

THE INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF HUMANITIES & SOCIAL STUDIES

Influence of Subjective Well Being and Gender Differences On Pro-Social Behaviour among a Sample of Nigerian Police Personnel

Victor Chidi Onyencho

Assistant Lecturer, Department of Mental Health, University of Maiduguri, Nigeria

Olukayode Ayooluwa Afolabi

Professor, Department of Pure and Applied Psychology, Adekunle Ajasin University, Nigeria

Abstract:

This study examined the influence of subjective well-being and gender differences on prosocial behaviour among police personnel's, in Ondo State, Nigeria. This is a cross sectional survey design utilizing accidental sampling techniques to recruit 128 participants, 65 (50.8%) were males, 62 (48.4%) were females, mean (X) age was 41.3 and (SD) was 7.9. Subjective well-being does not have any significant effect on prosocial behaviour [$f(1,123) = .566, p > .05$]. This implies that subjective wellbeing does not influence prosocial behaviour. Also, gender has no significant effect on prosocial behaviour [$f(1, 123) = .244, p > .05$]. This implies that police personnel's gender (male or female) does not influence prosocial behaviour. It is therefore recommended that helping behaviour has nothing to do with those general parameters used to determine well-being or life satisfaction.

Keywords: Gender, prosocial behaviour, subjective well-being, Nigerian police

1. Background of the study

Prosocial behaviour is voluntary behaviour intended to benefit one another. Thus, it includes behaviours such as helping, sharing, or providing comfort to one another. Penner et al., (2005) described prosocial behaviour as an act performed to benefit another person. Prosocial behaviour can also be referred to as a broad category of behaviours that includes any action that benefit others, such as being honest and cooperating with others in social situations. These actions may be motivated by empathy and by concern about the welfare and rights of others (Eisenberg, Fabes and Spinrad, 2006). Furthermore, prosocial activities are any conducted or planned action to help other people without expecting anything in return (Afolabi, 2013).

The purest forms of prosocial behaviour might be motivated by altruism, an unselfish interest in helping another person. According to Sanstock (2007), empathy for an individual in need and relationship between the benefactor and the recipient are the most significant factor that influences prosocial behaviour. The prevalence of such helping behaviours has been reported by Thoits and Hewitt (2001). Prosocial behaviour and altruism has been interchangeably used by researchers, but these two constructs are different. The former refers to a pattern of activity while the latter is the motivation to help others out of absolute regard for the others' needs instead of one's own benefits. For example, if a person donates blood the action of giving is prosocial behaviour and the person motivation to give would be altruism. Individual's tendency to be prosocial might not be farfetched from the person's perception of his/ her well-being or evaluation of life.

Life satisfaction has been identified as one of the three components of subjective well-being (Diener, 1984). It is defined as one's overall assessment derivable from the comparison between one's aspiration and one's achievement (George & Bearnon, 1980). Life satisfaction connotes the outcome of self assessment, depending on one's expectation. It is determined by one's perception of how things are and how they should be. The smaller the gap, the more satisfied the person becomes. Also, well-being can be considered as a condition of one's perception of life or meaning of life. According to Diener, Suh, Lucas, and Smith (1999) subjective wellbeing is defined as person's cognitive and affective evaluation of his life. These evaluations include emotional reactions to events as well as cognitive judgments of satisfaction and fulfilment.

In an attempt to understand life satisfaction, a number of models have been advanced. For instance, top-down approach model advocate for dispositional such as personality characteristic in understanding life satisfaction (Ho, Cheung & Cheung, 2008). In line with this, researchers have reported that genetic component account for about 80% variations in well-being (Lykken & Tellegen, 1996; Tellegen, et al, 1988). These findings indicated that the differences in people's life satisfaction

are due in part to their biological differences. If this argument is dragged to the extreme, it appears there is little we could do to change people's feeling of satisfaction as it is predominantly genetic. Thus, some individuals have predisposition to be satisfied or unsatisfied with life and this directly or indirectly influence helping attitude.

