# Selfhood and Pathways to Well-being: Some Indian Perspectives

**\* Girishwar Misra**

**\*\*Indiwar Misra**

## Abstract

*Concern for happiness and wellbeing are perennial human concerns. Renewed interest to understand its dynamics in the contemporary world is caused by the increased level of suffering and the urge to improve living conditions. However, the Euro-American scholarship in this area is organized within the framework of the notion of independent self which pursues happiness following a hedonistic pathway in a consumerist setting and maintains a separate and bounded notion of selfhood. The Indian notion of self extends the discourse on self and happiness by positing selfhood as porous, spiritual, and multilayered. It offers a pathway to happiness by relating to others and dissolving the self-other divide. This view also goes with creating and nurturing a viable life world that recognizes the value of sharing and cooperation.*
**Keywords**: Consumerism, Community, Culture, Dharma, Egoistic Self, Happiness, Wellbeing

Thinkers since ancient times have shown keen interest in understanding and identifying the best way to achieve states of happiness and wellbeing. In recent years the quest for these positive states as a personal and societal goal has become a priority concern. As positive and desirable qualities they need to be maximized for a better life. To this end, its study has become a point of intersection for the students of many disciplines including psychology, economics, and biology. The emerging field of positive psychology is dedicated to the study of various facets of happiness and wellbeing. In general, there is consensus on the idea that we are far from the desired level of well-being necessary for optimal functioning. It must be noted that much of the research on well-being has been framed within the framework of an independent, separate, and bounded notion of self. This model is reflected in many of the currently popular self-constructs (e.g. self-efficacy, internal control, self-enhancement, self-determination, and self-esteem). These concepts establish an independent and egoistic self as a normative category. In contrast, the Indian notion of selfhood acknowledges a mode of selfhood where relationships and spirituality also become significant. The present paper seeks to explicate the two pathways towards wellbeing and happiness which emerge from independent and relational modes of selfhood. Their implications for individual and societal functioning are also explored.

The ideology of liberal individualism underlying the notion of an independent self-promotes an explicit celebration of a kind of personhood destined to become more and more individuated, autonomous and self-contained. Within this framework, happiness and well-being imply hedonic qualities such as joy, excitement, possessions, and gains. The available research evidence tends to support the view that self-experiences fulfillment and realization in terms of personal growth, primary control, environmental mastery, and extraversion. This pattern of findings goes well with the spirit of materialism and utilitarianism. As a consequence, the endeavor is directed towards enhancing well-being by increasing possessions and exercising a greater and greater degree of control over the environment and capturing the resources. A significant correlate of this view is the steep rise of consumerism as one of the key features of life.

## Life in a Consumerist Culture

In consumerist culture buying and selling of commodities are becoming the main activities in peoples' lives. With the powerful influence of media, the lifestyle, fashion, ideals, meanings, and above all

*\*Ex Professor, Department of Psychology, University of Delhi, Delhi-110007 Current Contact: Tower 1, Flat 307, Parshvanath Majestic Floors, Baibhava Khand, Indirapuram, Ghaziabad-201014*
*\*\*Department of Applied Psychology, B.R.Ambedkar College, University of Delhi, Yamuna Vihar , Delhi-110094*

our notions of being and well-being are undergoing significant transformation. The messages of the desirable as manufactured and projected through advertisements through media relate various goods and objects to identities and articulate them as the indices of well-being. While continuous exposure to advertisements affects all age groups, children are affected the most. Mass media presentations bring legitimacy to goods and they are believed to be commonplace, desirable, and within the reach. The media projectsgood life in terms of materialistic pleasures and material prosperity. Doing so keeps people in a state of perpetual discontent. Since our judgments of happiness are relative and involve social comparison, one is cursed to remain in a state of deprivation and a sense of unhappiness. We are bound to suffer from an insatiable desire for more and more. The materialistic orientation externalizes self-control and the objects in the world outside become critical to well-being. In reality, the autonomy of the person is curtailed but the person feels a sense of choice and control.

