

Relationship Between Satisfying Psychological Needs and Resilience in B.Ed Students

Khin Myo Thein¹, Aye Chan Myat Phyoe²

Abstract

The primary purpose of this study is to investigate the relationship between satisfying psychological needs and resilience in B.Ed students. Design of this study is cross sectional in nature. Quantitative perspective was used in this study. Two Universities of Education, Yangon University of Education (YUOE) and Sagaing University of Education (SUOE) were purposefully selected for this study. A total of 1436 B.Ed students attending at the first year to final year classes participated in this study. Child and Youth Resilience Measure (CYRM) developed by Liebenberg, Ungar, and Van de Vijver (2012) and Basic Psychological Needs Scale developed by Deci and Ryan (2000) were used as research instruments in this study. The CYRM comprises three sub-scales: Individual Capacity/Resources, Relationship with Primary Caregiver and Contextual Factor. The BPNS consists of three sub-scales, namely, Need for Autonomy, Need for Competence and Need for Relatedness. Alpha reliability for CYRM and BPNS revealed at 0.83 and 0.78 respectively. The result of this study revealed that significant differences existed in B.Ed students' resilience with respect to gender, university and level of education. But there was no difference in resilience with respect to age group. Again, the result showed that significant differences existed in satisfying psychological needs by university and age group. However, significant differences in satisfying psychological needs were not found to be by gender and level of education. Moreover, all three subscales of psychological needs were positively correlated with resilience. Therefore, it could be said that the higher the satisfaction of a student's psychological needs, the higher his or her resilience. Besides, multiple regression analysis results showed that all basic psychological needs have positive and significant effect on resilience. In sum, findings of study provide good evidences for effect of satisfying psychological needs on resilience.

Key Words: Basic Psychological Needs, Resilience.

Introduction

In past and at the beginning of its evolution as a science, psychology has relied more on disease than health, aggression than love, fear than courage and psychologists had not emphasized so much on helping people for being more glad, more perfect, more hope, more love and more optimism (Seligman and Csikszentmihalyi, 2000). Today, positive psychology has been emerged against this trend which studies strength of human and has shifted its focus from treating and preventing mental disorders to helping individuals attain well-being and live a fulfilling and satisfied life.

To identify methods that follow human well-being and happiness is the final target in positive psychology. Resilience has attracted many researchers in recent years because of its impact on mental health. Resilience means successful conformity in spite of harmful conditions and threats in environment that people live in it. In reality, resilience is positive adaptation in reaction to worse conditions (Deci and Ryan, 2004).

¹ Lecturer, Department of Educational Psychology, Yangon University of Education

² Senior Assistant Teacher, Basic Education High School, Anangone, Ayeyarwady Region

Basic psychological need theory states that satisfying basic psychological needs leads to well-being (Deci & Ryan, 2000). These needs include: need for autonomy, need for competence and need for relatedness are important for individual. Need for autonomy means freedom in activities instead of control sense or obligation. This need meets when a person feels that based on his integrated perception of self, he acts according to his will (Deci and Ryan, 2000). Need for competence is capacity and efficacy in confronting environment, such that an individual feels that he can control environmental experiences and copes different challenges (White, 1959). Need for relatedness means need for having ties with others, such that a person feels that he is loved by those who are important for them (Deci et al., 2001). From the perspective of self-determination theory (Deci and Ryan, 2000), all individuals require satisfaction of basic psychological needs for autonomy, competence and relatedness. Based on this, this research investigates satisfaction of basic psychological needs with resilience.

It is the dream of every nation, community, parents, and students to have good academic attainment to adequately equip the individual to meet the challenges of the modern global world. Also in Myanmar, “to create a modern and developed country through education” is our nation’s motto. Charles Richard Van Hise, president of the University of Wisconsin and Charles Mc Carthy (1912) also stated that “What the brain is to a man’s hands, feel and eyes, the university is to the people of the state” (cited in Dr. Khin Zaw Oo, 2015). Among universities, the two universities of education, Yangon University of Education and Sagaing University of Education are the main pillars of education in Myanmar. Thus, our nation’s progress depends much on the today’s generation especially B.Ed students from these two universities since, through education, they can influence and transform society and the world at large. Therefore, it is very important for them to attain well-being and live a fulfilling and satisfied life. For these reasons, this research tries to investigate the relationship between satisfying psychological needs and resilience in B.Ed students.

