Tanja Radošević [1]
Goran Bulatović
Ljiljana Bulatović

QUALITY OF LIFE SHOWN IN CORRELATIONS BETWEEN SIGNIFICANT SOCIO-PERSONAL VALUES OF STUDENTS AND EMPLOYEES AND THEIR ATTITUDES TOWARDS CHANGE

Abstract: Purpose – This paper is aimed to show the quality of life seen through correlation among attitudes about changes and socio-personal (Quality of Life) values of students, as well as employees in public, state and private sector in Serbia. The paper intends to prove that the Quality of Life, as seen through attitudes about the importance of main socio-personal values concerning quality of life and workplace, strongly correlates with their attitudes towards changes. The Hypothesis 1 of this research: "There is a statistically significant correlation between attitudes towards changes and socio-personal values of employees concerning Quality of Life and workplace" has been proved. H2, which reads as follows: "There is statistically significant correlation between sub-dimensions of democracy and economic well-being and sub-dimension of attitudes towards changes which does not drastically change as people transfer from young to mature age" has also been confirmed.
Methodology – This research was conducted among 303 interviewees in 2015 and 342 interviewees in 2017. The research uses different statistical methods when analyzing data.
Findings –The findings indicate that, among other things, the view that the existence of a need for change represents a prerequisite for human development is statistically positively and significantly related to freedom, humanity, economic well-being and personal happiness and satisfaction, as prominent factors of Quality of Life.

Keywords: Quality of Life, socio-personal values, basic social values, attitude towards changes, well-being

1. Introduction

Quality of Life (QoL) is relatively difficult to measure and it usually consists of elements that, among others, are prevailingly based on economic well-being. It is also a term that quite hard to define. Quality of Life as a term has not been in use for a long time. According to Jovanović et al. (2016) it was first mentioned in 1920-ies only to receive its prominence in 1970-ies. These authors then suggest that an increase of standards of life

Corresponding author: Tanja Radošević
Email: tanja.radosevic@fmk.edu.rs

led scientists to pay attention to fulfilling one's personal and basic social needs, and this approach led to differentiation among QoL's subjective and objective indicators. Maric (2012) mentions two known concepts of defining the concept of Quality of Life: Scandinavian approach, which starts from objective indicators of the living quality of social such as the unemployment rate, poverty rate, mortality rate and newborn babies; and the American model, which is based on subjective indicators, which are related to the individual's experience and his own evaluation of the conditions in which he lives, so they include satisfaction with life, workplace, social relations etc. (Noll, according to Lučev & Tadinac, 2008; Milošević, 2009). In his paper Sahni (2017) points out that the Quality of work life (QWL) has been understood as the quality of mutual interconnection of employees and their working environment, pointing out human dimensions, as well as technical conditions and economic aspect. Our first research from 2015 has shown that young participants who have a positive attitude towards changes are more prone to perceiving Quality of Life and values that focus on their well-being as very important. The research conducted by Pavlovic et al. (2016) describes their expectations, when it comes to future jobs. These expectations boil down to having a safe job with provided resources to do it normally. Most importantly, they are looking for the job that will not jeopardize their private life. (Pavlović et al., 2016). Various authors (Jackson & Schuler, 1995; Muchinsky, 1997) mention that ambiguity and uncertainty related to the working role and position is a significant factor in reducing confidence, and strengthening feelings of helplessness, anxiety and depression, which are feelings completely opposite from everything that can be called *well-being*. This paper focuses on the research conducted among employed population in 2017, and just like the previous one, conducted in 2015, it shows strong correlation of positive attitudes towards changes and importance of Quality of Life

aspects. These two different research can therefore be compared and considered as contribution to the funds of known research on this topic.

2. Conceptual and theoretical framework

Commenting the different aspects, yet similar context of the two research we have conducted so far, and comparison to recent data that have been published on the related topics outlines the purpose of this work, where we are hoping to prove that Quality of Life, specifically, the notion of well-being, that can be reached through working efforts, depends not solely on economic factors, but also on socio-personal values of individuals, including their attitude towards changes, i.e. it depends on individual perception of their reality.

3. Literature review

There are numerous studies of Quality of Life (QoL) and they all investigate this notion from different aspects. Most scholar papers that discuss the Quality of Life are medical scientific papers that explain well-being as notion so utterly similar to the QoL itself. For instance, Diener et al. (2003) explains that subjective well-being arises from subjective feeling that defines level of happiness, enjoyment, fulfillment, pleasure and so on. Other QoL aspects include economic, environmental and psychological point of view and discuss the Quality of Life from those aspects. Economists assess the Quality of Life based on economic standards, while for the ecologists QoL depends primarily on the preservation of the natural environment. Nutritionists advocate healthy eating as a significant factor in QoL, while sociologists deal with social relationships among different groups of people. Managers are focused on the Quality of life within a working organization, as it is highly influenced by workplace relationships, atmosphere and working conditions. Psychologists and health

professionals study the Quality of Life from an individual's point of view. (Jašić and Kaluđerović, 2015). Arsovski (2007) argues that the quality of human life depends not only on economic factors, but also on numerous other factors, including physical and mental health, social security, social institutions (health, education, justice…), political stability and the environment. He points out that in some highly developed countries, security on the streets (terrorism, theft, etc.) is declining, which residents of those regions consider as an important element for decrease in Quality of Life.

Barrett (1994) explains that there are three main characteristics of Quality of Life:

1) The Quality of Life refers to individual life situations, i.e., it is viewed from a micro perspective. Economic and social reality are important but not at the heart of consideration.

2) The QoL is a multi-dimensional concept that includes everything that is already mentioned in this introduction.

3) The Quality of Life is measured by objective and subjective indicators. Subjective indicators are important for identifying goals and orientations, which can later be linked to objective living conditions. When mentioning objective living conditions, we are turning to local communities. They have been scope of interest of several studies contemplating QoL.

