

SUBJECTIVE WELL-BEING OF BUSINESSMEN AND PROFESSIONALS IN TERMS OF THEIR PRO-SOCIAL BEHAVIOUR AND INCOME

Manish Kant¹, Dr Lav Kumar Singh², Dr Dhruv Kumar³

Abstract

The present study examined the relationship between the subjective well-being and prosocial behaviour of businessmen and professionals. The study also attempted to understand their income level in relation to their subjective well-being. 302 businessmen and professionals from different districts of Bihar, India, were selected using a purposive-cum-incident sampling method. The participants' subjective well-being was measured using the Satisfaction with Life Scale (SWLS) developed by Diener et al. (1985) and Ed Diener et al.'s (2009) Scale of Positive and Negative Experience (SPANE). Caprara et al. (2012) developed the Prosocial scale, which contains 16 items, was used to measure their prosocial behaviour. The study found a partial relationship between subjective well-being and prosocial behaviour. However, a strong effect of income level on subjective well-being was also observed.

Keywords: Businessmen, Professionals, Subjective well-being, Prosocial Behaviour, Income level

¹. Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology, VSJ College, Rajnagar, Madhubani.

². Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology, A.P.S.M. College, Barauni, Begusarai.

³. Professor and Head, University Department of Psychology, L.N.M.U. Darbhanga.

Introduction

Subjective well-being (SWB) is a comprehensive construct that encompasses an individual's cognitive and affective evaluations of their life, including their overall satisfaction, happiness, and sense of purpose. It is a multifaceted concept that takes into account both positive and negative emotions and reflects an individual's perception of their life.

In recent years, there has been an increasing interest in understanding the relationship between subjective well-being and prosocial behaviour, which refers to voluntary actions that benefit others. Prosocial behaviour can range from small acts of kindness, such as holding the door for someone, to more significant acts of altruism, such as donating to charity or volunteering in the community. Empirical evidence suggests that engaging in prosocial behaviour can lead to higher levels of subjective well-being across various age groups and cultural contexts. This effect may be due to the positive feelings that arise from helping others, the enhanced sense of purpose and meaning in life, and the social connections that are fostered through prosocial behaviour. Ultimately, the relationship between subjective well-being and prosocial behaviour is a complex and dynamic one, with each influencing the other in a bidirectional manner. Nevertheless, the findings suggest that engaging in prosocial behaviour may be a valuable tool for enhancing subjective well-being and improving the overall quality of life.

Several studies have explored the association between subjective well-being and prosocial behaviour in different populations. For instance, research has shown that elementary school students who engage in more prosocial behaviour tend to report greater levels of subjective well-being (Tian et al., 2015 & Chen et al., 2020). Similarly, Chinese adolescents who exhibit prosocial behaviour have been found to have higher levels of SWB (Yang et al., 2017). Undergraduate students at Delhi University have also been shown to experience greater SWB when they engage in more prosocial behaviour (Khanna et al., 2017). Furthermore, this relationship between prosocial behaviour and subjective well-being has been observed in diverse cultural contexts worldwide (Kushlev et al., 2022).

Even though businessmen and entrepreneurs are often associated with philanthropic activities and charitable giving, research on the connection between prosocial behaviour and subjective well-being in this group is limited. Hence, the present study has been focused on exploring the association between the prosocial behaviour of businessmen and their

subjective well-being. Accordingly, the study has been planned to answer the following research questions:

- A. Does the prosocial behaviour of businessmen have anything to do with their subjective well-being?
- B. Are there any link between the level of income and subjective well-being of the businessmen?

Methodology

Sample

The study was conducted on 302 businessmen and professionals from different districts of Bihar. The sample was selected through purposive-cum-incident sampling technique. They were personally contacted during their working hours. After getting their written consent to participate in the study, a questionnaire was handed over to them. This questionnaire contained a Satisfaction with Life Scale (SWLS), a Scale of Positive and Negative Experience (SPANE), a Prosocialness Scale for Adults and a personal data sheet. Details of the used tests are as follows:

1. Satisfaction with Life Scale (SWLS) – This scale was used to measure life satisfaction. Diener, Emmons, Larsen, and Griffin developed it in 1985. This scale has five items and very high reliability and validity.
2. Scale of Positive and Negative Experience (SPANE) - This scale was used to measure positive and negative feelings in life. Ed Diener and Robert Biswas-Diener developed it in January 2009. This scale has 12 items. For each item, select a number from 1 to 5, and indicate that number on your response sheet.

The above two scales were used together to measure subjective well-being.

3. Prosocialness Scale for Adults. It was used for measuring the prosocial behaviour of the participants. It has been developed by G.V. Caprara et al. and has 16 items.
4. Personal Data Questionnaire – A personal data questionnaire was used to collect other respondents' demographic details, e.g., age, sex, income level etc.

