

Pro-Social Behaviour and Social Well-being of Adults

*Sukhwinder Kaur** *Anuradha Sharma***

Abstract

Pro-social behaviour is the behaviour of helping anyone, despite of relationship with family members or strangers. It also includes fulfilling the social responsibilities and performing one's duties on time. Social well-being shows social acceptance, responsibility, satisfaction, feeling of belongingness etc. of persons towards the society. Many studies have shown positive effect of pro-social behaviour on well being. The aim of the present research paper was to assess the relationship between pro-social behaviour and social well-being of office staff and to see the difference between males and females towards pro-social behaviour and social well-being. The data was collected from 120 office staff (60 females and 60 males) working in different departments at Panjab University, Chandigarh. For this purpose questionnaire on Social Well-Being and questionnaire on Pro-Social Behaviour were used to know the correlation and difference between the pro-social behaviour and social well-being of adults. The results of the study indicated slightly negative correlation between pro-social behaviour and social well-being of adults and it was found that age and income were significant factors affecting social well-being of adults.

Key words: *Pro-social behaviour, Social well-being.*

About Authors:

* & **Department of Community Education and Disability Studies
Panjab University, Chandigarh

Introduction

Pro-Social Behaviour

All the people need assistance or help at times in their lives by other people. The assistance or help provided by others at the time of need is known as pro-social behaviour. Pro-social behaviour may not attract direct benefits to the helper but may involve risk to the person who provides help to the needy. People often use pro-social behaviour and altruism interchangeably but the two terms are not the same. Altruism is the behaviour of a person which is motivated by an unselfish concern for the wellbeing of the other people whereas pro-social behaviour is a helpful action that provides assistance to the other people which may or may not attract direct benefits to the person, who is providing help (Baron, R. A., Byrne, D & Branscombe, N. R. 2006).

In our day-today life we see many examples of pro-social behaviour e.g. giving someone directions, lending a hand of help/lending money, listening to someone when he/she is emotionally disturbed etc. Our pro-social behaviour is affected by many things e.g. liking, self-respect, relationships etc. Help offered to strangers is less common than help offered to relatives, but still there are many studies which showed people's eagerness to help strangers in the time of (Taylor, S. E., Peplau, L. A. & Sears. D. O. 2006). Berkowitz, L. (1972) found that in Midwestern U.S. city more than the half of women shoppers offered money to a student who explained that his wallet had disappeared.

Latane, B. & Darley, J. M. (1970) found in their study that in New York, most of the pedestrians offered help to requests of a person

walking by. Both the studies show that people usually help others in the time of need.

Dimensions of Pro-Social Behaviour

The following dimensions of Pro-Social Behaviour have been considered in the present research paper (Baron, R. A., Byrne, D. & Branscombe, N. R. 2006):

- ⊙ Empathy- It is the capacity to be able to experience other's emotional states, feelings etc.
- ⊙ Helping as an Accomplishment- It feels good to have positive effect on other people's life.
- ⊙ Competitive Altruism- Helping others boosts one's own status and reputation.
- ⊙ Helping in Emergencies- People tend to help others in case of some emergencies.
- ⊙ Helping people who are familiar- People like to help those who are known to them or whom they like.

Pro-social behaviour is associated with the overall well-being of the persons. As social well-being is an important part of the total well-being, it may have effect on it.

Social Well-Being

The term social well-being means social happiness, connectedness with other people, trust and interactions within the society. It is a situation where person is ready to give and receive respect, tries to solve the problems of the community with the other members and is ready to forfeit his/her life for society in the time of need. People who are happy with their social life feel connected to the other members of the society and try to contribute something valuable for the society.

In the words of Keyes (1998) social well-being is a combination of many essentials that together describes whether and to what extent the persons are doing well in their social lives.

