

---

# Social Intelligence; Building Workplace Harmony in The Health Sector of Rivers State, Nigeria

Dr Patrick Nkiinebari Nwinyokpugi<sup>1</sup>  
Department of Office & Information Management

Rivers State University, John Kate Kelechi<sup>2</sup>  
Department of Office & Information Management  
Rivers State University

## ABSTRACT

This study is designed to investigate the relationship between Social Intelligence and Workplace Harmony in the Rivers State Health Sector. A cross sectional study approach was adopted to cover only senior employees of the Hospitals and health centres. The population of the study comprises of all the employees in selected hospitals in Port Harcourt, Rivers State, and to achieve the study objectives, recognize hospitals within Port Harcourt, Rivers State with easy proximity was selected. Because of high level of employees found in the sector, 25 employees were selected from ten outstanding hospitals in Port Harcourt, making a total of 248 employees. A total of 152 employees were sampled using the Krejcie and Morgan Determination Table. The hypotheses of the study were tested and analysed using Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS), version 20. Findings revealed that, the dimension of the predictor variable social intelligence; impression management, self-awareness, social relationship and grievance management have a significant relationship between the measure of the criterion variable workplace harmony; less grievances and employee bonding. The moderating variables of leadership and organizational climate also moderate the relationship between social intelligence and workplace harmony of hospitals in Port Harcourt, Rivers State. Therefore, we recommended that thoughtfulness and adherence should be geared towards implementing the dimension listed and discussed in this study as it enhances effective workplace harmony.

**Keywords:** Social Intelligence, Impression Management, Grievance Management, Social Relationship, Self-Awareness, Workplace Harmony

## 1. Introduction

Conflict has been known as inevitable in social setting, therefore, businesses nowadays are operating in a turbulent environment where leaders of organisations are searching for measures that will allow them to improve their performance and competitiveness through harmonious system using social intelligence tools in dealing with members of the organization. Workers agitation for improved welfare has continued to remain a concern to management of various organizations in many part of the world today. Many organizations in Nigeria are faced by a myriad of challenges and ailments caused by inefficient and ineffective leadership style or strained relationship between management of organization in managing the social structure under their control. There are other ailments that emanate from influence of external forces such as environmental factors and the global economic recession, Management-labour disagreement remains crucial because it is firm-specific and therefore can be addressed by harmonious working environment secured through effective work relations. Clearly speaking, there are ineffective relationship between management of organization and their employees in the health sector. It is so because many of the leaders of such organization that are responsible for employees pay, play down workers' rights and privileges at work and do not play to the rules that guide contract affairs. As such, it is our desire in this research work to

find out how harmonious working environment can be secured through effective social intelligence.

