



CENTRO DE INVESTIGACIONES
DE TRABAJO SOCIAL

ISSN 2244-808X
DL pp 201002Z43506

PERSPECTIVA ACCIÓN Y

Revista de Trabajo Social

Vol. 16 No. 3

Septiembre - Diciembre

2026

Universidad del Zulia

Facultad de Ciencias Jurídicas y Políticas
Centro de Investigaciones en Trabajo Social

INTERACCIÓN Y PERSPECTIVA

Revista de Trabajo Social

ISSN 2244-808X ~ Dep. Legal pp 201002Z43506

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.21170728>

Vol. 16 (3): 1043 - 1057 pp, 2026

ARTÍCULO DE INVESTIGACIÓN

La autenticidad como indicador del bienestar profesional

Elena Voitenko¹, Vasyl Osodlo², Viktoriia Staryk³,
Kateryna Kushnirenko⁴, Nataliia Boiko⁵

¹PhD in psychology, associate professor, Department of Psychology, State University of Trade and Economics, Kyiv, Ukraine (Corresponding author).

E-mail: helenmail73@ukr.net; ORCID ID: <https://0000-0002-9407-4574>

²Doctor of Psychological Sciences, Professor, Department of Psychology, State University of Trade and Economics, Kyiv, Ukraine.

E-mail: v.osodlo@knute.edu.ua; ORCID ID: <https://0000-0003-2893-4721>

³PhD in psychology, associate professor, Department of Psychology, State University of Trade and Economics, Kyiv, Ukraine.

E-mail: v.staryk@knute.edu.ua; ORCID ID: <https://0000-0001-5193-6034>

⁴PhD in psychology, associate professor, Department of Psychology, State University of Trade and Economics, Kyiv, Ukraine.

E-mail: k.kushnirenko@knute.edu.ua; ORCID ID: <https://0000-0003-3922-0388>

⁵PhD in psychology, associate professor, Department of Psychology, State University of Trade and Economics, Kyiv, Ukraine.

E-mail: n.boiko@knute.edu.ua; ORCID ID: <https://0000-0002-8673-9476>

Resumen. El estudio examina el papel de la autenticidad como factor psicológico que contribuye al bienestar de los empleados. El objetivo fue investigar empíricamente la presencia y la naturaleza de la relación entre la autenticidad personal y el bienestar profesional dentro de un marco motivacional y basado en valores, que conceptualiza el bienestar como un estado evaluativo integrado, determinado por el grado en que las necesidades y los valores de un individuo se satisfacen en su actividad profesional. La muestra estuvo compuesta por 167 docentes universitarios. Se empleó un diseño transversal utilizando la Encuesta de Satisfacción Laboral de Spector y la Escala de Autenticidad desarrollada por Alex Wood y colaboradores, que evalúa la autoalienación, la autenticidad en la vida y la aceptación de la influencia externa. Los hallazgos confirmaron la relación entre autenticidad y bienestar profesional; sin embargo, su intensidad y características varían según las distintas dimensiones de la autenticidad. En particular, se identificó la autoalienación como un factor significativo

que socava el bienestar. La autenticidad en la vida parece funcionar como un recurso personal general que apoya el bienestar individual, aunque no proporciona una base clara para diferenciar grupos según sus niveles de bienestar. No se encontró que la influencia social externa desempeñara un papel decisivo, especialmente en el contexto educativo. Estos resultados amplían la comprensión actual de los mecanismos psicológicos subyacentes al bienestar de los empleados y ofrecen nuevas perspectivas para su promoción y la prevención de su deterioro.

Palabras clave: autenticidad, bienestar profesional, satisfacción laboral, modelo de valor motivacional, profesores universitarios.

Authenticity as a predictor of professional well-being

Abstract. The study examines the role of authenticity as a psychological factor contributing to employee well-being. The aim was to empirically investigate the presence and nature of the relationship between personal authenticity and professional well-being within a motivational and value-based framework, which conceptualizes well-being as an integrated evaluative state shaped by the extent to which an individual's needs and values are fulfilled in their professional activity. The sample consisted of 167 university teachers. A cross-sectional design was employed using the Spector Job Satisfaction Survey and the Authenticity Scale developed by Alex Wood and colleagues, which assesses self-alienation, authentic living, and acceptance of external influence. The findings confirmed the relationship between authenticity and professional well-being; however, its strength and characteristics vary across different dimensions of authenticity. In particular, self-alienation was identified as a significant factor undermining well-being. Authentic living appears to function as a general personal resource supporting individual well-being, although it does not provide a clear basis for distinguishing groups by well-being levels. External social influence was not found to play a decisive role, especially in the educational context. These results expand current understanding of the psychological mechanisms underlying employee well-being and offer new directions for its promotion and the prevention of its decline.

