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Results and their interpretation have been presented in chapter V. In the present chapter, the results have been discussed in the light of findings and conclusions drawn by different researchers in the past.

6.1. The findings reveal that statistical significant variance exists on students' satisfaction - dissatisfaction due to difference in climates ( 'F' value = 11.004, p < .01 ). It confirms the findings of Mc. Chung (1971), who also found significant difference on student's satisfaction with school environment in different climates. Significant differences also exist on students' satisfaction - dissatisfaction with different areas of the S-D measure. The obtained 'F' values show that maximum variance exists with respect to satisfaction - dissatisfaction with 'Teacher and Teacher Behaviour' area followed by 'School Activities and Academic Orientation'; 'Inter-personal Relations'; 'School Policy, Administration, Administrative Behaviour and School Discipline'; and the least is in case of school plant, School Campus and Physical Surrounding area. It is supported by the findings arrived at, by Epstein and Mc. Partland (1976), that openness of the school has a greater impact on students' satisfaction with teacher. This also receives confirmation from the high mean score (47.07) on 'Teacher and Teacher Behaviour' area in open climate, which stands highest among all areas in different climates. Mr. Cann and Fisher (1977) also drew conclusion that teacher directiveness was significantly related with students' satisfaction. Hornstein, et al., (1968) also concluded that principal - teacher relationship is associated with the perception of higher student satisfaction.
Inter-climate comparisons have revealed that students are comparatively more satisfied towards open climate followed by familiar, autonomous, paternal and closed climates, but students have not been found to differ significantly in between open-familiar, and paternal-closed climates. Kumar's (1972) findings have revealed that open climate tends to show better personal adjustment on the part of the pupil, and better attitude development is possible in open climate. This might be due to the fact that in open climate schools, teachers are more humanistic in pupil control ideology than in closed climate schools. A significant relationship exists between openness of school organization, climate and teachers' pupil control ideology as is evident from the studies of Lenenburg and O'Reilly (1974), and Hoy, Apple Berry (1969, 1970).

Getzels and Cuba (1957; pp. 423 - 411) perceive schools and colleges from organization point of view. Each category of actors like principal, teachers, pupils, and other staff members have different sets of expectations from one another. Likewise, Bennis (1966, p. 7) talks about the two imperatives of schools namely reciprocity and adaptability. The essence of the two imperatives is that the balance must be maintained between satisfaction of the participant and the organization for the smooth running of the organization (school). In the absence of a balance, the teachers, pupils, etc. are bound to be affected and are likely to be more and more dissatisfied. In this context, Blair, Jones and Simpson (1975 p. 320), states, "another set of relation which are significant in determining the social climate in any school is the quality of interaction among teachers and between teachers and administrators ...."
tensions are developed, these are too often passed on down to the unfortunate pupil." Forehand (1963) also pointed out that the brooding discontent of teachers is palpable and the principal tries to hide his incompetence and poor leadership. The psychological sickness of such a faculty behaviour spills over on the students who, in their own frustrations feed back to the teachers a mood of despair. Therefore, in schools the resultant dissatisfaction among teachers affects their behaviours and their attitudes. This, in its turn affects their relationship with the students. In Open climate, which shows high esprit among the teachers, the principal provides maximum satisfaction to the teachers (Sharma, 1974), who in their turn shows more humanistic pupil control ideology. Their behaviour might be affecting the students positively. Satisfaction among teachers naturally percolates down to students. Thus, students seem to be more satisfied in open climate than in closed climate, where the teachers are least satisfied (Sharma), and have custodial pupil control ideology.

The study has also revealed significant but negative relationship between 'Intimacy' among teachers and students' satisfaction - dissatisfaction with school / college, as well as with different school areas; A, C, D and E. The negative relationship does not seem to be surprising as this dimension of school climate refers to the teachers' enjoyment of friendly social relations with each other to satisfy their own social needs, and which is not associated with task accomplishment.

6.2. Students' SES, Intelligence level and their satisfaction - dissatisfaction with school:

The findings indicate that students, when classified into high, average, and low SES groups vary significantly on satisfaction - dissatisfaction.
faction among themselves ( 'F' value : 12.48, p. < .01 ). The mean satisfaction scores are in an increasing order from high SES to low SES groups ( Ms = 200.35, 209.40 and 217.93 respectively ). Results donot conform to the findings of Bumstead ( 1975 ) who found no significant difference between lower and higher social class background groups of students in their satisfaction with school. On the contrary, the present finding, do correspond to the finding of Schmidt and Sedlacek ( 1972 ), who found that students from high SES were highly dissatisfied.