The flow of consumerism which started in the different parts of the world during the second half of the twentieth century has now encompassed almost the entire world. Of course, the globalization of consumer culture has not been uniformed. The different patterns of interaction with local cultures lead to varied outcomes in different regions. In the promotion of consumers, cultural media play a critical role by supplying impressive role models and an array of products is sold to people as technologies of self-promotion. To this end, people's imagination is ignited. The products are presented as ways to realize the dreams that people cherish. Thus, the market is not only informing us about the ideals of body, beauty, and behavior but is also directing the ways of achieving those ideals. It directly as well as indirectly sends messages informing us that we are defined by our possessions which in turn constitute the tools of happiness and identity. In this scenario, the cosmetic industry is becoming the most thriving enterprise.

The effects of consumer culture on our lives are becoming all-encompassing. The vocabulary from the market is supplying concepts to organize, represent and communicate the modes of thinking, relating, and feeling. The act of shopping is becoming a marker of one's identity. We often define ourselves in terms of what we buy. Our presence and participation in shopping malls are regulating our emotions and identity expressions. With the internet, the process of online marketing has brought a significant change in the buying environment. All this is making selfishness and materialism key drivers in peoples' lives. People are now guided more by the desire of making money and judging their own and others' well-being on their possessions, appearance, and purchasing capacity.

**The Changing Landscape of Family and Community Context**

However, the pursuit of happiness following the consumerist model cannot be called a success story. The materialistic values do not go well with the well-being of the larger society. Also, everyday life experiences are becoming unstable and inconsistent. People are experiencing a sense of anomie and powerlessness. Concurrent to it a shift is taking place in the organization of family life in which the social-cultural function is being replaced by an instrumental function. Instead of a set of relationships based on social and economic obligations, family is being treated as a contract for fulfilling personal goals. With the increase in social mobility and high values attached to personal career and professional goals, the sense of obligation and commitment to family life is losing its significance.

The recent rise in the divorce rate, domestic violence, number of non-family households, single-parent families, and live-in relationships is challenging the structure and functioning of the institutions of family and marriage. At the same time trends like the openness of expression and dialogue, reduction in vertical hierarchies, and lessening of suppression and restrictions on the acknowledgment of desire, including responsible sexual and emotional expression and shifts in easing power in human relationships, is in a liberal and creative direction. An ideological shift is taking place in which the consensual and egalitarian perspective is replacing the authoritarian and hierarchical one. Achieving a balance between family demands and personal fulfillment is becoming increasingly difficult.

The relationship between family and the larger community too is changing. In particular migration from villages and small cities to the urban centers and metros is leading to decline in the traditional sources of support and decreasing spontaneity and emotional resources. In such a scenario people are experiencing a loss of control in their hectic lives.

**Well-being at the Societal Level**

It has been reported that the relationship between life satisfaction and economic growth is not linear and after a certain level, there is no corresponding increase in life satisfaction with an increase in economic status. Happiness appears to be a function of relative income or social position rather than absolute purchasing power. While we are richer now, we are not to the same degree happier. This does not mean that economic status has no role in determining well-being and happiness. Poverty or lack of financial support certainly influences peoples' well-being and happiness. The empirical work does show that in low-income countries income does contribute to happiness and economic collapse often leads to poverty and decreased level of happiness.

In a societal context, well-being refers to a good life. The indicators of well-being are numerous and their use depends on the chosen theoretical perspective of the researcher. These include infant mortality, access to food, literacy, relationship, social participation, employment level, political freedom, self-reported satisfaction in life, material living standard, health, achievement in life, personal relationship, the feeling of safety, community connectedness, future security, self-expression, social identity, the satisfaction of basic needs, the experience of choice and control. It may be noted that there is a differential emphasis on the use of these indicators in different cultures.

A holistic approach to development and progress has to address these concerns along with preventing reduction in social and natural capital since any talk of well-being in a weak community with a degraded natural system becomes meaningless. In recent years the notion of development is treated in terms of freedom but freedom involves responsibility. Simply enhancing the functioning and capability of individuals may not be enough as it lacks a reflective and creative quest for being. A deeper analysis of happiness shows that the experience of an individual's personal happiness is inseparable from others' happiness. Hence, we need a socially responsible self, one which engages with society in a dialectical relationship. This requires the cultivation of the notion of an inclusive self.