Dimensions of Social Well-Being

The following are the five dimensions of social well-being (<http://the-mouse-trap.com/tag/social-well-being/>):

- ⊙ Social Acceptance –This means that persons acknowledge and accept other person's differences and complexity.
- ⊙ Social Actualization- It means that members of the society believe that society, social groups, community etc. can/will grow positively.
- ⊙ Social Contribution- People feel that they have something valuable to contribute to the society and contribution of one person is valued in the society by the other members of the society.
- ⊙ Social Coherence- Persons interact and co-operate with each other.
- ⊙ Social Integration- One person has sense of belongingness to the community.

Thus social well-being includes acknowledgement of social complexities, contribution towards society, co-operation among members and sense of attachment to the community/society.

A number of studies have been conducted on different areas of Pro-social behaviour and its effect on happiness, emotional well-being etc. Previous research studies had shown positive association between pro-social behaviour and well-being e.g. Khana, V. et al. (2017) studied whether happiness and well-being is affected by pro-social behaviour or not. The study was conducted on 250 undergraduates of Delhi University. In this study Pro-social personality questionnaire by Schwartz and Howard (1982), The Oxford Happiness Questionnaire by Michael Argyle and Peter Hills of Oxford Brookes University and Subjective Well-being Scale developed by Diener, Emmons and Griffin (1985) were used for the collection of the data. The results of the study found positive effect of pro-social behaviour on happiness and well-being.

Kumar, R. (2014) conducted a study to know the association between psychological well-being and pro-social behaviour of

adolescents. The researchers selected 200 adolescents of class IX and X as sample for the study. The researcher used Ryff's Psychological Well-being Scale (PWB), 1989b and Pro-social Tendencies Measure (PTM), Carlo and Randall, 2002 to collect the data of the study. The study unveiled that pro-social behaviour is positively associated with psychological well-being of adolescents.

The researchers aim to find correlation between pro-social behaviour and social well-being of adults, and to see whether or not males and females differ about pro-social behaviour and social well-being.

Rationale of the Study

We all help each other in the time of need. This helping nature of human being is known as pro-social behaviour and is affected by many things i.e. familiarity with the others, liking-disliking, relations etc. When we help others, it provides satisfaction to oneself. It affects the well-being of human beings. On the other side, social well-being is a process through which a person feels happy and feels connection with the society in which he/she lives. Past studies had shown that there is positive association between the well-being and pro-social behaviour of human beings but connection between pro-social behaviour and social well-being has not been researched. That's why the researchers had taken up the present research study.

The present study explores whether or not pro-social behaviour and social well-being is associated. It also investigated the effect of gender, age and income on pro-social behaviour and social well-being.

Objectives

The following were the objectives of the study:

1. To assess the pro-social behaviour and social well-being of the adults working at Panjab University, Chandigarh.
2. To compare the pro-social behaviour and social well-being of females and males.

3. To compare the pro-social behaviour and social well-being of females and males with respect to:

- Age
- Income

4. To find the significant difference among females regarding pro-social behaviour and social well-being with respect to:

- Age
- Income

5. To find the significant difference among males about pro-social behaviour and social well-being with respect to:

- Age
- Income

6. To find the significant correlation between pro-social behaviour and social well-being of females and males.

7. To determine the significant correlation between pro-social behaviour and social well-being of females and males with respect to:

- Age
- Income

Hypotheses

1. There will be no significant difference between females and males regarding pro-social behaviour and social well-being.

2. There will be no significant difference between females and males regarding pro-social behaviour and social well-being with respect to:

- Age
- Income

3. There will be no significant difference among females about pro-social behaviour and social well-being with respect to:

- Age
- Income

4. There will be no significant difference among males regarding pro-social behaviour and social well-being with respect to:

- Age
- Income

5. There will be no significant correlation between pro-social behaviour and social well-being of females and males.

6. There will be no significant correlation between pro-social behaviour and social well-being of females and males with respect to:

- Age
- Income

Delimitations

1. The study was delimited sixty males and sixty females i.e. total one hundred and twenty adults of Panjab University, Chandigarh.

