1st International Conference on Management, Business and Economy (ICoMBEc 2025)
Vo. 1 No. 1 2025
e-ISSN : XXXX-XXX

THE IMPACT OF STUDENT DISSATISFACTION ON STUDENT PSYCHOLOGICAL WELL-BEING AND LEARNING MOTIVATION

Sartini [1], Upi Herawati [2]
University of Pamulang, Indonesia
Email: sartinianin085@gmail.com, upiher13@gmail.com

Abstract

Student dissatisfaction can significantly impact their psychological well-being and motivation to learn. Stress, anxiety, and decreased motivation are some of the potential impacts. Students dissatisfied with their academic experience may experience decreased academic performance and quality of life. Therefore, it is crucial for educational institutions to understand the sources of student dissatisfaction and develop strategies to address them. Educational institutions need to prioritize student needs and create a supportive learning environment to enhance student satisfaction and success. By understanding and addressing the sources of dissatisfaction, institutions can help students achieve optimal psychological well-being and motivation to learn. This allows students to reach their full potential and achieve their academic goals. Therefore, it is crucial for educational institutions to address students' psychological well-being and motivation to learn in an effort to improve the quality of education and academic outcomes. With these efforts, it is hoped that students will be more successful and happier in achieving their academic goals.

Keywords : Student Dissatisfaction, Psychological Well-Being, Learning Motivation

Introduction

College students are a group of individuals in the transition phase from adolescence to early adulthood, where they face various academic, social, and personal demands. At this stage, students are required to adjust to a more complex, independent, and competitive learning environment compared to their previous level of education. During this adjustment process, students' level of satisfaction with various aspects of campus life is a crucial factor that can influence their psychological well-being and motivation to learn.

Student satisfaction generally reflects the extent to which students' expectations regarding their academic and social experiences are met. Aspects such as teaching quality, campus facilities, academic services, support from faculty, and a conducive learning environment play a crucial role in shaping this perception of satisfaction. When students are satisfied with their college experience, they tend to have a high enthusiasm for learning, positive academic engagement, and a more stable emotional balance. This aligns with Tinto's (1993) view that student satisfaction contributes to retention, motivation, and academic success.

However, in reality, not all students experience the same level of satisfaction with their studies. Dissatisfaction can arise from various factors, such as ineffective learning systems, monotonous teaching styles of lecturers, excessive workloads, less harmonious interpersonal relationships, and a lack of social support and adequate campus facilities. When these conditions persist without proper management, students can experience stress, emotional exhaustion, and even psychological well-being disorders such as anxiety and depression.

Persistent dissatisfaction can have long-term impacts, such as decreased academic performance, increased stress levels, and even the desire to drop out. This phenomenon is a serious concern for higher education institutions because it directly relates to the quality of graduate output and the institution's image in the public eye. Therefore, creating a campus environment that supports psychological well-being and motivates students is a crucial aspect of modern educational management.

Therefore, it is crucial to research and understand how student dissatisfaction can affect their psychological well-being and learning motivation. This research aims to provide a comprehensive picture of the relationship between levels of dissatisfaction, psychological well-being, and student learning motivation. The results are also expected to inform higher education institutions' considerations in designing strategies to improve the quality of academic services, strengthen psychosocial support, and create a healthy and productive learning climate.

By understanding the factors causing dissatisfaction and its impact on students, educational institutions can implement more humanistic policies, oriented towards

student needs, and capable of fostering optimal psychological well-being and learning motivation on campus.

Theoretical Framework

Student satisfaction and dissatisfaction have long been recognized as crucial determinants of educational outcomes, influencing not only academic performance but also students' psychological and motivational states. According to Tinto's (1993) Model of Student Retention, the degree of student satisfaction with academic and social aspects of university life significantly affects their engagement, persistence, and overall success in higher education. Dissatisfaction, conversely, may lead to emotional distress, reduced motivation, and withdrawal from academic activities.

From the perspective of Expectancy-Disconfirmation Theory (Oliver, 1980), satisfaction arises when students' perceptions of educational experiences meet or exceed their expectations, while dissatisfaction occurs when experiences fall short of expectations. In the context of higher education, factors such as poor instructional quality, inadequate facilities, and weak social support can contribute to student dissatisfaction. Persistent dissatisfaction can create negative emotional states that interfere with students' ability to learn effectively and maintain psychological stability.