Key words: authenticity, professional well being, job satisfaction, motivational-value model, university teachers.

INTRODUCTION

In the context of constant changes in organizational technologies, work intensification, and employment instability – which pose serious challenges for modern employees – the issue of professional wellbeing is becoming increasingly important. As the work environment continues to transform, researchers worldwide report an alarming rise in occupational stress levels (Pace et al., 2019; Hermansyah et al., 2023), high rates of burnout and depression (Conceição & Palma-Moreira, 2025), and decreased motivation and staff turnover resulting from unstable working conditions and work overload (Souisa et al., 2025). These trends underscore the urgent need to identify an optimal model of professional activity that would create conditions conducive to maintaining employees' professional wellbeing.

While various aspects of professional wellbeing are predominantly explained through organizational factors (Voitenko, 2022), dispositional personality characteristics – despite their potential contribution to shaping wellbeing – remain insufficiently explored. It is well established that certain personal traits can enhance work efficiency, influence goal achievement, and partially determine interindividual differences in performance among employees (Batsylyeva & Hresko, 2019; Singh et al., 2019). However, there is currently no comprehensive theoretical model that systematically describes how specific individual characteristics affect the level of professional wellbeing.

According to the motivational value model proposed by Voitenko et al. (2024), professional wellbeing is an integrated evaluative state that depends on the realization of individual needs, values, and meanings. Within this framework, identifying variables that influence an individual's ability to actualize their own aspirations helps elucidate the mechanisms through which professional wellbeing can be sustained. In this context, authenticity emerges as a potentially influential factor, given that authentic individuals tend to act in accordance with their personal interests and values (Zheng et al., 2020). The purpose of this study was to empirically examine the presence and nature of the relationship between personal authenticity and employees' professional wellbeing within the motivational value model.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Authenticity as a psychological construct

Authenticity is commonly understood as the tendency to draw upon one's personal experiences – considering thoughts, emotions, needs, desires, preferences, and beliefs – and to act in accordance with one's true self, expressing oneself in ways that align with inner experiences (Nicolotti & Magrin, 2021). According to self-determination theory, individuals behave authentically when their actions reflect their true selves, meaning that they are autonomous and self-determined (Ryan & Deci, 2017). Consistent with these perspectives, Van den Bosch and Taris (2018) define authenticity as the unobstructed expression and operation of one's true self in everyday activities.

Modern psychological conceptions of authenticity are deeply rooted in philosophical thought, beginning with the works of ancient Greek philosophers. Aristotle, in particular, viewed the “highest good” as the activity of the soul in accordance with the best and most complete virtues throughout a full life (Aristotle, 2002). D. Hume considered authentic behavior to be reflected in specific actions that express a person's values (Wilson, 2003). Such actions are closely associated with individuals' eudaimonic wellbeing (Ménard & Brunet, 2011). From this perspective, wellbeing is achieved through self-realization – that is, through engaging in activities that reflect one's true calling. The ultimate goal of such activity is a sense of fulfillment that emerges from living a life in which a person can fully actualize oneself.

There are several empirical approaches to understanding authenticity: as a construct shaped by culture and immediate social context, and as a variable describing stable individual differences. Considering authenticity as a property of social interactions (Ryan & Ryan, 2019) opens up

the possibility for organizations to influence employees' level of authenticity, given its potential significance for their professional wellbeing. Within this perspective, authenticity is conceptualized as a dynamic process shaped by social interactions, cultural values, and historical narratives (Kapusta, 2025).

Understanding authenticity as a dispositional trait helps explain individual differences in behaviors that align with core personality characteristics, as well as differences in people's ability to remain true to themselves across various situations (Sutton, 2020; Wood et al., 2008). Humanistic and existential approaches have emphasized that such individual differences in authenticity are critically important for understanding wellbeing as a holistic phenomenon and for conceptualizing freedom from psychopathology (Hjelle & Ziegler, 1992). Contemporary psychology provides substantial empirical support for these theoretical propositions (Sutton, 2020). Research shows that individuals who subordinate their own needs to maintain close relationships and who accept external influences to avoid confrontation tend to feel subjectively inauthentic and report lower levels of self-esteem, alongside higher levels of depressive symptoms (Neff & Harter, 2002). It is therefore reasonable to assume that the more consistently people remain true to their core values, identity, aspirations, and emotions, the higher their overall wellbeing is likely to be. Conversely, promoting values or expressing emotions that contradict one's internal states typically requires greater psychological effort than acting in ways aligned with one's genuine beliefs and sense of self (Humphrey et al., 2015). Consequently, authenticity can be viewed as one of the key variables in explaining individual wellbeing. Direct examinations of several theoretical models that conceptualize dispositional authenticity as an integral component of psychological wellbeing have confirmed its strong associations with self-esteem and multiple dimensions of psychological wellbeing (Rivera et al., 2019; Zheng et al., 2020).

