

CALIDAD DE VIDA LABORAL Y LA DISPOSICIÓN AL CAMBIO ORGANIZACIONAL EN FUNCIONARIOS DE EMPRESAS DE LA CIUDAD DE BOGOTÁ – COLOMBIA

Mónica García Rubiano*; Carlos Forero Aponte
Universidad Católica de Colombia

Recibido, junio 25/2014

Concepto evaluación, mayo 19/2015

Aceptado, octubre 19/2015

Referencia: García Rubiano, M. & Forero Aponte, C. (2016). Calidad de vida laboral y la disposición al cambio organizacional en funcionarios de empresas de la ciudad de Bogotá - Colombia. *Acta Colombiana de Psicología*, 19(1), 79-90. DOI: 10.14718/ACP.2016.19.1.5

Resumen

El propósito de la investigación fue determinar la relación entre la calidad de vida laboral y la disposición al cambio organizacional en una muestra de 100 funcionarios de empresas de la ciudad de Bogotá. Se realizó bajo un diseño transversal correlacional, a través de la aplicación de dos instrumentos: el instrumento de medición de cambio organizacional (IMC) (García & Forero, 2010) y el de calidad de vida percibida en organizaciones (Gómez – Rada, 2011). La participación de la población fue voluntaria. El análisis de los datos se realizó por medio del Rho de Spearman. Los resultados obtenidos muestran una correlación significativa al 0.001 con todas las variables de cambio organizacional y de calidad de vida, excepto las de resistencia al cambio. Estos hallazgos sugieren que algunos de los aspectos a resaltar son la importancia de la calidad de vida y el compromiso con las tareas a realizar, ya que estos definen las metas y objetivos planteados por la entidad y enmarcan el trabajo y la productividad de los empleados, al igual que su disposición al cambio.

Palabras Clave: cambio organizacional, calidad de vida laboral.

QUALITY OF LIFE AT WORK AND WILLINGNESS TOWARD ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGE IN OFFICERS OF COMPANIES IN THE CITY OF BOGOTÁ – COLOMBIA

Abstract

The purpose of the research was to determine the relationship between quality of work life and readiness to organizational change in a sample of 100 company workers in the city of Bogota. It was conducted following a correlational cross-sectional design through the application of two instruments: one that measures organizational change (BMI) (García & Forero, 2010) and another one that assesses perceived quality of life in organizations (Gómez - Rada, 2011). The sample participation was voluntary and data were analyzed using Spearman's Rho. Results show a significant correlation at 0.001 in all the variables of organizational change and quality of life with the exception of resistance to change. This suggests that some of the aspects to be highlighted are the importance of quality of life and commitment to the tasks to be performed as these define the goals and objectives set by the entity and frame the work and productivity of employees as well as their readiness to change.

Key words: organizational change, quality of work life.

* Mónica García Rubiano y Carlos Forero Aponte, D.P: Av. Caracas No. 46 – 40. Tel. (57) 3277300 ext. 5050, mgarcia@ucatolica.edu.co, cforero@ucatolica.edu.co

QUALIDADE DE VIDA PROFISSIONAL E A DISPOSIÇÃO À MUDANÇA ORGANIZACIONAL EM FUNCIONÁRIOS DE EMPRESAS DA CIDADE DE BOGOTÁ (COLÔMBIA)

Resumo

O propósito desta pesquisa foi determinar a relação entre a qualidade de vida profissional e a disposição à mudança organizacional numa amostra de 100 funcionários de empresas da cidade de Bogotá. Realizou-se sob um desenho transversal correlacional por meio da aplicação de dois instrumentos: o instrumento de medição de mudança organizacional (García e Forero, 2010) e o de qualidade de vida percebida em organizações (Gómez-Rada, 2011). A participação da população foi voluntária. A análise dos dados foi realizada por meio do rho de Spearman. Os resultados obtidos mostram uma correlação significativa a 0.001 com todas as variáveis de mudança organizacional e de qualidade de vida, exceto as de resistência à mudança. Esses achados sugerem que alguns dos aspectos a ressaltar são a importância da qualidade de vida e do compromisso com as tarefas a realizar visto que estes definem as metas e os objetivos propostos pela entidade e determinam o trabalho e a produtividade dos empregados, assim como sua disposição à mudança.

Palavras-chave: mudança organizacional, qualidade de vida profissional.

INTRODUCTION

Providing a nurturing work environment is an issue of utmost importance for many organizations. Human talent is the force that moves different processes, facilitates their development, and without a doubt strengthens the continuous progress of the employees as well as the organization. It is important not to merely meet the basic needs of the employee, since a great variety of personal needs could also emerge, directly influencing the behaviors and attitudes the employee has within the organization. Because of this, those needs should be adjusted within the organization so that the employee's quality of work life is optimal (Nair, 2013).

Elizur and Shye (1990) point out that quality of work life (QWL) has been studied from two theoretical-methodological perspectives: a) the quality of life in the work environment, whose goal is to attain a better quality of life through the achievement of organizational interests. Its aim is to analyze the organization as a system, taking into account the different subsystems that it comprises, thereby attaining greater productivity and efficiency as a preliminary step, without which it would not be possible to meet the demands of each worker and, b) the psychological quality of life, oriented towards showing a greater interest in the worker, developing analysis that allow the identification of specific elements that affect the worker's wellbeing in his/her daily life. Even though both approaches have a common goal of improving work life, they differ in the objectives they pursue.