**Models of Selfhood and Well-being**

In everyday life, people take it for granted that everybody has a single and particular self. It is based on several kinds of personal experiences. For instance, all of us have self-awareness. We frequently indulge in autobiographical reflections. At times we do experience identity crises. We often discuss accountability concerns. We are extraordinarily concerned with self-presentation. Each one of us has some notion of self. In brief, as human beings, we are self-perceiving and self-interpreting beings. The articulation of self is contingent on several things. Our answers to the question 'Who am I' depend on several factors. In particular, it is important to know who is asking this question. In this context, an array of questions comes to our minds: What is it to be a self? Is it a transcendental unity of consciousness? What is it to remain the same person over time? How to account for the unity experienced across time points? What is it to be this particular human being who I am? What it is to be a self in Indian society? Indeed self continues to be a puzzle of puzzles' as William James once described. Despite the ontological and epistemological centrality and voluminous literature on self, there is no consensus about its conceptualization. It seems that the self resists any definition.

Within the discipline of psychology self as a theme has a peculiar history of early neglect followed by a current resurgence. Currently, wide-ranging discussions of the problems of self are in vogue. Within the social sciences, these discussions have left a trail of issues and an increasing number of perspectives have emerged including positivist, constructivist and postmodern (Gergen,2011). A vast literature has grown surrounding them. Here we would selectively attend to some of the crucial issues and challenges in articulating the experience of self and examine their implications for wellbeing and positivity in life. In particular, some Indian notions pertaining to self would be described which have implications for wellbeing.

**Self as Subject and Self as Object**

In real life, the self appears as a multifaceted and dynamic system that regulates and mediates our behavior. It acts as an anchor and affords and constrains our behavior, perceptions, feelings, values, and meanings. However, in the course of increasing use of the term self has acquired several meanings and functions. It is used synonymously or interchangeably with a variety of constructs such as 'total person', 'personality', 'experiencing subject', 'beliefs about oneself, and 'executive agent' and has been assigned different roles in conceptualizing psychological and social processes. Its genesis in the social context and functions as a knower (*Jnata)*, actor or doer (*Karta),* and experiencer (*Bhakta)* has led to

much theorization and research (see Paranjpe, 1998). It is not only an object of knowledge but also the subject of experience. It is "*a mental capacity that allows an animal to take itself as the object of its own attention and to think consciously about itself*" (Leary & Tangney,2003, p.8). This definition takes into account the fundamental quality of self, the human ability to take oneself as the object of one's attention and thought. So, the experience of self involves the relationship between the subject and the object or the 'I' and 'me'. This implies that the sense of self-awareness (I) and its mental representation (Me) provide the main constituents of the construct of self.

The core of self appears to be the process of self-reflection which makes 'self' an object of attention and deliberates consciously about it. It involves attention, cognition, and regulation or knowledge (*Jnana!*). Thus, having self has implications for the whole range of psychological phenomena. In reality, the self is indeed a multifaceted, multi-voiced, and multilevel phenomenon. Its development, stability, variation, expression, and implications have been treated in many numerous ways. Its domain has fuzzy boundaries where the concerns originating in different disciplines and schools of thought meet and interact. The issue of continuity and flux in self-experience is now made more complex in the post-modern era. This makes self-knowledge and its representation a fairly complex exercise.

It may be noted that becoming aware of oneself and engaging with self-reflection is central to the lay understanding of human behavior, particularly of conscious behavior. Such a reflexive consciousness is held as an essential ingredient of the nature of human nature. This self-reflexive capacity, however, is not independent of the cultural meanings and practices within which people grow and develop. Human life is substantially organized by the set of cultural understanding and our cultural participation makes us selves (Baumeister,2011). It is, therefore, not surprising to find that the ontologies and ideologies of self vary across cultures. The way of being a person is not a natural category but depends on cultural models of personhood and a person's role in personal and social life (Shweder&Bourne, 1984).

Capturing the experiences of selfhood (e g. Process, structure, and contents) in its varied symbolic constructions across cultures is a massive task. It is more so because psychology has not been much responsive to the historical and cultural boundedness of self. However, the gradual realization of the relevance of culture as one of the central concerns of psychology is taking place due to the tendencies of globalization of economy, acceptance of multiculturalism, and increasing assertion of cultural identity. The emerging evidence indicates that self-processes may differ across cultures and shape psychological processes in diverse ways.