Greenwood (2001) thoroughly explains QoL Indicators. Namely, they refer to the local community (village, city, municipality, region, state) and express a whole range of factors based on life in the local community, especially in terms of sustainable development. In the later discussion the author puts her focus on measuring indicators of QoL. This is usually done on the basis of a questionnaire (for assessing individual perception of Quality of Life) and official sources of data (adequate ministries,

associations, etc.). She emphasizes that this second part of the data is very difficult to provide because there is no:

- an official methodology for measuring the parameters on which the Quality of Life indexes can be calculated,
- a system of continuous monitoring of the QoL indicators,
- a system of evaluating the Quality of Life and return activities for the promotion of "critical" areas of the Quality of Life.

Jašić and Kaluđerović (2015) explain that the Quality of Life is not the same as the standard of living, which is often (miscommonly) used in everyday speech. The standard of living is primarily based on income and money. Apart from indicators of standard of living, QoL does not only include material conditions and employment, but the construction of a favorable environment as well – the ambient of living, physical and mental health, education, recreation and rest, and belonging to society. According to Juran (1995), Quality of Life is the "degree to which a person enjoys the important possibilities of his or her life." This again emphasizes the importance of personal, i.e. subjective description and feelings towards basic values and expectations from satisfaction with personal life circumstances.

Vuletić (2011) explains that in the literature there were many approaches to the notion of QoL, through numerous research conducted form 60.-ies onward, from economic and sociological to psychological point of view. Lučev (2008) argues that analysis of Quality of Life can be divided into two basic approach models: Scandinavian, which focuses on objective QoL indicators for the entire society, and US model, where subjective QoL indicators are emphasized. Cummins (2000) also defines the QoL as multidimensional model, stating that Quality of Life is composed both of subjective and objective components. He also indicates that subjective component of QoL is comprised of seven

domains: emotional well-being, material well-being, productivity, intimacy, health, security and community. Vuletić (2011) also reminds that before-mentioned Robert Cummins is the founder of an international group of scientists and researchers, called "the International Well-Being Group", that argues that the QoL is a multidimensional construct consisting of: living standard, health, productivity, the ability to have close contacts, security, belonging to the community, and a sense of security in future (Cummins, 1998). Jovanović and Novović (2008) in their research also confirm that people do not see some neutral state and absence of negative experiences as the basic characteristic of QoL and mental health, but the presence of pleasant emotions as well as satisfaction with different domains in one's life. This can be explained by the research' conclusion that subjective well-being is not a phenomenon that is only significant at the individual's level. Here, it is greatly demonstrated by the fact life satisfaction and happiness, besides economic and social indicators, are among the most significant indicators of the life quality of a particular society. (Diener and Suh, 1998). Jovanovic and Novovic (2008) also refer again to Diener (1984), and his previous research, summarizing its results, where he defined the subjective well-being as a construct that is made out of three components: satisfaction with life, positive affect and low level of negative impact. Jovanović and Novović (2008) also discuss the subjective well-being. They mention that in the context of positive psychology, one of the most investigated constructs is the subjective well-being, a phenomenon that the most prominent authors in this field of study (such as Ed Diener and Daniel Nettle) study under the term "happiness".

Another set of authors (Layard, 2011; Veenhoven & Vergunst, 2014, Diener and Oishi, 2000; Diener and Oishi, 2004, Kashdan, 2004) are assessing happiness in correlations with the economic wealth of the society and an individual, and many research

on this topic have been done, even cross-cultural ones. In scope of those findings, Layard (2011) argues that most people want to have higher income, but it seems that as societies are becoming richer, their people are not becoming any happier. In his book he points out the research that has proven that "on average people have grown no happier in the last fifty years, even as average incomes have more than doubled. In fact, the First World has more depression, more alcoholism and more crime than fifty years ago. This paradox is true of Britain, the United States, continental Europe and Japan." His findings are not so surprising given the fact that many authors mention this paradox, or what is also known as Easterlin Illusion. The latter term was introduced by Richard Easterlin in 1974, when he published his wide-known paper "Does economic growth improve the human lot?" Easterlin's answer to this topic question was negative. However, Veenhoven and Vergunst (2014) have devoted their study to this paradox, trying to explain the notion and complexity, as well as results of this study from 1974. Just like Layard (2011), they have analyzed Easterlin's paper, concluding that when comparing across nations he noted that people do not live happier in rich nations than in poor nations and comparing across time he observed no rise in average happiness in the USA between 1944 and 1970, in spite of impressive economic growth in that period." This is why this notion became known as the "Easterlin paradox", or Easterlin Illusion. This paradox tried to explain why does not economic growth lead to happier individuals. It has been proved that to some extent people do become happier as they become wealthier. But where is the bottom line where economic wealth does not make anyone happy any more, or at least – why is it not always the case? Veenhoven (2009a) in one segment of his work doubts this theory that happiness is a result of comparison among individuals. They usually compare social rank and income, but satisfaction with life does not come from that comparison only. He explains this with the fact that it was proved that

""affective experience depends on meering innate 'needs' rather than learned 'wants'."(Veenhoven, 1991, 2009a). In this scope, Veenhoven & Vergunst (2014) then refer to Fisher (2008) who explains that happiness in the US has at least stagnated because there was a "demonstrable deterioration in family life, which is unrelated to economic development". Phelps (2011), on the other hand, refers to decreased number of altruist among general population and that it led to the stagnation of happiness. Veenhoven and Vergunst (2014) conclude in their review of "Easterlin paradox" that it has become the "Easterlin Illusion" because it has been proved that there are situations and nations where despite of the economic growth there were not noticed changes in growth of happiness, and then it rather remained stable, but despite these examples, they were not confirmed to be a rule, but rather exceptions. Jašić and Kaluđerović (2015), in their study, also mention happiness as the construct of QoL, claiming that it is subjective and difficult to measure, and therefore, largely unrelated to living standards and wealth. One of the most comprehensive and precise definitions of QoL is given by the World Health Organization: "Quality of Life is defined as the perception of individuals about their own position in life in the context of culture and value systems in which they live, as well as to their goals, expectations, standards and interests. This is a broad concept which covers the physical health of individuals, psychological status, material independence, social relations and their relations to the significant environmental characteristics." (The World Health Report, 1998).

