Influence of Social Intelligence and Change Readiness on Quality of Work Life[1]

Rona Beth S. Saban[2] and Rowena Imelda A. Ramos, Adventist University of the Philippines
Rosalie C. Nacar, Occidental Mindoro State College, Philippines

Abstract

Today's organizations aim to establish healthy work environments. Through purposive sampling, 150 participants from two higher educational institutions were selected to explore the factors influencing their quality of work life. The instrument was composed of adapted questions from the Tromsø Social Intelligence Scale, Assessment for Change Readiness, and Work-Related Quality of Life Scale. The findings revealed high levels of social intelligence and change readiness, along with an average quality of work life. Social intelligence ($p = .001$) and change readiness ($p = < .001$) were associated with the quality of work life. Significant differences in quality of work life were also exhibited in terms of educational attainment ($p = .045$) and work position ($p = .022$). The results of this study verified these associations with social intelligence, change readiness, and quality of work life. Furthermore, confidence and optimism were the specific subscales that significantly predicted the employee's quality of work life. The study underscored that work has the potential to influence life to a great extent, and thus managers of establishments are urged to create nurturing environments that promote personal advancement, work-life balance, satisfaction, and trusting relationships. These factors critically enhance the quality of work life.

Keywords: *Work-life quality, job satisfaction, social intelligence, performance*

Introduction

Work occupies a significant portion of available time and is an inseparable, integral part of human life (Çetinkanat & Kösterelioğlu, 2016; Martel & Dupuis, 2006). What we do in our work significantly influences our social and economic status, our health, and our psychological well-being (Ivancevich et al., 2014). Thus, organizations are continuously looking for strategies to meet the demands and challenges of today's dynamic work environment.

Nowadays, the realization of an organization's goals and the sustainability of its success are contingent upon the attainment of high levels of satisfaction and well-being of employees (Akar, 2018; Vasita & Prajapati, 2014). Hence, today's organizations seek to establish a positive and healthy work environment for their employees (Akar, 2018).

Recently, one of the prominent approaches to work environments that have been studied and developed is the concept of Quality of Work Life (QWL). The theoretical models and constructs of QWL have undergone many changes since its inception over 50 years ago (Martel & Dupuis, 2006). QWL refers to an organization's philosophy and practices that promote employee dignity, introduce changes in organizational culture, enhances employees' physical and emotional well-being, and create opportunities for growth and development (Ivancevich et al., 2014). QWL is a multi-dimensional, comprehensive, and transformational concept, the object of which is to raise employees' levels of satisfaction in the work environment, and further help to promote the human factor and human expectations as important elements in organizations (Akar, 2018; Akar & Ustuner, 2019; Çetinkanat & Kösterelioğlu, 2016; Sirgy et al., 2001). Sirgy et al. (2001) defined QWL as employee satisfaction with various needs measured by the resources, activities, and outcomes resulting from work engagement. It is not merely linked to job satisfaction (Öztürk et al., 2019), but also influences satisfaction in other domains such as family life, social environment, leisure, and financial life (Sirgy et al., 2001).

QWL is viewed as that umbrella under which organizations support employee efficiency, job security, morale, motivation, safety, and well-being (Leitão et al., 2019), and employee work experiences are rewarding, fulfilling, and devoid of negative consequences (Che Rose et al., 2006). QWL is meant to promote employees' feelings of being worthy and respected, give feelings of peace and happiness, and assist in development of a sense of security and belongingness (Akar, 2018; Akar & Ustuner, 2019; Çetinkanat & Kösterelioğlu, 2016). Employees who have high QWL experiences extend their wholehearted commitment and cooperation to their organizations, make good decisions, and positively contribute to the realization of organizational goals (Kamboj et al., 2015).

The concepts of learning how to interact with others and navigate a way through life's circumstances and experiences are some of the keys to keeping a multigenerational workforce engaged and successful. These are the realms of social intelligence. These principles give organizations tangible ways of managing and harnessing diversity, since a socially intelligent workforce will work together in harmony as a cohesive, collaborative team. The ability to relate to people, understand social circumstances, correctly interpret them, and react appropriately is referred to as social intelligence. It is the ability to develop and sustain harmonious interpersonal relationships as well as solve conflicts. Furthermore, it has the potential to build relationships that can support the interest of and provide benefits for an organization (Njoroge & Yazdanifard, 2014).

Over the years, various definitions of social intelligence have been proposed, each stressing different components of what is now clearly understood as a multi-faceted construct (Palucka et al., 2011). Social intelligence as a concept was first brought to the forefront by psychologist Edward Thorndike in 1920 (Weis & Süß, 2005). Social intelligence, in his own words, is "the ability to understand and manage men and women, boys and girls, and to act wisely in human relations" (Thorndike, 1920, p. 228). Moss and Hunt (1927, p. 108) defined it as the "ability to get along with others." Vernon (1933) provided the most wide-ranging definition of social intelligence, describing it as the concept

> Reflected in the ability to get along with people in general, social technique or ease in society, knowledge of social matters, and susceptibility to stimuli from other members of a group, as well as insight into the temporary moods or underlying personality traits of strangers. (Vernon, 1933, p. 44)

By the aforementioned definitions, the concept relates to how humans act toward each other, in both cognitive aspects (i.e., the ability to understand people) and behavioral aspects, which is the ability to deal effectively with and respond towards others (Palucka et al., 2011). In an organizational context, this can refer to how leaders treat their workers, how employees treat each other, and the nature of the organization's culture (Cooper, 2021).