From these two perspectives, González, Peiró and Bravo (1996) explain that QWL measures the way in which the working environment is experienced: a) objectively, where the whole organization is assessed as a multilevel

system, taking into account the physical and environmental characteristics of the work place which could lead to a better or worse quality of work life, b) subjectively, from the point of view of the worker, considering the factors that directly influence the way in which he/she views his/her work along with the individual characteristics that affect their perspectives of the work. These include all the emotional and attitudinal characteristics that could have an influence on it.

Pérez, Campos, Negro and Caballero (2011) understand quality of work life as the perception of demands in the work place and the possible means to meet them. These demands can stem directly from the worker or from the organization. This concept contains subjective and objective factors. The subjective factors refer to the beliefs the worker develops and which originate from their labor situation. This confirms that subjective experiences are not a dimension of life, but life itself. On the other hand, objective elements are those that make up the work environment such as working conditions, salary, health, etc. (Segurado & Argulló, 2000).

The perception that employees have of these subjective and objective factors can lead them to take diverse positions regarding the processes of change that are emerging within organizations. According to García, Camargo, Cervera, Ramírez and Romero (2010), given that organizations are open and dynamic systems, they are constantly changing and it is therefore necessary to understand what the change consists of, which factors influence it, and what is the most appropriate way to guide change within the organization.

Organizational change should not be understood as an isolated internal element within organizations, but should rather be seen as an invigorating element that allows change to be addressed from different aspects of organizational

behavior in its three levels (individual, group, and organizational). In this respect, this research corresponds to a line of work in which studies have been developed at these levels. At an individual level, variables such as attitude (García, Rojas & Díaz, 2011), motivation (García, Gómez & Londoño, 2009), motivation and satisfaction (García & Forero, 2014), and organizational justice (García & Forero, 2014) are considered. At the group level, variables such as leadership (García, 2011), communication (García, Arias & Gómez, 2013), and teamwork (García, Camargo, Cervera, Ramírez & Romero, 2010) have been studied. In general terms, these studies show correlations between the different variables mentioned above, which allows to assume that there are interrelated aspects within organizations and that these have an influence in processes of change.

Acosta (2004) understands organizational change as a set of transformations that are produced by internal or external forces to organizations and which generally seek to increase the effectiveness of the organization (Freire & Gutiérrez-Rubí, 2010).

With respect to forces that generate change, these could be: a) structural, which refer to mergers and acquisitions; b) reduction of costs, which allude to the elimination of non-essential activities or other operational costs; c) change in processes, with an emphasis on making them more effective and less costly; and d) cultural change, which are focused on human aspects, such as a change from autocratic management to participatory management (Luecke, 2003).

From a different perspective, Palací (2005) differentiates between planned and unplanned change. Planned change is aimed at the achievement of goals, is more organized, and has more control and is more in touch with financial issues such as costs generated. Unplanned change refers to all the actions that occur in response to the demand from external variables such as new directives or market demands. These changes include innovations in processes, services, products, structure, and management of the company.

Lippitt, Watson and Westley's planned change model (1958) is one of the most representative models of change and points out that all information should be shared within the whole organization and will only be functional if it is translated into plans of action to improve the company. The phases of this model are to explore the needs, to define the entry of an agent of change – preferably external – with the aim of carrying out diagnoses and to plan goals and solutions in order to generate real actions and later stabilize and assess the organization (Cited by Hernández, Gallarzo & Espinosa, 2011).

According to Ruiz, Ruiz, Martínez and Peláez (1999), the differentiation between the factors of organizational change and the management of organizational change has to be taken into account. Factors of organizational change are ways that, for various reasons, an organization can detect that need to be changed, and include: technological, structural, personnel, and cultural factors. In the current corporate world characterized by globalization, the power of clients and the avalanche of information, organizations have been in a permanent process of change in order to achieve continual improvement. Organizations have to react to technological, structural, personnel, and cultural factors, and in this way achieve the adaptation and/or proactivity they need to move forward. To manage the change in these factors, two aspects need to be very clear: the phases of change and the elements for the management of change. It is considered that organizational change can be divided into five phases: detecting the need for change, carrying out a diagnosis of the current situation, elaborating an action plan, implementing change, and controlling and assessing changes as they take place.

It is important to highlight that the way in which change is managed will generate greater or lesser resistance. This is understood as an organizational disagreement, which many individuals consider unpleasant since they do not understand it, either because it has not been explained in a clear way or because uncertainty is generated around the process (Vicenzi, Melo & Fonseca, 2011).

In this regard, the literature has a series of debates about the way in which organizational change should be carried out, but it always coincides with the idea that it should be implemented with a focus on ensuring that members of the organization recognize the need for change. In this way, the capacity for change implies a systemic approach for the development of the organization, taking advantage of the people's natural capacity, their perceptions with respect to equality in terms of treatment and status in the process, and the teams that want to change and support the change, which is a fundamental aspect (Kerber & Buono, 2010).