Objectives of the Study

The main objective of the research is to investigate the relationship between satisfying psychological needs and resilience in B.Ed students. The specific objectives of this study are:

- To find out the difference between satisfying psychological needs and resilience in B.Ed students by gender
- To compare the difference between satisfying psychological needs and resilience in B.Ed students by university
- To assess the difference between satisfying psychological needs and resilience in B.Ed students by age group
- To examine the difference between satisfying psychological needs and resilience in B.Ed students by level of education

Review of Related Literature

Resilience as a Multidimensional Process

Although it is now widely accepted that resilience is the capacity of individuals to overcome adversity and do well in spite of exposure to significant adversity, it is also accepted that resilience is associated with individual capacities (such as the capacity to form attachments, self-regulate, cognitive skills, and personality or temperament),

relationships (with family, friends, peers, and the ability to interact in socially appropriate ways with members of the broader community), and the availability of community resources and opportunities (including educational, health, recreational, and social services) (Luthar, 2006; Masten, 1999; Ungar, 2011). A three-factor structure best reflects the theoretical models of resilience as explained by Garmezy (1985), Luthar, Cicchetti, and Becker (2000), Masten (2001), Rutter (2000), and Werner (2000).

Garmezy (1985) held an ecological view of resilience based on the view that the environment around the child contributed significantly to the outcomes of children experiencing stress and he contended that protective factors at the individual and familial levels, and external to the family, all influence resilience. Some of these influences include:

1. **Individual factors** – dispositional attributes of the child such as temperament (activity level), how one meets new situations (positive responsiveness to others), and cognitive skills.
2. **Familial factors** – family cohesion and warmth (despite poverty or marital discord), the presence of a caring adult in the absence of responsive parents (such as a grandparent), or a concern by parents for the well-being of their children.
3. **Support factors** – external to family, and included the availability and use of external support systems by parents and children, a strong maternal substitute, a supportive and concerned teacher, or an institutional structure that fosters ties to the larger community (church, social worker).

Studies of these components and how they function in the lives of those confronted by risk have affirmed that resilience is not a static state, an outcome or an inherent trait within the individual. Rather, the interactions between an individual's environment and an individual's assets generate processes that help people to overcome adversity. As Ungar (2008) explains, in the context of exposure to significant adversity, whether psychological, environmental, or both, resilience is both the capacity of individuals to navigate their way to health sustaining resources, including opportunities to experience feelings of wellbeing, and a condition of the individual's family, community, and culture to provide these health resources and experience in culturally meaningful ways.

Self-Determination Theory (SDT)

According to Deci and Ryan (2000), self-determination theory is an organismic metatheory that attempts to explain how and why people self-regulate behavior. The major assumption of this theory is that all human beings are organisms with a natural orientation toward vitality and growth. Deci and Ryan (2000) suggest that this growth tendency will be actualized as long as three basic psychological nutrients (autonomy, competence and relatedness) are available. In brief, autonomy refers to the feeling that one has choice and is not subject to coercion or unwanted pressure, the feeling of volition, willingness, concurrence, and choice with respect to a behavior or experience one is engaged in (de Charms, 1968; Deci & Ryan, 1985, 2000); competence refers to the feeling that one is efficacious and able to master challenges (Deci & Ryan 2000; White, 1959) and the feeling effective and confident with respect to some behavior or goal (White, 1959); finally, relatedness satisfaction concerns the experience of love and care by significant others (Baumeister & Leary, 1995; Deci & Ryan, 1985). Essentially, optimal human

functioning results when these nutrients are supported and non-optimal functioning results when these nutrients are thwarted. Reis, Sheldon, Gable, Roscoe, and Ryan (2000) compared this to the needs that most plants have for sun, soil and water. When a plant's needs for sun, soil and water are met, a plant will flourish and grow. However, when such nutrients are in limited supply or are withheld, a plant may still survive, but may not reach its potential.

Method and Procedure

Participants

A total of 1436 students attending at the first year to final year classes participated in this study. Two Universities of Education, Yangon University of Education (YUOE) and Sagaing University of Education (SUOE) were purposefully selected for this study. The sample consists of 724 students (320 males and 404 females) from YUOE and 712 students (349 males and 363 females) from SUOE. Among the sample, 47% (669) of participants were males and 53% (767) were females.

Instrumentation

In order to investigate resilience of participated students, CYRM developed by Liebenberg, Ungar, and Van de Vijver (2012) was used. Child and Youth Resilience Measure comprised three sub-scales: individual capacities/resources, relationships with primary caregivers and contextual Factors (see Appendix C). A total of 28 items were involved in the Child and Youth Resilience Measure.

