

COMPARATIVE ROLE OF MINDFULNESS ON SUBJECTIVE WELL-BEING OF BUSINESSMEN AND PROFESSIONALS

Dr. Lav Kumar Singh*; Dr. Manish Kant**

*Assistant Professor,
Department of Psychology,
APSM College, Barauni, Begusarai, INDIA
Email Id: lkumarsingh@gmail.com

**Assistant Professor,
Department of Psychology,
VSJ College, Rajnagar, Madhubani, INDIA

DOI: 10.5958/2249-7137.2026.00007.9

ABSTRACT

The present study aimed to examine the comparative role of mindfulness on subjective well-being among businessmen and professionals. In the current fast-paced and competitive lifestyle, working adults frequently experience stress, mental burden and reduced life satisfaction. Mindfulness, which refers to present moment awareness and non-judgemental attention, is considered an important positive psychological factor that may enhance subjective well-being. A descriptive research design was used for the study. The sample consisted of 150 participants including 80 businessmen and 70 professionals with an average age of 41 years. Participants were selected through purposive and snowball sampling techniques. Data were collected using the Mindful Attention Awareness Scale (MAAS) and the Satisfaction With Life Scale (SWLS). Statistical analysis included mean, standard deviation, independent sample t-test, Pearson correlation and regression analysis. Results indicated that businessmen scored significantly higher than professionals in mindfulness as well as subjective well-being. Further, mindfulness showed a significant positive correlation with subjective well-being in both groups. Regression findings revealed that mindfulness significantly predicted subjective well-being among businessmen and professionals, though the predictive strength was stronger in businessmen. The findings suggest that mindfulness can be considered as a supportive psychological resource for improving well-being in occupational groups, and mindfulness-based practices may be useful in stress management and mental health promotion programs.

KEYWORDS: *Mindfulness, Subjective Well-Being, Businessmen, And Professionals.*

INTRODUCTION

In today's fast and fast-moving lifestyle, mental health and happiness is becoming a big concern for almost everyone. People are running behind success, money, achievements, promotions, business growth, targets etc., but still many are not feeling satisfied from inside. This is where the concept of **subjective well-being (SWB)** becomes very important. Subjective well-being mainly refers to how people evaluate their own life in terms of **life satisfaction, positive emotions and low negative emotions**. It is not only about having comfort or good income,

rather it is about *feeling good about life overall* (Diener, 1984). In this modern time, subjective well-being is affected by stress, workload, competition and lack of mental peace, which is very common among businessmen as well as working professionals.

Mindfulness has recently emerged as an effective psychological approach for improving well-being. **Mindfulness** means being present in the moment, paying attention intentionally, without judging our thoughts and feelings too much. It is a kind of mental skill that helps people to respond in a calmer way even when life is hectic (Kabat-Zinn, 1994). Mindfulness practices are now being widely used in clinical settings, educational institutes and even workplaces because it helps individuals manage anxiety, stress and emotional disturbances.

At the same time, it is also true that different occupational groups may experience stress in different way. A businessman handles risks, uncertain income, employee management, financial pressure and long decision-making load. While professionals like teachers, engineers, doctors or corporate employees have structured work roles but may face pressure of deadlines, performance evaluation, job insecurity and work-life imbalance. Due to these differences, the way mindfulness contributes to well-being may also vary. So, comparing mindfulness between these two groups becomes meaningful.

Mindfulness and Subjective Well-being

Previous research has shown that mindfulness has a positive association with subjective well-being and psychological health. People who are more mindful generally report higher satisfaction with life and more positive emotions, because mindfulness helps in reducing rumination and emotional reactivity (Brown & Ryan, 2003). Instead of overthinking about past failures or future worries, a mindful person focuses on what is happening right now, and this builds emotional balance slowly.

Mindfulness is also linked with better emotion regulation and self-control. When a person learns to observe thoughts without reacting immediately, it reduces stress and increases mental stability. Studies indicate mindfulness practices improve happiness, optimism and overall functioning in daily life (Lyubomirsky, King, & Diener, 2005). This is why mindfulness is sometimes considered as a kind of inner resource which supports well-being even in challenging situations.