A study carried out by Ernst, Lewis and Hammer (2010) summarized the perspectives of the employers in terms of work life and their initiatives related to possible phenomena of organizational change in the face of two challenges. The former refers to the structural organization (flexible work, human resources policies) and the second refers to cultural factors (support supervisors, atmosphere). The authors point out that even though work life and the initiatives respond to the need to adapt the organization to the changing relationships between work, family life and personal life of individuals, these aspects are marginalized instead of

becoming integrated into the systems of the organization. The vision should therefore change and become integrated to improve the effectiveness of the organization.

Research carried out by Gómez (2010) had the objective of discovering the understanding that temporary employees from the Aburrá valley had regarding certain factors of organizational change and the influence this change had on their quality of life. The author explains a strategy for the betterment of the quality of life in general that is structured in six steps: preparation, planning, reporting, deployment, implementation, and constant improvement of the quality and the organizational change that is involved. The research concluded that the quality of work life requires changes: changes in the way of seeing and doing things, in the way of managing things, in the way of directing the organizations, in the variants of people's participation and in the context of responsibilities, among others. This does not mean that it is necessary to change everything, but that progress in terms of quality requires adjustments in different aspects of administration that are obstacles for this progress. This implies the need to promote actions that boost local sustainable development, understood as a responsibility shared by each and every one of the social, economic, and environmental agents that, one way or another, have something to propose or recommend for the continuous improvement of workers' quality of life.

In this way, quality of life in the work place is a cross-cutting factor for decision-making regarding changes that should be made within the organization. These changes should strengthen the workers' perspectives regarding development, productivity and efficiency within the organization.

In general, the influence of the quality of work life and organizational change has not been well studied. Some type of relationship is expected because the quality of work life constitutes a subjective perception of organizational change. This involves the way in which people interiorize the process of change within the organizations, and therefore this paper only intends to explore the possible relationship between the target variables of the study and to offer empirical benchmarks for future research.

Taking this into account, the following research question is generated: What is the relationship between the quality of work life and staff members' readiness to organizational change in companies in the city of Bogotá? The general objective is to identify the relationship between the quality of work life and staff members' readiness to organizational change in companies in the city of Bogotá. Specific objectives are as follows: a) identify workers' readiness to organizational change in companies in the city of Bogotá, and b) identify the conditions that affect workers' quality

of work life in companies in the city of Bogotá. In accordance with the above, the research hypothesis proposed is: There is a significant relationship between quality of life and organizational change.

METHOD

Type of study

Given that the research variables were already present in the individuals and the organizations, and that it was not feasible to manipulate them, it made more sense to choose a non-experimental approach, with a correlational cross-sectional design which sought to establish a relationship between the variables of organizational change and quality of life. However, no attempt was made to determine the causality between them (Hernández, Fernández & Baptista, 2010). With this methodological decision, it was sought to establish the relationship between the variables drawing from the information obtained through the implementation of standardized tests. The development of this type of research is justified given that the variables of change and quality of life were already present in the context and no attempt was made to manipulate the variables in any way. The goal was then to determine the possible relationships that contribute to understanding organizational change.

Participants

The research was correlational given that it used quantitative variables that are present in the individuals before carrying out the research, which means that probabilistic sampling is not necessary. The normality of the distributions was assessed to determine the specific use of the correlation coefficient, which in this case was Spearman's Rho. The sampling technique was non-probability self-selection (Coolican, 2005). For this sample, 101 staff members were selected from companies in the process of structural, functional and/or administrative change in the city of Bogotá. The conditions for the selection of the participants included that they should have been working in the organization for three months or more and should give voluntary consent to participate in the research. Socio-demographically speaking, women made up the majority of the sampling (52.5%); 74.3% of the total were professionals, and 18.8% were technicians; 55.4% were single, and 33.7% married. Regarding contract types, 88.1% had service provision contracts. The average time of employment was 12.5 years and the average time in their position was 8.3 years. Both the time in the company and the time in the position have a positive bias, which indicates a tendency towards values below the average (asymmetries of 4.3 and 2.5 respectively).

Procedure

The research was carried out in two phases: a) proposals were sent to different institutions to carry out the study; b) after receiving consent from the entities, the logistical aspects of how to apply the instruments were defined, starting with the formation of population groups. Instructions for confidentiality were given and the instruments were applied collectively. The participation of the subjects was voluntary and anonymous, and no incentives were given to respond to the questionnaires. The approximate time to complete the instruments was one and a half hours.

Instruments

For the development of this research, the Instrument for Measuring Change – IMC – (García & Forero,

2010) was used. The instrument is constituted of 9 main variables: a) adaptability, b) leadership, c) participation/integration, d) communication, e) team work, f) acceptance, g) resistance to change, h) knowledge of the organization, i) culture of change. Three first order factors are: a) individual factor, b) group factor, and c) company factor. Two second order factors are: a) factor I: management of change, b) factor II: projection and development of change.

The total reliability of the test was Cronbach Alpha = 0.86. Table 1 shows the reliabilities for each component of the IMC test and the maximum scores; the minimum theoretical scores for each of the components is 1.

Table 1.

