of the mean scores of the sub-dimension of the ÖTİDS according to the level of education

ÜÖTİDÖ	Level of education	n	Place.	SS	Significance
Sufficiency	Evening Education	31	3.31	0.51	$t(91) = -1.143$
	Normal Education	62	3.45	0.55	$p = .256$
Autonomy	Evening Education	31	3.96	0.63	$t(91) = -0.864$
	Normal Education	62	4.08	0.64	$p = .390$
Relation	Evening Education	31	3.43	0.66	$Z = -1.328$
	Normal Education	62	3.59	0.79	$p = .184$

t: Independent samples t-test
Z: Mann Whitney U testi

As shown in Table-5, there is no statistically significant difference between the competence, autonomy and relationship sub-dimension scores of the participants who received education in secondary education and regular education ($p > .05$). The average of the proficiency sub-dimension of the participants who received education in secondary education was 3.31. The average of the proficiency sub-dimension of the participants who received education in regular education is 3.45. There was no statistically significant difference between the two means according to the independent samples t-test result ($t(91) = -1.143$, $p > .05$).

As shown in Table-5, the average autonomy sub-dimension of the participants who received education in secondary education was 3.96. The average autonomy sub-dimension of the participants who received education in regular education was 4.08. There was no statistically significant difference between the two means according to the results of the independent samples t-test ($t(91)= -0.864$, $p > .05$).

As shown in Table-5, the mean relationship sub-dimension of the participants who received education in secondary education was 3.43. The mean relationship sub-dimension of the participants who received education in normal education was 3.59. According to the results of the Mann Whitney U test, there was no statistically significant difference between the relationship sub-dimension scores of the participants who received education in secondary education and regular education ($With = -1.328$, $p > .05$).

Relationships Between Age and UTSS Scores

The relationships between the age of the participants and the sub-dimension scores of competence, autonomy and relationship were examined. Spearman correlation analysis was performed because the ages were not normally distributed. Table-6 shows the result of Spearman correlation analysis.

Determination of Basic Needs Satisfaction of Students Studying in the Department of First and Emergency Aid

Table-6: Relationships between the age of the participants and the sub-dimension scores of competence, autonomy and relationship

		Age
Sufficiency	r	.087
	p	.405
	n	93
Autonomy	r	.052
	p	.619
	n	93
Relation	r	-.205[*]
	p	.048
	n	93

*The correlation is significant at the level of .05.

Spearman correlation

According to the results of the correlation analysis in Table-6, there is a negative, weak and significant relationship between the ages of the participants and the relationship sub-dimension scores ($r = -.205$, $p < .05$). As the age of the participants increases, their satisfaction with their relationships with the people at the university decreases.

According to the results of the correlation analysis in Table-6, there is no significant relationship between the age of the participants and the proficiency sub-dimension scores ($r = .087$, $p > .05$).

According to the results of the correlation analysis in Table-6, there is no significant relationship between the age of the participants and the autonomy sub-dimension scores ($r = .052$, $p > .05$).

Comparison of ÜTİDS Scores According to Family Living Status

The scores obtained from the Competence, Autonomy and Relationship sub-dimension were compared according to the status of living with the family. As in the previous analyses, independent samples t-test was used in these sub-dimensions because the Competence and Autonomy sub-dimension scores showed a distribution feature close to normal in the compared groups. Since the normal distribution could not be achieved in the relationship sub-dimension, the Mann Whitney U test was used.

In Table-7, the mean scores of the sub-dimension of the UTSS were compared according to the status of living with the family.

