

Psychological Wellbeing of Self-Actualized and Non-Self-Actualized Individuals

Nagarathna M L^{1*}, Dr. Sreenivas M²

ABSTRACT

The very intention of the present study is to find the difference in perceiving psychological wellbeing of Self-actualized and non-self-actualized individuals. The study was conducted on 300 individuals with different cultural, professional backgrounds. The age range of the subjects is between 40-60 years. The obtained mean and 't' values indicates that there is no significant difference in perceiving psychological wellbeing of Self-actualized and non-self-actualized individuals. The determined results were discussed in this paper.

Keywords: *Psychological Wellbeing, Self-Actualized, Non-Self-Actualized Individuals*

Psychological wellbeing has two important facets. The first of these refers to the extent to which people experience positive emotions and feelings of happiness. Sometimes this aspect of psychological wellbeing is referred to as subjective wellbeing (Diener, 2000).

Types of psychological wellbeing

The term "Hedonic" wellbeing is normally used to refer to the subjective feelings of happiness. It comprises of two components, an affective component (high positive affect and low negative affect) and a cognitive component (satisfaction with life). It is proposed that an individual experiences happiness when positive affect and satisfaction with life are both high (Carruthers & Hood, 2004).

The less well-known term, "Eudaimonic" wellbeing is used to refer to the purposeful aspect of PWB. The psychologist Carol Ryff has developed a very clear model that breaks down Eudaimonic wellbeing into six key types of psychological wellbeing.

Key components of psychological wellbeing

Autonomy. Autonomy is the ability to make your own decisions about how to think and behave, rather than over-relying on others' opinions or approval.

- Competence.

¹Research Scholar, Department of Psychology, Bangalore University, Bangalore, India

²Associate Professor and Chairperson, Department of Psychology, Bangalore University, Bangalore, India

*Corresponding Author

Received: November 22, 2021; Revision Received: December 26, 2021; Accepted: December 28, 2021

Psychological Wellbeing of Self-Actualized and Non-Self- Actualized Individuals

- Healthy relationships.
- Self-acceptance.
- Personal growth. ...
- Purpose in life.

Theories of psychological wellbeing

Theories about psychological wellbeing generally focus on understanding the *structure* of psychological wellbeing or the *dynamics* (i.e., the causes and consequences of PWB). The breakdown of psychological wellbeing into hedonic and eudaimonic components and Carol Ryff's model are widely accepted theories of the structure of PWB.

As far as the dynamics of PWB are concerned it's important to recognise that, to some extent, PWB is relatively stable and will have been influenced by both previous experience (including, for example, early upbringing) and underlying personality. Stressful experiences can predispose people to subsequent mood and anxiety disorders (*Gladstone, Parker and Mitchell, 2004*); but, on the other hand exposure to extremely traumatic events can help to build resilience and actually protect PWB. For example, children exposed to moderately stressful events seem better able to cope with subsequent stressors (*Khobasa & Maddi, 1999*). The same "inoculating" impact of stressful events has also been observed in working adults (*Soloman, Berger and Ginsberg, 2007*).

Although baseline psychological wellbeing may be fairly stable, day to day events and experiences also exert an impact. For example, even the most resilient person may eventually become very low, or depressed, if his or her daily experiences are constantly troubling. There is strong evidence to show that exposure to work-related stressors over long periods of time will have a negative impact on PWB, so, although as mentioned above, short periods of adversity may be helpful in building resilience, long-term stress is not good for PWB. In turn, this lower level of PWB may well lead to serious illness, including cardiovascular disease, problems with blood sugar control, such as diabetes and immune system malfunctions (*Chandola et al, 2008*).

In summary, PWB theory proposes that early experience and underlying personality create a platform for psychological wellbeing but everyday experiences can help to maintain a good level of PWB (if they are positive) or, if they are negative, reduce levels of PWB, leading, in turn, to poor health outcomes.