Many models of mindfulness suggest that it works through developing acceptance and awareness. Acceptance does not mean giving up, but it means understanding feelings without fighting unnecessarily. This decreases internal conflicts and enhances peace of mind. Research supports that mindfulness-based interventions like MBSR show improvement in stress reduction and quality of life (Kabat-Zinn, 1990).

Occupational Stress and Need for Mindfulness

In workplaces, stress is now almost normal. High competition, less time and high expectations are creating emotional burnout in many people. Professionals often report fatigue, low job satisfaction, emotional exhaustion and sometimes even depression. Burnout is especially common among those who deal with people constantly like doctors, teachers, managers etc. (Maslach & Leiter, 2016). Mindfulness in such context works as a psychological protective factor, because it enhances coping and mental flexibility.

Businessmen also face unique stressors. Even though business provides autonomy and freedom, it also comes with high uncertainty. Business decisions involve profit-loss risk and long hours.

Many businessmen also struggle with work-life balance, because work and personal life often gets mixed. This makes businessmen vulnerable to stress and emotional strain. Some studies highlight that entrepreneurs are at risk of psychological distress due to constant responsibility and unpredictability (Baron, Franklin, & Hmieleski, 2016).

But still, compared to professionals, businessmen may have different coping patterns. Professionals have fixed job roles and organisational structure, while businessmen are mostly self-managed. So mindfulness may show different effects on them, because daily routine, control over work and stress type differs.

Mindfulness in Work and Organisational Life

Workplace mindfulness has gained serious attention. Organisations are now including meditation, breathing sessions and mindfulness training for employees. It is reported that mindfulness enhances job satisfaction, focus and interpersonal relationships, which indirectly improves well-being (Hülshager, Alberts, Feinholdt, & Lang, 2013). Mindful employees can better manage deadlines and avoid emotional outburst, which makes work environment healthier.

Also mindfulness improves cognitive performance and reduces emotional exhaustion. This suggests mindfulness can be beneficial for both businessmen and professionals. But the key question is: **is the level or impact same in both groups?** This is still not very clear. Because businessmen might already have a habit of self-regulation due to practical life experiences, whereas professionals might depend more on structured coping resources. So the need and use of mindfulness can vary.

Comparative Perspective: Businessmen vs Professionals

It is important to understand that businessmen and professionals have different lifestyle, job demands and stress sources. Professionals work in organisations where evaluation, hierarchy and fixed rules are there. This can create pressure of performance and fear of criticism. Businessmen, on the other hand, face economic uncertainties and social responsibility but also enjoy flexibility.

This difference can influence subjective well-being. For example, some research suggests that autonomy and sense of control increases well-being (Ryan & Deci, 2000). Businessmen might have higher autonomy, but they also experience uncertainty. Professionals may have stable income but lower control in many cases. So mindfulness may function as a balancing tool differently in these groups.

Few studies have compared well-being across occupational groups, but direct comparison focusing on mindfulness and SWB between businessmen and professionals is still less explored. Many studies are either on corporate employees or healthcare professionals, and businessman group is often ignored or mixed into general population. This creates a research gap.

Knowledge Gap

Even though mindfulness is widely studied, most research is focused on students, clinical population, teachers, nurses, corporate employees, etc. There is limited evidence about mindfulness and subjective well-being specifically among **businessmen**, especially in Indian context. Businessmen have a different psychological environment, and their coping style may be more practical, risk-based and decision-oriented. Still, they experience stress and emotional disturbances, but studies don't highlight them properly.

Another gap is that studies usually examine mindfulness and well-being in a general manner, not comparing **two distinct occupational groups** under the same framework. Since occupational stressors are not similar, it becomes important to assess whether mindfulness predicts SWB equally among businessmen and professionals or not. Also, most studies are based on single-group design and cross-sectional approach, and the comparative framework is still lacking.

Moreover, subjective well-being is influenced by cultural factors too. In Indian society, businessmen are often socially seen as successful, but their mental strain is less discussed. Professionals are respected for stability and education, but their job pressure is quite high. This cultural difference might influence self-reporting and perception of well-being. So, comparative analysis can give more realistic understanding.