Authenticity and professional well-being

Research has shown that authenticity is associated with various positive work-related outcomes, including higher job performance and job satisfaction (Van den Bosch & Taris, 2014), as well as increased organizational commitment and reduced turnover intentions (Cable et al., 2013). Numerous studies have demonstrated links between workplace authenticity and employee wellbeing across different organizational contexts. For instance, authentic leadership has been found to counteract dysfunctional leadership tendencies and help restore subordinates' trust in their leaders (Weiss et al., 2018). Additionally, suppressing emotions in interactive work settings has been shown to increase feelings of inauthenticity and emotional burnout (Erickson & Ritter, 2001). Inauthenticity appears to be particularly predictive of negative outcomes among employees who are strongly identified with their work roles (Sloan, 2007). According to egodepletion theory (Baumeister et al., 1998), the need to pretend, exaggerate, or suppress aspects of oneself requires significant psychological effort and negatively affects employee wellbeing by increasing stress levels and reducing work engagement. Moreover, employees' sense of authenticity tends to decrease when role demands and communication patterns restrict, devalue, or compromise openness, or when they involve threats of interpersonal conflict (Reis et al., 2016).

Overall, research findings indicate that authenticity has positive consequences for multiple aspects of professional functioning and may be a key factor in building healthy and sustainable work organizations. However, no existing model fully captures its specific influence on the level of professional wellbeing. According to the motivational–value model of occupational wellbeing, various factors contribute to employee wellbeing insofar as they support an individual’s ability to realize personal aspirations. Within this framework, authenticity – as the capacity to be aware of one’s needs, desires, preferences, beliefs, and to act in accordance with one’s true self – may meaningfully enhance professional wellbeing by enabling individuals to pursue work that aligns with their inner values and identity. Our study will contribute to the general theory of occupational wellbeing by providing an empirical examination of the theoretical explanations of how dispositional authenticity is related to employee wellbeing. We conceptualize authenticity as a multidimensional construct measured, according to the threecomponent model proposed by Wood et al. (2008), through the following indicators: selfalienation (the extent to which an individual experiences a sense of disconnection from their true self); authentic living (the degree to which a person’s behavior is aligned with their values, beliefs, and feelings); and accepting external influence (the extent to which an individual allows external expectations to shape their behavior). The research program is structured around the following hypotheses:

H1: Professional wellbeing is positively associated with authentic living.

H2: Professional wellbeing is negatively associated with accepting external influence.

H3: Professional wellbeing is negatively associated with selfalienation.

METHODS

To achieve the aim of the study, a cross-sectional design was employed using the Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS) by Paul Spector (Spector, 2022) and the Authenticity Scale (AS) developed by Alex Wood and colleagues (Wood et al., 2008).

The Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS) developed by Paul Spector measures an employee’s attitudes toward their job across nine dimensions: pay, recognition (monetary and nonmonetary rewards for work achievements), coworkers (satisfaction with colleagues), working conditions (internal regulations and bureaucratic barriers), supervision (immediate supervisor), fringe benefits, promotion (opportunities for career advancement), the nature of work (content of the tasks performed), and communication (availability of information on workrelated and general issues). It also provides an assessment of overall job satisfaction within the organization. Each aspect is rated on four points, and a total score is calculated from all points. A summative rating scale format is used with six response options for each item ranging from “strongly disagree” to “strongly agree”. Although the Job Satisfaction Survey was originally developed by its author for use in the service sector, it is suitable for a wide range of organizational types. The author presents high internal consistency reliability indicators for the scale, based on a sample of 2870 individuals (Spector, 2022).

To assess authenticity, the Authenticity Scale (AS) developed by Alex Wood and his colleagues (Wood et al., 2008) was used. The scale consists of 12 items grouped into three subscales, each comprising four items: “Authentic Living”, which measures the extent to which a person aligns their behavior and emotions with their beliefs, values, and psychological state; “Accepting External Influence”, which assesses the respondent’s belief that they should conform to others’ expectations; and “SelfAlienation”, which evaluates how well an individual knows themselves, their values, and their beliefs. Respondents are asked to provide a subjective assessment of how well each item describes them personally, on a scale from 1 (“not at all like me”) to 7 (“very much like me”). The psychometric quality of the Authenticity Scale has been examined and confirmed by several researchers from different countries (Grijak, 2017; Wood et al., 2008), which, combined with its concise format and ease of use, makes this diagnostic tool highly in demand in contemporary scientific research.

The selection of statistical tests for processing the research results was based on verifying whether the obtained data conformed to the normal distribution, using the Kolmogorov–Smirnov λ test. The results, along with the sufficiently large sample size ($n=167$), allowed for the use of parametric tests, namely: Student’s t test to assess differences between means obtained from two samples; Fisher’s F test to evaluate differences in variance; and oneway analysis of variance (ANOVA) to identify trends in the variation of the measured characteristic.