Cronbach Alpha reliability and maximum scores for the different aspects assessed by IMC

	Variable	Number of Items	Cronbach Alfa	Maximum score
General variables	Adaptability	5	0.512	20
	Leadership	6	0.776	24
	Participation-Integration	5	0.777	20
	Communication	5	0.709	20
	Team work	4	0.743	16
	Acceptance	8	0.542	32
	Resistance to Change	11	0.879	44
	Knowledge of the organization	4	0.604	16
	Culture of change	3	0.77	12
First order factors	Individual	11	0.745	44
	Group	14	0.845	56
	Company	26	0.756	104
Second order factors	Management of change	16	0.89	64
	Projection and development of change	6	0.736	24
Total	IMC	51	0.86	204

To assess the quality of work life, the test of the same name which was designed by Gómez-Rada (2011) was used, which consists of eight dimensions: compensation and benefits (5 items), conditions of the work environment (6 items), nature of the tasks (6 items), development and work security (3 items), organizational democracy (5 items), fundamental rights (4

items), work balance (4 items), and social impact (6 items). The test has a total of 39 items and consists of a Likert-type scale with a minimum value of 1 and a maximum of 4 for each item. It has a reliability of 0.97, obtained using the Cronbach Alpha analysis. This test was used given its consistency with Walton’s position (1975, cited by Toro, 1991).

RESULTS

For the analysis of results, descriptive statistics (measurements of central tendency, dispersion, asymmetry, and kurtosis) were calculated. The behavior of the distributions was determined using a Kolmogorov-Smirnov analysis, and finally the corresponding correlations were made using Spearman's Rho coefficient.

In the first part of the results, a descriptive analysis of the variables of readiness to organizational change and quality of work life is presented, and in the second, the correlations obtained with Spearman's coefficient of correlation. This method was utilized given that, when conducting the Kolmogorov-Smirnov normality test, the data were found to be abnormally distributed (Pérez, 2011).

Table 2.

Descriptive statistics of IMC variables and factors

	Variables/Factors	Descriptive Statistics					
		Mean	Median	Mode	St. Dev.	Asymmetry	Kurtosis
General variables	Adaptability	18.54	20.00	20.00	2.41	-1.75	2.34
	Acceptance	26.20	27.00	29.00	3.06	-1.37	1.87
	Communication	17.31	18.00	20.00	3.14	-1.32	1.67
	Knowledge of the organization	13.81	15.00	16.00	2.66	-1.37	1.84
	Culture of change	10.42	12.00	12.00	2.16	-1.55	2.33
	Leadership	22.06	24.00	24.00	2.93	-1.98	4.50
	Participation - Integration	18.04	19.00	20.00	2.56	-1.33	1.38
	Resistance to change	30.25	31.00	27.00	5.85	-0.36	0.33
	Team work	13.91	15.00	16.00	2.55	-1.43	2.04
	Total	170.53	176.00	178.00	17.55	-1.76	2.92
First order factors	Group Level	49.26	52.00	56.00	7.28	-1.58	2.97
	Individual Level	40.60	44.00	44.00	5.00	-1.95	4.19
	Company Level	80.67	83.00	83.00a	8.15	-1.11	0.85
Second order factors	Management of change	58.21	61.00	64.00	6.84	-2.08	5.46
	Projection and development of change	21.01	23.00	24.00	3.60	-1.47	1.68

With respect to the IMC, in table 2 it can be observed that in general, the averages of the variables tend to be towards the higher end of the scales, and some medians are actually at the maximum score of the distribution (Adaptability, Culture of change, and Leadership). The biases of the distributions can be seen in the asymmetry values: it is important to highlight that they are all negative which, together with the rest of the distribution values, shows evidence of the tendency to

reach the highest possible scores. The only variable that presented normal behavior was resistance to change. On the other hand, kurtosis in general has positive values and, together with the deviations presented, this shows evidence of the tendency to form homogeneous groups. These aspects could be the result of the respondents giving desirable, but not necessarily truthful answers, or due to the instrument's difficulties in discriminating differences.

Table 3.
Descriptive statistics for the scales of the Quality of Work Life instrument

Scales	Descriptive Statistics					
	Mean	Median	Mode	St. Dev.	Asymmetry	Kurtosis
Compensation and benefits	16.61	18.00	20.00	4.10	-1.32	0.65
Conditions of work environment	21.16	22.00	24.00	3.39	-1.72	2.87
Nature of the tasks	21.33	22.00	24.00	3.28	-1.96	4.25
Development and work security	10.17	11.00	12.00	2.25	-1.37	1.18
Organizational democracy	17.35	19.00	20.00	3.49	-1.53	1.51
Fundamental rights	14.14	15.00	16.00	2.43	-1.66	2.23
Work balance	13.67	15.00	16.00	2.78	-1.43	1.13
Social impact	21.77	23.00	24.00	3.11	-2.10	4.55

Just as with the IMC, the instrument of quality of work life also showed that the assessed scales did not behave normally. When looking at the averages of the scales, it is found that they tend towards the highest scores, and even though the medians were not exactly the same as the maximum scores in any of the scales, they were all very close. It is important to highlight that the mode corresponds to the maximum natural score in each one of the different scales (See Table 3).

Just as with the IMC, the asymmetry of all the scales is negative, which reinforces the understanding that the

scores tend to be at the higher end of the scales. A leptokurtic behavior can be seen in all the scales, which, together with the standard deviation, makes it clear that there is a tendency towards homogeneity in the distributions. Such behaviors could be due to an identified bias towards the desirability of those being assessed or a deficit in the discrimination capacity of the test.

Table 4 shows the correlation of the variables that make up the instruments with the exception of the resistance to change variable.