Culture and self mutually constitute each other. The notion of agency and basis of coherence and units of personality are found to be culturally variable. From a cultural perspective, the idea of an individualized, separate, and distinct self is a predominantly Euro-American construction. It has been observed that individualistic cultures treat individuals as separate, autonomous, and self-contained entities with well-defined boundaries. Such a view does not help to understand non-Western self-construal. The collectivist cultures, for instance, emphasize group orientation, are sensitive to the goals and needs of others, and show readiness to cooperate and maintain permeable boundaries (Markus &Kitatyama, 1991). In the current research, the individualistic/independent and relational/ interdependent models of self-construal have received increasing attention. While the former maintains separateness and indivisibility of self the latter holds that the two are inseparable from the surrounding social context. Other individuals present in that context are treated as continuous. As a result, the individual experiences 'self-in-relation-to-other'. People become meaningful only by relating to others or relationships of which they are parts. While a Western view emphasizes personal choice the non-Western view holds duties, roles, and obligations more important. Research in the Western world has shown that the individual is a separate, unconnected indivisible being. This notion has a clear imprint of Cartesian dualism, individual reason, free will, and capitalism. It projects the unified, integrated, autonomous, and objective view of self (Sampson, 1988). The same guides the child-rearing practices, and modes of relating to the environment, people, and community.

The interdependent mode of self-construal locates the self in a broader social-spiritual/divine context. Such a model is prevalent in Asian countries including Japan, Korea, China, and India (Misra, 2001; Roland, 1988). In this context, the goal of self-development is not

individuation but dissolving the self/other boundaries. Such models assume that an individual is an open system that constantly communicates with other-selves. Thus, self-realization implies not only expressing the internal attributes but becoming part of the group, community, and divinity. Its strategies require a kind of self-cultivation in which self-control and self-discipline play key roles.

Attaining the goal of interdependence demands acknowledging that one's behavior is jointly determined, and organized by what the actor considers to be the thoughts, feelings, and actions of others in the relationship and seeing oneself as part of a network of social relations. Individuals need to be receptive and responsive to the needs, expectations, hopes, and desires of the relevant others. Thus, in an interdependent mode self/other boundary has to be dissolved because the goal of selfhood or being is to fit in with others/context and become part of an interpersonal relationship. Control is self-directed discipline and tolerance, instead of the ability to influence others.

Kakar (1978) has noted that the basis of relationships is mutual caring, involvement, and emotional affinity. The studies of self-construal in the Indian context indicate the dominance of social identity (Dhawan, et al, 1995) and contextually in self-descriptions. Misra and Giri (1995) observed that the self-construal of Indians shared interdependent as well as independent modes of self-construal were present. Mascolo, Misra, and Rapisardi (2004) found that individual and relational concepts of self were present in Indian and American samples. The cultural differences arose in specific ways the two notions are constructed. We, therefore, need to look within as well as between cultures. It seems that the Indian view of self is not based on any firm boundary between self and nonself (object). Its continuity with other things occupying the universe broadens the scope. The indigenous Indian perspective on self, however, goes beyond the dichotomies and presents an alternative model.

### The Indigenous Indian View

The notion of self and the process of self-understanding in the Indian context is complex. may be illustrated by examining the way the Atman or inner self is considered as the real self. It transcends the empirical self that is socially embedded, context-sensitive, and subject to changes. The Indian conceptualization of self involves spiritual interiority and social duty both as significant. The individual (*Jivatman*) is construed in terms of structure with five sheaths (Panch Koshas). They include the body, the senses, the mind, thinking organ (*Manas*), ego (*Ahamkara*), intellect or reflection (*Buddhi*), and finally the *Atman.* The self consists of Atman which is a spiritual entity. The Atman is the realization of one's true or essential self. Also, it is indistinguishable from absolute reality called *Brahman,* which is ubiquitous and free of both form and matter.

