Viewpoint

Rethinking Wellness and Illness: two independent paradigms

Amresh Shrivastava[1], Avinash De Sousa[2]

[1]Department of Psychiatry, Western Unversity, London, Ontario and Mansik Shakti Foundation, India.
[2]Consultant Psychiatrist and Founder Trustee, Desousa Foundation, Mumbai.
Corresponding author: Avinash De Sousa
Email – avinashdes888@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Wellness is increasingly emphasized as a central goal of mental health care, yet it remains conceptually ambiguous and frequently conflated with the absence of illness. Dominant models in psychiatry implicitly assume that illness and wellness lie on a single continuum, such that symptom reduction necessarily implies movement toward wellness. However, converging evidence from epidemiology, clinical psychiatry, neuroscience, and intervention research challenges this assumption. Individuals with active or chronic psychiatric illness may demonstrate high levels of functioning, meaning, and quality of life, while individuals without diagnosable illness may experience poor well-being and elevated future risk. This paper argues that illness and wellness represent two distinct, though interacting, psychological dimensions rather than opposite ends of a single spectrum. Wellness is conceptualized as adaptive capacity, a dynamic consortium of psychological virtues that modulate functioning, risk, and recovery across health states. We review empirical evidence supporting this dual-dimension framework, examine its clinical and conceptual advantages over continuum models, and outline implications for assessment, treatment, and future research. Recognizing illness and wellness as distinct constructs provides a more accurate, humane, and clinically useful foundation for mental health science and practice.
Keywords wellness, illness, psychiatry, mental health.

(Paper received – 3rd September 2025, Peer review completed – 10th October 2025, Accepted – 18th October 2025)

INTRODUCTION

Wellness has become a central construct in contemporary psychology, psychiatry, public health, and education, yet it remains poorly defined and inconsistently operationalized. Despite its widespread invocation as a desired outcome of mental health care, there is limited consensus regarding what constitutes wellness, how it differs from health, or how it should be assessed and promoted [1]. Traditional psychiatric frameworks have largely defined wellness implicitly as the absence of illness, if symptom remission or freedom from diagnosable disorder equates to psychological well-being. Accumulating empirical and clinical evidence increasingly challenges this assumption.

Conceptually, wellness may be understood as higher-order human functioning characterized by emotional regulation, psychological resilience, meaningful engagement with life, ethical orientation, and social connectedness. Importantly, wellness is not synonymous with happiness, pleasure, or the absence of distress. Rather, it reflects the quality of adaptive functioning in the presence of internal vulnerability and external demand. Individuals may experience illness, loss, or adversity while maintaining purpose, agency, and functional balance, core features of wellness that are not captured by symptom-based models of mental health.

Early efforts to move beyond disease-centered thinking, most notably the WHO's definition of health as "complete physical, mental, and social well-being," marked an important conceptual shift [2]. However, subsequent research has demonstrated that such "complete" wellness is rare, unstable, and biologically unrealistic. Human biological and psychological systems are inherently dynamic, fluctuating across time,

context, and developmental stage [3]. Consequently, wellness cannot be meaningfully conceptualized as a fixed endpoint.

These observations expose a fundamental limitation of the illness–wellness continuum model, which assumes that illness and wellness lie on opposite ends of a single linear spectrum. According to this view, movement away from illness necessarily implies movement toward wellness. Population-based and clinical studies repeatedly contradict this assumption. Individuals without diagnosable illness frequently report emotional distress, impaired functioning, and lack of meaning, while individuals living with chronic psychiatric or medical conditions may demonstrate resilience, purpose, and high quality of life [1,4]. Such findings cannot be explained if illness and wellness are treated as inverse expressions of the same construct.

The Illness–Wellness Continuum Model: Conceptual Limits

The continuum model has intuitive appeal and has shaped psychiatric practice, outcome measurement, and public health messaging for decades. Within this framework, improvement in symptoms is assumed to correspond to movement toward wellness, and recovery is equated with the attainment of well-being. Longitudinal studies showing functional improvement following episodes of depression, anxiety, psychosis, or substance use are often interpreted as linear progression from illness to wellness.

However, this interpretation conflicts with the presence of wellness and fails to account for the multidimensional nature of well-being. Diagnostic systems such as DSM and ICD operationalize illness through symptom clusters, duration, and impairment. While these systems have improved diagnostic reliability and treatment development, they have reinforced a disease-centered model in which mental health is implicitly defined as the absence of diagnosable pathology.

Empirical evidence consistently demonstrates that symptom remission does not reliably predict quality of life, social functioning, or subjective well-being [1]. Many individuals who meet criteria for remission continue to experience loneliness, lack of purpose, and impaired role functioning. Conversely, individuals with persistent symptoms may report meaningful relationships, engagement, and acceptable quality of life. These dissociations undermine the assumption that illness and wellness are opposites.

The limitations of the continuum model are particularly evident in chronic and recurrent conditions such as schizophrenia, bipolar disorder, and major depressive disorder. Long-term outcome studies show substantial heterogeneity in functioning and quality of life that is only weakly related to symptom severity [5]. Such variability points to determinants beyond symptom burden alone.