METHODOLOGY

Problem

Study the perceived Psychological wellbeing of Self-actualized and non-self- actualized individuals

Objectives

To compare the perceived Psychological wellbeing between Self-actualized and non-self-actualized individuals.

Hypothesis

There is a significant difference in perceived Psychological wellbeing of self-actualized and non-self-actualized individuals.

Psychological Wellbeing of Self-Actualized and Non-Self- Actualized Individuals

Variables

Independent Variable: self-actualization and non-self-actualization

Dependent variables: Psychological wellbeing

Sample

The sample of the present study includes men and women professionals within the age group of 40-60 years of various professions such as medicine, engineering, and academics under the jurisdiction of Bengaluru urban district.

Table 1 Shows the sample details of professionals from different background such as medicine, engineering, and academics.

TOTAL SAMPLE - 300	
MEN-150	WOMEN-150

The data was collected from the professionals (Doctors, Engineers and professors) above the age range of 40 years to 60. Prior consent was taken from the Organizations before administering the survey. The questionnaire administration was done by the researcher during working hours and when employees had leisure time.

The rapport was established with the participants and the objective and the relevance of the current research was explained in a simple language. Once the participants were willing to be a part of the study, the demographic details were taken and instructions were given to complete the questionnaire. The participants went through the questionnaire items and understood what was expected from them and ticked the statements accordingly. The statements were self-explanatory and were easy to understand. The researcher was present during the administration and was able to clear the queries of the participants.

ANALYSIS OF RESULTS

Table 1: shows the difference descriptive values and difference between self-actualized and non-self-actualized individual and the difference in perceiving Locus of control

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pair 1	Self -Actualized	11.92	150	2.723	.222
	Non-Self Actualized	12.12	150	2.709	.221
Pair 2	Psy. Wellbeing	223.70	150	15.195	1.241
	Non-Psy. Wellbeing	175.45	150	45.568	3.721

Table 1 show the Mean and SD value for the dimensions of self-actualized and non-self-actualized individuals.

Self-actualization was assessed using self-actualization scale developed by Jones & Crandall. The mean score for self-actualized and non-self-actualized ranges from 11.92 to 12.12 which shows that there is a significant difference in self-actualized and non-self-actualized individuals. the obtained results could be attributed to the difference in individuals' perception towards life, their understanding of the major life events, sense of interpreting the self-image.

Psychological Wellbeing of Self-Actualized and Non-Self- Actualized Individuals

The psychological wellbeing was assessed using psychological wellbeing scale and the mean values ranges from 223.70 to 175.45 shows that there is a significant difference in perceiving in psychological wellbeing between self-actualized and non-self-actualized individuals. The obtained results could be attributed to the subjects would have experienced more external factors playing in their major life events and the approach towards the life changes.

Table 2: shows the ‘t’ value for the variables

	Subjects	Mean	SD	‘t’ value	df	significance
Pair 1	Self-Actualized Individuals Non-Self -Actualized Individuals	.200	3.62 1	.676	149	.500
Pair 2	Psy. Wellbeing – Non-Psy. Wellbeing	48.247	46.9 52	12.585	149	.000

Table 2 shows the statistically significant difference among the mentioned variables. From the above it is clear that there is a significant difference in perceiving Locus of control. The objective of the study is to analyze the difference in Locus of control between Self-actualized and non-self-actualized individual.

The obtained results indicates that there is no statistically significant difference between self-actualized and non-self-actualized individuals. The study by John Walter Bordages (1989) reviews Self-actualizing individuals, according to Maslow (1954), are hypothesized to operate autonomously of external expectations due to their undistorted perceptions of their own realistic abilities. Scores on the Personal Orientation Inventory, a measure of self-actualization, were used to divide subjects into high, medium, or low self-actualizing categories. Subjects were given a Logical Reasoning Ability Test over three treatment conditions: high, low, and no expectations with regard to performance. Analyses indicated greater personal autonomy for high and moderate self-actualizing subjects than in nonself-actualizing subjects, who showed the greatest variance in their reasoning test scores.