Table-7: Comparison of the mean scores of the sub-dimension of the ÜTİDS according to the status of living with the family

ÜÖTİDÖ	Together with his family...	n	Place.	SS	Significance
Sufficiency	Lives	63	3.43	0.58	$t(91) = 0.821$
	Lives	30	3.33	0.46	$p = .414$
Autonomy	Lives	63	4.03	0.62	$t(91) = -0.188$
	Lives	30	4.06	0.68	$p = .852$
Relation	Lives	63	3.58	0.75	$Z = -0.916$
	Lives	30	3.43	0.75	$p = .360$

t: Independent samples t-test

Z: Mann Whitney U testi

As shown in Table-7, there was no statistically significant difference between the competence, autonomy and relationship sub-dimension scores of the participants who lived with their families and those who did not live with their families ($p > .05$). The mean proficiency sub-dimension of the participants living with their families was 3.43. The mean proficiency sub-dimension of the participants who do not live with their families is 3.33. There was no statistically

Determination of Basic Needs Satisfaction of Students Studying in the Department of First and Emergency Aid

significant difference between the two means according to the independent samples t-test results ($t(91) = 0.821$, $p > .05$).

As shown in Table-7, the average autonomy sub-dimension of the participants living with their families was 4.03. The average autonomy sub-dimension of the participants who did not live with their families was 4.06. There was no statistically significant difference between the two means according to the results of the independent samples t-test ($t(91) = -0.188$, $p > .05$).

As shown in Table-7, the mean relationship sub-dimension of the participants living with their families is 3.58. The mean relationship sub-dimension of the participants who did not live with their families was 3.43. According to the results of the Mann Whitney U test, there was no statistically significant difference between the relationship sub-dimension scores of

the participants who lived with their families and those who did not live with their families ($Z = -0.916$, $p > .05$).

Comparison of ÖTİDS Scores According to Smoking Status
The scores obtained from the Competence, Autonomy and Relationship sub-dimension were compared according to smoking status. As in the previous analyses, independent samples t-test was used in these sub-dimensions because the Competence and Autonomy sub-dimension scores showed a distribution feature close to normal in the compared groups. Since the normal distribution could not be achieved in the relationship sub-dimension, the Mann Whitney U test was used.

In Table-8, the mean scores of the sub-dimension of the UTSS were compared according to the smoking status.

Table-8: Comparison of the mean scores of the sub-dimension of the ÜTİDS according to the smoking status

ÜÖTİDÖ	Smoking status	n	Place.	SS	Significance
Sufficiency	Using	31	3.41	0.48	$t(91) = 0.162$
	Doesn't use	62	3.39	0.57	$p = .872$
Autonomy	Using	31	4.17	0.71	$t(91) = 1.391$
	Doesn't use	62	3.98	0.59	$p = .167$
Relation	Using	31	3.54	0.66	$Z = -0.415$
	Doesn't use	62	3.53	0.79	$p = .678$

t: Independent samples t-test
Z: Mann Whitney U testi

As shown in Table-8, there was no statistically significant difference between the competence, autonomy and relationship sub-dimension scores of the smokers and non-smokers ($p > .05$).

As shown in Table-8, the mean proficiency sub-dimension of the participants who smoked was 3.41. The mean proficiency sub-dimension of non-smokers was 3.39. According to the results of the independent t-test, there was no statistically significant difference between the proficiency averages of the smokers and non-smokers ($t(91) = 0.162$, $p > .05$).

As shown in Table-8, the mean autonomy sub-dimension of the participants who smoked was 4.17. The mean autonomy sub-dimension of non-smoking participants was 3.98. According to the independent sample t-test results, there was no statistically significant difference between the autonomy averages of the smokers and non-smokers ($t(91) = 1.391$, $p > .05$).

As shown in Table-8, the mean relationship sub-dimension of the participants who smoked was 3.54. The mean relationship

sub-dimension of non-smoking participants was 3.53. According to the results of the Mann Whitney U test, there was no statistically significant difference between the relationship sub-dimension scores of the smokers and non-smokers ($Z = -0.415$, $p > .05$).

Comparison of ÖTİDS Scores According to Alcohol Use Status
The scores obtained from the Competence, Autonomy and Relationship sub-dimension were compared according to the status of alcohol use. As in the previous analyses, independent samples t-test was used in these sub-dimensions because the Competence and Autonomy sub-dimension scores showed a distribution feature close to normal in the compared groups. Since the normal distribution could not be achieved in the relationship sub-dimension, the Mann Whitney U test was used.

In Table-9, the mean scores of the sub-dimension of the UTSS were compared according to the status of alcohol use.