Again, students' satisfaction of psychological needs was measured by using Basic Psychological Needs Scale developed by Deci and Ryan (2000) was used in this study. This questionnaire consists of 21 items related to three subscales, namely, need for autonomy, need for competence and need for relatedness (see Appendix D). Each subscale of both instruments were coded by using a five-point likert scale, with 1 = "strongly disagree" to 5 = "strongly agree".

Procedure

First, relevant information was gathered for literature review from the libraries and internet sources. Next, the instruments required for the study were prepared under the guidance and suggestion of the supervisor. Then, expert review was conducted to ensure the content validity and face validity of instrument. Pilot study was also conducted to determine the internal consistency, the clarity of the items and the time allocated to complete the Basic Psychological Needs Scale and Child and Youth Resilience Measure. After validating the instrument, data collection was carried out at the two Universities of Education to collect the data required for this study. When the data collection procedure was finished, required data were analyzed step-by-step.

Data Analysis and Findings

By applying Child and Youth Resilience Measure (CYRM) and Basic Psychological Needs Scales (BPNS), differences in resilience and psychological needs of B.Ed students were examined at two Universities of Education. In addition, differences by gender, university, training, age group and level of education were investigated.

Table 1 Descriptive Statistics for B.Ed Students' Resilience and Psychological Needs

Variables	N	Mean %	Minimum	Maximum	SD	Cronbach's Alpha
Resilience	1436	82.43	46	101	6.56	0.83
Psychological Needs	1436	69.68	40	96	7.98	0.78

By using the data obtained from the selected participants, the students' resilience and satisfying psychological needs can be estimated. According to the descriptive statistics, the mean percentage of students' resilience and satisfying psychological needs were 82.43 and 69.68 respectively. Cronbach's alpha for resilience and psychological needs revealed at 0.83 and 0.78 respectively.

Table 2 Comparison of B.Ed Students' Resilience and Psychological Needs by Gender

Variables	Gender	N	Mean%	SD	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
Resilience	Male	669	81.74	6.805	-3.720***	.000
	Female	767	83.03	6.281		
Psychological Needs	Male	669	69.42	8.066	-1.170	.242
	Female	767	69.91	7.898		

*** $p < 0.001$

To find out the differences of students' resilience and satisfying psychological needs between male and female students from the selected universities, descriptive statistics were applied. According to Table 2, it can be seen that the mean scores of female students were higher than that of male students in resilience but a slightly variation of the mean scores exists between male students and female students.

To obtain more information for gender differences, the independent sample *t*-test was applied to find out the significant differences in resilience and psychological needs by gender. From the results of independent sample *t*-test, there were statistically significant differences in resilience by gender. So, it could be interpreted that the female students had higher ability to navigate to the culturally relevant resources they need to do well when confronting adversity than male students.

Table 3 Comparison of B.Ed Students' Resilience and Psychological Needs by University

Variables	University	N	Mean%	SD	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
Resilience	YUOE	724	81.92	6.474	-2.973**	.003
	SUOE	712	82.95	6.610		
Psychological Needs	YUOE	724	68.91	7.738	-3.744***	.000
	SUOE	712	70.47	8.144		

** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$

To find out the differences in resilience and psychological needs with regard to university, descriptive statistics and *t* test were calculated. The results were mentioned in table 3. According to table 3, the mean scores of Sagaing University of Education were higher than in both resilience and psychological needs.

From the results of independent sample *t*-test, there were significant differences in resilience and psychological needs by university. It could be concluded that students from Sagaing University of Education had more individual resources to adapt successfully to disturbances that threaten system function and higher satisfaction of psychological needs than those from Yangon University of Education.

Table 4 Comparison of B.Ed Students' Resilience and Psychological Needs by Age Group

Variables	University	N	Mean%	SD	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
Resilience	Below 20	720	82.64	6.485	1.246	.213
	20 & above	716	82.21	6.630		
Psychological Needs	Below 20	720	69.24	8.058	-2.138*	.033
	20 & above	716	70.13	7.876		

* $p < 0.05$

To figure out the differences in resilience and psychological needs with regard to age, descriptive statistics and *t*-test were applied. The means values of two age-groups: below 20 age group, and 20 and above age group were reported in table 4.

According to the results of independent sample *t*-test, there was significant difference in psychological needs by age group. It may be due to the fact that 20 and above age group students satisfied basic psychological needs more than those of below those of below 20 age group.