Statistical tools

Product moment correlation (r) was used in the study to measure the correlation between subjective well-being and prosocial behaviour. A t-ratio test was used to measure the effect of income level on their subjective well-being and prosocial behaviour.

Result and discussion

A Pearson correlation was calculated between the businessmen's subjective well-being and prosocial behaviour to answer the first research question. The first question was about the kind of relationship between the subjective well-being of businessmen and their prosocial behaviour. Table 1 contains the resulting data.

Table 1: Correlation between subjective well-being and prosocial behaviour

Subjective Well-being		Prosocial Behaviour
Positive Affect	Pearson Correlation	.204**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	302
Negative Affect	Pearson Correlation	.057
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.324
	N	302
Affective Balance	Pearson Correlation	.102
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.076
	N	302
Life Satisfaction	Pearson Correlation	.076
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.186
	N	302
**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).		

The above table shows correlation between subjective well-being and prosocial behaviour of the businessmen. The subjective well-being has been measured by its affective as well as cognitive/life satisfaction component. The affective component of subjective well-being consists of positive affect,

negative affect, and affective balance. As per the correlation table, 0.204, 0.057, 0.102 and 0.076 are the correlation coefficients between prosocial behaviour and positive affect, negative affect, affective balance & life satisfaction respectively. However, the only one association between prosocial behaviour and positive affect (among affective components of subjective well-being) found to be statistically significant. The relationship is significant at 0.01 level. This means that as the level of positive affect enhances/lowers, the level of prosocial behaviour of businessmen also increases/decreases in the same direction or vice-versa. This finding about the positive relationship between subjective well-being and prosocial behaviour has been supported by the result reported by Tian et al., 2015 & Chen et al., 2020.

To find out the second question of this study, t-ratios have been calculated for measuring the effect of level of income on the subjective well-being of the participants. For this purpose, respondents have been divided into three categories based on their level of income: low income group, medium income group and high income group. Thereafter, three t-ratios have been measured. The first t-ratio has been calculated for measuring the significance of difference between low-income group and medium-income group on account of their subjective well-being score. Whereas, the second t-ratio was assessed for measuring the significance of difference between low-income group and high-income group on account of their subjective well-being score. Finally, the third t-ratio was used for measuring the significance of difference between medium-income group and high-income group on account of their subjective well-being score. Tables 2, 3 and 4 recorded the above findings.

Table 2: t-ratio Showing Difference between low- and medium-Income group of respondents on Subjective Well-being

Group Statistics								
	Income	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	T	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Life Satisfaction	Low	173	24.6358	4.55334	.34618	1.142	282	.254
	Medium	111	25.2883	4.91452	.46647			
Positive Affect	Low	173	21.3873	4.74284	.36059	.225	282	.822
	Medium	111	21.5135	4.41045	.41862			

Negative Affect	Low	173	14.8786	3.44766	.26212	1.303	282	.194
	Medium	111	15.4144	3.27655	.31100			
Affective Balance	Low	173	6.5087	6.41910	.48804	.208	282	.835
	Medium	111	6.3423	6.81508	.64686			

The above table shows that the t-ratio for the mean difference between low and medium-income groups are 1.142, 2.225, 1.303 and 0.208 for life satisfaction, positive affect, negative affect and affective balance respectively. It is clear from the above table that no mean difference between low and medium-income groups is significant. This reveals that there is no difference between the low-income group and the medium-income group on account of their subjective well-being. In other words, the subjective well-being of the businessmen does not differ on the basis of low and medium-income groups.

Table 3: t-ratio, Showing the difference between low- and high-income groups of respondents on Subjective Well-being

Group Statistics						t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
	Income	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean			
Life Satisfaction	Low	173	24.6358	4.55334	.34618	-3.838	189	.000
	High	18	29.0625	2.26477	.56619			
Positive Affect	Low	173	21.3873	4.74284	.36059	-2.458	189	.015
	High	18	24.3125	.79320	.19830			
Negative Affect	Low	173	14.8786	3.44766	.26212	1.049	189	.296
	High	18	13.9375	3.27554	.81889			
Affective Balance	Low	173	6.5087	6.41910	.48804	-2.372	189	.019
	High	18	10.3750	3.55668	.88917			

It is clear from the above table 3 that the mean values of the low-income group are 24.64, 21.39, 14.88 and 6.51 for life satisfaction, positive affect, negative affect and affective balance, respectively. Whereas 29.06, 24.31, 13.94 and 10.38 are the means of the high-income group for life satisfaction, positive affect, negative affect and affective balance, respectively. It shows that the mean values of high-income groups are more than low-income groups for life satisfaction, positive affect and affective balance. The mean

value of the lower-income group was more than that of the high-income group only in case of negative effects. The table shows that the t-ratio for the mean difference between low and high-income groups are 3.838, 2.458, 1.049 and 2.372 for life satisfaction, positive affect, negative affect and affective balance respectively. It is clear from the above table that all mean differences between low and high-income groups are statistically significant except on account of negative effect. This reveals that there is a significant difference between the low-income group and the high-income group on account of their subjective well-being. In other words, the subjective well-being of businessmen differs on the basis of low and high-income groups. Diener et al. (1993), Cummins (2000), and Sacks et al. (2012) have observed similar results.