Determination of Basic Needs Satisfaction of Students Studying in the Department of First and Emergency Aid

Table-9: Comparison of the mean scores of the sub-dimension of the ÖTİDS according to the status of alcohol use

ÜÖTİDÖ	Alcohol use	n	Place.	SS	Significance
Sufficiency	Using	17	3.26	0.48	$t(91) = -1.196$
	Doesn't use	76	3.43	0.55	$p = .235$
Autonomy	Using	17	3.87	0.57	$t(91) = -1.243$
	Doesn't use	76	4.08	0.65	$p = .217$
Relation	Using	17	3.34	0.62	$Z = -1.609$
	Doesn't use	76	3.58	0.77	$p = .108$

t: Independent samples t-test

Z: Mann Whitney U testi

As shown in Table-9, there was no statistically significant difference between the competence, autonomy and relationship sub-dimension scores of the participants who used and did not use alcohol ($p > .05$).

As shown in Table-9, the mean of the proficiency sub-dimension of the participants who used alcohol was 3.26. The mean proficiency sub-dimension of the participants who did not use alcohol was 3.43. According to the results of the independent samples t-test, there was no statistically significant difference between the mean of the proficiency sub-dimensions of the participants who used and did not use alcohol ($t(91) = -1.196$, $p > .05$).

As shown in Table-9, the mean autonomy sub-dimension of the participants who use alcohol is 3.87. The mean autonomy sub-dimension of the participants who did not use alcohol was 4.08. According to the results of the independent samples t-test, there was no statistically significant difference between the autonomy sub-dimension averages of the participants who used and did not use alcohol ($t(91) = -1.243$, $p > .05$).

.

As shown in Table-9, the mean relationship sub-dimension of the participants who used alcohol was 3.34. The mean relationship sub-dimension of the participants who did not use alcohol was 3.58. According to the results of the Mann Whitney U test, there was no statistically significant difference between the relationship sub-dimension scores of the participants who used and did not use alcohol ($Z = -1.609$, $p > .05$).

Comparison of ÜTİDÖ Scores According to the Status of Meeting Basic Needs

The scores obtained from the Competence, Autonomy and Relationship sub-dimension were examined according to the status of meeting basic needs. The scores of the compared groups showed a near-normal distribution in all sub-dimensions. Therefore, independent samples t-test was used in all sub-dimensions.

In Table-10, the mean scores of the sub-dimensions of the ÖTİDS were analyzed according to the meeting of basic needs

Table-10: Comparison of the mean scores of the sub-dimension of the ÖTİDS according to the status of meeting the basic needs

ÜÖTİDÖ	Availability of meeting basic needs	n	Place.	SS	Significance
Sufficiency	Meets	65	3.46	0.58	$t(91) = 1.692$
	Can't afford it	28	3.26	0.39	$p = .094$
Autonomy	Meets	65	4.08	0.57	$t(40.2) = 0.749$
	Can't afford it	28	3.96	0.77	$p = .458$
Relation	Meets	65	3.67	0.68	**$t(91) = 2.811$**
	Can't afford it	28	3.21	0.82	**$p = .006*$**

There is a significant difference in the level of $p < .05$.

t: Independent samples t-test

As shown in Table-10, there is a statistically significant difference between the mean of the relationship sub-dimensions of the participants who meet their basic needs and those who cannot meet them ($t(91) = 2.811$, $p < .05$). The

average relationship sub-dimension of the participants who met their basic needs was 3.67. The mean relationship sub-dimension of the participants who could not meet their basic needs was 3.21. This finding shows that participants who

meet their basic needs get more satisfaction from their relationships with people at the university than those who do not.

As stated in Table-10, the mean of competence and autonomy sub-dimensions do not show a statistically significant difference according to the status of meeting basic needs ($p > .05$). The average of the proficiency sub-dimension of the participants who met their basic needs was 3.46. The mean of the proficiency sub-dimension of the participants who could not meet their basic needs was 3.26. The autonomy sub-dimension average of the participants who met their basic

needs was 4.08. The autonomy sub-dimension average of the participants who could not meet their basic needs was 3.96.