Table 5 Comparison of Students' Psychological Needs and Resilience by Level of Education

To test whether there was significant difference in psychological needs and resilience of B.Ed students by level of education, one way ANOVA were conducted.

Variables	Education Level	No. of Students	Mean %	SD	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
Resilience	1.1	209	84.29	6.594	5.038***	.000
	2.1	209	81.57	6.251		
	3.1	202	82.31	6.267		
	4.1	201	81.76	6.300		
	4.2	203	82.79	6.840		
	5.1	204	81.36	6.990		
	5.2	208	82.89	6.250		

Variables	Education Level	No. of Students	Mean %	SD	F	p
Psychological Needs	1.1	209	69.72	8.538	1.038	.399
	2.1	209	69.03	7.727		
	3.1	202	68.96	7.702		
	4.1	201	69.64	8.354		
	4.2	203	69.67	7.661		
	5.1	204	70.43	8.022		
	5.2	208	70.33	7.785		

*** $p < 0.001$

Note: 1.1= First Year (First Semester), 2.1= Second Year (Second Semester), 3.1= Third Year (First Semester), 4.1= Fourth Year (First Semester), 4.2= Fourth Year (Second Semester), 5.1= Fifth Year (First Semester), 5.2= Fifth Year (Second Semester)

Table 6 Results of Post-Hoc Analysis for Resilience and Psychological Needs by Level of Education

To obtain more detailed information of which level of education had significant differences, Post Hoc Test was conducted by Turkey's multiple comparison procedure (see Table 6).

Subscales of Resilience	(I) Education Level	(J) Education Level	Mean Difference (I-J)	p
Individual Capacity	2.1	4.2	-2.117*	.034
Relationship with Primary Caregivers	1.1	4.1	3.609*	.018
		5.1	4.261*	.002
Contextual Factor	1.1	2.1	3.507*	.000
		3.1	3.362*	.000
		4.1	3.962*	.000
		4.2	2.510*	.019
		5.1	4.668*	.000
		5.2	2.383*	.031
Need for Autonomy	3.1	5.2	-3.071*	.023

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

Note: 1.1= First Year (First Semester), 2.1= Second Year (Second Semester), 3.1= Third Year (First Semester), 4.1= Fourth Year (First Semester), 4.2= Fourth Year (Second Semester), 5.1= Fifth Year (First Semester), 5.2= Fifth Year (Second Semester)

According to the result of table 6, in individual capacity, it could be easily seen that there were significant difference between second year (first semester) and fourth year (second semester). Therefore, it could be reasonably concluded that the senior students such as students from fourth year had higher individual capacity to overcome adversity and more capacity to navigate their ways to resources that sustain well-being than their juniors such as students from second year. Similarly, in relationship with primary caregivers, there were significant differences between first year (first semester) and fourth year (first semester), and between first year (first semester) and fifth year (first semester). It could be interpreted that first year students were physically and psychologically provided more resources from their primary caregiver than their seniors. In contextual factor, there were significant differences between first year (first semester) and all other levels of education. It may be assumed that first year students involved numerous support services to get and seek community resources more than their seniors. Besides, it could be easily seen that there was significant difference between third year (first semester) and fifth year (second semester) in need for autonomy. It may be assumed that the final year students had higher need to pursue activities in which individuals are motivated internally and experience joy as a result of having personal choice than the third year students who were from education colleges.

Table 7 The Relationship Between Subscales of Psychological Needs and Resilience

Variables	NA	NC	NR	ICR	RPC	CF
NA	-	.447**	.397**	.390**	.296**	.286**
NC		-	.356**	.341**	.234**	.257**
NR			-	.486**	.291**	.359**
ICR				-	.356**	.463**
RPC					-	.443**
CF						-

** . Correlation is significant at 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Note: 1.1= First Year (First Semester), 2.1= Second Year (Second Semester), 3.1= Third Year (First Semester), 4.1= Fourth Year (First Semester), 4.2= Fourth Year (Second Semester), 5.1= Fifth Year (First Semester), 5.2= Fifth Year (Second Semester)

Table 7 showed that the inter-correlation between resilience and psychological needs. It could be seen that all three subscales of psychological needs were positively correlated with all resilience sub-scales. So, it could be said that the higher the satisfaction of a student's psychological needs: need for autonomy, need for competence and need for relatedness, the higher his or her resilience. Especially, individual capacity was strongly correlated with need for relatedness. Moreover, all the subscales in psychological needs and resilience were correlated with each other. Therefore, to investigate the predictive power of each subscale of psychological needs to resilience of B.Ed students, multiple regression analysis was conducted (see Table 8).