Table 4.
Correlations between acceptance of change and quality of work life

Variables	Compensation and Benefits	Environment and Work Conditions	Nature of the tasks	Development and Work Security	Organizational Democracy	Fundamental Rights	Work Balance	Social Impact
Adaptability	0.718**	0.576**	0.616**	0.638**	0.665**	0.568**	0.584**	0.567**
Acceptance	0.569**	0.610**	0.510**	0.598**	0.639**	0.548**	0.545**	0.488**
Communication	0.521**	0.567**	0.581**	0.548**	0.571**	0.594**	0.524**	0.573**
Knowledge of the organization	0.497**	0.588**	0.565**	0.512**	0.496**	0.467**	0.567**	0.500**
Culture of change	0.584**	0.593**	0.568**	0.594**	0.570**	0.554**	0.633**	0.543**

Continued table 3

Variables	Compensation and Benefits	Environment and Work Conditions	Nature of the tasks	Development and Work Security	Organizational Democracy	Fundamental Rights	Work Balance	Social Impact
Management of change (minor factor)	0.538**	0.622**	0.621**	0.556**	0.608**	0.543**	0.505**	0.630**
Leadership	0.550**	0.567**	0.619**	0.612**	0.633**	0.560**	0.537**	0.613**
Group Level	0.499**	0.614**	0.630**	0.541**	0.593**	0.615**	0.509**	0.635**
Individual Level	0.650**	0.621**	0.664**	0.674**	0.679**	0.593**	0.602**	0.645**
Company Level	0.448**	0.400**	0.319**	0.432**	0.433**	0.448**	0.474**	0.336**
Participation Integration	0.377**	0.474**	0.459**	0.360**	0.426**	0.374**	0.329**	0.474**
Projection and development of change (minor factor)	0.573**	0.607**	0.645**	0.567**	0.618**	0.620**	0.600**	0.610**
Resistance to change	-0.061	-0.154	-0.166	-0.098	-0.058	-0.054	-0.049	-0.086
Team Work	0.433**	0.527**	0.609**	0.511**	0.545**	0.609**	0.515**	0.599**

Note: ** Significance of 0.01.

The adaptability variable of the IMC correlates at the 0.01 level of significance with the variables of the quality of work life instrument: compensation and benefits (Rho=0.718); conditions of work environment (Rho=0.576); nature of the tasks (Rho=0.616); development and work security (Rho=0.638); organizational democracy (Rho=0.665); fundamental rights (Rho=0.568); work balance (Rho=0.584); and social impact (Rho=0.567).

The acceptance variable of IMC correlates at the 0.01 level of significance with the variables of the quality of work life instrument: compensation and benefits (Rho=0.569); conditions of the work environment (Rho=0.610); nature of the tasks (Rho=0.510); development and work security (Rho=0.598); organizational democracy (Rho=0.639); fundamental rights (Rho=0.548); work balance (Rho=0.545); and social impact (Rho=0.488).

The communication variable of IMC correlates at the 0.01 level of significance with the variables of the quality of work life instrument: compensation and benefits (Rho=0.521); conditions of the work environment (Rho=0.567); nature of the tasks (Rho=0.581); development and work security (Rho=0.548); organizational democracy (Rho=0.571); fun-

damental rights (Rho=0.594); work balance (Rho=0.524); and social impact (Rho=0.573).

The knowledge of the organization variable of IMC correlates at the 0.01 level of significance with the variables of the quality of work life instrument: compensation and benefits (Rho=0.497); conditions of the work environment (Rho=0.588); nature of the tasks (Rho=0.565); development and work security (Rho=0.512); organizational democracy (Rho=0.496); fundamental rights (Rho=0.467); work balance (Rho=0.567); and social impact (Rho=0.500).

The culture of change variable of IMC correlates at the 0.01 level of significance with the variables of the quality of work life instrument: compensation and benefits (Rho=0.584); conditions of the work environment (Rho=0.593); nature of the tasks (Rho=0.568); development and work security (Rho=0.594); organizational democracy (Rho=0.570); fundamental rights (Rho=0.554); work balance (Rho=0.633); and social impact (Rho=0.543).

The management of change variable of IMC correlates at the 0.01 level of significance with the variables of the quality of work life instrument: compensation and benefits (Rho=0.538); conditions of the work environment

(Rho=0.622); nature of the tasks (Rho=0.621); development and work security (Rho=0.556); organizational democracy (Rho=0.608); fundamental rights (Rho=0.543); work balance (Rho=0.505); and social impact (Rho=0.630).

The leadership variable of IMC correlates at the 0.01 level of significance with the variables of the quality of work life instrument: compensation and benefits (Rho=0.550); conditions of the work environment (Rho=0.567); nature of the tasks (Rho=0.619); development and work security (Rho=0.612); organizational democracy (Rho=0.633); fundamental rights (Rho=0.560); work balance (Rho=0.537); and social impact (Rho=0.613).

The group level variable of IMC correlates at the 0.01 level of significance with the variables of the quality of work life instrument: compensation and benefits (Rho=0.499); conditions of the work environment (Rho=0.614); nature of the tasks (Rho=0.630); development and work security (Rho=0.541); organizational democracy (Rho=0.593); fundamental rights (Rho=0.615); work balance (Rho=0.509); and social impact (Rho=0.635).