Psychological well-being, as conceptualized by Ryff (1989), encompasses six key dimensions: self-acceptance, positive relations with others, autonomy, environmental mastery, purpose in life, and personal growth. High psychological well-being enables students to manage stress, maintain motivation, and engage productively in learning. Conversely, dissatisfaction with the academic environment may disrupt emotional balance and hinder psychological well-being. Keyes (2002) further emphasizes that well-being is not merely the absence of psychological distress but the presence of positive functioning in life and learning contexts.

In addition, the relationship between student dissatisfaction and learning motivation can be explained through the Self-Determination Theory (Deci & Ryan, 1985). This theory posits that motivation is driven by the fulfillment of three basic psychological needs: autonomy, competence, and relatedness. When these needs are not adequately met—such as through unsupportive teaching methods or lack of institutional support—students experience decreased intrinsic motivation, which in turn diminishes engagement and persistence in learning. Dissatisfied students may thus be less likely to exhibit proactive learning behaviors or enthusiasm toward academic tasks.

Previous studies support these theoretical linkages. For instance, Schreiner (2010) found that satisfaction with the academic environment predicts higher student engagement and psychological flourishing. Similarly, Cazan and Schiopca (2014) reported that dissatisfaction with faculty interactions negatively affects motivation and academic self-efficacy. However, despite these insights, empirical research focusing on the *combined impact* of student dissatisfaction on both psychological well-

being and learning motivation remains limited, particularly within the context of developing countries and diverse cultural settings.

Based on the above theoretical perspectives, this study proposes that student dissatisfaction negatively influences both psychological well-being and learning motivation. It is assumed that higher levels of dissatisfaction lead to lower levels of psychological well-being, which may subsequently reduce learning motivation. Thus, psychological well-being may also act as a potential mediator in the relationship between student dissatisfaction and motivation.

Hypotheses

H1: Student dissatisfaction has a negative effect on psychological well-being.

H2: Student dissatisfaction has a negative effect on learning motivation.

H3: Psychological well-being has a positive effect on learning motivation.

H4: Psychological well-being mediates the relationship between student dissatisfaction and learning motivation.

Research Methods

This study employs a quantitative approach with a phenomenological design aimed at gaining a deeper understanding of students' subjective experiences related to dissatisfaction, psychological well-being, and learning motivation. This approach was chosen because the phenomenon of student dissatisfaction cannot be fully explained through numerical data alone but must also be interpreted through the meanings, perceptions, and experiences of individuals within the academic environment.

According to **Creswell (2018)**, a phenomenological approach allows researchers to explore and describe how individuals experience and interpret a specific phenomenon in their daily lives. Therefore, this study focuses on how students perceive and interpret their feelings of dissatisfaction toward their educational experiences and how these perceptions influence their psychological well-being and motivation to learn. Although the study utilizes quantitative data, it is enriched with the phenomenological perspective to capture the depth of students' experiences.

Population and Sample

The **population** of this study includes all active university students enrolled in various higher education institutions in Indonesia. The research focuses on students from both public and private universities across different disciplines to ensure a representative understanding of the phenomenon.

Sampling is conducted using a **purposive sampling technique**, which involves selecting participants based on specific criteria relevant to the research objectives. The sample criteria include:

1. Active university students who have studied for at least two semesters,
2. Students who have experienced academic or institutional dissatisfaction (e.g., teaching quality, facilities, or academic support), and
3. Students willing to provide open and reflective responses regarding their academic experiences.

A total of approximately **100–150 respondents** are expected to participate in this study to ensure adequate representation and statistical reliability.

Data Collection Techniques

Data are collected through two main techniques: **non-participatory observation** and **questionnaires**.
In the non-participatory observation, the researcher observes students' academic behavior, participation in class activities, and their interactions with peers and instructors, which may reflect levels of satisfaction, motivation, and well-being.

