

Predicting the effect of locus of control, emotional intelligence, and prosocial behavior of businessmen and professionals on their subjective well-being

Manish Kant¹, Dr Dhrub Kumar²

¹. Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology, V.S.J. College, Rajnagar, Madhubani.

². Professor, University Department of Psychology, L.N.M.U. Darbhanga.

How to cite this article: Manish Kant, Dhrub Kumar (2024) Predicting the effect of locus of control, emotional intelligence, and prosocial behavior of businessmen and professionals on their subjective well-being, 44(3), 1261-1269

ABSTRACT

This extensive study centered around examining the impact of three psychological domains—locus of control, emotional intelligence, and prosocial behavior—on the subjective well-being of a specific cohort: businessmen and professionals within the geographic and cultural context of Bihar, India. The research framework was meticulously structured, engaging a sample of 302 individuals. These participants were carefully selected through a methodological approach that combined purposive and incidental sampling strategies, aiming to enhance the representativeness and relevance of the findings to the target population.

To accurately capture the subjective well-being of these individuals, the research employed two specific scales that are well-established in psychological research. The Satisfaction with Life Scale (SWLS), pioneered by Diener et al. in 1985, served as a cornerstone measurement, offering a robust quantification of life satisfaction levels among the participants. Complementing this, Ed Diener et al.'s Scale of Positive and Negative Experience (SPANE) from 2009 provided a nuanced assessment of the participants' affective experiences, effectively mapping a broad spectrum of emotions and experiences linked to their overall well-being.

The emotional intelligence of the participants, a key variable of interest, was measured using the Emotional Intelligence Scale developed by Dr. Arun Kumar Singh and Dr. Shruti Narain. This scale is specifically designed to evaluate individuals' capabilities in recognizing, understanding, and managing their own emotions, as well as their aptitude in discerning and influencing the emotions of others. In parallel, the locus of control was assessed through Terry Pettijohn's scale, which aims to determine whether individuals attribute outcomes and experiences to their own actions (internal locus) or to external factors beyond their control (external locus).

Moreover, to evaluate prosocial behavior—a construct reflecting individuals' tendencies to benefit others through actions such as helping, sharing, and cooperation—the study utilized Caprara et al.'s scale from 2012. This measurement facet was anticipated to shed light on the extent to which such behaviors contribute to the overall subjective well-being of the study's subjects.

A rigorous regression analysis was conducted to delve into the relationships between these psychological constructs and subjective well-being. The findings illuminated a significant predictive link, revealing that each of the studied variables—locus of control, emotional intelligence, and prosocial behavior—distinctly contributed to the subjective well-being of the businessmen and professionals in Bihar, India. These insights not only enrich the understanding of well-being in a specific cultural and professional context but also underscore the interplay between individual psychological characteristics and their overarching satisfaction with life.

Keywords: Businessmen, Professionals, Subjective well-being, Locus of control, Emotional intelligence, and Prosocial behaviour.

INTRODUCTION

Subjective well-being (SWB) refers to an individual's overall satisfaction, happiness, and sense of purpose in life.

It encompasses both cognitive and affective evaluations and considers positive and negative emotions. There is growing interest in understanding the link between subjective well-being and prosocial behavior, which includes voluntary actions benefiting others, from small acts of kindness to larger altruistic gestures like charity donations. Research indicates that engaging in prosocial behavior can lead to higher levels of subjective well-being across different age groups and cultural contexts, possibly due to the positive feelings derived from helping others and the increased sense of purpose and social connections. Several studies have explored the relationship between subjective well-being and prosocial behavior in various populations. For example, elementary school students (Tian et al., 2015 & Chen et al., 2020), Chinese adolescents (Yang et al., 2017), and undergraduate students have reported greater subjective well-being when engaging in more prosocial behavior (Khanna et al., 2017). This association has been observed in diverse cultural contexts worldwide (Kushlev et al., 2022). Locus of control, which pertains to individuals' beliefs about their control over events in their lives, also influences subjective well-being. Empirical evidence suggests that having an internal locus of control, believing in one's ability to shape life events, is linked to higher subjective well-being, whereas an external locus of control, attributing life events to external forces, is associated with lower subjective well-being (Stocks et al., 2012; Dave et al., 2011; Hamarta et al., 2013; Popova, 2012; Singh & Choudhri, 2014; Chandiramani, 2014; Shin & Lee, 2021, November). Additionally, emotional intelligence has been found to positively correlate with subjective well-being (Sánchez-Álvarez et al., 2016; Bar-On, 2005; Zeidner, 2010; Gallagher & Vella-Brodrick, 2008; Llamas-Díaz et al., 2022; Schutte & Malouff, 2011).