Respondents

A total of 167 university academic staff members participated in the survey on a voluntary basis. The survey was conducted online using the Google Forms platform. The most important sociodemographic characteristics of the respondents are presented in Table 1.

TABLE 1. General characteristics of the sample of study participants ($N=167$).

Age	N	%	Gender	N	%	Status	N	%
25-35	26	15,6	Male	48	28,7	Head of Department	6	3,6
36-45	54	32,3				Lecturer	26	15,6
46-55	48	28,7				Senior Lecturer	17	10,2
> 56	39	23,4	Female	119	71,3	Associate Professor	95	56,9
						Professor	23	13,8
Total	167	100		167	100		167	100

Source: compiled by the authors.

The representativeness of the sample was ensured through the selection procedure and the sufficiently large sample size, which meets the statistical requirements for quantitative research. The sample was formed on a voluntary basis, with equal participation opportunities provided to all members of the target population, and no participant had any advantage over others. The resulting sample was not affected by researcher bias and is statistically clean, consisting exclusively of university faculty members with no mixed professional backgrounds and no missing responses. This ensured the possibility of applying classical statistical methods without corrections. The sample includes participants of different genders and ages – from earlycareer lecturers to experienced professors – which reflects the typical age structure of the academic community.

The structure of the sample by job categories reflects the typical hierarchy of academic positions: lecturers, senior lecturers, associate professors, full professors, and administrative staff. The distribution of respondents by work experience corresponds to the range typically observed in academic institutions. Such structural diversity aligns with the statistically typical parameters of university personnel and further supports the representativeness of the sample.

RESULTS

To differentiate the participants and to transition from quantitative to qualitative indicators, the respondents were classified into three levels of professional well-being (high, medium, and low) based on the “Overall Job Satisfaction” scale of Paul Spector’s Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS). Since the author of the questionnaire provides only the mean values for the subscales and the overall scale (for $n = 3764$), the sample can be divided into groups with low, medium, and high levels of professional well-being based on the criterion of deviation from the mean by one standard deviation (σ). Thus, the medium level corresponds to the range $\mu \pm \sigma$ (Moskalov & Lysenko, 2023).

According to Paul Spector’s methodology, the normative value for academic employees is $\mu = 137.2 \pm 8.1$ (Spector, n.d.). Accordingly, in our study, a low level of professional well-being corresponds to scores ≤ 129 , a medium level to 130–144, and a high level to ≥ 145 . The quantitative distribution of respondents across these three levels is presented in Table 2.

TABLE 2. Descriptive statistics and correlations between study variables (N=167).

Variables	M	SD	S	K	Professional Well-Being			
					Total N=167	Low Level N=66	Medium Level N=39	High Level N=62
Professional Well-Being	136,8	24,1	,127	-,440	1			
Authentic Living	23,26	3,36	-,850	,802	,122	,081	,025	,299*
Accepting External Influence	11,11	4,28	,192	-,541	-,020	-,003	-,042	-,028
Self-Alienation	13,77	3,07	,722	,353	-,218*	-,293*	-,169	,072

Note: M – mean; SD – standard deviation; S – skewness; K – kurtosis;

** – correlation statistically significant at the 0.001 level (2-sided)

* – correlation statistically significant at the 0.05 level (2-sided)

Source: compiled by the authors.

To compare the manifestations of authenticity among respondents with different levels of professional well-being, Fisher’s analysis of variance (ANOVA) was applied (Table 3). The ANOVA statistics indicate significant differences between the groups in the indicator of self-alienation, which allows us to reject the null hypothesis. The analysis of variance did not reveal any differences in the indicators of authentic living ($F = 0.466$; $p > 0.05$) or acceptance of external influence ($F = 0.466$; $p > 0.05$) across the three levels of employees’ professional well-being.

TABLE 3. Differences in authenticity scores in groups with different levels of professional well-being.

Variables		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p
Authentic Living	Between Groups	10,574	2	5,287	,466	,628
	Within Groups	1861,354	164	11,350		
	Total	1871,928	166			
Accepting External Influence	Between Groups	92,174	2	46,087	2,563	,080
	Within Groups	2948,665	164	17,980		
	Total	3040,838	166			
Self-Alienation	Between Groups	82,475	2	41,237	4,553	,012
	Within Groups	1485,417	164	9,057		
	Total	1567,892	166			

Source: compiled by the authors.