Owing to ignorance *(Avidya)* Atman is confused with the material elements and we misidentify ourselves with acquired identities (*Upadhis)* and develop an unwarranted attachment with them. The realization of Atman (M*oksha* or freedom/solvation) demands a lifelong and effortful process. The Atman is a non-material or metaphysical self, as opposed to the material, and empirical self, which is hierarchically lower than the metaphysical self (Bharati, 1985; Collins, 1991). The empirical self or ego is considered Ahamkara which needs to be transcended. The goal is to expand the empirical self and move upward by identifying with the higher and inclusive spiritual self. This conceptualization has implications for personal as well as social lives, including norms for conducting oneself (*dharma*).

The concern for transcendent spiritual reality is combined with the web of social life. Thus *dharma* (righteousaction) *artha* (wealth), *kama* (pleasure), and *moksha* (spiritual emancipation) are considered equally valuable life goals. The primary aspect of dharma is performing the duties prescribed for the various life stages. The social responsibilities are mandatory rather than optional. Through devotional practice *bhakti,* involving yoga, meditation, and righteous action, one's ultimate individual goal is to cultivate the awareness that one's true self is indistinguishable from the transcendental reality *Brahman.* Thus, spiritual journey relates to the spiritual order in the same way as the self's functions in everyday life are related to fulfilling one's duties in the social order. This necessitates going beyond the dichotomy of independent and interdependent selves and moving towards relational and encompassing models of self-conceptions.

### Contemporary Realities and Challenges for Selfhood

Indeed, having a notion of selfhood is one of the main features which distinguish humans from animals.

# 14/ Selfhood and Pathways to Well-being: Some Indian Perspectives

We as humans are endowed with the ability to perceive the self, reflect on it and use that self-reflection in regulating our actions. The ability to have a self is certainly a great achievement. It enables us to plan, to connect the past with the future, and helps in decision making and examining the possible consequences of our actions. These operations take place at conscious as well as non-conscious levels. The use of deliberate control processes in cognitive and behavioral domains demands that we should have a structure or entity of self. People hold beliefs about self-characteristics and those beliefs are functionally significant. We also engage in the process of self-evaluation and try to bring in self-change based on such evaluations. Thus, the self is a powerful instrument and expands the scope of an individual's functioning.

However, the current scenario poses several challenges that need serious attention while we deliberate about ourselves. Life in today's world is increasingly becoming more and more complex. With the rise of consumerism and mounting aspirations people are competing and becoming anxious and restless. The speed of change is contributing to a disproportional sense of uncertainty, insecurity, and mistrust. The result is an increase in the levels of anxiety, fear, loneliness, and hopelessness. People often complain of not having leisure and peace of mind. Their dreams of happiness and fulfillment are not realized. The space for self-awareness is diminishing and a vast majority of people is undergoing a deep sense of hopelessness and depression.

Self, therefore, is certainly not an unqualified blessing. As Mark Leary (2004) in his interesting work titled *The Curse of Self* has convincingly shown the notion of the self has many consequences which are quite tricky. It is the sense of self that distorts our perceptions of the world and leads us to draw inaccurate conclusions about ourselves and other people. We take bad decisions under the influence of self. Self often leads to personal suffering of various kinds (e.g. Depression, anxiety, frustration, anger, guilt, shame, envy, jealousy). Having a self also blinds us to our own shortcomings and undermines our relationships with other people. Perhaps, as Leary (2004) notes, self-emerged when we were prehistoric hunter-gatherers and during that period self-awareness had an adaptive value. In today's world, the situation has drastically changed, and having a self has become a curse. In subsequent work, Leary (2007) examined various self-related emotions and motivations. His analysis focuses on the Western individualistic tradition in which the self is construed as a separate, self-contained, independent, unitary, and private structure. Some of the conclusions drawn by Leary are as follows. He found that people believe that they are better than the average. The self-serving attribution (e.g., my success is because of my qualities and failures are because of external factors beyond control) has emerged as a very robust phenomenon. The positivity related to self extends to objects, symbols, and events associated with us. People maintain a strong meta-belief (a bias!) that they are not biased. We are blind to our prejudices. The cost of self-generated distortions that people pay is often very high in the long run. On the other hand, some people also suffer because they have unrealistic negative notions about themselves. Whatever may be the case, it's true that we all have a tendency to misconstrue our everyday experiences and relationships in a manner so as to fit them all in our "comfort zones", which are very difficult to abandon.