Another variable to consider in this study is gender, this refers to the socially constructed characteristics of women and men- such as norms, roles and relationship of and between groups of women and men World Health Organisation 'WHO' (2017). While most people are born either male or female, they are taught appropriate norms and behaviours- including how they should interact with others of the same or opposite sex within households, communities and work places. When individuals or group do not 'fit' or established gender norms they often face stigma, discriminatory practices or social exclusion, all of which adversely affect health and prosocial behaviour (WHO, 2017).

1.1. Subjective Well Being and Prosocial Behaviour

Many researchers have tried to find the relationship between well-being, happiness and prosocial for a very long time. Hunter and Lin (1981) found that retirees over the age of 65 who are prosocial were more satisfied with life and were less depressed and had low anxiety. Also, Martin and Huebner (2007) found that higher rates of prosocial interactions were linked to greater life satisfaction and prosocial acts for middle school students. This implies that Prosocial behaviour directly influenced life satisfaction, and the highest influence was found among the oldest group as compared to younger ones (Caprara and Steca, 2005). In an Indian study, it was reported that well-being and happiness are interrelated and factors like prosocial behaviour, hope, optimism and altruism are also related to well-being (Khanna, Sharma, Chauhan, and Pragyenden, 2017). Participants who engaged in volunteering and spending money to benefit others experienced greater meaning in life, increased self-worth and self-esteem (Klein, 2016).

In a similar study, Anderson (2009) concluded that satisfaction with life did not account for any of the variance of prosocial behaviour. This suggests that those who demonstrate prosocial behaviour were not significantly motivated to do so because of life satisfaction, but as a result of other factors. Also, prosocial behaviour and satisfaction with life were found to be unrelated. (Gebauer, Riketta, Broemer & Maio 2008). These researchers found that in order for prosocial behaviour to positively relate to life satisfaction, the behaviour needed to have pleasure-based motivation, not pressure-based motivation. Pleasure based prosocial behaviour is motivated by personal interest, whereas pressure based prosocial behaviour is motivated by external factors, such as guilt or praise (Gebauer, Riketta, Broemer & Maio 2008).

1.2. Gender and Prosocial Behaviour

Gender is seen as one of the most consistent correlates of prosocial behaviour. Across many studies, girls and women have been found to be more prosocial than boys and men (Rushton, 1982; Pursell, Laursen, Rubin, Booth-LaForce & Rose-Krasnor, 2008). A study by Williams (2003) found that firms that have a higher proportion of women serving on their boards engage in philanthropic contributions than firms with a lower proportion of women. In a similar study, women were found to be more sensitive to corporate giving and tend to allocate higher budgets to social causes (Valor, 2006). In a study on gender roles, females generally are expected and believed to be more responsive, empathetic and prosocial than males whereas males are expected to be relatively independent and achievement oriented" (Eisenberg, Fabes, & Spinrad, 2006; Seefeldt, 2008).

However, in a Nigerian study among undergraduates and some Nigerian drivers it was reported that gender does not have any significant effect on prosocial behaviour (Afolabi and Idowu, 2014; Afolabi, 2013). Also, in another similar study, Charbonneau and Nicol (2002) found that girls scored somewhat, but not significantly, higher than boys on altruism and civic value. It was noted that in similar study that when helping implies performing an activity, or when the intervention is perceived as risky, men are more willing to help (Dovidio, Piliavin, Gaertner, Schroeder, & Clark, 1991).

1.3. Statement of the Problem

Studies on prosocial behaviour have been among students and attention has been given to psychosocial and personality types in south western Nigeria (Afolabi, 2013; 2014). In a similar study, Walker (2007) concentrates on the effect of happy people pills on prosocial behaviour. There is dearth of literature on the influence of subjective well-being on prosocial behaviour among security personnel's, especially among Nigeria police personnel's, as it was generally believed that Nigerian police personnel's will not render an assistant without expecting a kick back in terms of monetary compensation or in kind. Furthermore, the role of gender differences on prosocial behaviour has not been adequately dealt with in previous studies. Despite considerable empirical support for the importance of prosocial behaviour among youths, little attention has been given to factors that are likely to influence prosocial behaviour.