Table 8 Multiple Regression Analysis Between Each Subscale of Psychological Needs and Resilience

Variables	<i>B</i>	β	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>R</i>	<i>R</i> ²	Adj <i>R</i> ²	<i>F</i>
Constant	51.025		40.018***	.000	.551	.304	.303	208.56***
NA	.145	.214	8.324***	.000				
NC	.083	.134	5.290***	.000				
NR	.215	.350	14.207***	.000				

***. Correlation is significant at 0.001 level (2-tailed).

Note: *** $p < 0.001$, Constant = Resilience(*R*), NA=Need for Autonomy, NC= Need for Competence, NR= Need for Relatedness

The result showed that resilience was positively related with psychological needs. All three basic psychological needs: need for autonomy, need for competence and need for relatedness were significant predictors of resilience in positive direction ($\beta = .214$, $\beta = .134$ and $\beta = .350$, respectively, $p < 0.001$). So, it could be said that the higher the satisfaction of a student's basic psychological needs, the higher his or her resilience. The adjusted *R*² value is .303. This indicated that approximately 30% of the variance in resilience could be explained from psychological needs. The model equation to predict the resilience from students' satisfaction of psychological needs was as follows;

$$R = 51.025 + .145NA + .083NC + .215NR$$

Conclusion, Discussion and Recommendations

Conclusion

Resilience makes the teacher to respond positively to challenging circumstances which they may meet over the course of a career. It is unrealistic to expect pupils to be resilient if their teachers, who constitute a primary source of their role models, do not demonstrate resilient qualities (Henderson & Milstein, 2003). A shift in focus from teacher stress and burnout to resilience provides a promising perspective to understand the ways that teachers manage and sustain their motivation and commitment in times of change. Moreover, resilience, defined as the capacity to continue to "bounce back", to recover strengths or spirit quickly and efficiently in the face of adversity, is closely allied to a strong sense of vocation, self-efficacy and motivation to teach which are fundamental to a concern for promoting achievement in all aspects of students' lives. Since, resilience is of importance in B.Ed students for the above reasons.

Self-determination Theory (SDT) is a theory of human motivation that examines a wide range of phenomena across gender, culture, age, and socioeconomic status. SDT proposes that all human beings have three basic psychological needs – the needs for competence, autonomy, and relatedness are essential nutrients for effective functioning and wellness. In brief, competence refers to the experience of a sense of effectiveness in interacting with one's environment (White, 1959); relatedness satisfaction concerns the experience of love and care by significant others (Baumeister & Leary, 1995; Deci &

Ryan, 1985); finally, autonomy refers to the experience of volition and the self-endorsement of one's activity (Ryan & Deci, 2008). Just as plants need water and sunshine to grow and to flower, the satisfaction of the basic psychological needs is deemed essential to psychological thriving (Ryan, 1995). When a plant's needs for sun, soil and water are met, a plant will flourish and grow. However, when such nutrients are in limited supply or are withheld, a plant may still survive, but may not reach its potential.

The primary purpose of this study was to investigate relationship between meeting basic psychological needs and resilience in B.Ed students. Besides, this study sought to explore differences in resilience and satisfaction of psychological needs with respect to gender, university, age group and level of education. A total of 1436 students attending at the first year to final year classes from Yangon University of Education (YUOE) and Sagaing University of Education (SUOE) participated in this study. The sample consisted of 724 students (320 males and 404 females) from YUOE and 712 students (349 males and 363 females) from SUOE. Child and Youth Resilience Measure (CYRM) and Basic Psychological Needs Scales (BPNS) were used as research instruments.

Regarding the gender, the mean scores of selected female students were higher in relationship with primary caregivers and contextual factors of resilience than those of selected male students. The results of *t* test confirmed that significant differences were found to be on resilience. However, gender related difference was not found to be on psychological needs. Although a slight variation of mean scores exists, no significant difference was found to be on overall scale of psychological needs while considering the gender variable.

Concerning the university, the mean scores of selected B.Ed students from Sagaing University of Education were higher in individual resources and relationship with primary caregivers than selected B.Ed students from Yangon University of Education. From the result of *t* test, as the overall scale, there was significant difference in resilience by university. Moreover, the mean scores of three sub-scales of psychological needs from SUOE were higher than those from YUOE. The results of *t* test also showed that significant difference was found to be on psychological needs by university.