Research findings suggest several benefits of social intelligence. It helps individuals establish and sustain interpersonal relationships, secure social progress, develop work satisfaction, and function in social groups (Joseph & Lakshmi, 2010). Moreover, it relates to positive psychological health, playing a significant role in one's resilience (Palucka et al., 2011).

Newstrom (2011) stressed the importance of cultivating and exhibiting social intelligence at all levels, and discussed Karl Albrecht's elegant but straightforward framework of social intelligence. According to Albrecht (2006), social intelligence is a set of five primal competencies for life and leadership, namely, empathy, presence, situational awareness, clarity, and authenticity. Silvera et al. (2001) designed a multi-faceted social intelligence measure known as the Tromsø Social Intelligence Scale. The development and validation of this measure led to the identification of three factors associated with social intelligence, namely, social information processing, social skills, and social awareness.

Individuals and organizations are surrounded by continuous progress, technological advancements, and global network connectivity, all of which have resulted in perpetual change. Individuals and organizations experience change for different reasons, including improving the human condition, increasing productivity and competitiveness, responding to new or altered social and political contexts and expectations, achieving personal or organizational objectives, and correcting previous mistakes (Howley, 2012). However, change can be difficult in an organization, and it often

results in fluctuations and negative consequences. Changes in an organization are inextricably linked with the emotions of its employees. Workers will react to change in several ways. For the implementation of a relatively new idea in an organization to be effective, all members of the organization must be prepared to undergo change.

Individual readiness for change, both as a leader or as an employee, has been considered a critical factor that leads to effective and successful organizational change implementation (Holt et al., 2007; Rafferty et al., 2013). When a single leader or employee does not believe in the need for change or in the organization's capacity to make changes, the initiative and plans for change will never materialize or be difficult to achieve (Saragih, 2015).

Holt et al. (2007, p. 235) described change readiness as a "comprehensive attitude that is influenced simultaneously by the content (i.e., what is being changed), the process (i.e., how the change is being implemented), and the individuals (i.e., characteristics of those being asked to change) involved." Accordingly, readiness represents the degree to which a person or group of individuals are cognitively and emotionally inclined to consider, support, and implement a specific strategy to purposefully change the status quo. Change readiness is a measure of how well-prepared and capable workers are for transition, as well as the likelihood of high or low employee resistance, and the reasons for it (Hussain et al., 2018). When an organization's readiness for change is substantial, workers are more likely to promote change, put in more effort, and be more persistent and cooperative, resulting in a successful implementation (Weiner, 2009).

Lewin's Change Theory accounts for both the complexity and resistance to change that can be seen at all levels of an organization's workforce. Lewin posited that people naturally resist change, preferring the familiar and searching out comfort zones. Employees classically show resistance to change, a general mistrust in unproven systems, and fear of abandoning what has succeeded in the past. These are just a few of the common roadblocks to change implementation. Lewin suggested that adapting to change can be done by recognizing the three different stages, namely, unfreeze (creating the motivation to change), followed by moving through the change process by effective communication an empowering individuals to embrace new ways, and lastly, refreeze. This is returning the organization to a sense of stability, which is an integral part of creating confidence for the next inevitable change (Lewin, 1951).

Over the years, researchers have separately uncovered significant predictors of social intelligence, of change readiness, and of QWL. Furthermore, the literature consistently has depicted strong associations between QWL and employees' work engagement, motivation, organizational performance, life and job satisfaction, health, and psychological well-being (Akar, 2018; Kanten & Sadullah, 2012; Martel & Dupuis, 2006; Muthukumaran, 2018; Sirgy et al., 2001; Thakur & Sharma, 2019; Vasita & Prajapati, 2014). But despite the increasing number of papers about the three primary variables of interest in this research, only a few studies have explored the associations between them. This provides an opportunity and an avenue to advance the body of knowledge through research. This study was conducted to address the scarcity of literature on the relationships of social intelligence, change readiness, and QWL. The researchers sought to address that dearth of information by exploring the influence of social intelligence and change readiness on the QWL of workers of two selected higher educational institutions.

Objectives of the Study

In this study, the aim was to establish the influence of social intelligence and change readiness on the QWL of leaders, faculty, and staff of the selected higher educational institutions. Specifically, the objectives were as follows: (a) the level of the social intelligence and change readiness of the leaders, faculty, and staff, (b) the quality of work life of the leaders, faculty, and staff, (c) the relationship between social intelligence and change readiness of the leaders, faculty, and staff, and their quality of work life, (d) the difference in the quality of work life of the leaders, faculty, and staff when gender, educational attainment, marital status, and work position are considered, and (e) the variables that have significant predictive ability relevant to QWL.

Methods

Research Design

In this study, a descriptive-correlational design was utilized that involved sufficient and precise measurement of the relevant variables, followed by an examination of their relationships.