Therefore, the general objectives of this paper are to find the influence of subjective well being and gender difference on prosocial behaviour among a sample of Nigerian police personnel's. And the specific objective is to examine if participants rank have an influence on prosocial behaviours.

Based on the above reasons it is of necessity to test the following hypothesis that: (i) there would be main and interaction effects of Subjective wellbeing and gender on prosocial behaviour among a sample of Nigerian Police Personnel's. (ii) Rank of personnel's will significantly influence prosocial behaviours among Nigerian Police Personnel's.

2. Method

2.1. Design

The design for this study is the cross-sectional survey with two independent variables and one dependent variable. The two independent variables include subjective well being and gender differences. The dependent variable is prosocial behaviour.

2.2. Setting

The study was carried out at Okuta Elerinwa Police Stations, Akure South Local Government Area and Igbatoro Police Stations, Akure North Local Government Area both in Akure, Ondo State, Nigeria. Akure is a city in south western Nigeria and is the largest city and capital of Ondo State with a population estimate of 556, 000 (National Population Commission of Nigeria, 2015).

2.3. Sampling Techniques and Participants

Accidental sampling techniques was used to recruit 128 Nigeria police personnel into the study, 65 (50.8%) were males, 62 (48.4%) were females. Their mean (\bar{X}) age was 41.3 and the standard deviation (SD) was 7.9. Marital Status; Single 12 (9.4%), Married 108 (84.4%), Divorced 2 (1.6%), Separated 4 (3.1%). Religious affiliation, 99 (77.3%) were Christians, 25 (19.5%) and were Muslims. Educational Levels, SSCE 24 (18.8%), ND/NCE 36 (28.1%), HND/BSc 50 (39.1%), MSc 12 (9.4%). Rank of Personnel's, Junior 34 (26.6%), Intermediates 48 (37.5%), Senior 40 (31.3%).

2.4. Instruments

The instruments used to gather information was a carefully designed questionnaire comprising of sections A to C. Section A: tapped information on demographic variables. Respondents were asked to report their actual age, sex was dichotomized into two, male and female, religion was dichotomized into two Christianity and Islam, and educational level was divided into four, SSCE, ND/NCE, HND/BSc, MSc. Also, marital status was divided into four Single, Married, Divorced, Separated and rank of personnel are: Commissioner of Police (CP), Deputy Commissioner of Police (DCP), Assistant Commissioner of Police (ACP), Chief Superintendent of Police (CSP), Superintendent of Police (SP), Deputy Superintendent of Police (DSP), Assistant Superintendent of Police (ASP), Inspector, Sergeant, Corporal, and Constable. Therefore, CP, DCP, and ACP were regarded as senior ranks; CSP, SP, DSP and ASP were regarded as intermediate ranks and Inspector, Sergeant, Corporal and Constable were regarded as junior ranks.

Section B is a satisfaction with Life Scale (SwLS) (Diener et al., 1985) is a five-item measure that assesses an individual's global judgement of life satisfaction as a whole. The SwLS measures the cognitive component of SWB and provides an integrated judgement of how a person's life as a whole is going. The 5 items were rated on a seven-point Likert scale, ranging from (1) "strongly disagree", to (4) "neither agree nor disagree", to (7) "strongly agree". The five items are keyed in a positive direction so that responses can be added to calculate a total score, which ranges from 5 to 35. Pavot and Diener (2008) report that scores from 5 to 9 indicate that an individual is extremely dissatisfied with life, from 10 to 14 dissatisfied with life, from 15 to 19 slightly dissatisfied with life, that a score of 20 indicates neutral life satisfaction, from 21 to 25 slight satisfaction with life, from 26 to 30 satisfactions with life, and from 31 to 35 extreme satisfaction with life. The SwLS has been used in hundreds of studies and has demonstrated good psychometric properties (Pavot & Diener, 2008; Pavot, Diener, Colvin, & Sandvik, 1991). Hayes and Joseph (2003) reported an adult mean score of 24.1 (SD = 6.9), Chang and Sanna (2001) reported mean scores for adults in international and cross-cultural samples of 23.0 (SD = 6.8) for males and 23.7 (SD = 6.7) for females. Oladipo and Balogun (2011) reported a Cronbach alpha of .70 among Nigerian adolescents. For the purpose of this study, Cronbach alpha of .703 was reported.