Empirical Evidence for Dual Constructs

Population-Level Evidence

Keyes' dual-continuum model provides the strongest empirical support for distinguishing illness and wellness as separate constructs. Using large epidemiological samples, Keyes demonstrated that mental illness and positive mental health are correlated but independent dimensions [1]. Individuals may be classified as flourishing, languishing, or moderately mentally healthy regardless of diagnostic status.

Notably, many individuals without diagnosable illness were classified as languishing, while a meaningful subset of individuals with mental illness met criteria for flourishing. Flourishing predicted lower mortality, reduced healthcare utilization, and better psychosocial outcomes independent of illness status [1].

Clinical Evidence

Clinical psychiatry consistently observes that symptom status does not predict wellness. Patients with persistent mood or psychotic symptoms may demonstrate resilience, meaning, and social engagement, while asymptomatic individuals may remain functionally impaired or existentially distressed [4-5].

Longitudinal and Risk Evidence

Risk trajectories further undermine continuum assumptions. Vulnerability to psychopathology may increase during periods of apparent wellness due to latent processes such as stress-system dysregulation, sleep disturbance, or emotional rigidity [3,6]. Conversely, individuals with established illness may reduce future risk through strong coping, insight, and meaning making despite persistent symptoms [4].

Neurobiological Evidence

Neuroscience and psychoneuroimmunology show that symptom reduction and well-being enhancement involve overlapping but non-identical systems. Pharmacological treatments may reduce negative affect without restoring reward processing, motivation, or social engagement, core components of wellness [7]. Stress physiology research similarly distinguishes pathways of pathology from pathways of resilience and recovery [3].

Intervention Evidence

Positive psychology and positive psychiatry interventions reliably enhance well-being, resilience, and functioning even when symptom change is modest, demonstrating that wellness is a separable therapeutic target [8].

Proposal: Illness and Wellness as Two Distinct Dimensions

Collectively, evidence supports a dual-dimension model in which illness and wellness are distinct but interacting with psychological constructs. Illness reflects dysfunction, dysregulation, and pathology. Wellness reflects adaptive capacity, the ability to regulate emotions, sustain relationships, derive meaning, and function effectively despite stress or illness [1,5].

Within this framework, individuals may experience any combination of illness and wellness. This model accommodates the coexistence of symptoms and high functioning, as well as vulnerability in the absence of illness.

Wellness as Adaptive Capacity

Wellness is not a unitary trait but a consortium of psychological capacities, including emotional regulation, psychological flexibility, resilience, social connectedness, and purpose in life. These capacities vary independently and are modified. No individual is always ever "fully well" across all domains [1].

Evidence demonstrates that emotional regulation predicts relapse risk and functioning independent of symptom severity [8-9]. Psychological flexibility predicts outcomes across chronic illness and psychiatric disorders [10]. Purpose in life predicts reduced mortality and better coping even after controlling for health status [11].

Clinical Implications

This framework shifts clinical focus from categorizing individuals as "ill" or "well" to assessing profiles of illness and wellness. It supports parallel goals: reducing pathology while strengthening adaptive capacities. This approach is especially relevant in chronic conditions, reduces stigma, validates patient experience, and aligns care with outcomes that matter to individuals.

CONCLUSION

Illness and wellness cannot be adequately understood as opposite ends of a single continuum. Evidence from population studies, clinical outcomes, longitudinal risk, neuroscience, and intervention research converges on a clear conclusion: illness and wellness are distinct, partially independent dimensions of mental health. Recognizing this distinction provides a more accurate scientific framework and a more humane foundation for prevention, recovery-oriented care, and wellness optimization.

REFERENCES

1. Keyes CLM. The mental health continuum: From languishing to flourishing in life. J Health Soc Behav 2002; 43(2):207–22.
2. World Health Organization. Constitution of the World Health Organization. WHO:Geneva; 1948.
3. McEwen BS. Physiology and neurobiology of stress and adaptation: Central role of the brain. Physiol Rev 2006;87(3):873–904.

4. Bonanno GA. Loss, trauma, and human resilience: Have we underestimated the human capacity to thrive after extremely aversive events? Amer Psychologist 2004;59(1):20–8.
5. Jeste DV, Palmer BW, Rettew DC, Boardman S. Positive psychiatry: Its time has come. J Clin Psychiatry 2005;76(6):675–83.
6. Insel TR. The NIMH Research Domain Criteria (RDoC) project: Precision medicine for psychiatry. World Psychiatry 2014;13(1):28–35.
7. Gross JJ, John OP. Individual differences in two emotion regulation processes: Implications for affect, relationships, and well-being. J Personal Soc Psychol 2003;85(2):348–62.
8. Hayes SC, Villatte M, Levin M, Hildebrandt M. Open, aware, and active: Contextual approaches as an emerging trend in the behavioral and cognitive therapies. Behav Ther 2011;42(4):676–88.
9. Slavich GM, Irwin MR. From stress to inflammation and major depressive disorder: A social signal transduction theory of depression. Psychol Bull 2014;140(3):774–815.
10. Aldao A, Nolen-Hoeksema S, Schweizer S. Emotion-regulation strategies across psychopathology: A meta-analytic review. Clin Psychol Rev 2010;30(2):217–37.
11. Hill PL, Turiano NA. Purpose in life as a predictor of mortality across adulthood. Psychol Sci 2011;25(7): 1482–6.

****

Acknowledgements – Nil
Conflict of Interest – Nil
Funding – Nil