Population and Sampling Technique

The population chosen for this study were the leaders, faculty, and staff who were currently employed for at least six months in the selected higher educational institutions. Through purposive sampling, 150 respondents were selected without regard to their age, marital status, work position, and educational attainment. The respondents consisted of 74 (49.3%) faculty, 51 (34%) staff, and 25 (16.7%) leaders that included administrators, directors, deans, and department heads. There were 96 (64%) females and 54 (36%) males. The majority (125) of the respondents were married, which accounted for 83.3% of the population; while 22 (14.7) were single, and 3 (2%) were widowed. Among the 150 respondents, 73 (48.7%) were master's degree holders, 42 (28%) were bachelor's degree holders, 30 (20%) had a doctoral degree, and 5 (3.3%) were undergraduates.

Instrumentation

The instrument used was divided into four parts and was administered through Google Forms. A constructed questionnaire was devised to determine the demographic profile of the respondents. The remaining three parts of the questionnaire were adapted from existing instruments. Permission to use the questionnaires was obtained from the corresponding authors. Modification of some parts of the questionnaire was done to cater to the uniqueness of the respondents.

The first part of the instrument was a demographic profile of the faculty and staff, which included their age, gender, marital status, educational attainment, and work position (leader, faculty, or staff).

The second part of the instrument was adapted from the Tromsø Social Intelligence Scale (Silvera et al. (2001) scored on a 7-point scale (ranging from 1 = *Extremely Poor* to 7 = *Extremely Well*) with 21 items. The three subscales of social intelligence used were social information processing, social skills, and social awareness. Cronbach's alpha coefficients obtained for these were .81, .86, and .79, respectively.

The third part of the instrument involved the assessment for change readiness. This scale consisted of 35 items measured on a 6-point scale (ranging from 1 = *Not Like Me* to 6 = *Exactly Like Me*). The seven traits of the change-readiness assessment included resourcefulness, optimism, passion or drive, adaptability, confidence, and tolerance for ambiguity. The scale had a Cronbach's alpha of .83.

The last part of the instrument was adapted from the Work-Related Quality of Life scale of Easton and Van Laar (2018). The 23-item psychometrically substantial scale gauged employees' perceived quality of life as measured through six psychosocial sub-factors: job and career satisfaction, general well-being, home-work interface, stress at work, control at work, and working conditions. Respondents answered questions on a 5-point scale (*Strongly Disagree*, *Disagree*, *Neutral*, *Agree*, and *Strongly Agree*). The Work-Related Quality of Life scale had good sub-scale reliability as well as good convergent, discriminant validity, and test-retest reliability, and is widely used (Easton & Van Laar, 2018a, 2018b). The Cronbach's alpha values for the subscales used in this study ranged between .75 and .89; overall reliability was .91.

Data Gathering Procedures

Ethics approval was obtained from an institutional Ethics Review Board. The ethical principles adopted upheld the dignity of the respondents. Extensive instruction and guidelines for filling out the survey were explained, as well as the purpose of the research. Participant confidentiality was maintained. Participants were given the right to withdraw if they wished. Honesty in answering the questions was also emphasized to ensure accurate results. Data were retrieved through responses submitted via Google Forms.

Analysis of Data

The information collected for the outcomes was statistically tested, evaluated, and summarized. Descriptive statistics were used to determine the respondents' demographic profiles, levels of social intelligence and change readiness, and respondents' QWL. Pearson's correlation coefficient was used to determine the significance of the relationship between the independent and dependent variables, and the strength of the associations between them. Kruskal Wallis test, Mann-Whitney U test, and Pairwise Comparisons were employed to determine the differences in respondents' QWL considering their marital status, gender, educational attainment, and work position as a leader, faculty, or staff. Multiple regression was used to determine the variable(s) that mostly predicted the QWL of the respondents.

Results

In this descriptive-correlational study, the aim was to assess the influence of social intelligence and change readiness on the QWL among employees of faith-based higher educational institutions. Further, the objective was to determine, if possible, the variables that significantly predicted employees' QWL.

Levels of Social Intelligence and Change Readiness

Descriptive statistics were used to analyze the levels of social intelligence and change readiness. The results obtained showed that the level for social information processing was very high. On the other hand, the levels of social skills, social awareness, and the overall social intelligence of the respondents was high.

Employees who participated in the study had very high levels of resourcefulness and confidence. Moreover, levels of optimism and passion and drive were both high, while levels of adventurousness, adaptability, and tolerance for ambiguity were moderate. Thus, the overall level of change readiness of respondents was high.

Quality of Work Life

Employee perceptions of the degree of their QWL are shown in Table 1. Respondents had an average degree of QWL in terms of home-work interface, control at work, working conditions, and stress at work. However, results also indicated that the degree of QWL of the respondents in terms of general well-being, along with job and career satisfaction, were low. As a result, the general QWL of respondents was average.