Significant but negative correlation, between SES and over all satisfaction - dissatisfaction with school, the \( r \) value being -.181. The correlation coefficient is however negligible. This finding is not in keeping with that of Quartar, Krish, Dimitri and Postle ( 1976 ), who concluded that SES was not related to students' satisfaction with school.

The reason for the difference between the findings in this study and that of Quartar, et al., ( 1976 ) and Bumstead ( 1975 ) may be due to cross-cultural differences.

The study has revealed that students belonging to high socio-economic status are more dissatisfied with the school than those with low socio-economic status. The reason for this may be attributed to family condition, family education, family income, the residential space, amanities provided at homes, as well as the social status of the family which provide a reference point for each individual student to affect his perception of school / college and there by generating satisfaction or dissatisfaction in him.

Like SES, when students are classified on the basis of their intelligence scores, into high, average and low intelligence groups, signi-
ificant variance on satisfaction - dissatisfaction among these groups have been found (p < .01), and satisfaction mean scores show an increasing trend from high intelligence to low intelligence groups (Ms = 199.70, 209.84 and 217.87).

The correlational analysis has also shown the same trend as is found in case of SES. Intelligence also holds significant, though low and negative relationship (p < .01) with sat. - dissat. with school / college (r = .161). The present finding does not support the findings of many previous researchers like Beelick (1973), Jackson and Getzels (1962), Diedrich and Jackson (1969), Brodie (1964), White (1962), Spillman (1959), and Odell (1957), that no significant relationship existed between students' intelligence and their satisfaction with school / college.

6.3. Rural-Urban Groups:

Comparison of rural and urban students has revealed that the former are more satisfied than the latter with their school / college (C.R. Value 10.721, p. < .01). Areawise comparisons have further revealed that rural students are comparatively more satisfied with school policy, administration, administrative behaviour, school discipline; school campus, school plant and physical surrounding of the school, school activities and academic orientation of the school, teacher and teacher behaviour, and with inter-personal relations with teachers and students (C.R. values: 9.341, 7.811, 9.257, 8.635, and 8.726 respectively, p < .01). The two groups are also found to differ significantly on SES, Intelligence, class-room functioning, n-bet., and n-agg. (C.R. Values: 15.688, 10.817, 2.053, 2.313, and 2.422 respectively, significant at
.05 or .01 levels) with mean scores higher for urban ones in all cases. The two groups are also different from each other on level of aspiration, anxiety, n-achievement, n-order, and n-endurance (C.R. values: 3.729, 4.329, 4.827, 2.713 and 2.082 respectively), with the mean scores significantly higher for rural group in all these cases. The findings in respect of classroom functioning support Sinha (1966), who also found that rural background was associated with low achievement. But the findings are not in conformity with those of Rao (1976) for n-ach., who found higher n-ach. in case of urban students, though the present findings do confirm his findings for self-concept, that the urban students have significantly higher self-concept than the rural ones. These results also do not support Goswami's (1978) finding that no significant difference existed between rural and urban students on their self-concept. As for anxiety is concerned, the present findings receive support from Rai's (1974) findings that anxiety as a personality trait had a changing role in scholastic achievement, and low level of anxiety helped in achieving high, whereas very high level of anxiety was detrimental to achievement. Likewise, his findings also revealed that level of aspiration was not a significant correlate of achievement. Kanekar (1977) found a non-significant negative correlation of -.03 between anxiety and academic achievement for the high intelligent students group and a moderate and negative correlation of -.39 for the low intelligent group. Similarly, Kannam (1977) also found that students with good self-concept displayed constant achievement. Therefore, the present findings in case of rural students do not seem to be unrealistic.
This confirms the earlier findings where it was stated that there is higher satisfaction among students endowed with low intelligence and having lower SES back ground. It points out that higher SES levels and intelligence among urban students perhaps make them more critical in their perception of the school/college as a whole and also its various aspects, causing less satisfaction in them as compared to rural students whose SES level and intelligence are lower. However, in case of classroom functioning, these variables seem to play positive role. The urban students endowed with high intelligence and better SES level, score high on their academic achievement. This supports Brookover’s (1953) findings that there existed a direct relationship between family background, and both intelligence test scores and school grades. Chatterjee et al., (1972) also concluded that Intelligence, SES and scholastic achievement are all positively inter-related. Chopra (1966, 1969) also found that the mean marks (representing academic achievement) scored by students of higher SES level was higher than those who belonged to low SES even when intelligence is held constant. Dugdale and Chan (1977) found strong associations between poor school performances and SES of students. Similarly, Greenberg & Davidson (1972) concluded that high achievers seemed to come from somewhat better socio-economic circumstances within the working class. Tolicic (1974) also found that urban children and those from higher SES had better test scores and achieved greater scholastic success than those from villages. Vasantha (1971) found significant relationship between SES, achievement and self concept.