2. The study was delimited to office staff working at the different departments of Panjab University, Chandigarh only.

Sample

The researchers systematically selected thirty (30) departments from Panjab University, Chandigarh. The sample consisted of 120 adults (60 females and 60 males) working at offices of those thirty departments selected by the researchers. Two females and two males were selected purposively from each department (4 adults* 30 departments=120). Two age groups were considered in the present research study i.e. 25-40 years and 41-55 years. The sample was further divided as per the income of adults i.e. adults earning less than Rs. 25000 /p.m. and adults earning more than Rs. 25000/p.m.

Tools

The following tools were used for the collection of the data:

1. Self developed four points Likert scale was used to assess the pro-social behaviour of the adults. The scale consisted of total twenty (20) statements including five dimensions of pro-social behaviour i.e. empathy, helping as an accomplishment, competitive altruism, helping in emergencies and helping people who are familiar.

2. The researchers adapted the six points Likert scale developed and standardized by Keyes (1998) on Social Well-being to know the

social well-being of the adults. The scale has total number of thirty statements divided into five dimensions named social acceptance, social actualization, social contribution, social coherence and social integration.

Procedure of Data Collection

The researchers took permission from the chairperson of each concerned department. The respondents were told about the purpose of the study and their doubts were made clear by the researchers. The two scales i.e. pro-social behaviour and social well-being were filled by the respondents in front of the researchers.

Data analysis

The data of the study was analyzed through the following statistical techniques:

Mean was computed to know the general nature of the data, t-test was calculated to know the difference between males and females about pro-social behaviour and social well-being and correlation was computed to know the association between pro-social behaviour and social well-being of females and males.

Results

The following are the results of the study:

Table 1 : Responses of Female and Male Adults for diverse dimensions of Pro-Social Behaviour

Dimensions	Females	Males
Empathy	70 %	78.33 %
Helping as an Accomplishment	58.33 %	65 %
Competitive Altruism	41.66 %	43.33 %
Helping in Emergencies	78.33 %	71.66 %
Helping people who are familiar	86.66 %	91.66 %

Table no. 1 reveals the responses of male and female adults towards the different dimensions of pro-social behaviour. The responses of the respondents were as follows: Maximum number of females (86.66 %) and males (91.66 %) said that they help people whom they are familiar with. 78.33 percent females and 71.66 percent males said that they help others in emergencies, 70 percent females

and 78.33 percent males help others due to empathy, 58.33 percent females and 65 percent males help others as an accomplishment whereas lowest number of females (41.66%) and males (43.33%) help others due to competitive altruism.

Thus it is concluded that both males and females had slight difference on pro-social behaviour.

Table 2 : Responses of Female and Male Adults for different dimensions of Social Well-being

Dimensions	Females	Males
Social Acceptance	46.66%	58.33 %
Social Actualization	40 %	51.66 %
Social Contribution	70%	81.66 %
Social Coherence	60 %	71.66 %
Social Integration	36.66 %	83.33 %

Table no. 2 shows the distribution of male and female adults for social well-being. The pattern of results were as follows: the highest number of females and males were in the

category of social contribution (70% females and 81.66% males) followed by social coherence (60% females and 71.66% males), then social acceptance (46.66% females and 58.33% males)

and social actualization (40% females and 51.66% males) whereas in the category of social integration the number of females was very low (36.66% females) as compared to their male (83.33%) counterparts.

Hence it is concluded from the above observation that social well-being was more in males than the females.