To more clearly identify the changes in the manifestations of authenticity among respondents according to their level of professional wellbeing, a comparative analysis was conducted between two opposite groups selected from the overall sample. The first group consisted of respondents with a high level of professional well-being ($n_1=62$), while the second group ($n_2=66$) included respondents with a low level of professional well-being. Excluding the group with a medium level of professional well-being ($n=39$) made it possible to more clearly distinguish the differences, as the medium level tends to “blur” the results. To ensure a qualitative and comprehensive analysis, a parametric Student’s t-test for independent samples was used. The calculations were performed using the IBM SPSS Statistics 23.0 software package. Levene’s test indicates homogeneity of variance for all variables (Table 4).

TABLE 4. Differences in authenticity scores between employees with high and low levels of professional well-being.

Variables	Levene’s Test for Equality of Variances		t	df	p*	MD	SE	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
	F	p						Lower	Upper
Authentic Living	4,649	,033	-,817	126	,415	-,475	,581	-1,624	,675
Accepting External Influence	3,109	,080	,095	126	,924	,077	,808	-1,522	1,675
Self-Alienation	1,116	,293	2,295	126	,023	1,283	,559	,177	2,388

Note: * – 2-sided.

Source: compiled by the authors.

As shown in Table 4, the t-test revealed statistically significant differences in the indicator of selfalienation ($t=2.295$; $p<0.05$) between respondents with low and high levels of professional well-being. No statistically significant differences were found for authentic living ($t=-0.817$; $p>0.001$) or acceptance of external influence ($t=0.095$; $p>0.05$). The selfalienation indicator shows a substantial decrease in the mean value when comparing the groups with low and high levels of professional wellbeing (from 14.62 ± 3.36 to 13.34 ± 2.93) (Table 5).

TABLE 5. Descriptive statistics on authenticity indicators in groups with different levels of professional well-being (N=167).

Variables		N	M	SD	SE	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Min	Max
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Authentic Living	low	66	23,11	3,583	,441	22,23	23,99	16	28
	medium	39	23,00	3,635	,582	21,82	24,18	12	28
	high	62	23,58	2,934	,373	22,84	24,33	16	28
	total	167	23,26	3,358	,260	22,74	23,77	12	28
Accepting External Influence	low	66	11,56	4,915	,605	10,35	12,77	4	20
	medium	39	9,77	2,906	,465	8,83	10,71	4	14
	high	62	11,48	4,164	,529	10,43	12,54	4	21
	total	167	11,11	4,280	,331	10,46	11,77	4	21
Self-Alienation	low	66	14,62	3,364	,414	13,79	15,45	9	23
	medium	39	13,00	2,449	,392	12,21	13,79	9	18
	high	62	13,34	2,925	,371	12,60	14,08	8	20
	total	167	13,77	3,073	,238	13,30	14,24	8	23

Source: compiled by the authors.

DISCUSSION

The aim of this study was to empirically examine the presence and nature of the relationship between authenticity and employees' professional wellbeing within the framework of the motivationalvalue model (Voitenko et al., 2024). Correlation analysis revealed a moderate positive relationship between authentic living and professional well-being only in the group with a high level of professional wellbeing ($r=0.299$; $p<0.05$). This relationship is logical, given that authentic living helps maintain an employee's inner balance by supporting the fulfillment of their psychological needs. Authentic living, understood as the aspiration to be oneself and to live in accordance with one's values and beliefs (Zheng et al., 2020), enables employees to experience a sense of meaning in their work and to be more engaged in work processes, thereby enhancing intrinsic motivation. Living in alignment with one's own values frees employees from the need to expend energy on adapting to others' expectations (Humphrey et al., 2015), which reduces levels of stress and anxiety; it also allows them to express their needs openly and establish boun-

daries, facilitating communication. Conversely, discrepancies between organizational values and employees' personal values and beliefs hinder the satisfaction of their basic needs, including the need for belonging and autonomy (Ryan & Deci, 2017), and thus become an obstacle to achieving professional well-being.

The comparative analysis of respondents with low and high levels of professional wellbeing did not reveal statistically significant differences in the indicator of authentic living ($t=-0.817$; $p>0.001$). The low sensitivity of this indicator to differentiation by wellbeing level is likely explained by the fact that authentic living, as part of the personality structure, is a stable characteristic that develops over years and is associated with personality traits (Nicolotti & Magrin, 2021), selfawareness (Zheng et al., 2020), and intrinsic motivation (Ryan & Deci). Therefore, despite differences in the degree of authentic living, employees' level of professional wellbeing – being a more variable state determined primarily by contextual, organizational, and situational factors – does not differ statistically.

The absence of differences between the groups with low and high levels of professional wellbeing may also be related to the professional homogeneity of the sample. In such samples, participants tend to share similar value orientations, approaches to work, and styles of interaction, as the professional environment shapes them in comparable ways. Similar professional roles, standards, levels of autonomy, and responsibility reduce the likelihood of detecting statistical differences in authenticity-related characteristics.