Analyzing the given literature, the authors have come to the conclusion that so far none of the research has been comparing QoL with specific set of values that explain Quality of Life in correlation to attitudes towards changes. Thus, the authors focus on this area. On the other hand, there were numerous research explaining values and value systems in terms of Quality of Life. Arsovski (2007)

refers to deterioration of QoL in certain western countries because of the presence of terror attacks and matters of safety. Arsovski is concerned because high level of economic development of society is often in contradiction with the freedom of the individual, his free and professional and other limitations. Accordingly, we should reevaluate social and individual values. White (2002) also investigates QoL from the education and values prism. In his work it is pointed out that values are universal notion of well-being and therefore are significant for each individual. He discusses that no one can talk about well-being if his basic human needs are not met (having a shelter, enough food, sufficient amount of money etc.) and rises the following question: "What counts as life of well-being given that one's basic needs are broadly met?" The author recalls all relevant literature sources and portraits 7 main characteristics:

1) Accomplishing things in one's life which make that life meaningful
2) Being self-directed or autonomous in the conduct of one's life
3) Knowledge and understanding
4) The enjoyment of beauty
5) Deep personal relationships
6) Moral goodness and
7) Sensual pleasures

These are considered broadly as main components of anyone's well-being; only after all basic needs are met. Naturally, the author argues that each individual will himself decide the priority of this list, and which item on it is the most important for them to be met, in order to satisfy his or her needs. He then turns to education's role, prevailingly because he considers that its role in society is to equip young people with skills that will help them understand and make these choices. The author concludes his paper with the statement that "those who have wider experience of the range of goods within the tradition are in a better position to make judgments about what constitutes human flourishing than those who lack this." Marsh (1975) was one of those authors who

compared value priorities and Quality of Life. His research was primarily an explanation of Inglehart's "Silent Revolution" and post-industrial changes in value systems among the young population in Great Britain. Inglehart (1971) has conducted a survey on a representative sample, questioning the measures of subjective estimates of QoL of the respondents. For that purpose he also used Bradburn's (1969) so-called "Domain Satisfactions" sequence that comprises of: job, housing, education, marriage, family life, 'the district you live in', leisure, health, religion and the "quality of democracy in Britain today". He then turns to Maslow's (1943) hierarchy of needs and motivation and concludes that "There is a direct linear relationship between higher socioeconomic status and higher satisfaction of all kinds." Marsh points out that for Maslow, reaching not only psychical health but also "self-actualization" includes a significant change of anxiety: "from basic material and security needs up through social needs, until the individual confronts his innermost needs to realize his full intellectual and emotional potential however limited or specialized this may be". The essence of this theory is that anxiety can be very motivational for fulfillment of an individuals' needs, if present in healthy doses, and in case that it is not suppressed or inhibited. Another researcher who put a lot of focus on values and QoL principles was Schwartz (1992). He claimed that values are our "guiding principles" and that they are those elements that guide us toward our goals and give us the strength to endure on that path. Zhang et al. (2014) thoroughly analyzed Schwartz's values model. They argue that meaning, purpose and well-being are ultimate concerns mutual to all people worldwide. It is very rare in literature that explains values, Quality of Life and subjective well-being that we can come across openness to change, which is part of the scope of our research as well, although in different context. Zhang et al. (2014) also discuss spiritual values and its impact on social behaviour and well-being among Chinese students and thus compare the results with western ones, giving it a cross-cultural note. Zhang then reminds of the research conducted by Sagiv and Schwartz (2000). They researched correlations between subjective well-being and value priorities. The conclusion was that "affective well-being was positively correlated with stimulation, self-direction and achievement; and negatively with security, conformity and tradition values." This, allegedly was the only survey by 2014 that examined the aforementioned correlations among college students' population. For the purpose of interpreting the results the focus was moved from well-being construct to a very similar one, the Quality of Life. The authors reminded us of yet another broad and widely accepted definition of the construct by The WHOQOL Group (1998): "QoL has been defined as people's perception of their position in life in the context of the culture and value systems in which they live and in relation to their goals, expectations, standards and concerns." Zhang et al.'s study has proved that people who consider themselves as being spiritual and who possess these values, as well as religious people can rely on these inner resources to overcome what we call challenges, i.e. problems that occur in their lives. They also conclude that their "finding is also consistent with the extant literature that developing spiritual values can enable individuals to find meaning and purpose in their lives and promote subjective well-being (Block, 1993; Ray, 1993)." There are several ways to understand, accept, and adopt some collective values. Without any doubt, all societies undergo value changes brought by a historical wheel. Changes occur in terms of what is desirable or undesirable; people change their criteria, and most of the previously socially acceptable norms, as well as forms of behavior and values begin to be perceived as completely unacceptable. This process is never fast or easy. However, it does not happen by itself. This is a process that can be seen as a process of knowledge dissemination. "The diffusion of ideas and

knowledge is most closely associated with their creation. Ideas and knowledge are spreading from the centers where ideological creativity was developed, and at the same time usually most actively accepted in other such centers" (Milić, 1986). For Milić, the spread of ideas and knowledge are two dimensions of a unique cognitive process. This process has several manifestations: free distribution and voluntary download, organized or concealed violent imposition, organized prevention of spread, secret spread and transfer (sale). What form of dissemination of knowledge will one society gain depends on the social position of the groups that create or receive knowledge, as well as the nature and contradiction of the system itself. Kuipers et al. (2014), reviewed 133 other scientific articles from this field and explain that most of the them agree that researchers should "examine context, content, process and outcomes when studying change." According to political scientist Lorna Štrbac (2007), social changes can influence the formation of a certain set of values, and even the mentality of people. In that sense Štrbac argues that changes "generate a specific human, individual and collective experience, which eventually institutionalizes and transforms into a structure that consists of certain values, norms, patterns of behavior and communication, and, ultimately, a mentality." Instead of traditional domination for individuals over the individual's autonomy, modern individualism has negated the traditional connection with others. The emergence of the aforementioned modern value - individualism is the phenomenon of alienation. It is becoming an ever more present feature of modern society. Consequently, this can undoubtedly cause changes in social life, i.e., Quality of Life as well.