Table 3: Difference between Females and Males regarding Pro-Social Behaviour and Social Well-Being

Variables	Mean score of Females (N-60)	S.D.	Mean score of Males (N-60)	S.D.	df	t	p-value	Level of significance
Pro-Social Behaviour	52.02	6.82	52.9	6.05	118	0.75	0.45	Not significant
Social Well-Being	112.333	17.60	117.55	14.42		1.77	0.07	Not significant

**Significant at 0.01 (2.58)

*Significant at 0.05 (1.96)

Table no. 3 indicates difference between females and males on pro-social behaviour and social well-being. Mean score of females for pro-social behavior was 52.02 and for social well-being was 112.33 where as mean score of males for pro-social behavior was 52.9 and for social well-being it was 117.55. t-value of female and male respondents for pro-social

behaviour was calculated 0.75 with p-value 0.45 and for social well-being it was 1.77 with p-value 0.07. Both the values are not significant at the 0.05 level of significance thus it indicates that there is no significance difference between males and females in their pro-social behaviour and social well-being.

Table 4: Comparison between Females and Males regarding Pro-Social Behaviour and Social Well-Being with respect to Age

Variables	Age group	Mean score of Females (N-30)	S.D.	Mean score of Males (N-30)	S.D.	Df	t	p-value	Level of Significance
Pro-Social Behaviour	25-40 years	52.13	7.09	53.7	6.01	58	0.805	0.42	Not Significant
Social Well-Being		113	16.65	97.85	13.36		1.157	0.25	Not Significant
Pro-Social Behaviour	41-55 years	52.04	6.65	51.61	6.13		0.24	0.81	Not Significant
Social Well-Being		128.18	15.77	117.96	15.41		1.31	0.19	Not Significant

**Significant at 0.01 (2.66) *Significant at 0.05 (2.00)

Table 4 indicates difference between females and males about pro-social behaviour and social well-being with respect to their age. Two age groups were considered in the study i.e. age group 25-40 years and age group 41-55 years. The mean score of females and males in the age group of 25-40 years for pro-social behaviour was 52.13 and 53.7 respectively whereas for social well-being it was 113 (females) and 97.85 (males). When comparison was done between females and males it was found that the difference was not significant at the 0.05 level of significance.

The mean score of females and males in the age group of 41-55 years for pro-social behaviour was 52.04 and 51.61 respectively whereas for social well-being for females it was 128.18 and for males it was 117.96. The difference for both pro-social behaviour and social well-being between females and males was not found significant at the 0.05 level of significance.

Thus it is said that age did not affect pro-social behaviour and social well-being of female and male adults.

Table 5: Difference between Females and Males regarding Pro-Social Behaviour and Social Well-Being with respect to income

Variable	Income (in rupees/pe r month)	Mean score of Female s (N-30)	S.D.	Mean score of Males (N-30)	S.D.	df	t	p- value	Level of Significanc e
Pro-Social Behaviour	Less than Rs. 25,000	53.04	6.04	53.86	6.65	58	0.48	0.63	Not Significant
Social Well-Being		112.08	13.25	115.17	12.24		0.733	0.46	Not Significant
Pro-Social Behaviour	More than Rs.25,000	51.33	7.01	52	6.32		0.410	0.68	Not Significant
Social Well-Being		121.86	13.53	119.17	11.04		2.07*	0.04	Significant

**Significant at 0.01 (2.66)

*Significant at 0.05 (2.00)

Table no. 5 depicts the difference between females and males about pro-social behaviour and social well-being with respect to their income. Two categories of income were considered in the study i.e. income less than Rs. 25000/per month and income more than Rs. 25000/per month. The mean score for pro-social behaviour of females was 53.04 and for males was 53.86 under the category of income less than Rs. 25000/per month, whereas mean score of females was 51.33 and for males was 52 under the category of income more than Rs. 25000/per month. No significant difference was found between females and males for pro-social behaviour with respect to their income.

The mean score for social well-being of females was 112.08 and for males was 115.17 under the category of income less than Rs. 25000/per month whereas 121.86 and 119.17 were the mean scores of females and males under the income more than Rs. 25000/per month. It was found that there is significant difference between females and males under the category of income more than Rs. 25000/per month.

It is concluded that income did not affect pro-social behaviour of males and females but social well-being of males and females was affected by income. The males who were earning more than Rs. 25000/per month were found to be more socially contented than the females.