No expected negative correlations between acceptance of external influence and professional wellbeing were found. Within the motivational-value model of employee professional wellbeing, the tendency to do what others expect does not necessarily facilitate the fulfillment of one's own needs and values, which we consider the key determinants of professional wellbeing (Voitenko et al., 2024). The absence of a linear relationship is likely explained by the fact that acceptance of external influence (the extent to which a person allows external expectations to shape their behavior) may represent an adaptive component within the concept of authenticity rather than an indicator of internal conflict. Previous research has shown that different components of authenticity play different roles, and acceptance of external influence is not inherently negative and does not equate to inauthenticity (Grijak, 2019). Instead, it is a neutral characteristic describing the degree to which a person is inclined to consider others' opinions, adapt to contextual demands, and remain sensitive to social norms. Modern scientific concepts view authenticity as a coherent process in which external advice, social norms, and cultural narratives can be integrated into one's identity without diminishing authenticity, provided they align with internal values (Dammann et al., 2021). It is emphasized that healthy consideration of external guidance does not constitute a loss of self (Nicolotti & Magrin, 2021). A person can remain fully authentic while being open to feedback, leadership, or team-based decisions. External influence becomes problematic only when it suppresses autonomy (Ryan & Deci, 2017).

The comparative analysis of respondents with low and high levels of professional wellbeing did not reveal statistically significant differences in the indicator of acceptance of external influence ($t=0.095$; $p>0.05$). The results obtained may be related to the professional context. In educational work, external requirements – such as standards that define the content, scope, and

learning outcomes – are structurally embedded in the professional activities of university instructors. This has been described as a systemic requirement of the profession (Singh, Allen, & Rowan, 2019) and is perceived by academic staff as a norm rather than a source of stress. Thus, acceptance of external influence is a variable that does not necessarily reflect internal inconsistency that could diminish professional wellbeing.

A weak negative correlation was identified between selfalienation and professional wellbeing ($r=-0.218$; $p<0.05$), along with a more pronounced negative correlation between these variables in the group of respondents with a low level of professional wellbeing ($r=-0.293$; $p<0.05$). Within the motivationalvalue model of professional wellbeing, this relationship is logically explained: the less an employee understands themselves and their workrelated experiences, the fewer opportunities they have to satisfy their own needs and, consequently, to achieve professional wellbeing. This result is consistent with previous research, which has repeatedly demonstrated that selfalienation is a risk factor for professional wellbeing (Van den Bosch & Tarris, 2018) and has a negative impact on both job performance and employee wellbeing (Vafeas et al., 2024).

The comparative analysis of respondents with low and high levels of professional wellbeing using the t-test revealed statistically significant differences in the indicator of selfalienation ($t=2.295$; $p<0.05$). A substantial decrease in the mean value of this indicator in the high wellbeing group compared to the low wellbeing group (from 14.62 ± 3.36 to 13.34 ± 2.93) confirms the importance of maintaining a connection with one's own needs and values for sustaining professional wellbeing. In the most wellknown empirical model (Wood et al., 2008), selfalienation is defined as a state in which an individual becomes detached from their own feelings, beliefs, needs, and values, essentially “living someone else's life” and acting according to external norms and expectations rather than internal orientations. It is an indicator of low authenticity that diminishes overall life satisfaction and engagement in everyday activities. Therefore, maintaining professional wellbeing is impossible without awareness of one's level of selfalienation. It is not merely a symptom but a structural component of the model of professional wellbeing, reflecting an internal mismatch between one's lived experience and personal aspirations.

CONCLUSIONS

According to the results of the study, authenticity was found to be related to employee wellbeing; however, this relationship is not uniform and does not exhibit the same strength across all of its dimensions. The findings demonstrate that professional wellbeing largely depends on an individual's internal coherence: the more authentic a person is and the less selfalienation they experience, the higher their level of professional wellbeing. External social influences, in contrast, do not play a determining role, particularly within the educational professional context.

The study confirmed that authentic living is statistically significantly and positively correlated with higher levels of professional wellbeing, indicating the role of internal coherence and alignment with personal values in shaping satisfaction with professional activity. However, the level of authentic living does not differentiate respondents with low and high levels of profes-

nal wellbeing. The absence of between-group differences suggests that authentic living may serve as a general resource that supports professional wellbeing at the individual level, but it is not a factor that determines structural distinctions between different levels of wellbeing.

The indicator of acceptance of external influence did not show any relationship with professional wellbeing. This finding suggests the neutral role of orientation toward social expectations as a factor of professional wellbeing, particularly within the educational professional environment. In contrast, self-alienation demonstrated negative correlations with professional wellbeing, especially pronounced among respondents with low wellbeing, indicating the detrimental impact of internal disconnection on job satisfaction. The between-group analysis showed that the self-alienation scores were significantly lower in the group with a high level of professional wellbeing compared to the group with a low level of wellbeing. This finding confirms the differential nature of self-alienation and its substantial role as a risk factor undermining professional wellbeing. Thus, a good understanding of oneself, awareness of one's work-related needs, and the aspiration to live in accordance with one's values and beliefs are clearly associated with higher professional wellbeing.