The question arises, as to why, the urban students whose academic achievements being higher than rural students, are less satisfied with
the school / college. This seems to be due to the differences in psychological health of the urban and rural students.

The study has revealed that n-het., and n-agg. exists in a greater degree in urban group as compared to rural one, the presence of these needs among students of this age group is but natural. Among rural students as compared to urban, n-het., does not seem to get proper outlet due to the less stimulating social life in rural setting. In urban students, when their n-het. is not fulfilled, it may result in frustration, and this frustration may cause arousal of n-agg. in them, as is evident in this study.

The study has further revealed significant difference between rural - urban highly satisfied students only on two variables viz. anxiety and n-chg. Mean scores for the rural ones are significantly higher for anxiety and low for n-change in comparison with the urban highly satisfied students. Differences have also been found between rural and urban highly dissatisfied students on self-concept, n-agg., level of aspiration and anxiety. The urban highly dissatisfied students have significantly higher means on self-concept and n-agg., and lower means on level of aspiration and anxiety than their rural counterparts (p < .01). High n-chg. among urban highly satisfied students may be due to the perception of comparatively more challenging atmosphere in and outside the school / college, while it remains subdued among rural students where traditionalism does not provide an outlet for manifestation of this need.
6.4. **Highly Satisfied - Normally Satisfied - Highly Dissatisfied Groups:**

Statistically significant variance exists among three groups of students, highly satisfied, normally satisfied and highly dissatisfied on self-concept, n-ach., n-def., n-ord., n-nur., n-end., n-het., and n-agg., the 'F' values being 27.19, 6.52, 10.47, 8.39, 8.87, 5.32, 9.26 and 7.40 respectively. On other variables viz., class-room functioning, level of aspiration, anxiety, n-exh., n-aut., n-aff., n-int., n-suc., n-dom., n-abs., n-nur., and n-chg., the significant differences are non-existent. This shows that the three groups of students classified on the basis of their satisfaction - dissatisfaction are almost homogeneous in respect of their class-room functioning, level of aspiration, anxiety, and some of the EFS needs namely n-aut., n-aff., n-int., n-suc., n-dom., n-nur., and n-chg. As regards class-room functioning the present findings confirm those of Diedrich and Jackson (1969), Jackson and Getzels (1959), who found that there does not exist a statistically significant superiority of satisfied students in their scholastic achievements. Brodie's (1964) findings that the difference is not significant for boys, is also confirmed. But, the present results are not in conformity with those arrived at, by Williams (1970), and Morton (1977) that the satisfied and dissatisfied groups differ significantly on achievement. Similarly Morton also found significant difference between highly dissatisfied and moderately satisfied on this variable. The result also does not conform to the findings of Duhamel, and Huguettes (1973), that when extreme groups were compared, academic performances favoured, consistently and significantly, the satisfied groups. Jackson and Getzels (1959), concluded that differences in between satisfied and dissatis-
fied groups were linked to psychological rather than scholastic variables. They also found that the satisfied group attained better scores on various tests than the dissatisfied and the normally satisfied groups, signifying a more adequate level of psychological functioning.

The present findings also do not confirm what Diedrich and Jackson (1969) suggested that dissatisfaction in extremely dissatisfied group might be due to much higher level of aspiration than in the average or extremely satisfied students.