Table 6: Difference among females for Pro-Social Behaviour and Social Well-Being with respect to Age and Income

Age group	Mean score for Pro-Social Behaviour	Mean score for Social Well-Being	df	t value for Pro-Social Behaviour	p-value	t value for Social Well - Being	p-value	
25-40 years	52.13	113	58	0.02 Not Significant	0.98	3.494** Significant	0.000	
41-55 years	52.04	128.18						
Income	Mean score for Pro-Social Behaviour	Mean score for Social Well-Being			t value for Pro-Social Behaviour	p-value	t value for Social Well - Being	p-value
Less than Rs. 25,000	53.04	112.08			0.94 Not Significant	0.35	2.15* Significant	0.03
More than Rs. 25,000	51.33	121.86						

**Significant at 0.01 (2.66)

*Significant at 0.05 (2.00)

The above table 6 indicates the difference among females for Pro-Social Behaviour and Social Well-Being with respect to age and income. Mean score of females was 52.13 in the age group 25-40 years and in the age group 41-55 years it was 52.04. t-value was found to be 0.02, which is not significant at the 0.05 level of significance.

In social well-being mean score of females was 113 in the age group 25-40 years whereas it was 128.18 in the age group 41-55 years. t-value was found to be 3.494, which is significant at the 0.01 level of significance.

Therefore it is concluded that pro-social behaviour was not affected by the factor age but social well-being was affected by the factor of age. The females who were in the age group of 41-55 years were more satisfied with their social life than the females who were in the age group of 25-40 years.

Table 6 further depicts the difference among females for pro-social behaviour and social well-being with respect to their income. The mean value of females was found to be 53.04 and 51.33 under the category of income less than 25000/per month and income more than 25000/per month respectively. t-value was found to be 0.94, which is not significant at the 0.05 level of significance.

The mean value for social well-being of both the categories was 112.08 and 121.86 respectively. t-value was found to be 2.15, which is significant at the 0.05 level of significance.

Therefore it is concluded that females who were earning more than Rs. 25000/per month were found to be more socially satisfied than the females who were earning less than Rs. 25000/per month.

Table 7: Difference among males for Pro-Social Behaviour and Social Well-Being with respect to Age and Income

Age group	Mean score for Pro-Social Behaviour	Mean score for Social Well-Being	df	t value for Pro-Social Behaviour	p-value	t value for Social Well-Being	p-value
25-40 years	53.7	97.85	58	1.31 Not Significant	0.19	2.84** Significant	0.006
41-55 years	51.61	117.96					
Income	Mean score for Pro-Social Behaviour	Mean score for Social Well-Being		t value for Pro-Social Behaviour	p-value	t value for Social Well-Being	p-value
Less than Rs. 25,000	53.86	115.17		1.19 Not Significant	0.23	1.24 Not Significant	0.22
More than Rs. 25,000	52	119.17					

**Significant at 0.01 (2.66)

*Significant at 0.05 (2.00)

The table 7 indicates the difference among males for Pro-Social Behaviour and Social Well-Being with respect to age. Mean score of males for pro-social behaviour in the age group 25-40 years and 41-55 years was 53.7 and 51.61 respectively. t-value was 1.31, which is not significant at the 0.05 level of significance.

Mean score for Social Well-Being of males in the age group of 25-40 years and 41-55 years was 97.85 and 117.96. t-value was 2.84, which is significant at the 0.01 level of significance.

The table revealed that the males who were in the age group of 41-55 years had better social well-being than the males in the age group of 25-40 years.

The Table further shows the difference among males for pro-social behaviour and social well-being with respect to their income. The mean value for pro-social behaviour of both the categories i.e. income less than Rs. 25000/per month and income more than Rs. 25000/per month was 53.86 and 52 respectively. t-value was calculated 1.19, which is not significant at the 0.05 level of significance.