The study aims to investigate whether locus of control, emotional intelligence, and prosocial behavior predict the subjective well-being of these individuals.

Methodology

Sample

The study was conducted on 302 businessmen and professionals from different districts of Bihar. The sample was selected through purposive-cum-incidental 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), an Emotional intelligence scale, a Locus of Control scale 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 measures life satisfaction. Diener, Emmons, Larsen, and Griffin developed it in 1985. It has five items and is very reliable and valid.
2. Scale of Positive and Negative Experience (SPANE)—This scale measures positive and negative feelings in life. Ed Diener and Robert Biswas-Diener developed it in January 2009. It 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—This scale, developed by G.V. Caprara et al. and having 16 items, was used to measure the participants' prosocial behaviour.
4. Locus of Control Scale - The Locus of Control Scale is a psychological measurement tool used to assess an individual's beliefs about the extent to which they perceive their lives as being controlled by internal or external factors. It was initially conceptualized by Julian Rotter in the 1966, and Terry Pettijohn developed a version of this scale.
5. Emotional Intelligence Scale (EIS-SANS)—This scale measures emotional intelligence. It was developed by Dr. Arun Kumar Singh and Dr. Shruti Narain. This scale measures the emotional intelligence of individuals older than 12 years. It is designed to measure four key dimensions of EI: **Understanding Emotions, Understanding Motivation, Empathy, and Handling Relations.**
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

A regression analysis has been conducted to assess the predictive value of participants' emotional intelligence, locus of control, and prosocial behaviour for their subjective well-being.

Result and discussion

Four regression analyses were conducted to predict subjective well-being based on emotional intelligence, locus of control, and prosocial behaviour. The first analysis used life satisfaction as the dependent variable, while the other three analyses used positive affect, negative affect, and affective balance as dependent variables.

The first regression analysis aimed to investigate the impact of emotional intelligence, locus of control, and prosocial behavior on life satisfaction. In this analysis, locus of control, prosocial behavior, and emotional intelligence were used as predictors, while life satisfaction was the criterion variable. The model summary, ANOVA, and coefficients are provided in Tables 1, 2, and 3, respectively.

Effect of Locus of Control, Prosocial Behaviour, and Emotional Intelligence on Life Satisfaction

Multiple regressions were computed to measure the effect of predictors like locus of control, Prosocial Behaviour, and Emotional Intelligence on life satisfaction. The results are given in Tables 1, 2, and 3, respectively.

Table 1: Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.269 ^a	.072	.063	4.58014
a. Predictors: (Constant), Locus of Control, Prosocial Behaviour, Emotional Intelligence				

The model summary presents important metrics, including the multiple correlation coefficient (R), the coefficient of determination (R Square), adjusted R Square, and the standard error of the estimate. The overall model, which considers locus of control, prosocial behavior, and emotional intelligence as predictors, exhibits a multiple correlation coefficient (R) of 0.269. This indicates a weak positive relationship among the variables. The coefficient of determination (R Square) is 0.072, suggesting that approximately 7.2% of the variance in the dependent variable can be explained by the combined effects of locus of control, prosocial behavior, and emotional intelligence.

The adjusted R Square is 0.063, accounting for the potential overfitting of the model. This adjusted value is slightly lower than the R Square, indicating that the model may not be substantially improved when considering the number of predictors. The standard error of the estimate is 4.58014. This value represents the average deviation of the actual values from the predicted values, indicating the accuracy of the model.