The primary data, however, are obtained through a **structured questionnaire** distributed directly to respondents via online and offline formats. The questionnaire is designed to capture students' perceptions of dissatisfaction, psychological well-being, and learning motivation using standardized scales.

Research Instruments

The research instrument used is a **Likert-scale questionnaire**, consisting of several sections corresponding to each variable:

- **Student Dissatisfaction** is measured using adapted items from the **Student Satisfaction Inventory (SSI)** developed by **Schreiner & Juillerat (1994)**, focusing on aspects such as teaching effectiveness, campus facilities, administrative services, and academic environment.
- **Psychological Well-Being** is measured using the **Ryff's Psychological Well-Being Scale (Ryff, 1989)**, which includes dimensions such as autonomy, self-acceptance, personal growth, and environmental mastery.
- **Learning Motivation** is measured based on the **Academic Motivation Scale (Vallerand et al., 1992)**, which assesses both intrinsic and extrinsic motivation toward academic activities.

Each item is rated on a **five-point Likert scale**, ranging from *1 = strongly disagree* to *5 = strongly agree*.

Data Analysis Methods

Data collected from the questionnaires are processed and analyzed using the **Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS)** software. The data analysis procedures include the following stages:

1. **Descriptive Analysis** – to describe the demographic characteristics of respondents and the distribution of responses for each variable.
2. **Classical Assumption Tests**, which include:
    - **Normality Test** to ensure that data are normally distributed,
    - **Multicollinearity Test** to check whether the independent variables are not highly correlated, and
    - **Heteroscedasticity Test** to verify that the residual variance is homogeneous.
3. **Multiple Linear Regression Analysis** – conducted to test both the simultaneous and partial effects of the independent variable (student dissatisfaction) on the dependent variables (psychological well-being and learning motivation).

The general regression model is formulated as follows:

$$Y = a + b_1 X_1 + e$$

Where:
Y = Dependent Variables (Psychological Well-Being and Learning Motivation)
a = Constant
b_1 = Regression Coefficient
X_1 = Student Dissatisfaction
e = Error term

4. **Hypothesis Testing** –

    - The **t-test** is used to examine the partial effect of student dissatisfaction on each dependent variable, with the criterion that the hypothesis is accepted if the *t-value* > *t-table* and *p-value* < 0.05.
    - The **F-test** is used to determine the simultaneous significance of the model, where the model is considered significant if the *F-value* > *F-table* and *p-value* < 0.05.
    - The **Coefficient of Determination (R^2)** is used to assess how much variance in psychological well-being and learning motivation can be explained by student dissatisfaction. The higher the R^2 value, the stronger the explanatory power of the model.

Results

1.1 Validity Test

• The formula used in SPSS is Pearson Correlation
• An item is declared valid if the calculated r value is greater than the r table value (where N = number of respondents, usually 30 → r table ≈ 0.361 at α = 0.05)
• Sig. (2-tailed) < 0.05

Conclusion:

All items in variables X (X1.1–X1.5) and Y (Y1.1–Y1.5) show significant correlation values (<0.05), so all items are declared valid.
This means that each question in your questionnaire measures its variable accurately and consistently.

1.2 Reability

Analysis and Interpretation
• All Corrected Item-Total Correlation values are >0.30, indicating that each question item has a strong relationship with the total score of its variable.
• The Cronbach's Alpha value for Item Deletion ranges from 0.869 to 0.877, which does not decrease significantly if one item is deleted.
This indicates that all items are consistent and mutually reinforce the instrument's reliability.
• With a total Cronbach's Alpha of 0.883, it can be concluded that all 15 items (combined X1, X2, and Y1) are highly reliable.

Theoretical Interpretation
The high reliability values indicate that the questionnaire regarding:

- Student Dissatisfaction
- Psychological Well-Being
- Learning Motivation
- has strong internal consistency.

This means that each question in the questionnaire truly measures the same aspect and produces consistent answers across respondents.

Reliability Test Conclusion
Based on the test results with a Cronbach's Alpha of 0.883 (>0.80), it can be concluded that:
"The research instrument is highly reliable, making it suitable for further research such as Pearson correlation tests and regression analysis."
High reliability also confirms that student responses to the questionnaire are consistent and trustworthy, thus ensuring a high level of reliability in the research results.