The mean value for social well-being of both income categories were 115.17 and 119.17 respectively. t-value was calculated 1.24, which is not significant at the 0.05 level of significance. It is concluded that income did not affect pro-social behaviour and social well-being of males.

Table 8: Correlation between Pro-Social Behaviour and Social Well-Being of Females and Males

Variables	Mean score of Females	df	r (F)	Mean score of Males	df	r (M)	Level of significance
Pro-Social Behaviour	52.017	58	-0.219	52.9	58	-0.224	Not significant
Social Well - Being	112.333			117.55			Not significant

**Significant at 0.01 (.325)

*Significant at 0.05 (.250)

Table no. 8 shows the correlation between pro-social behaviour and social well-being of females and males. The value of 'r' between pro-social behaviour and social well-being for females was calculated -0.219 whereas

for males it was -0.224 and the degree of freedom was 58. The value of 'r' is not significant for both females and males at the 0.05 level of significance though it is slightly negative.

Table 9: Correlation among Females between Pro-Social Behaviour and Social Well-Being with respect to Age and Income

Variables	Mean score for the age group 25-40 years	df	r	Mean score for the age group 41-55 years	df	r	Level of Significance
Pro-Social Behaviour	52.13	58	-0.48	52.04	58	-0.14	Not Significant for both the categories
Social Well-Being	113			128.18			
Variables	Mean score (income - less than Rs. 25000/month)	df	r	Mean score (income - more than Rs. 25000/month)	df	r	Level of Significance
Pro-Social Behaviour	53.04	58	-0.48	51.33	58	0.0134	Not Significant for both the categories
Social Well-Being	112.08			121.86			

**Significant at 0.01 (.325)

*Significant at 0.05 (.250)

The above table number 9 represents the correlation between pro-social behaviour and social well-being among females with respect to their age. The value of 'r' under the category of age group 25-40 years was -0.48 and the value of 'r' under the category of age group 41-55 years was -0.14 which shows a slightly negative correlation but for both the categories the correlation was not significant at the 0.05 level of significance.

It also outlines the correlation between pro-social behaviour and social well-being among females with respect to their income. The value of 'r' under the category of income less than Rs. 25000/per month came out to be -0.48, which shows a slightly negative correlation and the value of 'r' under the category of income more than Rs. 25000/per month came out to be 0.0134, which shows weak but positive correlation. The correlation is not significant at the 0.05 level of significance for both the categories.

Table 10: Correlation between Pro-Social Behaviour and Social Well-Being with respect to Age and Income among males

Variables	Mean score for the age group 25-40 years	df	r	Mean score for the age group 41-55 years	df	r	Level of Significance
Pro-Social Behaviour	53.7	58	0.085	51.61	58	0.21	Not Significant for both the categories
Social Well-Being	97.85			117.96			
Variables	Mean score (income- less than Rs. 25000/month)	df	r	Mean score (income- more than Rs. 25000/month)	df	r	Level of Significance
Pro-Social Behaviour	53.86	58	-0.47	52	58	-0.0007	Not Significant for both the categories
Social Well-Being	115.17			119.17			

**Significant at 0.01 (.325)

*Significant at 0.05 (.250)

Table 10 shows the correlation between pro-social behaviour and social well-being among males with respect to their age. The value of 'r' under the category of age group 25-40 years was 0.085, which shows a slightly positive correlation and the value of 'r' under the category of age group 41-55 years was 0.21 which shows positive correlation. The correlation for both the categories is not significant at the 0.05 level of significance.

Thus it is concluded that pro-social behaviour and social well-being is not related to each other in case of males.

The Table further outlines the correlation between pro-social behaviour and social well-being among males with respect to their income. The value of 'r' under the category of income less than Rs. 25000/per month was -0.47, which shows a slightly negative correlation and the value of 'r' under the

category of income more than Rs. 25000/per month was -0.0007, which shows weak but negative correlation. The correlation for both the categories is not significant at the 0.05 level of significance.