4. Research methodology

Empirical research on basic social values, especially those concerning Quality of Life,

as well as attitudes towards changes and their mutual correlation, will complement modest empirical findings on these topics. This paper will also be a contribution to a scientific fundus that combines topics related to values, Quality of life and attitudes towards changes of both young and employed citizens, by comparing the two research that we have conducted in 2015 and 2017.

5. Hypothesis

Based on presumptions, empirical research and literature review, two Hypothesis of this research have been defined - H1: "There is a statistically significant correlation between attitudes towards changes and socio-personal values of employees concerning Quality of Life and workplace.", and H2: "There is statistically significant correlation between sub-dimensions of democracy and economic well-being and sub-dimension of attitudes towards changes which does not drastically change as people transfer from young to mature age".

6. Sample

The study conducted in 2015 questioned young people; high school, college and University students, as well as employed students aged 15–30. It had 303 participants. The sample was suitable; respondents were selected by random sample by online surveys, personal contacts, and by visiting several high schools and Universities in three biggest cities in Serbia. Although this research did not predominantly look for the attitudes about the quality of life of the respondents (apart from the socio-demographic questions where they had to value their families' social status), it is relevant for comparison with 2017 research' results. The 2015 set of respondents comprised of young and predominantly unemployed, but they had the same set of questions regarding attitudes towards changes as well as basic social values. They were also questioned about their position in today's society. The study conducted in 2017

questioned working force in public, state and private sectors all over Serbia. It had 342 participants. Respondents were selected by random sample by online surveys, personal contacts in many companies, and by visiting relevant companies.

7. Instrument of research

The instruments used in both research was a questionnaire. The questionnaire from 2015 was conducted from May to September 2015. As the basic instrument of that research, apart from socio-demographic characteristics, it contains four thematic divided parts. The first refers to the social and personal values of the respondents; the second one includes a set of questions concerning relationship with the society in which young people live, the third is related to their views on the European Union, and finally, the fourth examines their attitudes towards change. The questionnaire from 2017 was conducted from September to December 2017. As the basic instrument of this research, apart from socio-demographic characteristics, it contains four thematic divided parts: the first refers to the basic social and personal values concerning Quality of Life of the respondents, the second one includes a set of questions concerning their attitudes towards change, the third is related to the views on their organization and work motivation, and finally, the fourth examines

their companies' internal and external communication and marketing.

8. Data Analysis

The instruments mentioned in the above description, in both cases, enabled us to do: descriptive statistics (Arithmetic mean, frequencies, percentages, dispersion: standard deviation), factor analysis (Varimax rotation), discriminant, Pearson's correlation coefficient and descriptive statistical methods in SPSS programme, so that the results can be interpreted with maximum precision. The choice of methods and techniques of the instruments used in both of these research are adapted to the specific problems of these research, variables of the tests, goals and hypotheses, which means that the obtained data was processed by appropriate mathematical-statistical methods and procedures.

9. Results

In accordance with the goals and Hypotheses of the research conducted in 2017, the attitudes of the respondents on basic social values as well as their personal priorities concerning the quality of life were examined. Respondents expressed their assessment of the stated values, on the continuum from 1 to 5. Descriptive indicators for attitudes on basic social values are shown in Table 1.

Table 1. Descriptive indicators for attitudes on basic social values

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Arithmetic mean	Standard deviation
Tolerance	338	1.00	5.00	4.3107	.80867
Freedom	**337**	**1.00**	**5.00**	**4.6617**	**.67134**
Humanity	**337**	**1.00**	**5.00**	**4.5846**	**.74769**
Trust in people	339	1.00	5.00	4.0354	.97540
Tradition	*338*	*1.00*	*5.00*	*3.3018*	*1.08294*
Religion	*336*	*1.00*	*5.00*	*2.5863*	*1.35987*
Economic well-being	339	1.00	5.00	4.0059	1.01467
Democracy	335	1.00	5.00	4.0060	1.09979
Family values	**286**	**1.00**	**5.00**	**4.4510**	**.93436**

On the basis of the obtained values of arithmetic means, we can see that the most significant social values for respondents were freedom (AS = 4.66), humanity (AS = 4.58) and family values (AS = 4.45), while the least important were religion (AS = 2.59) and tradition (AS = 3.3).

Table 2 below describes indicators for attitudes about main socio-personal values concerning Quality of Life and workplace:

Table 2. Descriptive indicators for attitudes about main socio-personal values concerning Quality of Life and workplace

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Arithmetic mean	Standard deviation
Harmonic family (marriage) life	339	1.00	5.00	4.3864	1.00351
Personal happiness and everyday satisfaction	**339**	**1.00**	**5.00**	**4.5605**	**.71648**
My health and the health of my family	**339**	**1.00**	**5.00**	**4.9292**	**.40082**
Resourcefulness	336	1.00	5.00	4.0833	.83517
Business success and affirmation at work	337	1.00	5.00	3.8961	.78937
High level of education	336	1.00	5.00	3.6756	1.07847
Financial success	337	1.00	5.00	3.8991	.82117
Quality time spent with friends	338	1.00	5.00	4.3136	.85222
Social affirmation	336	1.00	5.00	3.4762	1.03637
Sufficient free time for hobbies	336	2.00	5.00	3.8810	.91299
Freedom of decision making	**334**	**1.00**	**5.00**	**4.5689**	**.67986**
Financial independence and independence from others, in general	**338**	**1.00**	**5.00**	**4.5947**	**.67483**
Self-discipline	337	1.00	5.00	4.1602	.84047
Self-criticism	335	1.00	5.00	4.1104	.80959
Values and commitment to work	337	1.00	5.00	4.2166	.74240
Loyalty	335	1.00	5.00	4.1463	.89549
Obedience and respect for authority	*337*	*1.00*	*5.00*	*3.1246*	*1.11639*
Social appeal	*337*	*1.00*	*5.00*	*3.0950*	*1.08420*
Morality and honesty	**337**	**1.00**	**5.00**	**4.4481**	**.85102**
Courage	337	2.00	5.00	4.1840	.81393
Wisdom	336	1.00	5.00	4.2321	.82840

When it comes to main socio-personal values concerning Quality of Life and workplace, the most important ones for the respondents are: My health and the health of my family (AS = 4.93), Personal happiness and daily satisfaction (AS = 4.56), Freedom of decision making (AS = 4.57), Financial independence and independence from others, in general (AS = 4.59), and Morality and honesty (AS = 4.45). As the least significant, for the respondents personally, is The social appeal (AS = 3.1) and Obedience and respect for authority (AS = 3.12).