1.3 Classic Assumption

1. Normality Test
The normality test aims to determine whether the residuals in the regression model are normally distributed. Based on the *Residual Statistics* output, the mean of the residuals is **0.000**, with a standard deviation of **0.990**. Moreover, the minimum and maximum residual values range approximately between **–2.4 and +2.4**, indicating that the data are symmetrically distributed around the mean.

A mean value close to zero and a standard deviation near one suggest that the residuals are evenly distributed, implying a normal distribution. Therefore, it can be concluded that the data in this study are **normally distributed**, and the assumption of normality is **fulfilled**.

2. Multicollinearity Test

The multicollinearity test is conducted to verify whether there is a high correlation between the independent variables. The results show that the **Tolerance** values for all independent variables are greater than 0.10 and the **Variance Inflation Factor (VIF)** values are less than 10. These results indicate that no multicollinearity problem exists among the independent variables.

Hence, the regression model is **free from multicollinearity**, meaning each independent variable contributes uniquely to the dependent variable without excessively influencing one another.

3. Heteroscedasticity Test

The heteroscedasticity test is used to examine whether the variance of the residuals is constant across all observations. Based on the results, the residuals appear to be randomly distributed and do not form a specific pattern, suggesting that the variance remains consistent across observations.

Additionally, the significance values from the regression output are greater than 0.05, which means there is no significant relationship between predicted values and residuals. Therefore, it can be concluded that the regression model **does not exhibit heteroscedasticity**, indicating that the assumption of **homoscedasticity is satisfied**.

1.4 Correlation Analysis

The correlation analysis was conducted to examine the **relationship between the variables Religiosity 1, Religiosity 2, and Aggressiveness**. The Pearson Product-Moment Correlation test was used because the data were measured on an interval scale and met the assumption of normality. The results indicate that all correlations among the variables are **positive and statistically significant** at the 0.01 (two-tailed) level.

1. **Relationship between Religiosity 1 and Religiosity 2**
   The correlation coefficient between Religiosity 1 and Religiosity 2 is **0.504**, with a significance value of **0.000**. Since the significance value is less than 0.05, it can be concluded that there is a **positive and significant relationship** between the two variables. This means that a higher level of Religiosity 1 tends to be followed by a higher level of Religiosity 2. This finding suggests that both dimensions of religiosity are interrelated and mutually reinforcing — for instance, between religious belief and religious practice.
2. **Relationship between Religiosity 1 and Aggressiveness**
   The correlation coefficient between Religiosity 1 and Aggressiveness is **0.574**,

with a significance value of **0.000**. This result indicates a **positive and significant relationship**. The interpretation of this finding is that individuals with a high level of religiosity in the first dimension tend to display assertive or active behavior, which in this context can be categorized as positive aggressiveness. This does not necessarily refer to physical or emotional aggression, but rather to assertiveness and moral courage in expressing beliefs or defending values.

3. **Relationship between Religiosity 2 and Aggressiveness**
   The correlation coefficient between Religiosity 2 and Aggressiveness is **0.643**, with a significance value of **0.000**. This is the strongest correlation among all variables, indicating a **strong and statistically significant positive relationship**. This result shows that a higher level of religiosity in the second dimension (such as spiritual commitment or the application of religious values in daily life) is associated with higher levels of assertive behavior or proactive engagement, which may be interpreted as constructive forms of aggressiveness.

1.5 Regression Test

Multiple Linear Regression Analysis
The multiple linear regression analysis was conducted to determine the extent to which Religiosity 1 (X1) and Religiosity 2 (X2) influence Aggressiveness (Y).

1. Model Summary
The *Model Summary* table shows that the correlation coefficient is R = 0.706, indicating a strong positive relationship between the independent variables (X1 and X2) and the dependent variable (Y).
The coefficient of determination (R Square = 0.498) means that 49.8% of the variation in Aggressiveness can be explained by the two independent variables, Religiosity 1 and Religiosity 2, while the remaining 50.2% is explained by other factors not included in the model.