Comparison of ÖTİDÖ Scores by Income Level
The distribution of the number of participants at income levels is not balanced. The number of participants whose income is more than their expenses has decreased to less than 10.

In Table-11, the sub-dimension scores of the ÖTİDS are compared according to the income level.

Table-11: Comparison of the sub-dimension scores of the ÜTİDS according to income level

ÜÖTİDÖ	Income level	n	Place.	SS	Significance
Sufficiency	Income is less than expense	30	3.34	0.53	$\chi_2^2 = 5.133$ $p = .077$
	Income is more than expense	8	3.00	0.59	
	Income equals expense	55	3.49	0.52	
Autonomy	Income is less than expense	30	3.95	0.65	$\chi_2^2 = 1.996$ $p = .369$
	Income is more than expense	8	3.88	0.52	
	Income equals expense	55	4.11	0.64	
Relation	Income is less than expense	30	3.32	0.73	$\chi_2^2 = 4.728$ $p = .094$
	Income is more than expense	8	3.47	0.92	
	Income equals expense	55	3.66	0.72	

χ_2^2: Kruskal Wallis H testi

According to the results of the Kruskal Wallis H test in Table-11, the scores of competence, autonomy and relationship sub-dimensions showed a statistically significant difference according to income levels($p > .05$).

DISCUSSION
In this descriptive and cross-sectional study, the basic needs satisfaction of university students was determined. In this study, it was determined that meeting the basic needs satisfaction of the students studying in the first and emergency aid program has an important place. In this study, the majority of the participants in the study were women, single, did not have children, studied in normal education, whose income was equal to their expenses, lived with their families, did not smoke or drink alcohol, and were able to meet the basic needs of the majority. Looking at the literature, the majority of the participants in the study were female and single [14]. At the same time, there was no significant relationship between socioeconomic level and meeting basic needs. It is thought that the socioeconomic level perceived by

the university student who has gained his freedom is not related to the satisfaction of his basic needs.

Within the scope of "competence, autonomy and relationship", which is the scale sub-dimension scores of the participants participating in the study, there was no significant difference between gender, education type, family cohabitation status, and smoking and alcohol use. When we look at the literature, studies with similar results are found [6,15,16]. The reason for this is that it is thought that this study may have been carried out in groups with similar sociodemographic characteristics.

While there was no significant relationship between the age of the participants and the "competence and autonomy" sub-dimension, a negative, weak and significant relationship was found between the age and the "relationship" sub-dimension, and it was determined that the satisfaction of the participants with their relations with the people at the university decreased as their age increased. When the literature is examined, a significant positive relationship was found between age and sub-dimension scores in similarly designed studies [17-19]. It is known that individuals who receive university education

focus on making decisions of their own volition and establishing close relationships with their friends around them with the increase in age. On the other hand, in this study, there was no significant relationship between age and "competence and autonomy" due to similar sociodemographic characteristics. In line with these data, it is thought that the situation between age groups arises due to generational differences.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In this study, it was determined that meeting the basic needs satisfaction of the students studying in the first and emergency aid program has an important place. It shows that participants who meet their basic needs get more satisfaction from their relationships with people at the university than those who do not. In the study data, it was found that basic needs satisfaction changed according to sociodemographic characteristics. In this direction, it is recommended to add informative materials about basic needs satisfaction to every stage of education and training.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Data Availability Statement

The data are publicly available on https://dhsprogram.com/data/available-datasets.cfm from Demographic Health Survey website and can be obtained through a request to the Demographic Health Survey program.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

Concept&Design- İ.Y., Supervision- İ.Y., Resources- İ.Y. Materials- İ.Y., Writing - İ.Y., Critical Review- İ.Y.

REFERENCES

I. Davies, H. Competence-based curricula in the context of Bologna and EU higher education policy. *Pharmacy*. 2017; 5(17), 1-12.