Social Intelligence is the capacity of a person to know oneself and others in the social environment. One of the basic human needs is social relationship. This is why human beings are considered as social creature by their natures. They cannot live alone; away from each other. Practicing in social relationships determines human success from the personal and professional levels. Moreover, the psychologist Edward Thorndike (1920) stated that "The best mechanic in a factory may fail as a foreman for lack of social intelligence". This confirms the need of humans to feel sense love, belonging, loyalty, and participation in the conduct in their lives activities. Abraham Maslow in 1943 advocated this idea in his theory - the pyramid of human needs, where he explains that humans in general feel a strong need of belonging, loyalty, and love. He further elaborates that this need will provide the emotional support and the confidence. On the other hand, when people do not get their need efficiently, they will be more anxious, depressed, and socially isolated (Karnatovskaia, et. al. 2015). Babu (2013), describes social intelligence as "the ability to deal efficiently and thoughtfully, keeping one's own identity, employing opposite social inputs with a wider understanding of social environment; considering empathetic co-operation as a base of social acquaintance." It is the ability to successfully direct and convey difficulty of social affairs and surroundings. According to Honeywell (2015), affirms that social intelligence is a combined degree of self and social-awareness, advanced social views with approaches, capacity and desire to be able multifaceted social change. Scholars like Nicholas Humphrey, have thrown his weight behind social intelligence, rather than measurable intellect that states individuals. Social intelligence is the ability to control feelings and emotions; therefore it can aid mental activities, decision making and communication. In the opinion of Goleman(1998), the people who have amazing social intelligence know how to switch and channel their own and others' sentiments and spirits. Social intelligence is also business intelligence. It overcomes barriers, dramatically improves performance, maximize personal and organizational success. Social intelligence is capability to know person in general, as a part to speak with or talk to any person to know something presented to mind. In general perspective, social intelligence is the ability to manage the human relations (Ngonya & Yazdanifard 2014). These skills assist the managers to attain individual employee needs, irrespective of their generation. Theorists provide a wealth of reports on social intelligence (SI), but they all mention dual community modules: that is; (i) awareness of others, (ii) their response and adaptation to others, and social conditions. Logically speaking, individuals could not live in isolation from each other, particularly in the work environment. For many different reasons, conflicts appear among the employees in the business organizations. The outcomes of interpersonal conflict are determined not only by the conflict itself, but also by the way in which it is managed. In addition, the social intelligence is considered as one of the psychological and social dimensions and it may have an effect on the business organizational environment. The concept of social intelligence is associated with the assumption of different mental decisions and abilities which deal with the social content by having a set of skills. This set of skills helps individuals to solve their social problems, which include the ability to understand the feelings, thoughts, and behaviours of others in different situations and social conditions. Therefore, since conflict is inevitable in human society, there is need for management of organization to work out modalities to ensure workplace harmony. Harmony is achieved in the workplace only when the leaders determine what they want their organization's culture to look like and then strategize to make it a reality. Industrial harmony means harmony between persons or groups of persons. Conflict may arise, and harmony can conceivably be achieved, within a number of different pairs of opponents in industry, and conflict within any one may influence the course of conflict within the others, as when the demand of a certain job-group for higher pay than others may crosscut and imperil the unity of the workers as a whole in their relations with management, Nwinyokpugi, (2017).

## 2. Literature Review

Social intelligence shows what kind of ability managers have, such as social support, evidence-based treatment, social awareness and social attractiveness. Here, social skills include four parts: social assistance, social data processing, social response and social desire. In the respective definitions, cognitive, emotional, and deterministic factors are important because they provide the foundation for building and maintaining relationships. Social intelligence is also Business intelligence. It overcomes barriers, dramatically improves performance, maximize personal and organizational success. It is capability to know person in general, as a part to speak with or talk to any person to know something presented to mind.

### Impression Management

People have an ongoing interest in how others perceive and evaluate them. Each year, developing country like Americans and others spend billions of dollars on diets, cosmetics, and plastic surgery, all intended to make them more attractive to others. Political candidates are packaged for the public's consumption like automobiles or breakfast cereals. Because the impressions people make on others have implications for how others perceive, evaluate, and treat them, as well as for their own views of themselves, people sometimes behave in ways that will create certain impressions in others' eyes. Although most writers have used the terms impression management and self-presentation interchangeably, some have distinguished between them. Schlenker (1980), for example, defined impression management as the "attempt to control images that are projected in real or imagined social interactions" and reserved the term self-presentation for instances in which the projected images are "self-relevant. Apparently, people may manage the impressions of entities other than themselves, such as businesses, cities, and other people. Impressions may be managed by means other than self-presentation. For example, impressions of an individual may be managed by a third party. Some theorists have suggested that self-presentation involves not only people's attempts to manage the impressions others form, but also efforts to control their impressions of themselves as well (Schlender, 1985). Most important, the psychological manifestations of these two processes are often quite different. In most instances, the maintenance of private self-perceptions is mediated purely by cognitive processes. As Tedeschi (1986), observed, secret agendas, a desire to manipulate or deceive others, the goal of getting others to mediate reinforcements that otherwise would not be attainable, as well as possession of different perspectives, information, and values contribute to important differences