Table 4: t-ratio Showing the Difference between medium and high-income group of respondents on Subjective Well-being

Group Statistics								
	Income	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Life Satisfaction	Medium	111	25.2883	4.91452	.46647	3.018	125	.003
	High	16	29.0625	2.26477	.56619			
Positive Affect	Medium	111	21.5135	4.41045	.41862	2.524	125	.013
	High	16	24.3125	.79320	.19830			
Negative Affect	Medium	111	15.4144	3.27655	.31100	1.686	125	.094
	High	16	13.9375	3.27554	.81889			
Affective Balance	Medium	111	6.3423	6.81508	.64686	2.316	125	.022
	High	16	10.3750	3.55668	.88917			

It is clear from Table 4 above that the mean values of the high-income group are 29.06, 24.31, 13.94 and 10.38 for life satisfaction, positive affect, negative affect and affective balance, respectively. Whereas 25.29, 21.51, 15.41 and 6.34 are the medium income group for life satisfaction, positive affect, negative affect and affective balance, respectively. It shows that the mean values of high-income groups are more than medium-income groups for life satisfaction, positive affect and affective balance. The mean value of the income group was more than the income group only in case of negative effects. The table shows that the t-ratio for the mean difference between

medium and high-income groups are 3.018, 2.524, 1.686 and 2.316 for life satisfaction, positive affect, negative affect and affective balance respectively. It is clear from the above table that all mean differences between medium and high-income groups are statistically significant except on account of negative effects. This reveals that there is a significant difference between the income group and the high-income group on account of their subjective well-being. In other words, the subjective well-being of businessmen differs on the basis of the medium and high-income groups.

Conclusion

It was explicitly found that the prosocial behaviour of the businessmen was significantly associated with only a positive effect of the subjective well-being component. In other words, the subjective well-being of the businessmen and their prosocial behaviour were correlated with each other at a very superficial level. As far as the effect of the level of income on subjective well-being is concerned, subjective well-being was found to be significantly affected by the level of income. Medium and high levels of income strongly affected the level of subjective well-being of the businessmen. However, the low-income group was devoid of such an impact on the subjective well-being of the respondents.

References

- Caprara, G. V., Alessandri, G., & Eisenberg, N. (2012). Prosociality: the contribution of traits, values, and self-efficacy beliefs. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 102(6), 1289.
- Chen, X., Tian, L., & Huebner, E. S. (2020, February). Bidirectional relations between subjective well-being in school and prosocial behavior among elementary school-aged children: A longitudinal study. In *Child & Youth Care Forum* (Vol. 49, pp. 77-95). Springer US.
- Cummins, R. A. (2000). Personal income and subjective well-being: A review. *Journal of happiness studies*, 1(2), 133-158.
- Diener, E., Larsen, R. J., Levine, S., & Emmons, R. A. (1985). Intensity and frequency: dimensions underlying positive and negative affect. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 48(5), 1253.
- Diener, E., Sandvik, E., Seidlitz, L., & Diener, M. (1993). The relationship between income and subjective well-being: Relative or absolute?. *Social indicators research*, 28, 195-223.

- Diener, E., Wirtz, D., Biswas-Diener, R., Tov, W., Kim-Prieto, C., Choi, D. W., & Oishi, S. (2009). New measures of well-being. Assessing well-being: The collected works of Ed Diener, 247-266.
- Kushlev, K., Radosic, N., & Diener, E. (2022). Subjective well-being and prosociality around the globe: Happy people give more of their time and money to others. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, 13(4), 849-861.
- Sacks, D. W., Stevenson, B., & Wolfers, J. (2012). The new stylized facts about income and subjective well-being. *Emotion*, 12(6), 1181.
- Tian, L., Du, M., & Huebner, E. S. (2015). The effect of gratitude on elementary school students' subjective well-being in schools: The mediating role of prosocial behavior. *Social Indicators Research*, 122, 887-904.
- Yang, Y., Li, P., Fu, X., & Kou, Y. (2017). Orientations to happiness and subjective well-being in Chinese adolescents: The roles of prosocial behavior and internet addictive behavior. *Journal of happiness studies*, 18, 1747-1762.