Table 1 *Quality of Work Life of the Respondents (N = 150)*

Feature	Mean Score	SD	Interpretation
General Well-Being	65.21	8.45	Low
Home-Work Interface	76.20	9.46	Average
Job and Career Satisfaction	63.60	8.35	Low
Control at Work	76.57	10.18	Average
Working Conditions	79.93	10.34	Average
Stress at Work	82.31	10.76	Average
Quality of Work Life	73.97	9.47	Average

Note. Low = 23.00–71.49; *Average* = 71.50–82.49; *High* = 82.50–115.00.

Change Readiness, Social Intelligence, and Quality of Work Life

Pearson Product Moment Correlation was used to evaluate the relationship between change readiness and QWL, and between social intelligence and QWL. The results shown in Table 2 (please see next page) revealed that subscales of change readiness and the QWL were positively correlated. This also applied to the subscales of social intelligence and the respondents' QWL.

Table 2 *Descriptive Statistics and Correlations for Change Readiness, Social Intelligence, and QWL*

QWL Feature	Mean	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19
1. Resourcefulness	23.03	3.53																			
2. Optimism	18.63	3.51	.11																		
			.20																		
3. Adventurousness	13.57	3.69	-.17*	.37**																	
			.049	.000																	
4. Passion or Drive	20.69	3.54	.61**	-.095	-.27**																
			.000	.25	.001																
5. Adaptability	16.70	3.58	-.18*	.30**	.54**	-.28**															
			.030	.000	.000	.000															
6. Confidence	22.38	3.00	.64**	.16*	-.24**	.42**	-.15														
			.000	.044	.003	.000	.064														
7. Tolerance for Ambiguity	14.63	3.54	-.28**	.44**	.43**	-.51**	.48**	-.15													
			.001	.000	.000	.000	.000	.066													
8. Change Readiness	18.52	1.67	.49**	.69**	.53**	.24**	.53**	.46**	.44**												
			.000	.000	.000	.003	.000	.000	.000												
9. Social Information Processing	37.03	5.19	.551**	.123	-.104	.381**	-.018	.515**	-.145	.367**											
			.000	.134	.204	.000	.824	.000	.077	.000											
10. Social Skills	33.91	6.17	.427**	.416**	.188*	.126	.300**	.396**	.148	.587**	.39**										
			.000	.000	.021	.126	.000	.000	.071	.000	.000										
11. Social Awareness	33.91	6.17	-.016	.462**	.300**	-.133	.455**	-.022	.310**	.414**	.086	.41**									
			.844	.000	.000	.106	.000	.787	.000	.000	.29	.00									
12. Social Intelligence	34.47	4.33	.414**	.473**	.195*	.146	.359**	.383**	.164*	.629**	.63**	.83**	.72**								
			.000	.000	.017	.074	.000	.000	.044	.000	.000	.000	.000								
13. General Well-Being	65.21	8.45	.27**	.26**	.05	.13	.11	.28**	.013	.32**	.27**	.12	.16	.24**							
			.001	.001	.53	.11	.19	.001	.88	.000	.001	.144	.056	.003							
14. Home-Work Interface	76.20	9.46	.32**	.32**	.048	.18*	.10	.32**	.020	.38**	.25**	.15	.17*	.25**	.96**						
			.000	.000	.56	.031	.22	.000	.81	.000	.002	.062	.043	.002	.000						
15. Job and Career Satisfaction	63.60	8.35	.27**	.31**	.087	.11	.12	.29**	.066	.36**	.22**	.17*	.19*	.26**	.94**	.97**					
			.001	.000	.29	.19	.13	.000	.42	.000	.006	.039	.019	.001	.000	.000					
16. Control at Work	76.57	10.18	.28**	.30**	.050	.14	.12	.29**	.04	.35**	.24**	.14	.16	.24**	.96**	.98**	.97**				
			.001	.000	.54	.096	.16	.000	.62	.000	.004	.089	.051	.003	.000	.000	.000				
17. Working Conditions	79.93	10.34	.33**	.31**	.048	.18*	.096	.33**	.006	.37**	.27**	.16	.16	.26**	.97**	.99**	.97**	.98**			
			.000	.000	.56	.029	.25	.000	.94	.000	.001	.054	.053	.001	.000	.000	.000	.000			
18. Stress at Work	82.31	10.76	.34**	.31**	.037	.19*	.09	.31**	-.004	.37**	.29**	.15	.16	.26**	.96**	.98**	.95**	.98**	.98**		
			.000	.000	.65	.018	.24	.000	.96	.000	.000	.070	.059	.001	.000	.000	.000]	.000			
19. Quality of Work Life	73.97	9.47	.30**	.30**	.053	.16	.11	.31*	.023	.37**	.26**	.15	.17*	.26**	.98**	.99**	.98**	.99**	.995**	.99**	
			.000	.000	.518	.053	.195	.000	.784	.000	.001	.067	.043	.001	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	

*Note. *p < .05, **p < .01.*

Resourcefulness, optimism, and confidence were seen to be associated with all subscales of quality of work. Interestingly, passion or drive was significantly linked with home-work interface, working conditions, and stress at work. However, the results also revealed that there was no correlation between adventurousness, adaptability, and tolerance for ambiguity. Yet all the subscales of change readiness were correlated with the respondents' overall QWL. Hence, summing up the correlations between the subscales still generated a moderate degree of correlation with overall change readiness and the total QWL of the respondents [$r(148) = .37$, $p < .001$].