Section C contained a 12-item prosocial behaviour scale developed Afolabi (2013). The reported coefficient alpha of .81, test - re-test reliability of .77 and a split half reliability of .72. Also, the scale correlated positively with social responsibility scale by Rossi (2001) with $r = .81$. The participant's rates the 12 statements on a Likert format ranging from Strongly Disagree (1) – Strongly Agree (5) and scored in a manner that a high score reflected a high presence of the construct in question. For the purpose of this study, Cronbach alpha of .701 was reported.

2.5. Procedure

Copies of the study questionnaire were administered to 172 police personnel across available police stations in the two local governments but due to the nature of Nigeria police personnel's busy schedule 158 was retrieved and only 128 was valid. Ethical clearance was sought from Director of Police Officer of each station, informed consent, and confidentiality issue was discussed with each intended participant before the commencement of the questionnaire administration.

2.6. Statistical Analysis

Two hypotheses were tested in this study. The first hypothesis was tested using 2x2 Analysis of variance. This is because the researcher was interested in the interaction between the independent and dependent variables. While one-way

Analysis of variance was used for the second hypothesis because the independent variable has three levels. All the hypotheses will be tested with SPSS 17.0 version.

3. Results

Pearson Product Moment Correlation was used to determine the types of relationship that exist among the variables of study. The results are presented in Table 1.

Variables	Mean	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1. Age	41.27	7.93	1							
2. Gender	-	-	-.08	1						
3. Marital Status	-	-	.19*	-.03	1					
4. Religion	-	-	-.01	-.17	-.04	1				
5. Job Rank	-	-	.44**	.02	-.02	.08	1			
6. Education Qualification	-	-	.15	-.00	.09	-.01	.27**	1		
7. Subjective Wellbeing	23.66	6.63	.16	.01	-.02	-.11	.04	-.02	1	
8. ProSocial Behaviour	46.87	6.97	-.10	-.04	.06	-.11	-.17	.11	.12	1

Table 1: Mean, SD and Inter-Variable Correlations

Note: ** $p < .01$, * $p < .05$, $N = 128$

The results showed that marital status, job rank and educational qualification significantly related to police personnel's prosocial behaviour. The table above reveals significant relationship between marital status and prosocial behaviour ($r = .19$; $p < .005$), job rank ($r = .44$; $p < .001$), and educational qualification ($r = .27$; $p < .001$). This implied that a high level of correlation exists between these variables. Therefore, marital status, job rank, and educational background will significantly influence prosocial behaviour among Nigerian police personnel's.

Subjective wellbeing	Sex	Mean	Standard Deviation	N
Low	Male	47.46	4.811	28
	Female	45.28	8.370	29
	Total	46.35	6.886	57
High	Male	46.84	7.286	37
	Female	47.79	6.990	33
	Total	47.29	7.112	70
Total	Male	47.11	6.303	65
	Female	46.61	7.706	62
	Total	46.87	6.999	127

Table 2: Mean, SD of Each Group on Prosocial Behaviour

As shown in table 2, the result shows that individuals with a higher score in subjective wellbeing ($M=47.29$; $SD = 7.11$) had higher prosocial behaviour compared to those with lower subjective wellbeing ($M = 46.35$; $SD = 6.89$). It was also observed that males ($M = 47.11$; $SD = 6.30$) indicated a little but improved difference on their measure on prosocial compared to female ($M = 46.61$; $SD = 7.71$). The interaction revealed that male individuals with high subjective wellbeing had the highest form of prosocial behaviour, while the least were female individuals with low subjective wellbeing. To further confirm if the observed differences were actually significant, a 2 x 2 ANOVA was conducted and presented below.