Rationale of the Study

Due to rising stress and mental health challenges in working population, exploring factors like mindfulness that can promote subjective well-being is very necessary. Businessmen and professionals both contribute significantly to economic and social development, but their mental health is often neglected. If mindfulness has a positive role in improving SWB, then it can be applied as an intervention strategy in workplaces, business communities and professional settings.

This study becomes important because it attempts to compare mindfulness and SWB between businessmen and professionals, rather than treating working adults as one uniform group. It can help identify which group benefits more from mindfulness and which group needs more mindfulness-based support. Findings may help counsellors, organisational psychologists and policy makers to design better well-being programs, workshops and stress management training.

In short, by studying the **comparative role of mindfulness on subjective well-being** among businessmen and professionals, the present work can add new knowledge in positive psychology and occupational mental health, especially in Indian setting where such comparisons are still less done.

Objectives of the Study

1. **To compare mindfulness levels among businessmen and professionals.**
2. **To compare subjective well-being among businessmen and professionals.**
3. **To examine the role (predictive influence) of mindfulness on subjective well-being among businessmen and professionals.**

Hypotheses of the Study

H1: There will be a significant difference in mindfulness between businessmen and professionals.

H2: There will be a significant difference in subjective well-being between businessmen and professionals.

H3: Mindfulness will significantly and positively predict subjective well-being among businessmen and professionals, and its predictive strength will differ across the two groups.

Methodology

Research Design

The present study followed a **descriptive research design**, because it aims to describe and compare the levels of mindfulness and subjective well-being among businessmen and professionals, and also examined how mindfulness played a role in predicting subjective well-being in both groups. The study conducted in a natural setting without manipulating any variable, so it was suitable for descriptive type of research.

Sample

The sample for the present study consisted of **150 participants**. Out of these, **80 were businessmen** and the remaining **70 were professionals**. The average age of the participants was approximately **41 years**.

- **Group 1:** Businessmen ($n = 80$)
- **Group 2:** Professionals ($n = 70$)

Professionals includes individuals working in areas such as teaching, banking, healthcare, engineering, office jobs, or other service-based fields.

Sampling Technique

The participants selected using **purposive sampling**, since the study specifically required individuals from two occupational categories (businessmen and professionals). Along with this, **snowball sampling** was also be used, where initial participants helped in contacting other eligible participants from their professional or business networks. This combined approach helped in reaching the required sample size more easily and in limited time.

Psychological Tools / Measures

To collect data for the study, following standardised psychological tools were used:

1. **Mindfulness Measure - Mindful Attention Awareness Scale (MAAS)** developed by **Brown and Ryan (2003)** was used to assess mindfulness. It is a widely used tool that measures present-moment awareness and attention in daily life.
2. **Subjective Well-being Measure - Subjective well-being** was assessed using **Satisfaction with Life Scale (SWLS)** developed by **Diener et al. (1985)**. This scale measures the cognitive component of subjective well-being, mainly life satisfaction.

Procedure of Data Collection

Participants were approached personally and the purpose of the study were explained clearly. Informed consent was taken from all participants. They were also assured that their responses would be kept confidential and would be used only for academic purpose. The questionnaires were administered either in printed form or in online form depending upon participant convenience. It took around **15–20 minutes** for one participant to complete the tools.

Statistical Analysis

The collected data were analysed using appropriate descriptive and inferential statistics:

- **Mean and Standard Deviation (SD)** were used to describe the levels of mindfulness and subjective well-being.
-

- **Independent samples t-test** was used to compare businessmen and professionals on mindfulness and subjective well-being.
- **Pearson’s correlation** was used to examine the relationship between mindfulness and subjective well-being.
- **Simple linear regression analysis** was conducted to study the predictive role of mindfulness on subjective well-being in both occupational groups.

All statistical analysis were done using standard statistical software (SPSS), and results has been interpreted at **0.05 level of significance**.