Remarkably, social information processing was clearly linked with all the subscales of QWL. Meanwhile, social skills were found to be associated only with job and career satisfaction. The subscale of social awareness was linked with home-work interface and job and career satisfaction. The correlations between the subscales generally yielded a small degree of correlation with the overall social intelligence and total QWL of the respondents [$r(148) = .26$, $p = .001$].

Educational Attainment and Quality of Work Life

Kruskal Wallis-Test was used to determine if there was a significant difference in the QWL of the respondents related to educational attainment. The results in Table 3 show that there were significant differences involving educational attainment and QWL involving the home-work interface ($p = .029$), working conditions ($p = .042$), stress at work ($p = .013$), and the general quality of work life ($p = .045$).

Table 3 *Means, Standard Deviations, and Kruskal-Wallis Test in Educational Attainment and QWL*

QWL Feature	Mean Rank				χ^2	*p-value*	ε^2
	Undergraduate Level (5)	Bachelor's Degree (42)	Master's Degree (73)	Doctoral Degree (30)			
General Well-Being	88.40	67.51	74.17	87.77	2.27	.228	0.03
Home-Work Interface	83.50	63.29	74.36	94.05	7.66	.029	0.06
Job & Career Satisfaction	72.70	65.19	74.49	92.85	7.09	.065	0.05
Control at Work	85.70	64.42	74.97	90.60	6.18	.084	0.05
Working Conditions	81.60	63.95	74.38	93.38	7.55	.042	0.06
Stress at Work	82.70	63.52	73.15	96.78	10.61	.013	0.07
Quality of Work Life	83.00	64.32	74.10	93.30	9.43	.045	0.06

The results of a pairwise comparison test indicated that respondents with a doctoral degree had a significantly higher level of QWL than those with a bachelor's degree in terms of home-work interface ($p = .003$), working conditions ($p = .027$), stress at work ($p = .008$), and general QWL ($p = .031$).

Work Position and Quality of Work Life

A Kruskal-Wallis H test was applied to investigate the differences in the QWL when work position was considered. The results in Table 4 (please see next page) substantiated the existence of differences in home-work interface, job career satisfaction, working conditions, stress at work, and total QWL.

The results of the pairwise comparison test revealed that leaders (administrators, directors, deans, and department heads) had a significantly higher level of home-work interface ($p = .009$), job and career satisfaction ($p = .012$), working conditions ($p = .021$), stress at work ($p = .005$), and general QWL ($p = .018$) than faculty and staff members.

Table 4 *Means, Standard Deviations, and Kruskal-Wallis Test in Work Position and QWL*

QWL Feature	Mean Rank			χ^2	*p-value*	ε^2	*Interpretation*
	Staff **(***n* = 51**)**	**Faculty** **(***n* = 74**)**	**Leaders** **(***n* = 25**)**				
General Well-Being	67.75	75.31	91.86	5.18	.075	0.04	Not Significant
Home-Work Interface	64.74	75.95	96.12	8.79	.012	0.06	Significant
Job and Career Satisfaction	66.03	74.93	96.52	8.31	.016	0.06	Significant
Control at Work	66.78	76.59	90.06	4.92	.086	0.03	Not Significant
Working Conditions	65.53	76.09	94.08	7.29	.026	0.05	Significant
Stress at Work	63.42	76.54	97.06	10.16	.006	0.07	Significant
Quality of Work Life	65.55	75.86	94.74	7.59	.022	0.05	Significant

Influence of Social Intelligence and Change Readiness on Quality of Work Life

Stepwise regression was executed to determine if social intelligence and change readiness predicted QWL. The regression analysis generated two models as reflected in the summary in Table 5. The first model showed that Confidence (8.8%), a subscale of change readiness, was the highest predictor of QWL. The second model revealed that if optimism, which is also a subscale of change readiness, is added to confidence, the QWL increased. It specifically indicated that confidence and optimism predicted 14.8% of the QWL.

Table 5 *Model Summary of the Regression Analysis*

Model	*R*	R^2	Adj. R^2	*SE* of Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R^2 Change	*F* Change	*df*1	*df*2	Sig. *F* Change
1	.307[a]	.094	.088	9.043	.094	15.389	1	148	.000
2	.400[b]	.160	.148	8.738	.066	11.494	1	147	.001

Note. a = Model 1—Predictors: (Constant), Confidence; b = Model 2—Predictors: (Constant), Confidence, Optimism.

An ANOVA analysis was performed to determine whether the overall regression model was a good fit for the data. The first model returned the following result, $F(1, 148) = 15.39$, $p < .001$, and the second gave values $F(2, 147) = 13.99$, $p < .0001$. This showed that some independent variables had significant predictive ability for the dependent variable. These results implied that each regression model was a good fit.

Furthermore, in Table 6 a summary is provided of the coefficients for regression. Confidence ($\beta = .307$, $p < .001$) and Optimism ($\beta = .260$, $p = .001$), which are both subscales of change readiness, were significant predictors of QWL. The findings suggest that a high QWL was associated with high levels of confidence and optimism.