Table-2: ANOVA

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	487.905	3	162.635	7.753	.000
	Residual	6251.343	298	20.978		
	Total	6739.248	301			
a. Dependent Variable: Life Satisfaction						
b. Predictors: (Constant), Locus of Control, Prosocial Behaviour, Emotional Intelligence						

The ANOVA table indicates that the regression model, which includes locus of control, prosocial behavior, and emotional intelligence as predictors, significantly explains the variation in life satisfaction ($F = 7.753$, $p < 0.001$). The model accounts for a substantial portion of the variance in life satisfaction, with the sum of squares for regression (487.905) compared to the sum of squares for the residuals (6251.343). Collectively, the predictors contribute to explaining life satisfaction, as indicated by the significant F-statistic, suggesting that at least one of the predictors has a statistically significant relationship with life satisfaction - whether it's locus of control, prosocial behavior, or emotional intelligence.

The results of the ANOVA analysis show that locus of control, prosocial behavior, and emotional intelligence collectively have a significant effect on life satisfaction, implying that individuals' perceptions of control over their lives, their engagement in prosocial behaviors, and their level of emotional intelligence are crucial factors influencing their overall life satisfaction.

Table-3: Coefficients

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		

1	(Constant)	19.666	1.893		10.391	.000
	Prosocial Behaviour	-.023	.028	-.052	.840	.401
	Emotional Intelligence	.306	.070	.296	4.341	.000
	Locus of Control	-.008	.024	-.019	.313	.755
a. Dependent Variable: Life Satisfaction						

The results of the regression analysis show that there is a negative relationship between prosocial behavior and life satisfaction, but the effect size is very small and not statistically significant. On the other hand, emotional intelligence has a strong positive relationship with life satisfaction, with a moderate effect size and high statistical significance. However, the analysis does not support a significant relationship between locus of control and life satisfaction. It appears that emotional intelligence has a more substantial impact on life satisfaction compared to prosocial behavior and locus of control in this model.

Effect of Locus of Control, Prosocial Behaviour and Emotional Intelligence on Positive Affect

Table-4: Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.407 ^a	.165	.157	4.15887
a. Predictors: (Constant), Locus of Control, Prosocial Behaviour, Emotional Intelligence				

The model as a whole, which includes locus of control, prosocial behavior, and emotional intelligence as predictors, shows a moderate positive relationship among the variables with a multiple correlation coefficient (R) of 0.407. This means that there is a moderate positive relationship among the variables. The coefficient of determination (R Square) is 0.165, indicating that around 16.5% of the changes in the dependent variable can be accounted for by the combined effects of locus of control, prosocial behavior, and emotional intelligence. The adjusted R Square is 0.157, which takes into consideration the potential overfitting of the model. This adjusted value is slightly lower than the R Square, suggesting that the model may not be significantly improved when accounting for the number of predictors. The standard error of the estimate is 4.15887. This value represents the average deviation of the actual values from the predicted values, indicating the accuracy of the model.

The analysis suggests a moderate overall relationship among locus of control, prosocial behavior, and emotional intelligence. While the model explains a significant portion of the variation in the dependent variable (16.5%), the influence of the predictors, as indicated by the R Square, is moderate. The adjusted R Square suggests that adding more predictors may not substantially enhance the model's explanatory power.

It's important to note that the specific nature of the dependent variable and the context of the study are not provided, which limits a more detailed interpretation of the results. Further investigation, potentially through additional analyses or inclusion of other relevant variables, may be necessary to better understand the relationships between locus of control, prosocial behavior, and emotional intelligence in the given context.

Table-5: Effect of Locus of Control, Prosocial Behaviour and Emotional Intelligence on Positive Affect (ANOVA)

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	1021.773	3	340.591	19.692	.000 ^b
	Residual	5154.267	298	17.296		
	Total	6176.040	301			
a. Dependent Variable: Positive Affect						
b. Predictors: (Constant), Locus of Control, Prosocial Behaviour, Emotional Intelligence						

The ANOVA results show that the regression model, which includes locus of control, prosocial behavior, and emotional intelligence as predictors, significantly accounts for the variation in positive affect ($F(3, 298) = 19.692$, $p < 0.001$). The model explains a large portion of the variance in positive affect, as indicated by the sum of squares for regression (1021.773) compared to the sum of squares for the residuals (5154.267). The predictors combined

contribute to explaining positive affect, as shown by the significant F-statistic, indicating that at least one of the predictors (locus of control, prosocial behavior, or emotional intelligence) has a statistically significant relationship with positive affect.