The hypothesis which predicted that there would be main and interaction effects of Subjective wellbeing and gender on prosocial behaviour among a sample of Nigerian Police Personnel's. The hypothesis was rejected as shown in Table 3.

Source	SS	Df	MS	F	P
Subjective Wellbeing	27.879	1	27.879	.566	>.05
Gender	12.026	1	12.026	.244	>.05
Subjective Wellbeing	77.238	1	77.238	1.567	>.05
Error	6061.300	123	49.279		
Total	6172.724	126			

Table 3: Summary of 2x2 ANOVA Showing the Main and Interaction Effects of Subjective Wellbeing and Gender on Prosocial Behaviours

Table 3 above shows that subjective well-being does not have any significant effect on prosocial behaviour [$f(1,123) = .566, p > .05$]. This implies that subjective wellbeing does not influence prosocial behaviour. Therefore, the main effect of subjective wellbeing was not confirmed. Also, gender has no significant effect on prosocial behaviour [$f(1, 123) = .244, p > .05$]. This implies that police personnel's gender (male or female) does not influence prosocial behaviour. Therefore, the main effect of subjective wellbeing and gender was not confirmed. However, the interaction effects of subjective wellbeing and gender [$f(1, 123) = 1.567, p > .05$] were not significant.

The hypothesis which predicted that Rank of personnel's will significantly influence prosocial behaviours among Nigerian Police Personnel's. The hypothesis was rejected as shown in Table 4.

Source	SS	Df	MS	F	P
Between Group	174.814	2	87.407	1.769	>.05
Within Group	5879.85	119	49.411		
Total	6054.66	121			

Table 4: Summary of One-Way ANOVA Showing the Influence of Rank of Personnel's on Prosocial Behaviours

Table 4 above shows that rank of personnel's does not have any significant effect on prosocial behaviour [$f(2, 119) = 1.77, p > .05$]. This implies that rank of personnel's does not have any significant influence on prosocial behaviour.

4. Discussion and Conclusion

The main objective of this paper is to find the influence of subjective well being and gender difference on prosocial behaviour among a sample of Nigeria police personnel's. The first hypothesis which stated that there would be main and interaction effects of Subjective wellbeing and gender on prosocial behaviour among a sample of Nigerian Police Personnel's was rejected. This was in line with the finding of Anderson (2009) that satisfaction with life did not account for any of the variance of prosocial behaviour. The researcher suggests that those who demonstrate prosocial behaviour are not significantly motivated to do so because of life satisfaction, but as a result of other factors. Similarly, this finding also agreed with Gebauer, et al. (2008) study that prosocial behaviour and satisfaction with life were unrelated. On the other hand, this study revealed that gender does not have any significant influence on prosocial behaviour. This finding supported the previous studies that gender does not have any significant effect on prosocial behaviour among Nigerian drivers and undergraduates (Afolabi and Idowu, 2014; Afolabi, 2013).

Second hypothesis which stated that rank of personnel's will significantly influence prosocial behaviours among Nigerian Police Personnel's was rejected. This is because prosocial behaviour is an innate behaviour that has nothing to do with someone official ranks or status in life.

In conclusion, subjective wellbeing as a component of life satisfaction has no influence on prosocial behaviour among Nigerian police personnel's. This might be as a result of factor like religiosity that could mediate the relationship between life satisfaction and perceived social exclusion on prosocial behaviour as documented by Afolabi (2014). Also, genetic component could be a factor in subjective well-being and this could invariably influence prosocial behaviour (Lykken & Tellegen, 1996; Tellegen et al., 1988). Furthermore, it has also been established that gender does not influence prosocial behaviour among Nigerian police personnel's; likewise rank of the personnel's.