Result

Mindfulness among Businessmen and Professionals

Table 1 Comparison of Mindfulness (MAAS) Scores between Businessmen and Professionals

Group	N	Mean	Mean Dif	SD	t-value	df	p-value	Result
Businessmen	80	55.72		8.41				
Professionals	70	52.11	3.61	7.96	2.70	148	0.008	Accepted

Subjective Well-being among Businessmen and Professionals

Table 2 Comparison of Subjective Well-being (SWLS) Scores between Businessmen and Professionals

Group	N	Mean	M.diff	SD	t-value	df	p-value	Result
Businessmen	80	23.84		4.93				
Professionals	70	21.62	2.22	4.88	2.76	148	0.006	Accepted

Mindfulness and Subjective Well-being

Table 3 Correlation between Mindfulness and Subjective Well-being

Group	N	r-value	p-value	Interpretation
Businessmen	80	0.46	0.000	Significant positive correlation
Professionals	70	0.32	0.007	Significant positive correlation

Prediction of Subjective Well-being through Mindfulness

Table 4 Regression Analysis Showing Predictive Role of Mindfulness on Subjective Well-being

Group	N	R	R ²	β	t-value	p-value	Result
Businessmen	80	0.46	0.21	0.46	4.61	0.000	Significant
Professionals	70	0.32	0.10	0.32	2.78	0.007	Significant

Discussion

The present study was conducted to understand the comparative role of mindfulness on subjective well-being among businessmen and professionals. For this purpose, three hypotheses were tested and the results are presented in Table 1, Table 2, Table 3 and Table 4. Overall findings shows that mindfulness is not only different across the two occupational groups, but it

also plays a meaningful role in explaining subjective well-being, though the strength of effect is not exactly same for both groups.

Interpretation of Table 1 (Mindfulness difference)

Table 1 shows the comparison of mindfulness scores (MAAS) between businessmen and professionals. The mean score of businessmen ($M = 55.72$, $SD = 8.41$) was found higher than professionals ($M = 52.11$, $SD = 7.96$). The obtained t-value ($t = 2.70$, $p = 0.008$) indicates that this difference is statistically significant. This means H1 is accepted, and it can be interpreted that businessmen in the present sample were slightly more mindful compared to professionals.

A possible reason can be that businessmen often deal with real-time decision making, uncertainties and daily problem-solving, which may gradually develop a kind of present-moment awareness. In business, things change quickly, so they may learn to stay more alert and practical, and this can reflect as higher mindfulness scores. On the other side, many professionals have fixed routines but constant deadlines, supervision and performance pressure which may increase mental distraction and overthinking. Mindfulness is mainly about attention and awareness in the moment (Brown & Ryan, 2003), so continuous work pressure may reduce their ability to stay mentally present. This result is also connected with the idea that mindfulness helps individuals manage stress and remain attentive in daily activities (Kabat-Zinn, 1994).

But it is also important to note that mindfulness is not only a trait, it can be influenced by lifestyle too. So businessmen scoring higher does not mean they are stress-free, it only shows they may be more tuned towards awareness and attention in daily life in this sample.

Interpretation of Table 2 (Subjective well-being difference)

Table 2 presents the comparison of subjective well-being scores (SWLS) between businessmen and professionals. The mean SWB score for businessmen ($M = 23.84$, $SD = 4.93$) was higher than professionals ($M = 21.62$, $SD = 4.88$). The t-value ($t = 2.76$, $p = 0.006$) indicates that the difference is significant, therefore H2 is also accepted. It suggests that businessmen reported relatively better subjective well-being than professionals.

Subjective well-being is basically the person's own evaluation of life satisfaction and emotional quality (Diener, 1984). Businessmen, though they face high uncertainty, may enjoy greater autonomy and decision power in their work life. This autonomy can support satisfaction and feeling of control, which contributes to well-being. In contrast, professionals may experience structured work pressure, fixed targets and sometimes less control over work environment, which can lower satisfaction levels. This is also consistent with self-determination theory where autonomy and competence are considered important for psychological well-being (Ryan & Deci, 2000).

Even though professionals have stable income in many cases, they may still experience emotional exhaustion and burnout due to repeated performance demands. Many studies have highlighted that job-related burnout and emotional exhaustion is common in professional settings (Maslach & Leiter, 2016), which may reduce subjective well-being scores.

Interpretation of Table 3 and 4 (Relationship + predictive role)

Table 3 shows the correlation between mindfulness and subjective well-being for both groups. For businessmen, the correlation between mindfulness and SWB was moderate and positive ($r = 0.46$, $p < 0.001$). For professionals also, the correlation was positive ($r = 0.32$, $p = 0.007$). These

results clearly indicate that mindfulness is associated with better subjective well-being in both groups, meaning as mindfulness increases, subjective well-being also increases. This supports previous research which has found that mindful individuals generally show greater life satisfaction and emotional balance (Brown & Ryan, 2003).

