



ISSN (E): 2277- 7695
ISSN (P): 2349-8242
NAAS Rating: 5.23
TPI 2021; SP-10(12): 1525-1527
© 2021 TPI
www.thepharmajournal.com
Received: 19-10-2021
Accepted: 21-11-2021

Nagarathna ML
Research Scholar,
Department of Psychology,
Bangalore University,
Karnataka, India

Dr. Sreenivas M
Associate Professor and
Chairperson, Department of
Psychology, Bangalore
University, Karnataka, India

Achievement motivation of self-actualized and non-self-actualized individuals

Nagarathna ML and Dr. Sreenivas M

Abstract

The very intention of the present study is to find the difference in perceiving Achievement motivation 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 internal and Achievement motivation of Self-actualized and non-self- actualized individuals. The determined results were discussed in this paper.

Keywords: motivation, self-actualization, achievement, behavior, expectancy

Introduction

Achievement motivation is an affect in connection with evaluated performance in which competition with a standard of excellence was paramount. (McClelland, Atkinson, Clark, & Lowell, 1953). Intentional actions are usually considered the prototype of all acts of will. Theoretically, a complete intentional action is conceived of as follows: Its first phase is a motivation process, either a brief or a protracted vigorous struggle of motives; a second phase is an act of choice, decision, or intention, terminating this struggle; the third phase is the consummatory intentional action itself, following either immediately or after an interval short or long. (Lewin, 1926, reprinted in 1999).

The theory of achievement motivation is a miniature system applied to a specific context, the domain of achievement-oriented activities, which is characterized by the fact that the individual is responsible for the outcome (success or failure), he anticipates unambiguous knowledge of results, and there is some degree of uncertainty or risk (McClelland, 1961). Yet it is our belief that the type of theory that views the strength of an individual's goal-directed tendency as jointly determined by his motives, by his expectations about the consequences of his actions, and by the incentive values of expected consequences will have wider utility when these concepts are applied toward other goals. (Atkinson & Feather, 1966) Achievement motivation can, therefore, be defined as the striving to increase or to keep as high as possible, one's own capabilities in all activities in which a standard of excellence is thought to apply and where the execution of such activities can, therefore either succeed or fail. (Heckhausen, 1967).

Achievement motivation theory

The Achievement motivation theory relates personal characteristics and background to a need for achievement and the associated competitive drive to meet standards of excellence. Achievement Motivation Theory (AMT) explains the integral relationship between an individual's characteristics and his/her need to achieve something in life. In doing so, it also takes into account the kind of competitive drive a person has to achieve set goals.

Achievement Motivation Theory was put forward and refined by a group of researchers Murray (1938), Lowel (1953), Atkinson, Clark and Mc Clelland (1961) over the years. According to this theory, an individual's motivation to achieve something in life or the dire need to achieve a specific goal is governed by various internal factors such as willingness, determination, punctuality, personal drive along with numerous external factors (also known as environmental factors) such as pressures, expectations, targets, etc., set by relevant organizations, members of the family or the society. A person's need to achieve something and the reason behind his/her overall motivation to achieve a certain goal, according to the AMT, more often than not, comes from within and is strongly related to the individuals need for power and affiliation.

Corresponding Author
Nagarathna ML
Research Scholar,
Department of Psychology,
Bangalore University,
Karnataka, India

McClelland theory of Human Motivation

In the early 1940s, Abraham Maslow created his theory of needs. This identified the basic needs that human beings have, in order of their importance: physiological needs, safety needs, and the needs for belonging, self-esteem and "self-actualization". Later, David McClelland built on this work in his 1961 book, "The Achieving Society." He identified three motivators that he believed we all have: a need for achievement, a need for affiliation, and a need for power.

People will have different characteristics depending on their dominant motivator.

According to McClelland, these motivators are learned (which is why this theory is sometimes called the Learned Needs Theory). McClelland says that, regardless of our gender, culture, or age, we all have three motivating drivers, and one of these will be our dominant motivating driver. This dominant motivator is largely dependent on our culture and life experiences. These characteristics are as follows:

These characteristics are as follows:

Dominant Motivator	Characteristics of This Person
Achievement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has a strong need to set and accomplish challenging goals. • Takes calculated risks to accomplish their goals. • Likes to receive regular feedback on their progress and achievements. • Often likes to work alone.
Affiliation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wants to belong to the group. • Wants to be liked, and will often go along with whatever the rest of the group wants to do. • Favors collaboration over competition. • Doesn't like high risk or uncertainty.
Power	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wants to control and influence others. • Likes to win arguments. • Enjoys competition and winning. • Enjoys status and recognition.

Methodology

Problem: Study the perceived Achievement motivation of Self-actualized and non-self- actualized individuals

Objectives

To compare the perceived Achievement motivation between Self-actualized and non-self-actualized individuals.

Hypothesis

1. There is a significant difference in perceived Achievement motivation of self-actualized and non-self-actualized individuals.

Variables

1. **Independent Variable:** Self-actualization and non-self-actualization
2. **Dependent variables:** Achievement motivation

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 2: 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	Achievement Motivation	49.15	150	27.763	2.267
	Non-Achievement Motivation	54.04	150	31.978	2.611

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.

The achievement motivation scale was assessed using achievement motivation scale and the mean value ranges from

49.15 to 54.04 and shows that there is a significant difference in perceiving in achievement motivation between self-actualized and non-self-actualized individuals. The yielded results indicates that there is a difference in perceiving

achievement motivation between self-actualized and non-self-actualized individuals and the it could be attributed to the life experiences and the environmental factors of the subjects.

Table 2: Shows the 't' value for the variables

	Subjects	Mean	SD	't' value	df	significance
Pair 1	Self-Actualized Individuals	.200	3.621	.676	149	.500
	Non-Self -Actualized Individuals					
Pair 2	Achievement Motivation – Non-Achievement Motivation	-4.893	38.157	-1.571	149	.118

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 yielded results for the variable achievement motivation indicate that there is no statistically significant difference in perceiving achievement motivation between self-actualized and non-self-actualized individuals. The same could be attributed to the individual's self-motivation and thirst for achievement. The subjects might have not experienced the inferiority complex during the major life changes.

The above analysis of the obtained mean and 't' values clearly indicates that there is no significant difference in perceiving in achievement motivation between self-actualized and non-self-actualized individual.

References

- Huntsman KH. Improvisational Dramatic Activities: Key to Self-Actualization?. Children's theatre review 1982;31(2):3-9.
- Maslow A. Self-actualization and beyond, 1965.
- Maslow AH. Self-actualization. Big Sur Recordings, 1971.
- Orth U, Robins RW. The development of self-esteem. Current directions in psychological science 2014;23(5):381-387.
- Cast AD, Burke PJ. A theory of self-esteem. Social forces, 2002;80(3):1041-1068.
- Heatherton TF, Wyland CL. Assessing self-esteem, 2003.
- Leary MR, Baumeister RF. The nature and function of self-esteem: Sociometer theory. In Advances in experimental social psychology. Academic Press 2000;32:1-62.
- Leary MR. Making sense of self-esteem. Current directions in psychological science 1999;8(1):32-35.

- Kernis MH. Toward a conceptualization of optimal self-esteem. Psychological inquiry 2003;14(1):1-26.
- Zenzen TG. Achievement motivation, 2002.