The results of the ANOVA analysis reveal that locus of control, prosocial behavior, and emotional intelligence collectively have a significant effect on positive affect. This suggests that individuals' perceptions of control over their lives, their engagement in prosocial behaviors, and their level of emotional intelligence are important factors influencing their overall positive affect. The findings highlight the importance of considering psychological factors such as locus of control, prosocial behavior, and emotional intelligence in understanding and promoting positive affect. Further research could explore the specific mechanisms through which these variables impact positive affect, as well as investigate potential interactions or mediation effects among them.

Table-6: Coefficients

Coefficients						
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	9.605	1.719		5.589	.000
	Prosocial Behaviour	.031	.025	.073	1.228	.220
	Emotional Intelligence	.216	.064	.218	3.375	.001
	Locus of Control	.084	.022	.226	3.858	.000
a. Dependent Variable: Positive Affect						

The unstandardized coefficient for prosocial behavior is 0.031, indicating a positive relationship with positive affect. However, the standardized coefficient (Beta) is 0.073, suggesting a small effect size. The associated p-value (Sig.) is 0.220, which is not statistically significant.

The unstandardized coefficient for emotional intelligence is 0.216, indicating a positive relationship with positive affect. The standardized coefficient (Beta) of 0.218 suggests a moderate effect size. The t-value is 3.375, and the associated p-value (Sig.) is highly significant ($p = 0.001$).

The unstandardized coefficient for locus of control is 0.084, indicating a positive relationship with positive affect. The standardized coefficient (Beta) is 0.226, suggesting a moderate effect size. The t-value is 3.858, and the associated p-value (Sig.) is highly significant ($p < 0.001$).

The regression coefficients provide valuable insights into the impact of each predictor on positive affect. The results suggest that prosocial behavior has a negligible and statistically non-significant impact on positive affect (Beta = 0.073, Sig. = 0.220). Emotional intelligence shows a significant positive relationship with positive affect (Beta = 0.218, Sig. = 0.001), indicating that individuals with higher emotional intelligence tend to report higher levels of positive affect. The results indicate a significant positive relationship between locus of control and positive affect (Beta = 0.226, Sig. < 0.001). The moderate effect size and significance suggest that variations in locus of control may influence positive affect in this context.

Overall, emotional intelligence and locus of control appear to be more influential predictors of positive affect compared to prosocial behavior in the examined model. These findings provide nuanced insights into the specific contributions of each variable to individuals' positive affect.

Effect of Locus of Control, Prosocial Behaviour and Emotional Intelligence on Positive Affect

Table-7: Multiple correlation among Locus of Control, Prosocial Behaviour and Emotional Intelligence (Model Summary)

(Model Summary)				
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.453 ^a	.205	.197	3.02794
a. Predictors: (Constant), Locus of Control, Prosocial Behaviour, Emotional Intelligence				

The provided data presents the results of a multiple correlation analysis among the variables of locus of control, prosocial behavior, and emotional intelligence. The model summary provides essential metrics, including the

multiple correlation coefficient (R), the coefficient of determination (R Square), adjusted R Square, and the standard error of the estimate.

The overall model, incorporating locus of control, prosocial behavior, and emotional intelligence as predictors, demonstrates a multiple correlation coefficient (R) of 0.453. This indicates a moderate positive relationship among the variables. The coefficient of determination (R Square) is 0.205, suggesting that approximately 20.5% of the variance in the dependent variable (not specified in the provided information) can be explained by the combined effects of locus of control, prosocial behavior, and emotional intelligence.

The adjusted R Square is 0.197, which accounts for the potential overfitting of the model. This adjusted value is slightly lower than the R Square, suggesting that the model may not be substantially improved when accounting for the number of predictors.

The standard error of the estimate is 3.02794. This value represents the average deviation of the actual values from the predicted values, providing an indication of the accuracy of the model.

The analysis indicates a moderate overall relationship among locus of control, prosocial behavior, and emotional intelligence. While the model accounts for a significant proportion of the variance in the dependent variable (20.5%), the impact of the predictors, as indicated by the R Square, is moderate. The adjusted R Square suggests that adding more predictors may not significantly enhance the model's explanatory power.