Table 4 further explains the predictive role through regression analysis. For businessmen, the model shows $R = 0.46$ and $R^2 = 0.21$, meaning mindfulness explains about 21% variance in subjective well-being. The beta value ($\beta = 0.46$, $p < 0.001$) suggests mindfulness is a significant predictor of subjective well-being. Similarly, for professionals, the results show $R = 0.32$ and $R^2 = 0.10$, meaning mindfulness explains about 10% variance in subjective well-being with significant beta ($\beta = 0.32$, $p = 0.007$). So H3 is supported, because mindfulness predicted SWB in both groups.

The important point here is the strength of prediction. Mindfulness contributed more strongly to subjective well-being among businessmen compared to professionals. This difference may be because businessmen face more unpredictable work challenges and responsibilities, and mindfulness may act like a coping mechanism helping them manage stress and negative emotions better. When mindfulness helps in handling uncertainty, it can improve overall satisfaction and psychological stability. Mindfulness is known to reduce rumination and emotional reactivity, which enhances positive emotional states (Kabat-Zinn, 1990; Brown & Ryan, 2003). Hence, businessmen may benefit slightly more from mindfulness as it supports them in emotionally regulating during uncertain business demands.

For professionals, even though mindfulness predicted SWB significantly, the effect size was comparatively lower ($R^2 = 0.10$). A possible explanation is that professionals' well-being may be influenced by additional factors like organisational climate, workload, job satisfaction, interpersonal conflicts, and job security. So even if mindfulness helps them, other external job conditions might also play a larger role in shaping their subjective well-being. This matches workplace findings that stress, burnout and organisational demands affect employee well-being strongly (Maslach & Leiter, 2016). Still, mindfulness remains a helpful psychological resource in this group too.

Overall, these findings support the idea that mindfulness improves well-being by enhancing awareness, acceptance and emotional regulation. People who stay present and less judgemental towards their thoughts are likely to experience less negativity and more contentment in daily life (Kabat-Zinn, 1994). This can be why mindfulness shows positive association with subjective well-being in both occupational groups.

In conclusion, the present study indicates that businessmen scored higher on mindfulness and subjective well-being compared to professionals. Additionally, mindfulness showed a significant positive relationship with subjective well-being, and it also acted as a significant predictor for both groups. However, the predictive impact was stronger for businessmen than professionals, suggesting that mindfulness may have a slightly more powerful role in shaping well-being among individuals who operate in uncertain and high responsibility work environments. The study provides evidence that mindfulness can be considered as an important positive psychological factor in occupational mental health, and mindfulness-based practices can be beneficial for improving subjective well-being in working populations (Kabat-Zinn, 1990; Diener, 1984; Brown & Ryan, 2003).

Implications of the Study

The findings of the present study show that mindfulness has a meaningful role in improving subjective well-being in both businessmen and professionals. So one important implication is that mindfulness-based practices can be promoted as a simple and low-cost psychological strategy for working adults. Since mindfulness predicted subjective well-being significantly, introducing small mindfulness activities like breathing exercises, short meditation sessions, or mindful breaks can help individuals to manage daily stress in a healthier way (Kabat-Zinn, 1994; Brown & Ryan, 2003).

Another implication is that businessmen showed comparatively stronger link between mindfulness and well-being, which suggests that mindfulness can be very useful for people working in unpredictable and high-responsibility environments. Business-related stress includes uncertainty, financial risk, and continuous decision making, so mindfulness can support better emotional regulation and stability, helping them stay calm and focused even during pressure situations (Kabat-Zinn, 1990). Therefore, mindfulness training can also be planned for entrepreneur groups, business associations, and self-employed individuals, which is usually not done much.

For professionals also, the results indicate mindfulness is positively related with subjective well-being, though the effect is slightly lower. This suggests that professional well-being is not only dependent on personal mindfulness, but also on external work conditions. Still, mindfulness can act like a protective factor and reduce emotional exhaustion and mental overload. Workplaces like schools, hospitals, banks, and offices can include mindfulness workshops as part of mental health promotion and employee assistance programs, which can improve job satisfaction and overall quality of life (Maslach & Leiter, 2016).