Table 6 *Coefficients for the Regression Analysis*

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients			95% Confidence Interval for Beta	
		Beta	*SE*	Beta	*t*	Sig.	Lower Bound	Upper Bound
1	Confidence	.970	0.247	.307	3.923	.000	.481	1.459
2	Confidence	.835	0.242	.264	3.447	.001	.356	1.314
	Optimism	.701	0.207	.260	3.390	.001	.293	1.110

Note. Dependent Variable: QWL

Discussion
Level of Social Intelligence and Change Readiness

The results of the study revealed that the surveyed institutional employees possessed a high level of social intelligence. According to Hesson and Olpin (2016), people crave for human relations. This notion helps to explain respondents' high levels of social intelligence.

Employees with high social intelligence are highly empathic individuals; therefore, it is easier for them to understand the thoughts and interpret the intentions of the people with whom they interact (Popp, 2017). On the other hand, leaders with high social intelligence can help to hasten the realization of the organization's goals (Nouri et al., 2015).

The results showed that respondents' change readiness ranged from moderate to very high. The change readiness level can differ depending on how the costs and benefits of continuing a behavior are viewed versus the costs and benefits of changing it (Vakola, 2014). Employees who are willing to change will engage in proactive actions to help their organization realize its goals (Muafi et al., 2019).

Quality of Work Life

Quality of work life in an organization is a vital factor for determining employee-related outcomes in modernorganizations (Ramawickrama, 2018). QWL is thought of as determining how organizations promote employee efficiency, job security, morale, motivation, safety, and well-being (Leitão et al., 2019), and ensuring that employees' work experiences are rewarding and fulfilling (Rose et al., 2006).

In general, employees of these institutions were moderately satisfied with their work life in terms of their home-work interface, control at work, working conditions, and stress at work. Thus, they are likely to extend their wholehearted cooperation and support to management to improve productivity and the work environment (Chand, 2021). However, the results of this study revealed the low condition of the general well-being and job and career satisfaction of faculty and staff. According to Medhi (2021), job dissatisfaction is more likely to lower employee engagement, as well as increase turnover rates.

Educational Attainment and QWL

The differences in the home-work interface imply that there is variation in balancing home and work demands (Dorsey, 2003). In this study, doctoral degree holders had a more fulfilled life inside and outside of their paid work. They had higher perceived levels of working conditions, and had better perceived job security and available resources to do their jobs effectively. In contrast, disappointment with physical working conditions, including health, safety, and work hygiene, can have significant adverse effect on employees' quality of work life (Shanafelt et al., 2012). The doctoral degree holders in this study perceived higher work-related stress. However, Freeborn (2001) reported that people who recognized their work pressures as reasonable tended to have higher levels of job satisfaction.

Work Position and QWL

The burdens of work among the staff made them unable to leave work behind, as they needed to render not less than 40 hours in the workplace. This gave them the feeling that they could not invest in other aspects of their lives as they wished (Easton & Laar, 2018). This idea was supported by Shanafelt et al. (2012). Accordingly, working longer hours lead to a poor home-work interface.

Conclusion and Implications

Quality of work life deals with the process of creating a work environment that fosters cooperation among the employees to contribute to achieving organizational goals. The indicators of QWL included in this study were general well-being, home-work interface, job and career satisfaction, control at work, working conditions, and stress at work. Based on these findings, the following conclusions were drawn.

The respondents' levels of social intelligence and change readiness were high, while their quality of work life was average. These results suggest that respondents were highly empathic; thus, it was easier for them to appreciate the opinions and understand the intentions of people with whom they interact (Popp, 2017). Additionally, faculty and staff were resourceful and confident to face change. According to Weiner (2009), when organizational change readiness is high, organizational members are more likely to initiate change, exert greater effort, exhibit greater persistence, and display more cooperative behavior.

Though the respondents' general QWL was satisfactory, it should be noted that general well-being and job satisfaction were low. Employers need to embrace a certain level of employment security and job safety so that employees are free from job anxiety, receive a reasonable wage, enjoy a family day or leisure in life, have social life opportunities, and participate in decision making. Hence, administrators should seek to find ways to reach these ideals so that profound problems do not arise in the organization.

Significant differences in the QWL were also exhibited in terms of educational attainment and work position. Doctoral degree holders had a higher home-work interface level than those who with bachelor degrees. Moreover, department heads, deans, directors, and administrators exhibited a significantly higher quality of work life in terms of home-work interface, job and career satisfaction, working conditions, stress at work, and overall quality of work life than did staff members. From these results, it is recommended that relevant policies and services be reviewed to provide awareness, simplify responsibilities, and foster conditions that support attaining successful QWL. Further, both individuals and administrators need to enthusiastically observe a work-life balance and make modifications if necessary. Discussion and compromise on flexibility, if needed, should be addressed to find acceptable solutions.

The results of this study verified the associations among social intelligence, change readiness, and quality of work life. Furthermore, confidence and optimism were the specific subscales that significantly predicted employees' quality of work life. Specifically, the findings of this study revealed that a high QWL was associated with high levels of confidence and optimism. In this regard, the researchers suggest that the administrators establish approaches that will augment employees' confidence and optimism to promote more staff engagement and increase QWL.