10. Answers on a questionnaire on attitudes towards changes

The attitude of the respondents towards the changes has been checked by a questionnaire with ten statements. Respondents expressed their consent with the stated statements on the continuum from 1 to 5. The arithmetic means and standard deviations for each statement regarding descriptive indicators for attitudes about changes are shown in Table 3.

Table 3. Descriptive indicators for attitudes about changes

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Arithmetic mean	Standard deviation
Changes themselves are a positive phenomenon.	**342**	**1.00**	**5.00**	**3.5760**	**1.01531**
People who love change have creative potentials.	**341**	**1.00**	**5.00**	**3.6804**	**1.03492**
It is better to opt for certainty than for changes that are always accompanied by uncertainty.	342	1.00	5.00	2.6316	1.02402
People who are more prone to change are unreliable.	342	1.00	5.00	2.3129	1.05775
People who are prone to change are an obstacle to the organization.	*340*	*1.00*	*5.00*	*1.9324*	*.93039*
Changes are always accompanied by problems and should therefore be avoided.	*341*	*1.00*	*5.00*	*1.7625*	*.91356*
Changes are always a negative phenomenon.	*338*	*1.00*	*5.00*	*1.5237*	*.86870*
The need for change is a prerequisite for human development.	**339**	**1.00**	**5.00**	**4.0295**	**1.06269**
A man can change himself if he changes the world in which he lives.	341	1.00	5.00	2.7566	1.32709
Major changes, as a rule, lead to bad interpersonal relationships in organizations.	341	1.00	5.00	2.3959	.99934

According to the values of arithmetic meanings, we can say that the respondents show the highest agreement with the following statements: The existence of a need for change is a prerequisite for human development (AS = 4.03), People who love change have creative potentials (AS = 3.68), and Changes themselves are a positive phenomenon AS = 3.58). The respondents are the least likely to agree with the statements: Changes are always a negative phenomenon (AS = 1.52), Changes are always accompanied by problems and should be avoided (AS = 1.76), and People who are prone to change are an obstacle to the organization (AS = 1.93).

11. Correlation of attitudes towards changes and socio-personal values of employees concerning Quality of Life and workplace

The first part of this study is based on the assumption that there is a statistically significant correlation between attitudes towards changes and social and personal values of employees concerning Quality of Life and workplace (Hypothesis H1), so we had this correlation checked by the Pearson coefficient of linear correlation between attitudes about changes and relevant figures. Only statistically significant results of the correlation of Quality of Life and workplace are shown in Table 4.

Table 4: Pearson coefficient of linear correlation between attitudes about changes and relevant figures:

(left figure)		Changes themselves are a positive phenomenon	People who love change have creative potentials	It is better to opt for certainty than for changes that are always accompanied by uncertainty	People who are more prone to change are unreliable	People who are prone to change are an obstacle to the organization	(right figure)		Changes are always accompanied by problems and should therefore be avoided	Changes are always a negative phenomenon	The need for change is a prerequisite for human development	A man can change himself if he changes the world in which he lives	Major changes, as a rule, lead to bad interpersonal relationships in organizations
Tradition	r	-.016	.085	**.162(**)**	-.082	-.073	Freedom	r	.019	.106	**.167(**)**	-.006	.066
	p	.775	.120	.003	.130	.180		p	.725	.054	**.002**	.914	.225
Religion	r	.033	**.126(*)**	-.093	-.069	-.078	Humanity	r	**.138(*)**	.069	**.156(**)**	-.021	.043
	p	.541	**.021**	.089	.209	.156		p	**.011**	.209	**.004**	.708	.432
Economic well-being	r	-.080	**-.151(**)**	-.022	-.018	.092	Tradition	r	-.070	**-.110(*)**	.051	.023	-.072
	p	.142	.005	.686	.745	.091		p	.198	.045	.353	.673	.186
Family values	r	**.227(**)**	**-.123(*)**	-.115	.042	.031	Religion	r	-.084	**-.122(*)**	.108	-.006	-.007
	p	**.000**	**.039**	.052	.481	.601		p	.125	**.026**	.059	.907	.904
Personal happiness and everyday satisfaction	r	**.109(*)**	**.113(*)**	-.014	.041	**-.114(*)**	Economic well-being	r	.020	.039	**.118(*)**	**-.111(*)**	-.031
	p	**.045**	**.038**	.796	.451	**.036**		p	.720	.474	**.030**	**.042**	.576
The health of me and my family	r	-.042	.038	-.009	.017	**.124(*)**	Personal happiness and everyday satisfaction	r	.086	**.116(*)**	**.122(*)**	-.041	.049
	p	.446	.061	.872	.757	**.023**		p	.115	**.033**	**.025**	.451	.372
High level of education	r	**.140(*)**	-.065	.017	.067	.057	The health of me and my family	r	**.126(*)**	.079	.109	-.061	.100
	p	**.010**	.236	.759	.220	.300		p	**.020**	.147	.056	.260	.066
Quality time spent with friends	r	**.125(*)**	-.088	.013	.080	.090	Quality time spent with friends	r	**.141(**)**	.046	.038	-.009	.027
	p	**.021**	.105	.816	.145	.101		p	**.009**	.404	.111	.867	.620
Enough free time for hobbies	r	**.125(*)**	-.077	.077	.046	.073	Social affirmation	r	**-.124(*)**	**-.144(**)**	.036	-.075	-.077
	p	**.022**	.157	.157	.399	.184		p	**.023**	**.008**	.113	.171	.161
Freedom of decision making	r	-.078	-.068	.064	.002	**-.134(*)**	Obedience and respect for authority	r	-.073	**-.204(**)**	.024	-.040	**.125(*)**
	p	.157	.217	.244	.974	**.014**		p	.181	**.000**	.223	.463	**.021**
Financial independence and independence from others, in general	r	**.156(**)**	**.143(**)**	**-.147(**)**	.102	**-.178(**)**	Social appeal	r	-.065	**-.153(**)**	.030	-.065	-.077
	p	**.004**	**.009**	**.007**	.062	**.001**		p	.234	.005	.217	.232	.158
Diligence and dedication to work	r	**.154(**)**	-.030	-.083	.021	-.048							
	p	**.005**	.586	.130	.697	.384							
Obedience and respect for authority	r	-.055	.052	**.125(*)**	-.006	-.057							
	p	.317	.346	**.022**	.911	.297							
Social appeal	r	.039	.084	**.113(*)**	.037	-.078							
	p	.476	.123	**.037**	.496	.156							