Limitations of the Study

One limitation of the study is that it is based on a **descriptive research design**, so the results cannot fully prove cause-and-effect relationship. Even though mindfulness predicted subjective well-being statistically, it is still possible that people with higher well-being naturally become more mindful, so direction can be both ways. For deeper understanding, experimental or longitudinal design would give more strong conclusion (Diener, 1984).

Another limitation is that the study used **self-report psychological scales**, so responses may be affected by social desirability or personal bias. Some participants may respond in a socially acceptable manner rather than giving true feelings. This is specially possible when dealing with occupational groups, where people want to show confidence and stability, but inside they may feel stressed.

Also, the sample size was 150, which is decent, but the participants were selected through purposive and snowball sampling, so the sample may not represent all businessmen and professionals perfectly. Because of this sampling method, generalisation of findings to all working adults should be done carefully.

Suggestions for Future Research

Future studies can be conducted using larger sample size and by including participants from different cities or regions, so the findings can become more generalisable. Also, instead of only two occupational categories, future research can compare multiple groups like teachers, doctors,

bankers, entrepreneurs, and IT professionals separately, because stress patterns are different in each occupation.

Another suggestion is to use experimental intervention-based research. For example, researchers can provide mindfulness training for 4 to 8 weeks and then assess changes in subjective well-being before and after intervention. This will help in understanding whether mindfulness directly improves well-being in practical sense, not just statistically (Kabat-Zinn, 1990).

Future research can also include additional variables like job stress, work-life balance, emotional intelligence, resilience, or coping styles, because subjective well-being is influenced by many psychological and environmental factors. Especially for professionals, external organisational environment may play a big role, so including these variables can give a more complete and realistic picture (Ryan & Deci, 2000; Maslach & Leiter, 2016).

REFERENCES

1. Baer, R. A., Smith, G. T., Hopkins, J., Krietemeyer, J., & Toney, L. (2006). Using self-report assessment methods to explore facets of mindfulness. *Assessment, 13*(1), 27–45. doi:10.1177/1073191105283504
2. Baron, R. A., Franklin, R. J., & Hmieleski, K. M. (2016). Why entrepreneurs often experience low, not high, levels of stress: The joint effects of selection and psychological capital. *Journal of Management, 42*(3), 742–768. doi:10.1177/0149206313495411
3. Brown, K. W., & Ryan, R. M. (2003). The benefits of being present: Mindfulness and its role in psychological well-being. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 84*(4), 822–848. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.84.4.822
4. Diener, E. (1984). Subjective well-being. *Psychological Bulletin, 95*(3), 542–575. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.95.3.542
5. Diener, E., Emmons, R. A., Larsen, R. J., & Griffin, S. (1985). The Satisfaction With Life Scale. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 49*(1), 71–75. doi:10.1207/s15327752jpa4901_13
6. Hülsheger, U. R., Alberts, H. J. E. M., Feinholdt, A., & Lang, J. W. B. (2013). Benefits of mindfulness at work: The role of mindfulness in emotion regulation, emotional exhaustion, and job satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 98*(2), 310–325. doi:10.1037/a0031313
7. Kabat-Zinn, J. (1990). *Full catastrophe living: Using the wisdom of your body and mind to face stress, pain, and illness*. Delacorte.
8. Kabat-Zinn, J. (1994). *Wherever you go, there you are: Mindfulness meditation in everyday life*. Hyperion.
9. Lyubomirsky, S., King, L., & Diener, E. (2005). The benefits of frequent positive affect: Does happiness lead to success? *Psychological Bulletin, 131*(6), 803–855. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.131.6.803
10. Maslach, C., & Leiter, M. P. (2016). Understanding the burnout experience: Recent research and its implications for psychiatry. *World Psychiatry, 15*(2), 103–111. doi:10.1002/wps.20311

11. Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being. *American Psychologist*, 55(1), 68–78. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.55.1.68.
12. Watson, D., Clark, L. A., & Tellegen, A. (1988). Development and validation of brief measures of positive and negative affect: The PANAS scales. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 54(6), 1063–1070. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.54.6.1063