Lastly, the researchers aimed to underscore that the work environment has the potential to influence life to a great extent, and that nurturing workers' opportunities for personal advancement, work-life balance, satisfaction, and trusting relationships is critical in enhancing the QWL. This aim was fulfilled at a certain level.

Limitations

This study has its own limitations. The generalization of the findings should be treated with caution since the study was conducted with participants from just two organizations. Generalizability is limited due to the small homogenous sample; nevertheless, the study's results may be aligned with other studies that highlight the need for improving QWL. Future studies covering larger samples may strengthen the findings' generalizability.

References

Akar, H. (2018). The relationships between quality of work life, school alienation, burnout, affective commitment and organizationalcitizenship: A study on teachers. *European Journal of Educational Research*, *7*(2), 169–180. https://doi.org/10.12973/eu- jer.7.2.169

Akar, H., & Ustuner, M. (2019). The relationships between perceptions of teachers' transformational leadership, organizational justice, organizational support and quality of work life. *International Journal of Research in Education and Science (IJRES)*, *5*(1),309–322. www.ijres.net

Albrecht, K. (2006). *Social intelligence: The new science of success*. Jossey-Bass.

Çetinkanat, A., & Kösterelioğlu, M. A. (2016). Relationship between quality of work life and work alienation: Research onteachers. *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, *4*(8), 1778–1786. https://doi.org/10.13189/ujer.2016.040806

Chand, S. (2021). *Quality of work life: Its meaning and definition* [Employee Management]. YourArticleLibrary.com. https://www./yourarticlelibrary.com/employee-management/quality-of-work-life-its-meaning-and-definition-employee-man

Cooper, K. (2021). *Why corporate social intelligence should be on your company's radar*. Centre for Social Intelligence.https://www.centreforsocialintelligence.ca/blog/

Crispo, A., Vandeveer, R., & Sugarman, H. (2005). *Appreciative inquiry helps define "best-in-class leadership": An exciting philosophy for change* [Electronic proceedings]. International Leadership Association 7th Annual Conference, Amsterdam, Netherlands.

Easton, S., & Van Laar, D. (2018a). *User manual for the work-related quality of life (WRQoL) scale: A measure of quality of working life* (2nd ed.). University of Portsmouth. www.qowl.co.uk

Easton, S., & Van Laar, D. (2018b). Reconciling organizational stress, cultural differences and quality of working life. *Indian Journal of Career and Livelihood Planning*, *7*(1), 38.

Frankovský, M., & Birknerová, Z. (2014). Measuring social intelligence-the MESI methodology. *Asian Social Science*, *10*(6), 90–97.https://doi.org/10.5539/ass.v10n6p90

Holt, D. T., Armenakis, A. A., Feild, H. S., & Harris, S. G. (2007). Readiness for organizational change: The systematic development of ascale. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, *43*(2), 232–255. https://doi.org/10.1177/0021886306295295

Howley, C. (2012). *Readiness for Change*. ICF International. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED535400.pdf

Hussain, S. T., Lei, S., Akram, T., Haider, M. J., Hussain, S. H., & Ali, M. (2018). Kurt Lewin's change model: A critical review of the role of leadership and employee involvement in organizational change. *Journal of Innovation and Knowledge*, *3*(3), 123–127.https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jik.2016.07.002

Ivancevich, J. M., Konopaske, R., & Matteson, M. T. (2014). *Organizational behavior and management* (10th ed.). McGraw-Hill.

Joseph, C., & Lakshmi, S. S. (2010). Social intelligence, a key to success. *The IUP Journal of Soft Skills*, *4*(3), 15–21.https://papers.ssrn.com/abstract=1706610

Kamboj, S., Rani, V., Kohli, S., & Malik, A. (2015). Emotional competence and quality of work life in call center employees: A genderbased study. *Indian Journal of Health and Wellbeing*, *6*(10), 994–998.

Kanten, S., & Sadullah, O. (2012). An empirical research on relationship quality of work life and work engagement. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *62*, 360–366. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.09.057

Kihlstrom, J. F., & Cantor, N. (2011). Social Intelligence. In R. J. Sternberg & S. B. Kaufman (Eds.), *The Cambridge Handbook ofIntelligence* (pp. 564–581). Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511977244.029

Leitão, J., Pereira, D., & Gonçalves, Â. (2019). Quality of work life and organizational performance: workers' feelings of contributing,or not, to the organization's productivity. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, *16*(20), 3803. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph16203803

Lewin, K. (1951). *Field theory in social science.* Harper and Brothers. http://www.sciepub.com/reference/37764

Lorincová, T., & Lelková, A. (2016). Prediction of manipulation, empathy and social irritability through selected personality traits among managers. *Periodica Polytechnica Social and Management Sciences*, *24*(2), 83–87. https://doi.org/10.3311/PPso.8765

Martel, J. P., & Dupuis, G. (2006). Quality of work life: Theoretical and methodological problems, and presentation of a new modeland measuring instrument. *Social Indicators Research*, *77*(2), 333–368. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-004-5368-4