The obtained results for the psychological wellbeing show that there is a statistically significant difference in perceiving psychological wellbeing between self-actualized and non-self-actualized individuals. The results could be supported with the research by Carol D. Ryff et.al (2013) examined are ideas about positive human functioning from existential and utilitarian philosophy as well as clinical, developmental, and humanistic psychology. How these perspectives were integrated to create a multidimensional model of psychological well-being [Ryff, C.D.: 1989, Journal of Personality and Social Psychology] is described, and empirical evidence supporting the factorial validity of the model is briefly noted. Life course and socioeconomic correlates of well-being are examined to underscore the point that opportunities for eudaimonic well-being are not equally distributed. Biological correlates (cardiovascular, neuroendocrine, immune) of psychological well-being are also briefly noted as they suggest possible health benefits associated with living a life rich in purpose and meaning, continued growth, and quality ties to others. We conclude with future challenges in carrying the eudaimonic vision forward.

In a study by Marie P. wissing and Chrizzane(2002) revealed that conceptualizations of the nature of psychological well-being are very diverse, and that it is still unclear what the nature and / or dimensions of psychological well-being are. Scales based on several models and constructs from diverse theoretical traditions were completed by a multicultural group of

Psychological Wellbeing of Self-Actualized and Non-Self- Actualized Individuals

550 participants. The validity of the scales for use in this particular group was determined. The manifestations of psychological well-being in different gender, cultural and age groups were compared. Similarities and differences were found. In a factor analysis on the data of the total group, a general psychological well-being factor was identified. Psychological well-being seems to be multidimensional with regard to facets of self that are involved (e.g., affect, cognition, behaviour), as well as with regard to the domains of life in which these facets manifest themselves (e.g., intra- and interpersonal, social and contextual, in love and work). A sense of coherence, satisfaction with life and affect-balance are strong indicators of general psychological well-being. Findings from this perspective may point to new directions for capacity building. Douglas T. Kenrick & Jaimie Arona Krems(2018) reviews psychological wellbeing from an evolutionary perspective, feelings of subjective well-being signal progress toward adaptive goals. We discuss life history theory and fundamental motives—integrating ideas from social psychology and evolutionary biology that offer a potentially useful perspective on subjective well-being. We discuss some preliminary research from this perspective, and outline implications for future research. In doing so, we suggest that different people may have very different notions of which behaviour evokes feelings of subjective well-being, linked to their particular life history features (e.g., age, sex, relationship status). This perspective also suggests predictable variations in what evokes subjective well-being across geography and cultures.

The above analysis of the obtained mean and ‘t’ values clearly indicates that there is a significant difference in perceiving in psychological wellbeing between self-actualized and non-self-actualized individual.

REFERENCES

- Ivtzan, I., Chan, C. P., Gardner, H. E., & Prashar, K. (2013). Linking religion and spirituality with psychological well-being: Examining self-actualisation, meaning in life, and personal growth initiative. *Journal of religion and health*, 52(3), 915-929.
- Ivtzan, I., Gardner, H. E., Bernard, I., Sekhon, M., & Hart, R. (2013). Wellbeing through self-fulfilment: Examining developmental aspects of self-actualization. *The Humanistic Psychologist*, 41(2), 119.
- Kenrick, D. T., & Krems, J. A. (2018). Well-being, self-actualization, and fundamental motives: An evolutionary perspective. *e-Handbook of Subjective Well-Being*. NobaScholar.
- Wissing, M. P., & Van Eeden, C. (2002). Empirical clarification of the nature of psychological well-being. *South African Journal of Psychology*, 32(1), 32-44.

Acknowledgement

The author(s) appreciates all those who participated in the study and helped to facilitate the research process.

Conflict of Interest

The author(s) declared no conflict of interest.

How to cite this article: Nagarathna M L & Sreenivas M (2021). Psychological Wellbeing of Self-Actualized and Non-Self- Actualized Individuals. *International Journal of Indian Psychology*, 9(4), 2311-2315. DIP:18.01.216.20210904, DOI:10.25215/0904.216