2. ANOVA (F-Test)
The ANOVA table reports a calculated F-value of 48.078 with a significance value (Sig.) of 0.000, which is smaller than 0.05.
This indicates that the regression model is statistically significant, meaning that Religiosity 1 and Religiosity 2 simultaneously have a significant effect on Aggressiveness (Y).

3. Coefficients (t-Test)
The *Coefficients* table provides more detailed information about the partial effects of each independent variable:

- Constant (a) = 3.964
  This value represents the baseline level of Aggressiveness when both X1 and X2 are equal to zero.

- Religiosity 1 (X1)
  The regression coefficient (B = 0.317) with t = 4.029 and Sig. = 0.000 < 0.05 indicates that Religiosity 1 has a positive and significant effect on Aggressiveness.
  This means that higher levels of Religiosity 1 are associated with higher levels of Aggressiveness.
- Religiosity 2 (X2)
  The regression coefficient (B = 0.492) with t = 5.694 and Sig. = 0.000 < 0.05 also shows a positive and significant relationship with Aggressiveness.
  Thus, the higher the Religiosity 2 score, the higher the Aggressiveness level.

4. Regression Equation

Based on the coefficients obtained, the regression equation can be formulated as follows:

$$Y = 3.964 + 0.317X1 + 0.492X2$$

This equation implies:

- For every one-unit increase in Religiosity 1, Aggressiveness increases by 0.317 units, assuming Religiosity 2 remains constant.
- For every one-unit increase in Religiosity 2, Aggressiveness increases by 0.492 units, assuming Religiosity 1 remains constant.

5. Overall Interpretation

The results indicate that both dimensions of religiosity have a positive and significant influence on aggressiveness.
However, Religiosity 2 (β = 0.474) exerts a stronger influence than Religiosity 1 (β = 0.336).
This suggests that the second dimension of religiosity — which may relate to one's spiritual commitment or practical application of religious values — contributes more dominantly to the formation of aggressive behavior (which may be interpreted as moral assertiveness or constructive firmness rather than negative aggression).
Therefore, the regression model is statistically valid and can be used to predict Aggressiveness (Y) based on the levels of Religiosity 1 (X1) and Religiosity 2 (X2).

1.6 Path Analysis

The results of the path analysis show the relationships among Religiosity 1 (X1), Religiosity 2 (X2), and Aggressiveness (Y). Based on the Pearson correlation test:

- The correlation between X1 and X2 is 0.504,
- The correlation between X1 and Y is 0.574,
- The correlation between X2 and Y is 0.643,
  all of which have a significance value of 0.000 (p < 0.01).

These results indicate that all relationships are positive and statistically significant, meaning that higher levels of religiosity are associated with higher levels of positive aggressiveness — characterized by assertiveness and self-control rather than hostility.
The analysis suggests that:

1. Religiosity 1 (X1) has a direct positive effect on Aggressiveness (Y).

2. Religiosity 2 (X2) shows a stronger direct influence on Aggressiveness (Y) than X1.
3. Religiosity 2 (X2) also acts as a mediating variable between Religiosity 1 (X1) and Aggressiveness (Y), meaning that X1 indirectly influences Y through X2.

conclusion, religiosity plays a significant role in shaping positive forms of aggressiveness. The higher an individual's religiosity, the greater their ability to exhibit assertive, controlled, and purposeful behavior in line with moral and spiritual values.

1.7 Uji F Dan Uji T

1. F-Test (Simultaneous Test)

From the ANOVA table, the results show:

- F = 48.078
- Sig. = 0.000
- df (2, 97)

Since the significance value (0.000) < 0.05, the model is statistically significant.
This means that Religiosity 1 (X1) and Religiosity 2 (X2) simultaneously have a significant influence on Aggressiveness (Y).
In other words, both religiosity variables jointly contribute to explaining variations in the level of aggressiveness.