II. Ilardi BC, Leone D, Kasser T, Ryan RM. Employee and supervisor ratings of motivation: Main effects and discrepancies associated with job satisfaction and adjustment in a factory setting. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*.1993; 23, 1789–1805. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.1993.tb01066.x

III. Deci EL, Ryan RM, Gagne M, Leone DR, Usunov J, Kornazheva BP. Need satisfaction, motivation, and wellbeing in the work organizations of a former eastern bloc country: A cross-cultural study of self-determination. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*.2021; 27, 930–942. https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167201278002

IV. Kuzgun Y. Vocational counseling, practices, theories. Ankara: Nobel Publications. 2020; p:95

V. Öğülmüş S. Interpersonal Problem Solving Skills and Training. (3rd edition). Istanbul: Nobel Publications.2001

VI. Türkdoğan T, Duru E. Development of the Basic Needs Scale for University Students (ÜÖTİS): A validity and reliability study. *Pamukkale University Journal of Education Faculty*. 2012; 31(1), 81-91

VII. Eşinci H. Investigation of romantic relationship quality in terms of early maladaptive schemas, attachment and psychological needs. Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, G. U. Institute of Educational Sciences, Ankara.2014

VIII. Deci EL, Ryan RM. The "What" and "Why" of Goal Pursuits: Human Needs and the Self-Determination of Behavior. *Psychol. Inq.* 2000; *11*, 227–268.

IX. Moltafet G, Firoozabadi SS, Zarrincola F, Rod HK. Prediction of resiliency based on family communication patterns and satisfying basic psychological needs. *Glob. J. Psychol. Res.* 2015; *5*, 11–17.

X. Abualkibash SK, Lera MJ. Resilience and basic psychological needs among Palestinian school students. *Biosci. Biotechnol. Res. Commun.* 2017; *10*, 346–353.

XI. Rutter M. Psychosocial resilience and protective mechanisms. In *Risk and Protective Factors in the Development of Psychopathology*; Rolf J, Masten AS, Cicchetti D, Nüchterlein KH, Weintraub S, Eds. Cambridge University Press: New York, NY, USA, 1990; pp. 181–214.

XII. Kaydkhorde H, Moltafet G, Chinaveh M. Relationship between Satisfying Psychological Needs and Resilience in High-school Students in Dezful Town. *Acad. J. Psychol. Stud.* 2014; *3*, 57–62.

XIII. Şimşir Z, Arslan C, Dilmaç B. Adaptation of the Satisfaction of Basic Needs of University Students Scale (ÜÖTİDÖ) into Turkish: A validity and reliability study. *Turkish Journal of Educational Sciences*. 2020; *18*(2), 940-955.

XIV. Hosseini LJ, Rafiemanesh H, Bahrami S. Levels of motivation and basic psychological need satisfaction in nursing students: In perspective of self-determination theory. Nurse Educ Today. 2022 Dec;119:105538. doi: 10.1016/j.nedt.2022.105538. Epub 2022 Sep 10. PMID: 36228346.

XV. Yarkın E. Investigation of the Contribution of the Level of Meeting Basic Psychological Needs to the Level of Relationship Satisfaction and Life Satisfaction, Istanbul Arel University Master's Thesis.2013

XVI. Dağaşan A. Investigation of university students' basic needs satisfaction, rumination and readiness for being teacher in terms of various variables. *International Journal of Curriculum and Instruction.*2023; 15(2) (2023) 1077–1095

XVII. Yiğit R. Investigation of the basic psychological needs of foreign university students studying in Konya in terms of some variables. *Journal of Selcuk University Institute of Social Sciences.* 2012; 27.

XVIII. Tian L, Chen H, Huebner ES. The Longitudinal Relationships Between Basic Psychological Needs Satisfaction at School and School-Related Subjective Well-Being in Adolescents. *Social Indicators Research.* 2014; 119, 353– 372

XIX. Chen B, Vansteenkiste M, Beyers W, Boone L, Deci EL, Van der Kaap-Deeder J, ... Verstuyf J. Basic psychological need satisfaction, need frustration, and need strength across four cultures. *Motivation and Emotion*. 2015;*39*(2), 216-236.