The individual level variable of IMC correlates at the 0.01 level of significance with the variables of the quality of work life instrument: compensation and benefits (Rho=0.650); conditions of the work environment (Rho=0.621); nature of the tasks (Rho=0.664); development and work security (Rho=0.674); organizational democracy (Rho=0.679); fundamental rights (Rho=0.593); work balance (Rho=0.602); and social impact (Rho=0.645).

The organizational level variable of IMC correlates at the 0.01 level of significance with the variables of the quality of work life instrument: compensation and benefits (Rho=0.448); conditions of the work environment (Rho=0.400); nature of the tasks (Rho=0.319); development and work security (Rho=0.432); organizational democracy (Rho=0.433); fundamental rights (Rho=0.448); work balance (Rho=0.474); and social impact (Rho=0.336).

The participation and integration variable of IMC correlates at the 0.01 level of significance with the variables of the quality of work life instrument: compensation and benefits (Rho=0.377); conditions of the work environment (Rho=0.474); nature of the tasks (Rho=0.459); development and work security (Rho=0.360); organizational democracy (Rho=0.426); fundamental rights (Rho=0.374); work balance (Rho=0.329); and social impact (Rho=0.474).

Regarding the variable of projection and development of change of IMC, it correlates at the 0.01 level of significance with the variables of the quality of work life instrument: compensation and benefits (Rho=0.573); conditions of the work environment (Rho=0.607); nature of the tasks (Rho=0.645); development and work security (Rho=0.567);

organizational democracy (Rho=0.618); fundamental rights (Rho=0.620); work balance (Rho=0.600); and social impact (Rho=0.610).

The team work variable of IMC correlates at the 0.01 level of significance with the variables of the quality of work life instrument: compensation and benefits (Rho=0.433); conditions of the work environment (Rho=0.527); nature of the tasks (Rho=0.609); development and work security (Rho=0.511); organizational democracy (Rho=0.545); fundamental rights (Rho=0.609); work balance (Rho=0.515); and social impact (Rho=0.599).

DISCUSSION

The general objective of this research was to identify the relationship between quality of work life and the staff members' readiness to organizational change in a public entity in the city of Bogotá.

To give a response to the first specific objective, the readiness of workers to change was identified. The results show a positive tendency in all the variables and factors assessed with the IMC. However, it is necessary to make two comments: the first has to do with the evident bias towards maximum values in the test, which is much more evident in the variables of adaptability, culture of change, leadership, and participation/ integration, as well as in the individual, management of change, and projection and development of change factors. The second is related to the asymmetry and kurtosis that show not only a tendency towards high values, but also towards rather homogeneous distributions.

Regarding the first aspect, it is necessary to take into account factors related to motivation and perception when thinking about the possible implications of the research on the members of the sample. It is clear that, for ethical reasons, participation is strictly anonymous and confidential, but this is not necessarily the perception that many participants have about this type of research.

Secondly, despite the technical conditions under which the test was designed and which show adequate levels of reliability, it is appropriate to question its quality and sensitivity to measuring the variables that are supposed to be assessed. In other words, a deep technical analysis is needed in order to be able to determine if the test complies with the necessary conditions required for an accurate evaluation of the aspects that are intended to evaluate.

Regarding the second objective, which aimed to identify the conditions of quality of life, a very high appraisal done by the people evaluated leading to high scores, means, medians, and modes located in the upper extremes of each scale was found. However, just as with the measurement

of change, it is appropriate to question both the capacity of the test to adequately measure the variable it was supposed to measure and the biases generated by those evaluated as a result of personal judgments or unfounded beliefs with respect to the scope and ethical limitations of the research.

It is clear, in both cases, that other variables can influence the responses of those evaluated with this type of test. Aspects like motivation, anxiety, and doubts about later consequences that the publication of the results could have, among others, are factors that can affect the honesty of the evaluated person when they answer the questions.

In response to the general objective, it was identified through the analysis of the results that the majority of variables of organizational change correlate with the variables of the quality of work life instrument, with the exception of resistance to change. Robbis (2002) mentions five reasons why he thinks organizations resist change: habits, security, economic factors, selective processes, and selective hearing of information. This can explain that resistance to change is not only due to the current situation of the entity in terms of the quality of work life, but also to the intervention of other factors. Understanding this can improve the productivity and functionality of the work done by each one of the employees (Dolan & García – Sánchez, 1999).

Taking into account that the variables of the two instruments correlate in a significant way, it can be pointed out that the quality of life within the work environment and the benefits given by the entity open a path so that the employee can adequately adapt to the changes that occur within the organization. Poza and Prior (1988, cited by González, Peiró & Bravo, 1996) explain what factors influence the way in which the work environment is experienced, which includes both objective (security, hygiene, salary, etc.) and subjective conditions (the way in which the worker lives).

It is important to highlight these results because not only do they show evidence of the relationships of the main variables in the study, but they also support the research hypothesis. Additionally, it can be established that quality of life is a subjective perception of organizational change.

In this regard, while it is clear that organizational change can be studied from different viewpoints related to organizational behavior, quality of life can also be seen from different perspectives, in this case from the worker's point of view, which is considered as being subjective. In the same way, when studied from psychological perspectives, where individual characteristics such as emotional and attitudinal characteristics are considered, subjective aspects are also evident (Segurado & Argulló, 2000).