It's essential to note that the specific nature of the dependent variable and the context of the study are not provided, limiting a more detailed interpretation of the results. Further investigation, potentially through additional analyses or inclusion of other relevant variables, may be warranted to better understand the dynamics between locus of control, prosocial behavior, and emotional intelligence in the given context.

Table-8: Effect of Locus of Control, Prosocial Behaviour and Emotional Intelligence on Negative Affect (ANOVA)

ANOVA ^a						
Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	703.693	3	234.564	25.584	.000 ^b
	Residual	2732.188	298	9.168		
	Total	3435.881	301			
a. Dependent Variable: Negative Affect						
b. Predictors: (Constant), Locus of Control, Prosocial Behaviour, Emotional Intelligence						

The following text summarizes the results of an analysis of variance (ANOVA) that examined the impact of locus of control, prosocial behavior, and emotional intelligence on negative affect. ANOVA helps determine if there are statistically significant differences in the average levels of the dependent variable (negative affect) across different levels of the independent variables (locus of control, prosocial behavior, and emotional intelligence).

The ANOVA table shows that the regression model, which includes locus of control, prosocial behavior, and emotional intelligence as predictors, effectively accounts for the variation in negative affect ($F(3, 298) = 25.584$, $p < 0.001$). This means the model explains a significant portion of the variance in negative affect, as demonstrated by the regression sum of squares (703.693) compared to the sum of squares for the residuals (2732.188).

Locus of Control, Prosocial Behavior, and Emotional Intelligence: When taken together, these predictors substantially contribute to explaining negative affect, as indicated by the significant F-statistic. This implies that at least one of the predictors (locus of control, prosocial behavior, or emotional intelligence) has a statistically significant relationship with negative affect.

The p-value associated with the F-statistic is highly significant ($p < 0.001$), indicating that the observed results are unlikely to be due to random chance alone.

The ANOVA results suggest that locus of control, prosocial behavior, and emotional intelligence collectively have a significant impact on negative affect. This indicates that individuals' perceptions of control, their engagement in prosocial behaviors, and their emotional intelligence levels are important factors influencing their overall negative affect.

These findings emphasize the importance of considering psychological factors such as locus of control, prosocial behavior, and emotional intelligence when understanding and addressing negative affect. Further research could explore the specific mechanisms through which these variables impact negative affect and

investigate potential interactions or mediation effects among them.

Table-9: Effect of Locus of Control, Prosocial Behaviour and Emotional Intelligence on Negative Affect
(Coefficients)

Coefficients						
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	16.656	1.251		13.312	.000
	Prosocial Behaviour	.087	.018	.276	4.775	.000
	Emotional Intelligence	-.403	.047	-.547	8.659	.000
	Locus of Control	.045	.016	.163	2.847	.005
a. Dependent Variable: Negative Affect						

The provided data includes coefficients from a regression analysis, providing insights into the impact of locus of control, prosocial behavior, and emotional intelligence on negative affect. The coefficients consist of unstandardized coefficients (B), standard errors, standardized coefficients (Beta), t-values, and associated significance levels (Sig.).

The constant term represents the estimated intercept when all predictor variables are zero. In this case, it is 16.656 with a standard error of 1.251 and a highly significant t-value of 13.312 ($p < 0.001$).

In the case of Prosocial Behavior (Beta = 0.276, Sig. < 0.001), its unstandardized coefficient is 0.087, indicating a positive relationship with negative affect. The standardized coefficient (Beta) is 0.276, suggesting a moderate effect size. The associated p-value (Sig.) is highly significant ($p < 0.001$).

Whereas, in the case of Emotional Intelligence (Beta = -0.547, Sig. < 0.001), its unstandardized coefficient is -0.403, indicating a negative relationship with negative affect. The standardized coefficient (Beta) of -0.547 suggests a strong effect size. The t-value is 8.659, and the associated p-value (Sig.) is highly significant ($p < 0.001$).

The unstandardized coefficient for the locus of control (Beta = 0.163, Sig. = 0.005) is 0.045, indicating a positive relationship with negative affect. The standardized coefficient (Beta) is 0.163, suggesting a moderate effect size. The t-value is 2.847, and the associated p-value (Sig.) is significant ($p = 0.005$).