The identified features of the relationship between different aspects of authenticity and professional wellbeing expand current understanding of the psychological mechanisms underlying employee wellbeing and open new perspectives for preventing its deterioration. However, despite its academic contribution, the present study has certain limitations. Conducting the survey online made it impossible to fully ensure the voluntariness of participants' involvement, which may have led some respondents to provide formal or superficial answers, potentially affecting the results obtained.

A promising direction for future research is to examine whether the relationship between acceptance of external influence and employee wellbeing depends on the professional context.

CRedit authorship contribution statement

Elena Voitenko: Conceptualization, Investigation, Writing – original draft. **Vasyl Osodlo:** Supervision, Writing – review & editing. **Viktoriia Saryk:** Methodology, Writing – review & editing. **Kateryna Kushnirenko:** Data curation. **Nataliia Boiko:** Writing – review & editing.

BIBLIOGRAPHIC REFERENCES

- Aristotel (2002). *Nikomakhova etyka* [Nicomachean Ethics] / Per. z *davnobretskoi V. Stavniiuk*. Kyiv: «Akvilon-Plius» [In Ukrainian].
- Batsylyeva, O., & Hresko, I. (2019). Positive self-concept as a resource of a person's psychological health. *Psychological journal*, 5(11), 73–89. <https://doi.org/10.31108/1.2019.5.11.5>
- Baumeister, R. F., Bratslavsky, E., Muraven, M., & Tice, D. M. (1998). Ego depletion: is the active self a limited resource? *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 74(5), 1252–1265. <https://doi.org/10.1037//0022-3514.74.5.1252>
- Cable, D. M., Gino, F., & Staats, B. R. (2013). Breaking Them in or Eliciting Their Best? Reframing Socialization around Newcomers' Authentic Self-expression. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 58(1), 1–36. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0001839213477098>

- Conceição, A., & Palma-Moreira, A. (2025). The Relationship Between Occupational Stress, Burnout, and Perceived Performance: The Moderating Role of Work Regime. *Administrative Sciences*, 15(10), 377. <https://doi.org/10.3390/admsci15100377>
- Dammann O., Friederichs K.M., Lebedinski S. and Liesenfeld K.M. (2021) The Essence of Authenticity. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 11, 629654. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.629654>
- Erickson, R.J., & Ritter, C.S. (2001). Emotional labor, burnout, and inauthenticity: Does gender matter? *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 64, 146-163. <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:146964022>
- Grijak Đ. (2017) Psychometric evaluation of the Authenticity Scale on the sample of students in Serbia. *Psihologija*, 50(1), 85-99. <https://doi.org/10.2298/psi160504001g>
- Grijak, Đ. (2019). Authenticity and Its Adaptive and Maladaptive Relations. *Psychology and Behavioral Sciences*, 8(2), 33-37. <https://doi.org/10.11648/j.pbs.20190802.11>
- Hermansyah., Notosudjono, D., Yusnita. N. (2023). Determinant of Role Stressors on Job Stress and Counterproductive Work Behavior among Employee in Automotive Industry. *International Journal of Behavior Studies in Organizations*, 10, 18-28. <https://doi.org/10.32038/JBSO.2023.10.02>
- Hjelle, L., & Ziegler, D. (1992). Personality theories: Basic assumptions, research, and applications (3rd ed.). McGraw-Hill.
- Humphrey, R. H., Ashforth, B. E., and Diefendorff J. M. (2015). The bright side of emotional labor. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 36, 749–769. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2019>
- Kapusta, A. (2025). The role of authenticity in transformative experience. *Culture & Psychology*, 32(1), 156-184. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1354067X251340199>
- Ménard, J., & Brunet, L. (2011). Authenticity and well-being in the workplace: a mediation model. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 26, 331-346. <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:53354358>
- Moskalov I. O., Lysenko D. P. (2023). Zastosuvannia metodiv matematychnoi statystyky u psykholoho-pedahohichnykh doslidzhenniakh: navchalnyi posibnyk [Application of mathematical statistics methods in psychological and pedagogical research: a textbook]. Kyiv: NUOU.
- Neff, K.D., Harter, S. (2002). The Authenticity of Conflict Resolutions Among Adult Couples: Does Women's Other-Oriented Behavior Reflect Their True Selves? *Sex Roles*, 47, 403–417. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1021692109040>
- Nicolotti, M., Magrin, M.E. (2021). Authenticity: Psychological Perspectives and Operationalizations. In: F. Maggino, (Eds.) *Encyclopedia of Quality of Life and Well-Being Research*. Springer, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-69909-7_104669-1
- Pace, F., D'Urso, G., Zappulla, C., & Pace, U. (2019). The relation between workload and personal well-being among university professors. *Current Psychology*, 1-8. <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:164458824>
- Reis G, Trullen J, Story J (2016). Perceived organizational culture and engagement: the mediating role of authenticity. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 31(6), 1091–1105. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JMP-05-2015-0178>