Therefore, the psychological aspects of the individual that have been studied with organizational change, such as

attitude (García, Rojas & Díaz, 2011), motivation (García, Gómez & Londoño, 2009), motivation and satisfaction (García & Forero, 2014), and organizational justice (García & Forero, 2014), are important factors which conclude that the perceptual aspects of the worker in response to different processes of change are going to depend on the way in which they are experienced and understood from the worker's point of view.

Additionally, it can be established that organizational change as well as the quality of work life are multidimensional, and therefore they cannot be understood as independent elements within organizations, but rather are going to be affected by other aspects that, in some way, generate influence on the way they are perceived by the workers.

The social impact of this research will be the generation of more important theoretical contributions for organizational psychology with respect to the existing relationship between the mentioned variables, as well as the possibility to generate more theories at an empirical level by means of the revision of existing literature about these variables. Furthermore, it could enrich the investigation of new relationships and enable explanations that contribute to the way in which change can be adequately managed in Colombian organizations, taking into account some variables about individuals.

REFERENCES

- Acosta, C. (2004) Cuatro preguntas para iniciarse en cambio organizacional. *Revista Colombiana de Psicología*, 11, 9-24.
- Alcover, M., Rico, R., & Gil, F. (2011). Equipos de trabajo en contextos organizacionales: Dinámicas de cambio, adaptación y aprendizaje en entornos flexibles. *Papeles de psicología*, 32, 7-16.
- Arriero, C., & Natividade, L. (2009), Qualidade de vida no trabalho. *Revista Tecer Belo Horizont*, 2, 1-12.
- Camacaro, P. (2010). *Aproximación a la calidad de vida en el trabajo en la organización castrense venezolana*. Edición electrónica.
- Acosta, C. (2004) Cuatro preguntas para iniciarse en cambio organizacional. *Revista Colombiana de Psicología*, 11, 9-24.
- Cañon, S., & Galeano, G. (2011). Factores laborales psicosociales y calidad de vida laboral de los trabajadores de la salud de ASSBASALUD E.S.E. *Archivos de Medicina*. 11 (2), 114 - 126.
- Chiang M.M., & Krausse, K (2009). Estudio empírico de calidad de vida laboral, cuatro indicadores: satisfacción laboral, condiciones y medio ambiente del trabajo, organización e indicador global, sectores privado y público. *Horizontes empresariales*. 23-50.