In the analysis of resilience by age group, the mean scores of two sub-scales as well as overall scale of resilience were found to be nearly identical. According to *t* test result, age related difference was not found on resilience. Concerning the age group, the mean scores of psychological needs of 20 and above age group were higher than that of below 20 age group. From the results of *t* test, significant difference was found to be on resilience by age group.

Again, resilience and psychological needs of B.Ed students were explored across level of education. Regarding the level of education, significant differences were found to be on overall scores as well as sub-scale scores of resilience. These differences were, again, confirmed by Post-Hoc analysis. Results revealed that, in individual capacity, there were significant difference between second year (first semester) and fourth year (second semester). Similarly, in relationship with primary caregivers, there were significant differences between first year (first semester) and fourth year (first semester), and between first year (first semester) and fifth year (first semester). In contextual factor, there were significant differences between first year (first semester) and all other levels of education. In addition, significant difference was not found to be on overall scores of psychological

needs by level of education. According to Post-Hoc results, there were significant difference between third year (first semester) and fifth year (second semester).

Finally, regression result showed that resilience was positively related with psychological needs. By reviewing results, supporting autonomy, competence and relatedness positively can predict resilience which was consistent with self-determination theory of Deci and Ryan (2004) that social factors, especially supporting environments and contexts which help basic psychological needs, has positive effect on resilience and health. Also results are consistent with Deci and Ryan (2004), Sigelman (1999), Deci and Ryan (2000) studies. These researchers believed that when relation of parents with children and context behavior with students, based on supporting independent behaviors and contribution in students, meeting basic needs facilitates and leads to mental adaptability, resilience and well-being. Fundamental psychological needs and their dissatisfaction can have considerable role in resilience, because meeting these needs provide necessary conditions for growth and development, consistency and well-being (Deci et al., 2001). According to self-determination theory, variations in meeting needs directly predict well-being variations. Sheldon, Ryan and Reis (1996) have tested routine changes in autonomy and competence. They found that in individual differences level satisfaction of two psychological needs: autonomy and competence are correlated with psychological well-being.

Satisfaction of each of the three basic psychological needs is essential for continuing growth, resilience and flourishing. Individuals will orient toward growth and well-being to the extent that their societies and social environments respond to them in ways that support these needs, enabling them to flexibly adapt to drastic socio-economic changes. Importantly, the relevance of basic psychological needs for well-being is not a culturally specific one. Research has shown that satisfaction of the basic psychological needs is important universally, for example in both Western individualistic cultures as well as in Eastern, collectivist ones (Chirkov, Ryan, Kim, & Kaplan, 2003; Jang, Reeve, Ryan, & Kim, 2009; Ryan, La Guardia, Solky-Butzel, Chirkov, & Kim, 2005). Using samples from a diverse set of cultures, studies have specifically shown that basic need satisfaction allows people to experience a sense of well-being, life meaning, and energy or aliveness (Ryan & Frederick, 1997). On the other hand, being deprived of need satisfaction results in poorer stress regulation and consequent higher anxiety, depression, burnout, and lower energy or vitality (Gagné, Ryan, & Bergmann, 2003; Reis et al., 2000).

Discussion and Recommendation

In justifying the results, satisfying basic psychological needs had positive impact on resilience. Therefore, for B.Ed students, societies including peers, teachers and parents should provide them continuing opportunities for basic psychological need satisfaction which has positive effect such as resilience. In other words, students will have more energy, motivation and desire to come together to cope with and recover from setbacks and challenges when they feel cared for and supported by their community. In addition, parents and teachers should provide grounds for meeting needs and resilience by emphasis on cooperative behaviors like providing useful feedback, listening, reducing mental and behavioral pressures, establishing warm and closed relations, contribution in educational activities. Human beings require psychological nutriment from their social environments and life experiences in much the same way that plants require oxygen and water. Without

these psychological nutriment people are less likely to thrive – much as a plant struggles to grow under depleted environmental conditions.