On closer scrutiny, we find that the individualistic view of self-hood and well-being has several important limitations. There is sufficient evidence that the idea of a good life is culturally defined and self-realization has many pathways. The notions of self and well-being which are experienced in many non - western as well as in western societies, termed as interdependent and relational, offer such an alternative. As hinted earlier the inclusive multilayered notion of self in terms of *PanchKosas* includes the physical, vital, social, mental, and blissful levels of existence and situates the discourse of the self in an increasingly inclusive configuration of reality in which transcendence has great significance. It considers selfhood in which one is embedded in the 'other', rather than in opposition to the other (e.g., person/group/community/environment). This is so because the goal is interdependence and harmonious living, which leads to the dissolution of the boundaries between self and non-self and through that reaches increasingly complex levels of individuation but not exclusive individualism. There exists a dialectical relationship between self and other with a potential of a balance of opposite forces instead of contradiction. Also, there is a clear recognition of the constantly changing nature of the world and a holistic and encompassing view that can handle the dynamic life world (Sinha& Naidu, 1994).

The physical reality is fluid, constantly changing, temporary, and of transitory nature. It reflects a momentary phase within a larger cosmic existence. For Indian thinkers submitting to this kind of reality has been treated as constraining and oppressive as it is contingent on immediate and changing circumstances. Attachment to these transitory things is bound to create unhappiness as the things themselves are perishable. The peace, and calmness that one needs may come from involvement in action in a disengaged or non-attached fashion (*Anasakt*). The attachment comes when one tries to engage with the act as one who is charged with ego. This view emphasizes self-realization or liberation i.e., independence from the conditions and contingencies. Understanding the limitations of this kind of egoic self, however, is problematic on many counts.

Being Narcissistic, the individualistic self often fails to take note of the fact that sociality is a primary human need and that human development is intrinsically dialogical. It is becoming increasingly clear that there exists a fundamental dialogical relation in human development across all the domains including survival, communication, language, emotions, morality, and knowledge about the world and self. An independent self-ignores the broader societal and ecological context within which human beings are embedded, live, and grow. Therefore, an individualistic/independent self is not viable in the long run and poses a serious threat to sustainable development. Our existence demands transcending the boundaries of body and ego and moving towards a more and more inclusive existence( Triandis, 1989).

It may be noted that the individualistic model of self relates to social welfare to the extent it is compatible with personal gratification. However, the current state of family life and society at large suggests the need for a balance of sociality and individuality. In the expanded view of self, happiness and well-being are realized in one's relationship with the surroundings, both social and non-social. It must be remembered that sensory pleasures do not exhaust the sources of happiness. Pleasures in art and aesthetic works, relationships, pro-social acts, and spiritual pursuit do create opportunities for happiness that are more absorbing and invigorating.

Also, life, in general, involves positive as well as negative experiences. It includes pleasure as well as pain. The two make each other meaningful and emphasizing pleasure alone is only a distortion that only suits the egoic self (Ahamkara). Everyday happenings are often punctuated by suffering or pain (*Dukh*) and a desire for pleasure or happiness (*Sukha*). One needs to endure suffering in order to enjoy pleasure. The real Self (*Atman)* is beyond both. The associations or conditions are ascribed to it and therefore should not be treated as part of the real self. Buddhism too shares a similar view. Here the self is seen as essentially empty of independent and self-sustaining qualities. The stress is rather dependent-co-arising and co-origination. Suffering holds a deep transformative potential. For instance, enduring pain and suffering has been found to give meaning to life and make people resilient. The experience of optimal self involves meeting the multiple challenges of life.

It may be noted that happiness or the lack of it is a subjective experience, at least beyond absolute (objective) deprivation conditions. The experience of happiness, therefore, depends on the self-definition or identity of a person. Happiness and well-being may be treated as ongoing processes of expansion towards the dissolution of the boundaries of self and others. Happiness at a physical plane, being deficiency driven is inherently degenerating. The resulting binding creates a misperception of the self as an object. The self-reflexivity, the basis of self, is good and bad. It is because of this that we are able to plan, innovate and do many good things. But it also leads to misconceptions, wrong decisions, and anxiety.