- r-Pearson's linear correlation coefficient
- p-level of significance:
** Correlations are significant at 0.01
* Correlations are significant at 0.05

The attitude that the changes themselves are a positive phenomenon is statistically significantly in correlation with family values, personal happiness and everyday satisfaction, high level of education, quality time spent with friends, enough time for hobbies, financial independence and independence in general, diligence and dedication to work. All correlations are of low intensity and positive value. The statement that people who love change have creative potential is in a positive correlation with religion, personal happiness and everyday satisfaction, financial independence and independence in general; and in negative correlation with economic well-being and family values. The statement that it is better to opt for certainty than for changes that are always accompanied by uncertainty statistically correlates in a positive direction with tradition, social appeal and obedience and respect for authority; while it correlates in negative direction with financial independence and independence from others in general. The attitude that people who are prone to change pose an obstacle to organization statistically significantly correlates, in a negative direction, with personal happiness and everyday satisfaction, freedom of decision-making and financial independence, while it positively correlates with health. The attitude that changes are always accompanied by problems and therefore should be avoided is in correlation in a positive direction with humanity, personal and family health, and time spent with friends, as important (general) values, and in negative correlation with social affirmation as a value. The attitude that changes are always a negative phenomenon is in a statistically significant, but negative correlation with the following values: tradition, religion, social affirmation and social appeal, as well as obedience and respect for authority, while it positively correlates with personal happiness and satisfaction. The attitude that the existence of a need for change is a prerequisite for human development is statistically significantly, in a

positive direction, correlated to freedom, humanity, economic well-being and personal happiness and everyday satisfaction. The attitude that a person can change himself only if he changes the world in which he lives is in a negative correlation with economic well-being, while the attitude that major changes, as a rule, lead to bad interpersonal relationships in organizations is in positive correlation with obedience and respect for authority.

Based on all correlations, their comparison and all other significant factors taken into account, it can be claimed that the Hypothesis 1 of this research, which reads as follows: "There is a statistically significant correlation between attitudes towards changes and socio-personal values of employees concerning quality of life and workplace" has been proved.

12. Correlation between sub-dimensions of democracy and economic well-being and sub-dimension of attitudes towards changes

In terms of comparison of the two research we have conducted so far, there is an interesting correlation of sub-dimensions of democracy and economic well-being and sub-dimension of attitudes towards changes. In the first research the respondents were young students, and in another research from 2017 the respondents were all employed. In the 2015 research the factor analyses for both of these sub-dimensions was done: values and attitude towards changes accordingly. The factor analyses has shown on a scree test that there are four factors describing values and we named those factors Democracy and economic well-being as basic social values, Humanism, tolerance and freedom as basic social values, Religion and tradition as basic social values and Trust in people as a basic social value. When it comes to sub-dimensions of attitudes towards changes, three factors were extracted. The factors were

obtained by Varimax normalized rotation and comprise 61.21% of the total variance. These are called: Positive attitude towards changes, Negative attitude towards changes and Indifferent attitude towards changes.

Correlation between sub-dimensions of democracy and economic well-being as basic social values and sub-dimension of attitudes towards changes is shown in Table 5.

Table 5. Correlation table (Pearson coefficient) between sub-dimensions of democracy and economic well-being as basic social values and sub-dimension of attitudes towards changes (2015 research):

	Negative attitude towards changes	Positive attitude towards changes	Indifferent attitude towards changes
Democracy and economic well-being as basic social values	-0.15	**0.42**	0.28
Humanism, tolerance and freedom as basic social values	0.22	**0.37**	0.19
Religion and tradition as basic social values	**0.41**	0.04	0.21
Trust in people as a basic social value	**0.38**	0.17	0.09

Correlations are statistically significant at the level of significance .05

Based on the results obtained, it can be said that these two phenomena are statistically significant, both at the level of summing scores and at the level of their sub-dimensions. This connection is of moderate intensity. The positive attitude towards changes is significantly positively correlated with the factor of democracy and economic well-being as the basic social value, as well as with the factor of humanism, tolerance and freedom as the basic social value. This means that those young people who have a positive attitude towards change, at the same time perceive democracy, economic well-being, humanism, tolerance and freedom as the highest social values. Young people who have a negative attitude towards change, predominantly emphasize religion and tradition as basic social values, as well as trust in people. Based on the results obtained, it can be concluded that young people today see the trust in people as more traditional value as they do not consider them as an important virtue of contemporary society. The indefinable attitude towards changes lowly correlates with democracy and economic

well-being as basic social values.

In 2017 research we analyzed the latent structure of attitudes towards changes by analyzing the main components. Factor analyses for both of these sub-dimensions were done: values describing well-being and QoL and attitude towards changes accordingly. The factor analysis for values has shown on a scree test that there are two distinct factors and those factors were: Humanism, tolerance and freedom and Religion and tradition. When it comes to attitude towards changes, three factors were extracted, having a characteristic root bigger than 1. The factors were obtained by Varimax normalized rotation and comprise 62.27% of the total variance. These three factors are called: Positive attitude towards changes, Negative attitude towards changes and Inevitability of changes. Correlation table between sub-dimensions of democracy and economic well-being as basic social values and sub-dimension of attitudes towards changes is shown in Table 6.