As three basic needs: needs for autonomy (deCharms, 1968; Deci, 1975), competence (Deci & Ryan, 1985; Ryan & Deci, 2000) and relatedness (Baumeister & Leary, 1995) are most essential to human functioning, the suggestions for satisfaction of each needs are presented. For satisfaction of the need for *autonomy*, social environments should encourage behaviors that are congruent with the individuals' desires and values, rather than pressuring them to act in ways that are consistent with other people's values. In addition, societies should create a sense of autonomy by helping individuals to understand the rationale for particular decisions or changes at the community level, which in turn helps members to volitionally engage in behaviors they adopt for accommodating to changes. For *competence*, social contexts should provide positive and useful feedback and presenting individuals with optimal challenges. Finally, for *relatedness*, social environments should by support close relationships and helping them to feel they are 'on the same team' as their community members.

Limitations of the Study

The design of this study was cross-sectional in nature but selected institutions for this study were only two Universities of Education. Given the cross-sectional design of this study, causal relationships among the variables could not be established. Longitudinal studies should be employed to test the hypotheses. Due to the shortage of time and relevant resources, such kind of design was impossible for this study. Moreover, the participating institutions were drawn only one University from upper Myanmar and another one from lower Myanmar. Although there are two Universities of Education in Myanmar, more than twenty Colleges of Education are still left to be included in this study. In this regard, investigation the relationship between satisfying psychological needs and resilience in B.Ed students can be examined only at the above mentioned two Universities of Education. In addition, since the demographic factors about parents of participants were incomplete in the answers of survey questionnaire, they were not used in this study. Therefore, it is suggested that relation of family relatedness patterns with meeting psychological needs considered in a causal model. Moreover, the use of self-report measures may have inherent limitation (e.g. inability to recall, social desirability). A combination of self-report questionnaires and objective assessments would be ideal.

Suggestion for Future Research

To confirm and validate the findings of this study, it is suggested that longitudinal studies may be undertaken. The present study has some necessities because of its recruited scope and selected sample. It is suggested that the further study for satisfying psychological needs need to conduct not only for B.Ed students but also for teachers from Basic Education and Higher Education since, regardless of gender, social class, and cultural background, the satisfactions of the three basic psychological needs which universally serve as the essential vitamins that energize personal growth and integrity. Besides, it is also hoped that the findings of this study will benefit teachers, parents and society in caring and assisting students to experience a sense of volition, mastery, and mutual care.

Acknowledgements

I would like to convey deep and genuine thanks to Dr. Aye Aye Myint (Acting Rector, Yangon University of Education) and Dr. Pyone Pyone Aung (Pro-Rector, Yangon University of Education) for their official permission to do this research. Especially, I also wish to my very profound gratitude to Dr. Khin Pyone Yi (Professor and Head of Department of Educational Psychology, Yangon University of Education) and Dr. Naing Naing Maw (Professor, Department of Educational Psychology, Yangon University of Education) for their encouragement and valuable comments. Moreover, I am especially grateful to all principals and participants of this study.

References

- Baumeister, R. F., & Leary, M.R. (1995). The need to belong: Desire for interpersonal attachments as a fundamental human motivation. *Psychological Bulletin*, *117*, 497-529.
- Chirkov, V. I., Ryan, R. M., Kim, Y., & Kaplan, U. (2003). Differentiating autonomy from individualism and independence: A self-determination theory perspective on internalization of cultural orientations and well-being. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology*, *84*, 97-109.
- Deci, E. L. (1975). *Intrinsic motivation*. New York: Plenum.
- deCharms, R. (1968). *Personal causation*. New York: Academic Press.
- Deci, E. L. & Ryan, R. M. (1985). *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior*. New York: Plenum.
- Deci, E. L. & Ryan, R. M. (2000). The "what" and "why" of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior. *Psychological Inquiry*, *11*, 227-268. doi: [10.1207/S15327965PLI1104_01](https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327965PLI1104_01)
- Deci, E. L. & Ryan, R.M. (2004). Human autonomy: The basis for true self – esteem. In M. Kernis (Ed.), *Efficacy, agency and self – esteem* (pp. 31- 49). New York: Plenum.
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2008). Facilitating optimal motivation and psychological well-being across life's domains. *Canadian Psychology*, *49*, 14-23. doi: 10.1037/0708-5591.49.1.14
- Deci, E. L., Ryan, R. M., Gagne, M., Leone, D. R., Usunov, J. & Kornazheva, B. P. (2001). Need satisfaction, motivation, and well-being in the work organizations of a former Eastern Bloc country. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *27*, 930-942.
- Gagné, M., Ryan, R. M., & Bergmann, K. (2003). Autonomy Support and Need Satisfaction in the Motivation and Well-Being of Gymnasts, *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*, *15*, 372-390. doi: 10.1080/10413200390238031