between the observations and evaluations of one's own behaviour and the attributions made by others. Although concerns about how one is perceived and evaluated by others are prevalent in everyday life, people are not always attuned to what others might be thinking about them, and do not direct all of their behaviours toward creating an impression. People regularly monitor their impact on others and try to gauge the impressions other people form of them. Often, they do this without any attempt to create a particular impression, but simply to ensure that their public persona is intact. Under certain circumstances, however, people become motivated to control how others see them. This impression motivation process is associated with the desire to create particular impressions in others' minds, but may or may not manifest itself in overt impression-relevant actions. In some instances, people are highly motivated to manage their impressions but refrain from doing so. Thus, our review first identifies the conditions under which people become motivated to manage their public impressions. The second component of impression management involves impression construction. Once motivated to create certain impressions, people may alter their behaviours to affect others' impressions of them. This involves not only choosing the kind of impression to create, but deciding precisely how they will go about doing so, such as deciding whether to create the desired impression via self-description, nonverbal behaviour, or props, for example. Thus, our model accounts not only for why people are concerned with others' impressions of them in a particular social setting, but also for why people adopt one impression management tactic rather than another. Put another way, what has been called impression management is composed of at least two distinct sub-processes: impression motivation and impression construction.

### **Self – Awareness**

The importance of informal work relationships in getting things done in organizations has been recognized by researchers and practiced by organizational members. Thus, it's not just formal relationships that affect member's outcomes but, the set of informal network ties that affect one's influence, Sparrow and Liden, (2005). Research implies that our level of self-awareness and degree of accuracy is strongly influenced by the psychological state we are in at the time. And this, in turn, is largely determined by our context or situations. This is because such things as the tasks that we are engaged with, our goals for the moment and our level of arousal will affect the aspects of the self-concept that is made salient or that becomes accessible, Brown, and McConnell, (2009). For instance, if performing well in the face of difficulty is salient, our approach will be guided by different aspects of the self-system. By and large, individuals can be encouraged or discouraged from an active consideration of the self by situations cues. Moreover, the aspects of self-system so activated necessarily affect the accuracy of self-insights, assuming that we know some aspects of our self-better than others. As a generalization, any context has the potentials to stimulate self-focussed attention, but most often this occurs where threat is perceived, or certain emotions are aroused. Recent research by Neiwirth, (2009) shows that, as a characteristic of human nature, social awareness affects how we relate to others and, necessarily, self-awareness, evolved early in our history because these attributes had survival value. Viewing self-awareness as a trait motivates many of our practices in family, school and work. The assumption is that, if people differ on this attribute, we might use it as a basis for choosing someone as life partner or as an employee. Further, its operation as a trait allows us to assume or predict that a person with high levels of self-awareness will exhibit this attribute on a relatively consistent basis across settings and time. Nonetheless, certain level of consistency does not imply changeableness or absolute stability. Self-awareness can be seen as a malleable trait. Therefore, one could invest in programs to improve its degree or accuracy in those seen as deficient. To obtain or maintain self-awareness, people need many related skills, such as self-monitoring skills, self-regulation skills, and self-assessment skill, all of which could be trained through programs with developmental purposes. Self-awareness and self-insight can be thought of as reciprocally related insight refers to the nature of our understanding regarding important aspects of the self-system. It reflects sudden and new discoveries regarding self-awareness. While there are many potential self-relevant attributes that could be considered, the focus will be on a set of these that seem to make an important difference in how we react to social situations in particular. Self-knowledge is usually a shorthand term for the degree of completeness and accuracy of our self-insights, Wilson, (2009). Self-knowledge concerns the question of how we are, whereas self-awareness concerns the question of what we do and why. Self-awareness also implies a route to building self-insight. It is through our self-awareness that we gain insight (our feelings, thoughts, or behaviours). In a like manner, it contributes to our share of self-knowledge.

### **Social Relationship**

According to Aquino & Lamertz, (2004), Workplace social relationships are unique interpersonal relationships with important implications for the individuals in those relationships and the organizations in which the relationships exist and develop. Various studies conducted in this respect have indicated that workplace social relationships directly affect a worker's ability to work & produce. According to Gordon and Hartman (2009), spending so much time at work, leads to development of friendships among people at the workplace. They observe further that individuals are likely to have more workplace friendships than any other kind of relationship in the workplace. This is as a result of constant interface between individuals at workplace on a daily basis. Friendship has been defined as, a voluntary interdependence between two persons over time, that is intended to facilitate social emotional goals of the participants, and may involve varying types and degrees of companionship, intimacy, affection and mutual assistance. According to Lee and Park, (2006) friendships that develop in the workplace may be called blended friendships which can have a positive impact on an employee's work performance & productivity. However, it has been observed that, although workplace friendships tend to have a positive impact on the employee's overall productivity and attitude toward the job, they can also lead to unhealthy competition, envy, gossiping and distraction from work related activities as they may result in more closely woven, emotional, and occasionally physical relationship, that goes beyond a typical co-worker relationship. However, as regards working relationships at the workplace, one of the most important relationships is the relationship between the Superior & his subordinates. Maintaining the relationship between superior and subordinate will differ greatly, depending on the expectations of the individual parties involved. Some will settle for nothing less than a close friendship with their superior, others may be just focused on maintaining a professional relationship, while those may not get along with their superiors may be focused on just maintaining a civil relationship. Workplace social relationship is a motivational con-