Table 6. Correlation table (Pearson coefficient) between sub-dimensions of democracy and economic well-being as basic social values and sub-dimension of attitudes towards changes (2017 research):

		Humanism, tolerance and freedom	Religion and tradition
Negative attitude towards changes	Pearson Correlation	-.082	**.221**(*)
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.144	.031
Positive attitude towards changes	Pearson Correlation	**.232**(*)	-.026
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.018	.646
Inevitability of changes	Pearson Correlation	-.003	.023
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.961	.677

* Correlations are statistically significant at the 0.05 level

Based on Pearson's coefficients of linear correlation we can say that Positive attitude towards changes statistically significantly correlates with the values of humanism, tolerance and freedom. This correlation is of lower intensity (0.23) and of positive sign, which means that the more positive attitude towards changes the respondents have, the more they value humanism, tolerance and freedom, as well as democracy in society. The negative attitudes towards changes is in the correlation of low intensity (0.22) and of positive sign with tradition and religiosity, which means that the more a person emphasizes religiousness and tradition, the more negative attitudes towards changes he or she has.

Our presumption that values concerning well-being and Quality of Life correlate with attitudes towards changes, and that they do not change dramatically within years, led us to create The Hypothesis 2, which refers to the comparison of the two research, and it reads as follows: H2: "There is statistically significant correlation between sub-dimensions of democracy and economic well-being and sub-dimension of attitudes towards changes which does not drastically change as people transfer from young to mature age." It has been confirmed.

13. Conclusions

Young people of today are facing financial dependency on their parents (Stanojević et al., 2016) and do not have much faith in society, nor quality of their lives, as has been proved by 2015 research. They do not trust the official institutions, nor do they believe that future will bring drastic changes. Their economic well-being that drastically influences their Quality of Life is jeopardized, as they are facing the lack of job vacancies everywhere in the country. Regardless of their expectations form employment possibilities young people still want to leave Serbia, as they do not believe in finding the jobs that will help them reach the Quality of Life they think they deserve. Negative trends have been present since the beginning of the 1990-ties, and only by 2003 (Pejić, 2004) that number increased to 60%. OECD report from third quarter of 2017 states that those who left Serbia by the end of 2017 made Serbia become the 31st country in the world according to number of immigrants who are leaving the country. The results of correlation for both 2015 and 2017 research lead us to the conclusion that basic values are formed in relatively young age and they do not drastically change during adulthood. This work proves that, regardless of their age and employment status, people who value tradition and religion are logically, least prone to changes. Also, both research have

shown that Positive attitude towards changes statistically significantly, in positive direction, correlates with the values of humanism, tolerance and freedom. Depending on the social norms of the individual, more or less, he will express what he considers to be worthy and therefore will have a greater or lesser chance of influencing the change in the content of the ruling social values, and thus influence his QoL. Whatever the values are, it is important that they exist because the modern world considers it the biggest problem, especially for the youth, a state of worthlessness, apathy, anomy and so on. One perceives one's own values as an integral part of his own self. An important feature of the values is the person's feeling that it is the standard that he or she personally chose or built. Therefore, it can be concluded that people who are willing to undergo certain changes in their attitude or value system are the ones who can and will influence their Quality of Life and improve it, accordingly. This research can be further developed into a cross-cultural comparison, similar to this one. Namely, Quality of Life has been proven to be dependent on personal beliefs, value system and attitudes towards changes. It will be interesting to see whether this can be a universal point that stands for numerous nations worldwide, or is it so in the context of general value system that exists in Serbia, on the mentality level.

References:

Arsovski, S. (2007). Put od kvaliteta do kvaliteta života. In: *Festival kvaliteta 2007, (2)* Nacionalna konferencija o kvalitetu života, Kragujevac, (8-11. 05. 2007): Asocijacija za kvalitet i standardizaciju Srbije.

Barett, D. (1994). *Fast focus on TQM*: A concise guide to company wide learning. Portland, OR: Productivity Press.

Block, P. (1993). *Stewardship*: *Choosing service over self-interest.* San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler.

Bradburn, N. (1969). *The structure of Psychological Well-Being.* Chicago, IL: Aldine Press

Cummins, R. A. (2000). Personal income and subjective well-being: A review. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, *1*, 133-158.

Cummins, R. A. (1998). Quality of Life definition and terminology: a discussion document from the International Society for Quality of Life Studies. *International Society for Quality of Life Studies*, *1*, 43.

Diener, E. (1984). Subjective well-being. *Psychological Bulletin*, *95*, 542-575.

Diener, E., & Oishi, S. (2000). Money and happiness. In E. Diener and E. M. Suh (Eds.), *Culture and subjective well being* (pp. 185-218). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Diener, E., & Oishi, S. (2004). Are Scandinavians happier than Asians? Issues in comparing nations on subjective well-being. In F. Columbus (Ed.) *Asian Economic and Political Issues* (Vol. 10, pp. 1-25). Hauppauge, NY: Nova Science Publisher.

Diener, E., & Suh, E. (1998). Age and subjective well-being: An international analysis. *Annual Review of Gerentology and Geriatrics*, *17*, 304-324.

Diener, E., Scollon, C. N., & Lucas, R. E. (2003). The Evolving Concept of Subjective Well-Being: The Multifaceted Nature of Happiness. *Advances in Cell Aging and Gerontology*, *15*, 187-219. Retrieved from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-90-481-2354-4_4

Fisher, C. S. (2008). What wealth-happiness paradox? A short note on the American case. *Journal of happiness Studies*, *9*, 219-226.

Greenwood, D. (2001). Local indicators of Quality of Life: A Preliminary Look at the Pikes Peak Region. *Working paper No. 6,* Center for Colorado Policy Studies. Retrieved February 27, 2018, from: https://www.uccs.edu/~Documents/ccps/qol.pdf

Inglehart, R. (1971). The Silent Revolution in Europe: Intergenerational Change in Post-Industrial Societies. *American Political Science Review*, *65*, 991-1017.

Jackson, S. E., & Schuler, R. S. (1995). Understanding human resource management in the context of organizations and their environments. In: M. Rosenzweig and I. Porter (Eds.): *Annual Review of Psychology* (237-264). Paolo Alto, CA: Annual Reviews.