Moss, F. A., & Hunt, T. (1927). Are you socially intelligent? *Scientific American*, *137*(2), 108–110. https://doi.org/10.1038/scientificamerican0827-108

Muafi, Fachrunnisa, O., Siswanti, Y., El Qadri, Z. M., & Harjito, D. A. (2019). Empowering leadership and individual readiness tochange: The role of people dimension and work method. *Journal of the Knowledge Economy*, *10*(4), 1515–1535. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13132-019-00618-z

Muthukumaran, M. (2018). Effect of quality of work life on job satisfaction and organizational performance: A structural equation analysis. *Optimization: Journal of Research in Management*, *10*(2), 46–51. http://www.publishingindia.com/ojrm/109/effect-of- quality-of-work-life-on-job-satisfaction-and-organizational-performance-a-structural-equation-analysis/717/5002/

Newstrom, J. W. (2011). *Organizational Behavior: Human behavior at work* (13th ed.). McGraw Hill.

Njoroge, C. N., & Yazdanifard, R. (2014). The impact of social and emotional intelligence on employee motivation in amultigenerational workplace. *Global Journal of Management and Business Research*, *14*(3), 31–36.

Nouri, M., Pourghaz, A. W., & Jenaabadi, H. (2015). Social intelligence and its relationship with school administrators' knowledge absorption capability. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, *6*(6), 333–342. https://doi.org/10.5901/mjss.2015.v6n6s6p333

Olpin, M. & Hesson, M. (2016). *Stress management for life: A research- based, experiential approach* (4th ed.). CengageLearning.

Öztürk, Ö. T., Soytürk, M., & Gökçe, H. (2019). Investigation of relationship between communication in academic environment and quality of work life among academic staff. *Asian Online Journal Publishing Group Asian Journal of Education and Training*, *5*(1),280–286. https://doi.org/10.20448/journal.522.2019.51.280.286

Palucka, A., Celinski, M. J., Salmon, J. D. J., & Shermer, P. (2011). Social and emotional intelligence: Contributors to resilience andresourcefulness. In K. Gow & M. J. Celinski (Eds.), *Wayfinding through Life Challenges: Coping and Survival* (pp. 47–62). Nova Science Publishers.

Popp, J. (2017, April–June). Social intelligence and the explanation of workplace abuse. *SAGE Open*, *7*(2), 1–7. https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244017715076

Rafferty, A. E., Jimmieson, N. L., & Armenakis, A. A. (2013). Change readiness. *Journal of Management*, *39*(1), 110–135.https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206312457417

Ramawickrama, J., Opatha, H. H. D. N. P., & Pushpakumari, M. D. (2018), Quality of work life and job performance: Empirical evidence from station masters working at Sri Lanka railways. *Sri Lankan Journal of Human Resource Management*, *8*(1), 1–22. http://doi.org/10.4038/sljhrm.v8i1.5638

Rose, R., Beh, L., Uli, J., & Idris, K. (2006). An analysis of quality of work life (QWL) and career- related variables. *American Journal of Applied Sciences*, *3*(12), 2151–2159. https://doi.org/10.3844/ajassp.2006.2151.2159

Saragih, E. H. (2015). Individual attributes of change readiness: A case study at Indonesia state-owned railway company. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *172*, 34–41. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.01.332

Silvera, D. H., Martinussen, M., & Dahl, T. I. (2001). The Tromsø Social Intelligence Scale, a self-report measure of social intelligence. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology*, *42*(4), 313–319. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9450.00242

Sirgy, M. J., Efraty, D., Siegel, P., & Lee, D. J. (2001). A new measure of quality of work life (QWL) based on need satisfaction and spillover theories. *Social Indicators Research*, *55*(3), 241–302. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1010986923468

Thakur, R., & Sharma, D. (2019). A study of impact of quality of work life on work performance. *Management and Labour Studies*,*44*(3), 326–344. https://doi.org/10.1177/0258042X19851912

Thorndike, E. L. (1920). Intelligence and its uses. *Harper's Magazine*, *140*, 227–235. https://harpers.org/archive/1920/01/intelligence-and-its-uses/

Vakola, M. (2014). What's in there for me? Individual readiness to change and the perceived impact of organizational change. *Leadership and Organization Development Journal*, *35*(3), 195–209. https://doi.org/10.1108/LODJ-05-2012-0064

Vasita, M., & Prajapati, K. (2014). A study of quality of work life and its impact on job satisfaction in selected higher educationinstitutions of Western Rajasthan. *Annamalai International Journal of Business Studies & Research*, *6*(1), 26–34.

Vernon, P. E. (1933). Some characteristics of the good judge of personality. *Journal of Social Psychology*, *4*(1), 42–57.https://doi.org/10.1080/00224545.1933.9921556

Weiner, B. J. (2009). A theory of organizational readiness for change. *Implementation Science*, *4*(1), 67. https://doi.org/10.1186/1748-5908-4-67

Weis, S., & Süß, H.-M. (2005). Social Intelligence--A review and critical discussion of measurement concepts. In R. Schulze & R. D. Roberts (Eds.), *An International Handbook of Emotional Intelligence* (pp. 203–230). Hogrefe & Huber Publishers.