- Coolican, H. (2005). Métodos de investigación y estadística en psicología (3ra Ed.) México: Manual Moderno.
- Da Silva, M., (2006). Nuevas perspectivas de la calidad de vida laboral y sus relaciones con la eficacia organizacional. Tesis doctoral: Universidad de Barcelona.
- Díaz, J. (2005) Cambio organizacional, una aproximación por valores. *Revista Venezolana de Gerencia*. 10(32) ,605-627.
- Duran, M. (2010). Bienestar psicológico: el estrés y la calidad de vida en el contexto laboral. *RNA revista nacional de administración*, 1, 71-84.
- Dolan, S.L., & Garcia-Sanchez, S. (1999). *La gestion par valeurs*. Montréal: Éditions Nouvelles.
- Duro, A. (2004). Calidad de vida laboral. *Calidad de vida laboral: Área de Psicología Social*. España: Universidad Rey Juan Carlos.
- Elizur, D. et Shye, S. (1990). Quality of work life and its relation to quality of life. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 39(3), 275-291.
- Ernst, E., Lewis, S., & Hammer, L (2010). Work-life initiatives and organizational change: Overcoming mixed messages to move from the margin to the mainstream. *Hum Relat*, 63(1), 3-19.
- Ferreira, D., Barbosa, I., Hastenreiter, J.M., & De Acevedo, F. (2011). Mudança organizacional em uma instituição hospitalar: um estudo de caso sobre as percepções dos gestores. *Belo Horizonte*. 12(2), 85-110.
- Flores, N., Jenaro, C., González, F., & García P. (2010) Análisis de la calidad de vida laboral en trabajadores con discapacidad. *Instituto Universitario de Integración en la Comunidad (INICO)*, Universidad de Salamanca. Pp. 95-107.
- Freire, J., & Gutiérrez-Rubí, A (2010). *32 tendencias de cambio*. España: Gráfico.
- García M., Rojas M., & Díaz S. (2011). Relación entre el cambio organizacional y la actitud al cambio en trabajadores de una empresa de Bogotá. *Diversitas Perspectivas en Psicología*, (1) 7, 2-1.
- García, G., & Sandoval, A. (2010), Cultura gerencial y cambio organizacional en Cierres Ideal de México: un "modelo" de calidad guadalupano. *Revista Redalyc*, 34, 133-148.
- García, M, Gómez, G y Londoño, O. (2009). Relación entre motivación y resistencia al cambio en personas que trabajan en una empresa del sector público. *Revista Diversitas Perspectivas en Psicología*, 5(1), 141-159.
- García, M. & Forero, C. (2010). IMC - Instrumento de Medición de Cambio Organizacional. Manual Técnico. Bogotá, Colombia: RH&T. (Documento no publicado).
- García, M. (2011). Liderazgo transformacional y la facilitación de la aceptación al cambio organizacional. *Pensamiento Psicológico*, 9(16), 41-54.
- García, M., & Forero, C. (2014). Cambio organizacional y percepción de la justicia organizacional en una entidad de la ciudad de Bogotá-Colombia. *Revista Diversitas Perspectivas en Psicología*. 10(2), 293 -305.
- García, M., & Forero, C. (2014). Motivación y satisfacción laboral como facilitadores del cambio organizacional: una explicación desde las ecuaciones estructurales. *Psicogente*, 17(31), 120-142.
- García, M., Arias, F., & Gómez, P. (2013). Relación entre comunicación y cambio organizacional en trabajadores de una empresa del sector terciario. *Revista Diversitas Perspectivas en Psicología*. 9(1), 89-95.
- García, M., Camarco, J., Cervera, A., Ramírez, A & Romero, B. (2010). Relación entre grupos/ equipos de trabajo y cambio organizacional en una empresa comercializadora de Bogotá. *Psychologia: avances de la disciplina*. 4(2).31-46.
- Giraldo, M (2009). *Modelo de Gestión del cambio planeado para la sunción supervisoria.*, Caso empresa de consumo masivo. 3rd, International Conference on Industrial Engineering and industrial management, XII Congreso de Organizaciones e Ingeniería, Barcelona-Terrasa, Sept, 2-4.
- Gómez., M.A. (2010). Calidad de vida laboral en empleados temporales del valle de Aburrá, Colombia. *Revista ciencias estratégicas*, 18(24), 225-236.
- Gómez-Rada, C (2011). Instrumento calidad de vida laboral. Manual Técnico. Bogotá, Colombia. Documento no publicado.
- González, P., Peiró, J.M., & Bravo, M. (1996). Calidad de vida laboral. In J.M.Peiró & F.Prieto (Eds.): *Tratado de Psicología del Trabajo (vol. 2)*. Madrid: Síntesis (pp. 161-186).
- González, T. (2010). Agroindustrias: cambio organizacional como estrategias de sobrevivencia y transformación regional. *Universidad autónoma*, 4, 1-12.
- Granados, I. (2011) Calidad de vida laboral: historia, dimensiones y beneficios. *Revista IIPSI*. 14(2), 271-276.
- Hernández, P., Gallarzo, M., & Espinosa, J. (2011). *Desarrollo organizacional enfoque latinoamericano*. México: Pearson.
- Hernández, R., Fernández, C., & Baptista, P. (2010). *Metodología de la Investigación*. México: McGraw Hill.
- Jeanie, D. (2002) *El monstruo del cambio, El factor humano como elemento decisivo para estimular o frustrar el cambio en la empresa*. España: Ediciones Urano, S.A.
- Kerber, K., & Buono, A. (2010). Intervention and organizational change: building organizational change capacity. En Buono, A.F. & Jamieson, D.W. (Eds.).
- Kotter, P., & Cohen, D. (2003). *Las claves del cambio*. España: Deusto.
- Luecke, R. (2003), *Gestionar el cambio y la transición*. España: Deusto.
- Montalván, C., (2005). *Calidad de vida laboral: hacia un enfoque integrador desde la Psicología Social*. España: Universidad de Oviedo.
- Nair, S. (2013). A study on the effect of quality of work life (QWL) on organizational citizenship behaviour (OCB) - With Special reference to College Teachers in Thrissur District, Kerala . *Integral Review- A Journal of Management* . 6(1), 34-46.

- Ooi, T. (2011). Organization Transformation – What matters most is the Leader’s Actions. *Int. J. Emerg. Sci.* 1(1), 211-230
- Palací, F.J. (2005). *Psicología de la Organización*. España: Pearson-Prentice Hall.
- Palací, F.J. (2005). *Psicología de la Organización*. España: Pearson-Prentice Hall.
- Pérez, C. (2001). *Técnicas estadísticas con SPSS*. Madrid, España: Prentice - Hall.
- Pérez, T., Campos, A., Negro, A., & Caballero, F. (2011) Professional Burnout and Work Satisfaction in Spanish Allergists: Analysis of Working Conditions in the Specialty. *J Investing Allergol. Clin. Immunol.* 21(1), 13-21.
- Quirant, E. (2006). La importancia del factor humano para lograr el éxito del proceso de cambio. *Revista de empresa.* 18, 50-63.
- Robbins, S. (2004). *Comportamiento Organizacional*, México: Editorial Pearson.
- Ruiz, M., Ruiz, S., Martínez, L., & Peláez, I. (1999). Modelo para la gestión del cambio organizacional en las pymes. Departamento de Economía de la Empresa. Universidad de Murcia.
- Segurado, A., & Agulló, E. (2002). Calidad de vida laboral: hacia un enfoque integrador desde la psicología social. *Psicothema.* 14(4) 828 - 836.
- Toro, F. (1991). *Desempeño y productividad. Contribuciones de la psicología organizacional*. Medellín: Cincel.
- Uribe - Rodríguez, A. F., Garrido - Pinzón, J., & Rodríguez, A.M (2011). Influencia del tipo de contratación en la calidad de vida laboral: manifestaciones del capitalismo organizacional. *Revista Virtual Universidad Católica del Norte.* 33, 101 – 116.
- Vincenzi, L., Melo, M., & Fonseca, P. (2011) Resistência À Mudança Organizacional: Avaliação de Atitudes e Reações em Grupo de Indivíduos. 1-15.