Inter-group comparisons have further revealed that the highly satisfied and highly dissatisfied groups differ significantly on self-concept (p. < .01). Similarly, highly satisfied and normally satisfied, as well as normally satisfied and highly dissatisfied groups also differ significantly either at .05 or .01 levels. The mean scores for self-concept are highest for highly satisfied group, followed by normally satisfied and least for highly dissatisfied groups. The present findings are similar to those found by Williams (1970).

Inter-group comparisons on different needs have suggested significant difference between highly satisfied and highly dissatisfied groups on n-sch., n-def., n-ord., n-exh., n-nur., and n-end. (p. < .05 or .01) with higher mean scores for the highly satisfied group on these variables. The two extreme groups have also been found to differ significantly on n-het. and n-sgg. (p. < .01) with higher mean scores for the highly dissatisfied group. Similarly, significant mean differences have also been noticed between highly satisfied - normally satisfied students on most of these needs either at .05 or .01 levels of confidence. The results are in tune with Kurtzman (1967), who found that there were
differences between adolescent group on different personality variables in terms of their satisfaction - dissatisfaction with school.

Some of the differences which were not apparent in the above findings have flashed out when rural highly satisfied - highly dissatisfied, as well as urban highly satisfied and highly dissatisfied groups have been compared separately (Table: 5.36 to 5.40).

Some other variables viz., level of aspiration and anxiety which were not significantly different in the previous pooled comparison, have been found to distinguish significantly the highly satisfied and highly dissatisfied groups in both rural and urban sub-populations, with mean scores higher for highly dissatisfied groups in both cases. Similarly, n-chg. has been found to differ significantly (p. < .01) between urban highly satisfied and highly dissatisfied students with higher mean for the latter.

The findings have further revealed that differences are more pronounced on psychological needs among highly satisfied and highly dissatisfied students who read in urban schools / colleges (viz., n-sch., n-def., n-ord., n-nur., n-chg., n-net., and n-agg.), than those who study in rural institutions (viz., n-exh., n-nur.).

It seems that urban environment is comparatively more stimulating to bring about greater differences in the psychological needs of highly satisfied and highly dissatisfied students. These needs may be linked in some way with their high satisfaction and high dissatisfaction. But, the position of classroom functioning remains the same (non-significant difference) in both cases as was found in the case of the pooled highly satisfied and dissatisfied groups.
6.5. Relationship between class-room Functioning, Psychological Health Variables and Satisfaction - Dissatisfaction of students with school / college:

A. Class-room Functioning:

Results show no significant relationship between class-room functioning and satisfaction - dissatisfaction of students (r = -.059). The same trend is maintained when effect of SES / Intelligence is controlled separately. Partial 'R' value is also found non-significant (.032). The present finding in respect of this variable is in tune with those of Bryan (1979), Modu (1976), Booth, Mc Nally and Berry (1976), Quarter, Krish, Dimitri and Postle (1976), Frantz and Walsh (1972), Diedrich and Jackson (1969), White (1962), Jackson and Getzel (1959), Spillman (1959) and Odell (1957), but not with those of Hatcher (1965), Bealick (1973), DuCutt and Wolk (1972), Jackson and Lahaderne (1967) and Berdie (1944), who all found that a significant relationship exists between academic achievement and satisfaction with school.

B. Psychological Health Variables:

(i) Self-concept:

This variable has been found to correlate significantly and positively (p < .01) with students' satisfaction - dissatisfaction (r value .232). When SES and intelligence are controlled separately, the nature of relationship between the two remains unchanged. Likewise, Partial 'R' value (.239) also confirms about the positive relationship of this variable with students' satisfaction - dissatisfaction. It seems that students with higher self-concept perceive their school / college as
more satisfying than those who have lower self-concept. The present
findings do not conform with that of Pervin and Rubin (1967), who
found no significant relationship between self-concept and academic
dissatisfaction. Likewise, Weiner and Weiner (1972) also did not
find any significant relationship between self-concept and students' satisfaction with school.

(i) **Level of aspiration:**

This variable is found not significantly related with satisfac-
tion - dissatisfaction, though its relationship to positive ($r = .002$). When SES or the intelligence is controlled, the relationship remains non-significant. The part 'R' value has also been found non-significant (part 'R' = .032). The present findings support the findings of Nisam (1973), who also did not find any significant relationship between level of aspiration and students' satisfaction with school.