Based on the above findings following observations can be made:

- (i) There is a significant positive relationship between prosocial behaviour and negative affect (Beta = 0.276, Sig. < 0.001), indicating that individuals who engage in more prosocial behaviours tend to experience higher levels of negative affect.
- (ii) There is a significant negative relationship between emotional intelligence and negative affect (Beta = -0.547, Sig. < 0.001), indicating that individuals with higher emotional intelligence tend to experience lower levels of negative affect.
- (iii) There is a significant positive relationship between locus of control and negative affect (Beta = 0.163, Sig. = 0.005). The moderate effect size and significance suggest that variations in locus of control may influence negative affect in this context.

Overall, emotional intelligence and prosocial behavior have notable impacts on negative affect, with emotional intelligence showing a stronger negative association and prosocial behavior exhibiting a positive association. Locus of control also plays a significant role, albeit to a lesser extent, in influencing negative affect. These findings provide nuanced insights into the specific contributions of each variable to individuals' negative affect.

Effect of Locus of Control, Prosocial Behaviour, and Emotional Intelligence on Affective Balance

To measure the anticipated impact of prosocial behavior, emotional intelligence, and locus of control on affective balance (well-being), a regression equation was calculated using the step method. The Model Summary, ANOVA, and coefficients can be found in Tables 10, 11, and 12, respectively.

Table-10: Multiple correlations among Locus of Control, Prosocial Behaviour and Emotional Intelligence

(Model Summary)				
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.458 ^a	.210	.202	5.79636
a. Predictors: (Constant), Locus of Control, Prosocial Behaviour, Emotional Intelligence				

Table-11: Effect of Locus of Control, Prosocial Behaviour and Emotional Intelligence on Affective Balance

ANOVA ^a						
Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	2659.520	3	886.507	26.386	.000 ^b
	Residual	10012.139	298	33.598		
	Total	12671.659	301			
a. Dependent Variable: Affective Balance						
b. Predictors: (Constant), Locus of Control, Prosocial Behaviour, Emotional Intelligence						

Table-12: Coefficients states Effect of Locus of Control, Prosocial Behaviour and Emotional Intelligence on Affective Balance

Coefficients ^a						
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	-7.090	2.395		-2.960	.003
	Prosocial Behaviour	-.069	.035	-.113	-1.959	.001
	Emotional Intelligence	.646	.089	.456	7.241	.000
	Locus of Control	.043	.030	.080	1.408	.002
a. Dependent Variable: Affective Balance						

The model summary in Table 10 indicates that the R-value is 0.458, suggesting that the independent variables can predict the affective balance (an affective component of well-being) of the participants. The analysis of variance (ANOVA) results in Table 11 shows an F value of 26.386 ($P < 0.0001$), indicating that the regression model fits the data very well. All predictors in the table significantly predict the affective balance of the participants.

The coefficients are presented in Table 12. When other independent variables are held constant, unstandardized coefficients reveal the extent to which the negative affect dimension of the affective component of well-being varies with each unit increase in prosocial behavior, emotional intelligence, and locus of control. Specifically, an enhancement of one unit in prosocial behavior increases the affective balance by -0.069 units, emotional intelligence by 0.646 units, and locus of control by 0.043 units. The P values for prosocial behavior, emotional intelligence, and locus of control are all < 0.0001 for predicting the positive affect dimension of the affective component of well-being, indicating that these variables significantly predict affective balance.

Conclusion

This study indicates that the subjective well-being among businessmen and professionals is substantially influenced by a combination of factors including their locus of control, emotional intelligence, and prosocial behavior. Specifically, individuals displaying a higher degree of internal locus of control, meaning they believe they have control over the outcomes of their actions, tend to report greater levels of happiness and satisfaction in their personal and professional lives. Additionally, emotional intelligence, which encompasses the ability to recognize, understand, manage, and use emotions effectively in interpersonal interactions, plays a critical role in enhancing an individual's subjective well-being. Moreover, engagement in prosocial behaviour, actions intended to benefit others, is also associated with improved subjective well-being. This synthesis of psychological attributes underscores the multifaceted nature of well-being in the professional sphere, suggesting that it is not merely financial success, but a balance of psychological strengths and interpersonal skills that contributes to the overall happiness and satisfaction of businessmen and professionals.

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.