- Garmezy, N. (1985). Stress-resistant children: The search for protective factors. In A. Davids (Ed.), *Recent research in developmental psychopathology* (pp.213-233). Elmsford, NY: Pergamon press.
- Jang, H., Reeve, J., Ryan, R. M., & Kim, A. (2009). Can self-determination theory explain what underlies the productive, satisfying learning experiences of collectivistically-oriented Korean students? *Journal of Educational Psychology, 101*, 644-661. doi: 10.1037/a0014241
- Henderson, N., & Milstein, M. (2003). *Resiliency in schools: Making it happen for students and educators*. Thousand Oaks, California: Corwin Press.
- Liebenberg, L., Ungar, M., & Van de Vijver, F. (2012). Validation of the Child and Youth Resilience Measure-28 (CYRM-28) among Canadian youth with complex needs. *Research on Social Work Practice, 22*, 219–226.
- Luthar, S. S. (2006). Resilience in development: A synthesis of research across five decades. In D. Cicchetti & D. J. Cohen (Eds.), *Developmental psychopathology: Vol. 3. Risk, disorder, and adaptation* (2nd ed., pp. 739–795). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Luthar, S. S., Cicchetti, D., & Becker, B. (2000). The construct of resilience: A critical evaluation and guidelines for future work. *Child Development, 71* (3), 543–562. New York: Wiley.
- Masten, A. S. (2001). Ordinary magic: Resilience processes in development. *American Psychologist, 56*, 227–238. doi:[10.1037/0003-066X.56.3.227](https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.56.3.227)
- Masten, A. S. (1999). Resilience comes of age: Reflection on the past and outlook for the next generation of research. In M. D. Glantz, J. Johnson, & L. Huffman (Eds.), *Resilience and development: Positive life adaptations* (pp. 289-296). New York: Plenum Press.
- Reis, H. T., Sheldon K. M, Gable, S. L., Roscoe, J., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). Daily well-being: The role of autonomy, competence and relatedness. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 26*, 419-435.
- Rutter, M. (2000). Resilience reconsidered: Conceptual considerations, empirical findings, and policy implications. In J. P. Shonkoff & S. J. Meisels (Eds), *Handbook of early childhood intervention* (pp. 651-682). New York : Cambridge.
- Ryan, R. M. (1995). Psychological needs and the facilitation of integrative processes. *Journal of Personality, 63*, 397-427.

- Ryan, R. M., & Frederick, C. M. (1997). On energy, personality and health: Subjective vitality as a dynamic reflection of well-being. *Journal of Personality*, 65, 529-565.
- Ryan, R. M. & Deci, E. L. (2000). Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being. *American Psychologist*, 55, 68-78. doi: [10.1037//0003-066X.55.1.68](https://doi.org/10.1037//0003-066X.55.1.68)
- Ryan, R. M., La Guardia, J. G., Solky-Butzel, J., Chirkov, V., & Kim, Y. (2005). On the interpersonal regulation of emotions: Emotional reliance across gender, relationship, and cultures. *Personal Relationships*, 12(1), 145-163.
- Seligman, M. E. P., & Csikszentmihalyi. (2000). Positive psychology: An introduction. *American Psychologist*, 55, 5-14.
- Sheldon, K.M., Ryan, R.M. & Reis, H. T. (1996). What makes for a good day? Competence and autonomy in the day and in the person. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 22, 1270-1279.
- Sigelman, C. K. (1999). Life-span human development (3rd ed.). Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole.
- Ungar, M. (2011). The social ecology of resilience. Addressing contextual and cultural ambiguity of a nascent construct. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 81, 1-17.
- Ungar, M. (2008). Resilience across cultures. *British Journal of Social Work*, 38(2), 218-235. doi: [10.1093/bjsw/bc134](https://doi.org/10.1093/bjsw/bc134)
- Werner, E. E. (2000). Protective factors and individual resilience. In J. P. Shonkoff & S. J. Meisels (Eds), *Handbook of early childhood intervention* (pp. 115-132). New York: Cambridge.
- White, R. W. (1959). "Motivation reconsidered: The concept of competence". *Psychological Review*. 66, 297-333. doi: [10.1037/h0040934](https://doi.org/10.1037/h0040934)

ခင်ဇော်ဦး၊ ဒေါက်တာ။(၂၀၁၅)။ ပါမောက္ခ ပညာဖြင့်လျှင် နိုင်ငံမြင့်မည်။ ရန်ကုန်၊ ဆုစာပေ။