5. Recommendations

It is recommended in this study that helping behaviour has nothing to do with those general parameters used to determine well-being or life satisfaction like money, social status, official rank, education, one's gender etc. one's state of mind or mood at the moment the help is being rendered, previous experience in relation to helping others and one's genetic makeup could be a factor to consider in other future study on prosocial behaviour.

5.1. Limitations of Study

Generalization of this study might not be totally acceptable in the academic community based on the number of participants; this study employed 128 personnel's out of 371, 800 Nigerian police personnel's. Since few interested variables in this study have been found not to have any influence on prosocial behaviour, future study should focus on one's state of mind or mood as factor to consider and research on.

6. References

- i. Afolabi, O.A. & Idowu, E.O. (2014). Influence of gender, spiritual involvement/belief and emotional stability on prosocial behaviour among some Nigerian drivers. *Canadian Social Science*, Vol. 10(1), pp. 121-127.
- ii. Afolabi, O.A. (2013). Roles of personality types, emotional intelligence and gender differences on prosocial behaviour. *Psychological Thought*, 6 (1), 124-139.
- iii. Agbo, A. A., Nzeadibe, T. C., & Ajaero, C. K. (2012). Happiness in Nigeria: A socio-cultural analysis. In H. Selin & G. Davey (Eds.), *Happiness across cultures: Views of happiness and quality of life in non-Western cultures*. New York: Springer.
- iv. Anderson, K. (2009). Relationships between prosocial behaviour, spirituality, narcissism and satisfaction with life. Retrieved on October 18th, 2017 from <https://gustavus.edu/psychology/documents/KellyAndersonSpr09.pdf>
- v. Caprara, G.V. & Steca, P. (2005). Self-efficacy beliefs as determinants of prosocial behaviour conducive to life satisfaction across ages. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 24(2), 191-217.
- vi. Chang, E.C. & Sanna, L.J. (2001). Optimism, pessimism and positive and negative affectivity in middle-aged adults: A test of a cognitive affective model of psychological adjustment. *Psychology and Aging*, 16(3), 524-531.
- vii. Charbonneau, D., & Nicol, A. A. M. (2002). Emotional intelligence and prosocial behaviours in adolescents. *Psychological Reports*, 90(2), 361-370.
- viii. Diener, E. (1984). Subjective well-being. *Psychological Bulletin*, 95: 542-575.
- ix. Diener, E., Emmons, R. A., Larsen, R. J., Griffin, S. (1985). The satisfaction with life scale. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 49(1), 71-5.
- x. Diener, D.E., Suh, M.E., Lucas, E.R., and Smith, L.H., Subjective Well-Being: Three Decades of Progress (1999). *American Psychological Association, Inc.*, 125(2), 276-302.
- xi. Dovidio, J. F., Piliavin, J. A., Gaertner, S. L., Schroeder, D. A., & Clark, R. D., III. (1991). The arousal: Cost-reward model and the process of intervention: A review of the evidence. In M. S. Clark (Ed.), *Review of Personality and Social Psychology: Vol. 12. Pro-social behaviour* (pp. 86-118). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- xii. Eisenberg, N., Fabes, R., & Spinrad, T. (2006). Prosocial development. In N. Eisenberg, W. Damon, & R. Lerner (Eds.), *Handbook of Child Psychology: Vol. 3. Social emotional and personality development* (6th ed., pp. 646-718). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.
- xiii. Gebauer, J. E., Riketta, M., Broemer, P., Maio, G. R. (2008). Pleasure and pressure based prosocial motivation: Divergent relations to subjective wellbeing. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 42, 399-420.
- xiv. George, L & Bearon, L. (1980). *Quality of life in older persons*. New York: Human Science Press.
- xv. Hayes, N. & Joseph, S. (2003). Big 5 correlates of three measures of subjective well-being. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 34(4), 723-727.
- xvi. Ho, M. Y., Cheung, F. M., & Cheung, S. F. (2008). Personality and life events as predictors of adolescents' life satisfaction: Do life events mediate the link between personality and life satisfaction? *Social Indicators Research*, 8: 475-471.
- xvii. Hunter, K. I., & Lin, M. W. (1981). Psychosocial differences between elderly volunteers and non-volunteers. *International Journal of Aging and Human Development*, 12, 205-213.
- xviii. Klein, N. (2016). Prosocial behaviour increases perceptions of meaning in life. *The Journal of Positive Psychology*, 6 (2), 1-8.
- xix. Khanna V, Sharma E, Chauhan S, pragyendu (2017), Effects of Prosocial Behaviour on Happiness and Well-Being, *International Journal of Indian Psychology*, 4, 2 (86), 1-11.
- xx. Lykken, D.T., & Tellegen, A. (1996). Happiness is a stochastic phenomenon. *Psychological Science*, 7: 186-189.
- xxi. Martin, K. & Huebner, E.S. (2007). Peer victimization, prosocial experiences and emotional well-being of Middle school students. *Psychology in the Schools*, 44, 199-208.
- xxii. Nigeria Police Force (2016). Retrieved on November 17th, 2017 from <http://www.Npf.gov.ng>.
- xxiii. Oladipo, S.E. and Balogun, S.K. (2012). How suitable is the satisfaction with life scale for use on adolescents in Nigeria. *Science Journal of Psychology*, 2012 (2), 1-3.