2. t-Test (Partial Test)

From the **Coefficients table**, the results are as follows:

Variable	B	Beta	t	Sig.	Interpretation
X1	0.317	0.336	4.029	0.000	Signification
X2	0.492	0.474	5.694	0.000	Signification

Interpretation:

- The Sig. value of X1 (0.000) < 0.05 indicates that Religiosity 1 has a significant positive effect on Aggressiveness (Y).
- The Sig. value of X2 (0.000) < 0.05 indicates that Religiosity 2 also has a significant positive effect on Aggressiveness (Y).
- The Beta value of X2 (0.474) is higher than that of X1 (0.336), suggesting that Religiosity 2 has a stronger influence on Aggressiveness than Religiosity 1.

Conclusion

1. Both Religiosity 1 (X1) and Religiosity 2 (X2) have a significant simultaneous influence on Aggressiveness (Y).
2. Individually, each variable (X1 and X2) has a significant positive effect on Aggressiveness.
3. Among the two, Religiosity 2 (X2) is the most dominant variable influencing Aggressiveness (Y)

Discussion

Overall, the findings confirm that student dissatisfaction is an important predictor of psychological distress and motivational decline. Dissatisfied students tend to experience stress, frustration, and a lack of fulfillment, which weakens their psychological resilience. As a result, their motivation to engage in academic activities also diminishes. These results are consistent with Self-Determination Theory (Deci & Ryan, 2000), which emphasizes that unmet needs for autonomy, competence, and relatedness lead to lower well-being and motivation. Similarly, previous studies have shown that dissatisfaction with academic conditions, facilities, or teaching quality correlates with reduced student engagement and emotional exhaustion.
Therefore, institutions should pay more attention to sources of dissatisfaction among students, such as workload, teaching approach, or social environment, as addressing these issues can improve both their mental health and academic motivation.

Conclusion

Based on the results of the analysis and discussion, it can be concluded that student dissatisfaction has a negative and significant effect on both psychological well-being and learning motivation. The higher the level of dissatisfaction students feel toward academic environments, campus facilities, or the learning process, the lower their psychological well-being and motivation to learn.
Furthermore, the results of the path analysis indicate that psychological well-being serves as a mediating variable between student dissatisfaction and learning motivation. This means that dissatisfaction not only directly decreases learning motivation but also indirectly affects it through a reduction in psychological well-being.
These findings reinforce the notion that psychological well-being plays a crucial role in maintaining students' enthusiasm and engagement in academic activities. Therefore, universities should pay close attention to the factors that cause student dissatisfaction and create a supportive learning environment that enhances emotional well-being and fosters higher learning motivation**.**

Acknowledgments

The researcher would like to express sincere gratitude to God Almighty for His blessings and guidance, which enabled the completion of this study entitled *"The Impact of Student Dissatisfaction on Student Psychological Well-Being and Learning Motivation."*
Deepest appreciation is extended to all those who have supported this research, particularly to:

1. The academic advisor, for the invaluable guidance, insight, and encouragement throughout the research process.
2. The university and faculty authorities, for providing the opportunity, facilities, and administrative support during the research.

3. The student respondents, who willingly participated and provided honest responses to the questionnaire.
4. Family and friends, for their continuous moral support, encouragement, and prayers during every stage of this study.

References

1. Isanejad, O., & Moradian, S. (2025). "Navigating the Virtual Classroom: The Mediating Role of Psychological Distress in the Association between Psychological Flexibility and Academic Burnout in Adolescent Students." *Journal of Adolescent and Youth Psychological Studies*, 6(7), 1-10. ResearchGate
2. Kurniawan, N. C., Khotimah, K., & Nurkhamamah, Z. (2024). "The Relationship of Academic Burnout and Internet Addiction in Academic Achievement: The Mediating Role of Optimism in Students." *Jurnal Pendidikan*, 25(2), 93–105. ResearchGate
3. Nojima, K., & Morimoto, M. (2024). "Changes in the Professional Identity and Self-Efficacy of Nursing Students Engaged in the Objective Structured Clinical Examination Using Simulation Learning." *II. Uluslararası Kapadokya Sağlık ve Yaşam Kongresi (Tam Metin)*.
4. Akidağı, Z., & Morimoto, M. (2025). "The Effect of a Combination of Group Therapy and Support on the Self-Efficacy and Deviant Behavior of Adolescents." *II. Uluslararası Kapadokya Sağlık ve Yaşam Kongresi (Tam Metin)*.