- Rivera, G. N., Christy, A. G., Kim, J., Vess, M., Hicks, J. A., & Schlegel, R. J. (2019). Understanding the relationship between perceived authenticity and well-being. *Review of General Psychology*, 23(1), 113–126. <https://psycnet.apa.org/record/2019-24520-005>
- Ryan R., Deci E. (2017). *Self-Determination Theory: Basic Psychological Needs in Motivation, Development, and Wellness*. Guilford Press.
- Ryan, W. S., & Ryan, R. M. (2019). Toward a Social Psychology of Authenticity: Exploring Within-Person Variation in Autonomy, Congruence, and Genuineness Using Self-Determination Theory. *Review of General Psychology*, 23(1), 99-112. <https://doi.org/10.1037/gpr0000162>
- Singh, P., Allen, J., & Rowan, L. (2019). Quality teaching: standards, professionalism, practices. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*, 47(1), 1–4. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1359866X.2019.1557925>
- Singh, S. & Pradhan, R. & Panigrahy, N P & Jena, L. (2019). Self-efficacy and workplace well-being: Moderating role of sustainability practices. *Benchmarking An International Journal*, 26(6), 1692-1708. <https://doi.org/10.1108/BIJ-07-2018-0219>
- Sloan, M.M. (2007). The “Real Self” and Inauthenticity: The Importance of Self-Concept Anchorage for Emotional Experiences in the Workplace. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 70, 305-318. <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:145557925>
- Souisa, N., Macpal, S. J., & Biay, A. (2025). The Influence of Workload and Motivation on Employee Performance through Job Satisfaction. *Indonesian Journal Economic Review (IJER)*, 5(1), 23-32. <https://doi.org/10.59431/ijer.v5i1.509>
- Spector P. (2022). *Job satisfaction: From Assessment to Intervention*. New York City: Routledge.
- Spector, P. (n.d.). Job Satisfaction Survey norms. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*. <https://paulspector.com/assessments>
- Sutton A. (2020). Living the good life: A meta-analysis of authenticity, well-being and engagement. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 153, 109645. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2019.109645>
- Vafeas M., Little E. & Vafeas A. (2025). Mitigating work alienation: what can we learn from employee ownership? *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 36(1), 1-31. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2024.2439258>
- Van de Bosch R., Taris T. (2014). Authenticity at Work: Development and Validation of an Individual Authenticity Measure at Work. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 15, 1-18. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10902-013-9413-3>
- Van den Bosch R., and Taris T. (2018). Authenticity at Work: Its Relations with Worker Motivation and Well-being. *Frontiers in Communication*, 3, Article 21. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fcomm.2018.00021>
- Voitenko, E., Myronets, S., Osodlo, V., Pozdnyshev, Y., & Hordynia, N. (2022). The specifics of the perceptions of professional well-being by teachers of higher educational institutions in Ukraine. *Revista Conrado*, 18(88), 44-53. <https://conrado.ucf.edu.cu/index.php/conrado/article/view/2563>
- Voitenko, E., Zazymko, O., Myronets, S., Saryk, V., & Kushnirenko, K. (2024). The mediating role of values in the relationship between needs and professional well-being of uni-

- versity academic staff. *International Journal of Organizational Leadership*, 13(1), 102-116. <https://doi.org/10.33844/ijol.2024.60401>
- Weiss M., Razinskas S., Backmann J., & Hoegl M. (2018). Authentic leadership and leaders' mental well-being: An experience sampling study. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 29(2), 309-321. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2017.05.007>
 - Wilson, F. (2003). David Hume. Treatise of human nature (1740): A genial skepticism, an ethical naturalism. In J. Garcia, G. Reichberg, & B. Schumacher (Eds.), *The classics of western philosophy: A reader's guide* (pp. 291–308). Blackwell Publishing.
 - Wood, A. M., Linley, P. A., Maltby, J., Baliousis, M., & Joseph, S. (2008). The authentic personality: A theoretical and empirical conceptualization and the development of the Authenticity Scale. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 55(3), 385–399. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0167.55.3.385>
 - Zheng S., Sun S., Huang C., Zou Z. (2020). Authenticity and subjective well-being: The mediating role of mindfulness. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 84 (2), 103900. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2019.103900>