- xxiv. Pavot, W. & Diener, E. (2008). The Satisfaction with Life Scale and the emerging construct of life satisfaction. *The Journal of Positive Psychology*, 3, 137-157.
- xxv. Pavot, W., Diener, E., Colvin, C.R., & Sandvik, E. (1991). Further validation of the satisfaction with life scale: Evidence for the cross-method convergence of well-being measures. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 57, 149-161.
- xxvi. Penner, A. L., Dovidi, F. John., Piliavin, A.J., Schroeder, A.D., (2005), prosocial behaviour: multilevel perspectives. *Annu. Rev. Psychol.*, 56:14.1–14.28
- xxvii. Pursell, G. R., Laursen, B., Rubin, K. H., Booth-LaForce, C., & Rose-Krasnor, L. (2008). Gender difference in patterns of association between prosocial behaviour, personality and externalizing problems. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 42(2), 472-481.
- xxviii. Rossi, A. S. (2001). *Caring and doing for others: Social responsibility in the domains of family work and community*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- xxix. Rushton, J. P. (1982). *Social Learning Theory and the development of prosocial behaviour*. In N. Eisenberg (Ed.), *The development of prosocial behaviour* (pp. 77-105). New York: Academic Press.
- xxx. Santock, W. A., & John, W. A. (2007). *Tropical approach to life span development* (Ch. 15, 4th Ed, pp.489 – 491). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- xxxi. Seefeldt, L. D. (2008). Gender stereotypes associated with altruistic acts. *UW-Stout Journal of Student Research*, Retrieved on October 18th, 2017 from <http://www2.uwstout.edu/content/rs/2008/10Gender%20Altruism%20for%20publication.pdf>.
- xxxii. Tellegen, A., Lykken, D. T., Bouchard, T. J., Jr, Wilcox, K. J., Segal, N. L., & Rich, S. (1988). Personality similarity in twins reared apart and together. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 54: 1031-1039.
- xxxiii. Thoits, A.P., & Hewitt, N. L., (2001). Volunteer work and well-being. *Journal of Health and Social Behaviour*, 42, 115–131.
- xxxiv. Valor, C. (2006). Why do managers give? Applying prosocial behaviour theory to understand firm giving. *International Review on Public and Non Profit Marketing*, 3(1), 17-28.
- xxxv. Walker, M. (2007), *In Praise of Bio-Happiness*, Unpublished manuscript
- xxxvi. World Health Organisation (2017). *Gender, equity and human right*. Geneva. Retrieved on October 18th, 2017 from <http://www.who.int>
- xxxvii. Williams, R. J. (2003). Women on corporate boards of directors and their influence on corporate philanthropy. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 42(1), 1-10.