Here lies the need to conceptualize responsible participation in the life processes within the framework of *Dharma* or harmonious order. Freedom or liberation, conceived as the highest state of happiness (a state of having no desire), is possible if one is able to regulate oneself and make the experience of happiness independent of the happenings in the outer world. This implies that the search for happiness outside is a misplaced search. It needs to be looked into within.

Interestingly some other lines of inquiry like self-regulation too underscore the significance of the need for autonomy. In particular, there is growing data that autonomy is positively associated with well-being, mental health, and intrinsic motivation. Inherent satisfaction is more important than working for external incentives which externalize the self. The challenge is to nurture autonomy and allow optimal self to thrive.

As noted earlier the mass consumer societies are undergoing economic structural, sociocultural, and psychological transformations. We need to create a supportive family environment, strengthen neighborhoods, prioritize incentives, and foster social participation and relation to the broader community (Misra, 2010).

Today, relating to the larger surrounding society and the needs of planet earth has become a dominant concern. Should we sit as silent observers and accept the socio-political-economic structures uncritically and collaborate in the dehumanizing process? We do share social responsibility and it is imperative that we must make conscious moral choices rather than surrender to the ideology of those who are in power. We need to move forward to humanize the discipline and work towards creating a world where there is peace and happiness and people are able to make sense of life and the world with faith, hope, and courage.

## References

Baumeister, R. F. (2011). The unity of selfhood at the interface of animal body *Psychological Studies, 56*, 5-11.

Bharati, A. (1985). The self in Hindu thought and action. In G. Marsella, A.J. DeVos, &F.L.K Hsu (Eds.), *Culture and self.* New York: Tavistock.

Collins, A. (1991). From Brahma to a blade of grass: Towards an Indian Self-psychology. *Journal of Indian Philosophy, 19*, 143-189.

Dhawan, N., Roseman, I.J., Naidu, R.K., Thapa, K. &Rettek, S.I. (1995). Self-concepts across two cultures: India and the United States. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 26,* 606-621.

Gergen, K,J. 2011 Self as social construction. *Psychological Studies, 56,* 108-116.

Kakar, S. (1978). *The inner world: A psycho-analytic study of childhood and society in India.* New Delhi: Oxford University Press.

Leary, M.R. (2004). *The curse of self*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Leary, M.R.(2007). Motivational and emotional aspects of the self. *Annual Review of Psychology, 58*, 317-344.

Markus, H.R., &Kitayama, S. (1991) Cultural and the self: Implications for cognition, emotion, and motivation. *Psychological Review, 98*, 224-253.

Mascolo, M.F., Misra, G. &Rapisardi, C.(2004) Individual and relational conceptions of self in India and the United States. *Culture and Developing Selves: BeyondDichotomization,* 104, 9-26.

Misra, G. (2001). Culture and self: Implications for psychological inquiry. *Journal of Indian Psychology,* 19(1&2), 1-20.

Misra, G. (2010). The cultural construction of self and emotions: Implications for well-being. In R. Schwarzer & P. A. Frensch (Eds.) *Personality, human development and culture; International perspective on psychological science* (pp.95-111). Hove & New York; Psychology Press.

Misra, G., &Giri, R. (1995). Is the Indian Self predominantly interdependent? *Journal of Indian Psychology*, 11*,* 15-19.

Paranjpe, A.C. (1998). *Self and identity in modern psychology and Indian thought.*New York: Plenum.

Roland, A. (1988). *In Search of self in India and Japan: Towards cross-cultural psychology*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Sampson, E.E. (1988). The debate on individualism: Indigenous psychologies of the individual and their role in personal and social functioning. *American Psychologist, 43*, 15-22.

Shweder, R.A., &Bourne, F. (1984). Does the concept of the person vary cross-culturally? In R.A. Shweder& R.A. Levine (Eds.), *Culture theory: Essays on mind self and emotion*, (pp. 158-199). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Sinha, D., & Naidu, R. K. (1994). Multilayered hierarchical structure of self and not self: The Indian perspective. In A.M. Bouvy, F.J.R. van de vijver, P. Voski, & P. Schmitz (Eds.) *Journey in to cross-cultural psychology* (pp.41-49). Lisse: Swets&Zeitlinger.

Triandis, H.C. (1989). The self and social behavior in differing cultural contexts. *Psychological Review*, 96, 506-520.

✦