(iii) **Anxiety:**

The findings reveal that anxiety is not significantly related to students' satisfaction with school, and the relationship is negative ($r = .003$). SES and intelligence both have been found to act as intervening variables in between anxiety and students' satisfaction - dissatisfaction with school. When the effect of the two variables is controlled separately, the relationship between the two have been found to be significant ($p < .05$), though it remains negative. But, its independent relationship with sat. - dissat. remains non - significant (part 'R' = .044).
(iv) EPPS Needs:

The results have shown that n-ach., n-def., n-ord., n-exh., n-aff., n-dom., n-asa., n-mur., n-chg., n-end., n-agg., and n-het., are significantly and positively related to students satisfaction - dissatisfaction (r values = .255, .126, .286, .090, .210, .251, .193, .134, .150, .268, .101, and .078 respectively, (p. < .05 or p. < .01). Hierarchically, n-ord. seems to have maximum relationship, followed by n-end., n-ach., n-dom., n-aff., n-asa., n-chg., n-mur., n-def., n-agg., n-exh., and n-int. Further, statistically control on SES or intelligence has not brought about any substantial change in the relationship of different needs with sat. - dissat. Results of the regression analysis have further disclosed that the significant relationship exists between different needs and sat. - dissat. independently as well, except for n-aff., and n-agg., where the relationship is found non-significant. It has also disclosed that n-suc., and n-het., have significant independent relationship with students' satisfaction - dissatisfaction. This finding shows congruency on three needs with Hatcher (1975), who found a significant canonical correlation (p. < .05) between n-dom., n-agg., n-suc., n-aut. and sat. - dissat. of students with college (except for n-aut.).

From the above discussion, it is evident that self-concept, most of the EPPS needs, SES, and intelligence of students show significant relationship with their satisfaction - dissatisfaction with school / college. These findings partially support the conclusions arrived at by Hersey (1977), that satisfaction with school seemed to influence indicators of both performance and psychological health. Likewise, the present findings also conform with Beelick (1973), Getzels and Jackson
(1959), and Odell's (1957) conclusions, that psychological functioning levels of students influence significantly their satisfaction with the school.

Findings of the present study have not shown any uniformity in the relationship of different variables with students' sat. - dissat. with school, and with different aspects of the school (Tables 5.12 and 5.14). Self-concept, n-ach., n-nur., influence positively while n-het., influence negatively students' satisfaction with all the five aspects of the school / college studied. Like wise, n-ord., and n-agg. influence their satisfaction with respect to four out of five aspects of the school, positively in the case of the former and negatively in the case of the latter. Other needs seem to influence students' satisfaction either positively or negatively with respect to few aspects of the school / college. By and large, the findings have revealed that students' sat. or dissat. with different aspects of the school / college (as measured by S-D measure) is independent of their overall satisfaction - dissatisfaction with school / college.

The correlation coefficients (Table 5.12) have suggested a trend for positive relationship of students' sat. - dissat. with some, and negative relationship with few other variables. But, these relationships, though significant, do not seem to be high enough to make a definable judgement. The correlations between sat. - dissat. scores and other independent variables for the highly satisfied and for the highly dissatisfied groups separately have revealed that the size of relationships between different independent variables and satisfaction - dissatisfaction scores found in general sample have either increased or decreased. N-ach., n-ord., n-exh., n-aff., n-suc., n-dom., n-aba., n-chg., n-end., n-het.,
and n-agg. again show significant and positive relationship with S-D scores, while SES and intelligence show negative relationship with these scores among highly satisfied students. These correlation coefficients have been found comparatively much higher for n-ach., n-ord., n-exh., n-aff., n-int., n-dom., n-abs., n-chg., n-end., and n-agg., than those found for the general sample. The only exceptions are self-concept, n-def., and n-mur., but self-concept is also found significantly related when the effect of Intelligence is controlled. This has led to infer that Intelligence acts as an intervening variable between students' self-concept and their high satisfaction with school / college.

Another fact, that has come to light, is that n-suc., and n-het. which have not been found related in the general sample, also show significant and positive relationship with satisfaction among highly satisfied students.

The findings have further revealed a low, though significant and negative relationship between S-D scores and classroom functioning among highly dissatisfied students. This indicates that students' high dissatisfaction with school is significantly related with their classroom functioning, though the relationship is not high (r = .161). Other variables have not been found to hold significant relationship with dissatisfaction among highly dissatisfied students.