Jašić, O., & Kaluđerović, Ž. (2015). Poimanje kvaliteta života među studentskom populacijom Univerziteta u Tuzli. *Kom, IV* (1), 57-77.

Jovanović, J., Krivokapić, Z., Vujović, A., & Cvetić, T. (2016). Evaluation of Quality of Life of Students. *International Journal for Quality Research*, *10*(4), 813-822.

Juran, J. (1995). *Managerial Breakthrough*. New York: Mc Grow-Hill.

Kashdan, T. B. (2004). The assessment of subjective well-being (issues raised by the Oxford Happiness Questionnaire). *Personality and Individual Differences*, *36*, 1225-1232.

Kuipers, B. S., Higgs, M., Kickert, W., Tummers, L., Grandia, J., & Van der Voet, V. (2014). The management of change in public organizations: A literature review. *Public administration*, *92*(1), 1-20.

Layard, R. (2011). *Happiness-lessons from a new science (second edition).* London: Penguin.

Lučev, I., & Tadinac, M. (2008). Kvaliteta života u Hrvatskoj – povezanost subjektivnih i objektivnih indikatora temperamenta i demografskih varijabli s osvrtom na manjinski status. *Migracijske i etničke teme*, *24*(1-2), 67-89.

Maric, M. (2012). Permanentno obrazovanje, opšte zadovoljstvo životom i psihičko blagostanje. *Andragoške studije*, *1*, 81-98.

Marsh, A. (1975). The Silent Revolution. Value Priorities, and the Quality of Life in Britain. *American Political Science Review*, *69*(1), 21-30. doi:10.2307/1957882.

Maslow, A. (1943). A theory of human motivation. *Psychological Review*, *50*(4), 370-396. doi:10.1037/h0054346.

Milić, V. (1986). *Sociologija saznanja.* Sarajevo: Veselin Masleša.

Milošević, L. (2009). Obrazovanje za treće doba u funkciji očuvanja i unapređenja kvaliteta života u starosti. *Godišnjak za sociologiju*, *5*, 207-217.

Muchinsky, P. (1997). *Psychology applied to work: An introduction to industrial and organizational psychology* (5). Pacific Grove, California: Brookes/Cole Publishers.

OECD: *International Migration Outlook 2017*, (OECD Publishing, Paris, 2017). Retrieved February 10, 2018 from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/migr_outlook-2017-en

Pavlović, D., Zubović, J., & Zdravković, A. (2016). Youth Expectations in Job Search in Serbia, *Industrija*, *44, 4*, 7-18.

Pejić, V. (2004). Young people in Serbia – attitudes, moral values and perspectives. *South-East Europe Review*, *6*, *4*, 65-78.

Phelps, C. (2001). A clue to the paradox of happiness. *Journal of Economic Behaviour and Organization*, *45*, 293-300.

Ray, M. (1993). *The emerging new paradigm in business.* In J. Renesch (Ed.), *New traditions in business* (pp.25-38). San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler.

Sagiv, L., & Schwartz, S. H. (2000). Value priorities and subjective well-being: Direct relation and congruity effects. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *30*(2)*,* 177-198. doi: 10.1002/(sici)1099-0992(200003/04)30:2\177:aid-ejsp982[3.0.co;2-z

Sahni, J. (2017). Exploring what constitutes 'quality' in quality of work life for female employees. *International Journal for Quality Research*, *11*(4), 785-798.

Schwartz, S. H. (1992). Universals in the content and structure of values: Theoretical advances and empirical tests in 20 countries. In M.P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology*, *25* (1-65. New York, NY: Academic Press.

Stanojević, D., Tomanović, S., & Ljubičić, M. (2016). Elements of life satisfaction among young adults in Serbia, *Journal of Youth Studies*, 19(7), 973-989. doi: 10.1080/13676261.2015.1136057

Štrbac, L. (2007). Kulturni neoliberalizam. *Nova srpska politička misao*, *1*(2), 12-14.

The WHOQOL Group (1998). The World Health Organization Quality of Life assessment (WHOQOL): Development and general psychometric properties. *Social Science and Medicine*, *46*(12), 1569-1585. doi: 10.1016/s0277-9536(98)00009-4.

The World Health Report (1998). *Life in 21ˢᵗ century, a vision for all*. Geneva: The World Health Organization.

Veenhoven, R. (1991a). Is happiness relative? *Social Indicators Research*, *24*, 134.

Veenhoven, R. (2009b). *How do we assess how happy we are?* In: Dutt, A.K., & Radcliff, B. (Eds.) *Happiness, Economics and Politics: Towards a 23 multi-disciplinary approach* (Chapter 3, pp. 45-69)*.* Cheltenham: Edwards Elgar Publishers.

Veenhoven, R., & Vergunst, F. (2014). The Easterlin Illusion: Economic growth does go with greater happiness. *International Journal of Happiness and Development*, *1*, 311 doi: 10.1504/IJHD.2014.066115.

Vuletić, G. (2011). *Kvaliteta života i zdravlje. (1ˢᵗ ed.)* Osijek: Filozofski fakultet, Sveučilište J. J. Strossmayer. Retrieved from: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/ 229428730_KVALITETA_ZIVOTA_I_ZRAVLJE

White, J. (2002). Education, the Market and the Nature of Personal Well-Being. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, *50*(4), 442-456.

Zhang, K., Hui, C., Lam, J., Lau, E., Cheung, S., & Mok, D. (2014). Personal Spiritual Values and Quality of Life: Evidence from Chinese College Students. *Journal of Religion and Health*, 53(4), 986-1002. doi: 10.1007/s10943-013-9686-1.

Tanja Radošević	**Goran Bulatović**	**Ljiljana Bulatović**
Fakultet za medije i komunikacije, Serbia	Fakultet za medije i komunikacije, Serbia	Fakultet za medije i komunikacije, Serbia
tanja.radosevic@fmk.edu.rs	goran.bulatovic@fmk.edu.rs	ljiljana.bulatovic@fmk.edu.rs

T. Radošević, G. Bulatović, Lj. Bulatović