Discussion

The findings of the present study revealed that maximum number of females and males help people who are familiar them whereas very few number of females and males said that they help others because it boosts their own status. No significant difference was found between female and male adults regarding pro-social behaviour with respect to age but significant difference at the 0.05 level was found between females and males about social well-being in the category of income more than Rs. 25000/per month. The males who were earning more than Rs. 25000/per month were found to be

more socially satisfied than the female counterparts.

Difference among female adults for pro-social behaviour with respect to two age groups i.e. 25-40 years and 41-55 years was not significant but for social well-being the difference was found to be significant. Females in the age group of 41-55 years were found to be more socially satisfied as compared to the females in the age group of 25-40 years. Insignificant difference was found among male adults for pro-social behaviour with respect to two age groups i.e. 25-40 years and 41-55 years but for social well-being the difference was significant. The males between the age group of 41-55 years were found to be more satisfied with the social life than the males between the age group of 25-40 years.

Difference among female adults for pro-social behaviour with respect to income i.e. income less than Rs. 25000/per month and more than Rs. 25000/per month was not significant but for social well-being the difference was significant. The study revealed that the females who were earning more than Rs. 25000/per month were more socially satisfied as compared to the females who were earning less than Rs. 25000/per month. Male adults did not differ significantly about pro-social behaviour and social well-being with respect to income. The mean score of female and male adults for pro-social behaviour revealed that they indulged in high pro-social behaviour whereas the mean score of females and males for social well-being indicated that they were averagely satisfied with their social life. The difference among females and males regarding pro-social behaviour and social well-being was not significant which depicted that they had same level of pro-social behaviour and social well-being.

Correlation between pro-social behaviour and social well-being of female and male adults was not significant with respect to

age and income. No significant correlation was found between pro-social behaviour and social well-being for both female and male adults though the relationship was slightly negative.

Conclusion

The study revealed that both female and male adults had similar level of pro-social behaviour and social well-being behaviour. Slightly negative but not significant correlation was found between pro-social behaviour and social well-being of adults. Pro-social behaviour was not affected by the age and income of males and females but social well-being was affected by the age and income of the males and females. The study indicated that males and females in the age group of 41-55 years felt social connectedness and were socially happy. The results also unveiled that males and females who were earning income more than Rs. 25000/per month were more socially satisfied than who were earning income less than Rs. 25000/per month. Thus it is concluded that age and income affects one's social well-being.

References

- Baron, R. A., Byrne, D & Branscombe, N. R. (2006). *Social psychology* (11th ed.). India: Dorling Kindersley, Pvt. Ltd.
- Berkowitz, L. (1972). Social norms, feelings, and other factors affecting helping and altruism. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 6). New York: Academic Press.
- Five dimensions of Social Well-being, available at <http://the-mouse-trap.com/tag/social-well-being/>.
- Keyes, C.L.M. (1998). Social Well-Being. *Social psychology quarterly* (1998) 61 (2), 121-140. Retrieved from <http://midus.wisc.edu/findings/pdfs/58.pdf>

- Khanna, V., Sharma, E., Chauhan, S. & Pragyendu (2017). Effects of prosocial behavior on happiness and well-being. *The International Journal of Indian Psychology*, 4 (2), No.86, DIP: 18.01.031/20170402. Retrieved from <http://www.ijip.in/Archive/v4i2/18.01.031.20170402.pdf>.
- Kumar, R. (2014). Psychological well-being among adolescents: Role of prosocial behaviour. *Indian Journal of Health & Wellbeing*, 5(3).
- Latane, B. & Darley, J. M. (1970). *The unresponsive bystander: Why doesn't he help?* New York: Appleton-Centruy-Crofts.
- Taylor, S. E., Peplau, L. A. & Sears. D. O. (2006). *Social psychology* (12th ed.). India: Dorling Kindersley, Pvt. Ltd.