The combined relationship of different independent variables with students' sat. - dissat. with school / college is found highly significant (R value .566467, adjusted R = .551940, p < .01). 32.0885% of the total variance in students' sat. - dissat. with school / college is explainable in terms of independent variables, included in the present
study (except school climate). After correction of Shrinkage, 30.4642% of the variances are explainable by these independent variables. This shows that 67.9115% (69.5358% after correction for Shrinkage) of the variances are left unaccounted. Needs as a whole contribute maximum to the variances in students' sat. - dissat. (23.92048% positive, and .57907% negative); followed by self-concept (5.41815%); intelligence (1.88355%); and SES (1.82264%), all being positive contributors. The findings confirm the findings of Hatcher (1975) for n-dom., n-suc., and n-agg., but not for n-aut., which has been found as a non-significant contributor.

Factor analysis has revealed five factors underlying the indicators of students' satisfaction - dissatisfaction: (1) Unconducive school conditions, (2) Group Indifference, (3) Goal Motivation, (4) School Academic Pursuits, and (5) Scholastic Potential. Of these, the factor 'Unconducive School Conditions' seems to be influencing most in the generation of satisfaction - dissatisfaction (eigen value = 4.3465). 'Group Indifference' factor holds the next place (eigen values = 3.2912), which is a 'need' dominated factor, but this factor does not show any meaningful relationship with students' satisfaction - dissatisfaction. However, its influence seems to be negative in the generation of sat. - dissat, among students. On the contrary, 'Goal-Motivation' factor which is also need dominated seems to influence students' sat. - dissat. positively, but, its influence does not seem to be substantive. Similarly, factor 'School Academic-Pursuits' influences positively, while 'Scholastic Potential' factor mainly dominated by intelligence and class-room functioning influences negatively students' sat. - dissat, with school / college, but their effects seem to be almost negligible.
It is interesting to note that all variables except n-aff. seem to be of complex nature, as these have been found loaded significantly on more than one factor. But, factorial validity coefficients show that n-ach., n-def., n-ord., n-exh., n-aff., n-suc., n-dom., n-aba., n-mur., n-chg., and n-end. influence students' sat. - dissat. with school / college positively, while SBS, intelligence, anxiety, n-aut., influence negatively. However, influence of these variables in students' sat. - dissat. does not seem to have any predictive value, the relationships being very low. This shows that both intrinsic factors (self-concept, needs, anxiety, intelligence, SBS) as well as extrinsic factors (different aspects of school) are influencing factors for satisfaction - dissatisfaction among students, but the former is of low intensity. Definite conclusions do not seem to be apparent from these findings. Field, Halley and Armenakis (1974), and Hulin and Waters (1971) also found that a clear dichotomy of intrinsic-extrinsic factors in predicting students' satisfaction with school does not exist. Findings support Gregg (1973) who also found faculty-students relationship as the best predictor of students' satisfaction with the college.

Factor analytic study of the highly satisfied and highly dissatisfied students* have revealed that almost different factorial patterns exist in the two extreme groups, with nine factors evolved in the former and twelve factors in the latter. Of these, only three factors could be located as common among the two groups: (1) 'Unconducive School Conditions', (2) 'Social-class Belonging', and (3) 'Scholastic Potential'.

Among highly satisfied students, in addition to 'Unconducive School Conditions' factor, two more factors viz., 'Psychological and School Needs Satisfaction' and 'Reverence = non-succorant-non erotic psychological health' factors have been found as indicators of students' satisfaction. Both these are need-oriented factors and have high loadings on different needs.

Factor = 'Unconducive School Condition', is mainly constituted of perception of School aspects. Loadings for satisfaction - dissatisfaction is very high in case of 'Psychological and School Needs Satisfaction' factor, moderate on 'Unconducive School Conditions' and low, but, significant on 'Reverence-Non Succorant- Non erotic Psychological Health' factor. The factor structure of the above mentioned three factors suggest that among highly satisfied students needs play a major role in the generation of high satisfaction, where as school aspects play a secondary role. Among highly dissatisfied students, 'Unconducive School Conditions' factor is the only factor significantly related to students' high dissatisfaction with school / college. SES, intelligence, classroom functioning and different psychological health variables do not seem to play any significant role in the generation of high dissatisfaction among them.