cept that can be shared by employees in the workplace. Workplace relationship is fundamentally a motivational construct that represents the active allocation of personal resources toward the task associated with a work role, Brief & Weiss (2002). Workplace social relationship has been found out to be more positively related to an individual job performance and studies have found positive relationship between workplace social relationship and organizational performance outcomes: employee retention, productivity, and profitability.

### 3 Methods

The study used a cross-sectional research design. The target population comprised of the entire employees of selected hospitals in Port Harcourt, Rivers State. For convenient purposes, ten hospitals was chosen from the total numbers of hospitals in Port Harcourt, Rivers State, and this became necessary due to the proximity of the ten hospitals selected for the researcher. A total of 25 employees were randomly selected from the ten hospitals, making a total population of 250 employees. Sample size of 152 respondents was sampled using the Krejcie and Morgan Determination table. The content validity of our instrument was achieved using supervisor's vetting and approval while the internal consistency of instrument was achieved using the Cronbach's Alpha coefficient with all the items being above 0.70. Data was analyzed and results presented using tables, mean and standard deviation. The hypotheses were tested using the Pearson Moment Correlation Coefficient. The study found out that there is a strong significant positive relationship between social intelligence and workplace harmony with all the dimensions and measures also showing positive correlation. Organizational climate and leadership positively moderated the relationship be. The choice of these hospitals is basically because they are administratively removed from private sector governed hospitality and the philosophy of general good is mostly found in the government owed hospitals. The administrative units of the hospital were consulted and a total of 248 senior employees of the hospitals including, medical doctor, and lab scientists and nurses, who are headway units. The nature of the study population demanded that a sample should be drawn from the large population of 248 senior personnel and head of units of the selected hospitals. Therefore, a study sample of 152 was derived using the Krejcie & Morgan sample determination table. This became necessary given cross sectional nature of the study design. Based on the nature of the study, which tends to find the relationship between two variables, (social intelligence and workplace harmony), the Pearson's product moment correlation co-efficient will be used to analysed the data. The analysis on the relationship between the variables was carried out at a 95% confidence interval and a 0.05 level of significance. The tertiary level of analysis involved the interpretation of the results of the secondary analysis which constitutes the findings with a view of making conclusions and recommendations.

#### Presentation of Results on the Test of Hypotheses

We had proposed ten research hypotheses in chapter one of this study to seeks explanation to the relationship between social intelligence and workplace harmony as well as the moderating influence of organizational climate and leadership in such relationship. The Pearson Moment Correlation Coefficient statistics was calculated using the SPSS version 20 to establish the relationship among the empirical referents of the predictor variable and the measures of the criterion variable. Correlation coefficients can range from -1.00 to +1.00. The value of -1.00 represents a perfect negative correlation while +1.00 represents a perfect positive correlation. A value 0.00 represents a lack of correlation. In testing hypothesis 1 – 10, the following rules were upheld in accepting or rejecting the null hypotheses. All the coefficient values that indicate levels of significance (\* or \*\*) as calculated using SPSS were accepted and therefore, our null hypotheses rejected; when no significance is indicated in the coefficient (r) value, we accept our null hypotheses. Our confidence interval was set at the 0.05 (two tailed) level of significance to test the statistical significance of the data in this study.

**Table 1: Reliability Coefficients of variable measures**

| S/N | Dimensions/Measures of study variable | Numbers of items | Numbers of cases | Cronbach Alpha |
|-----|---------------------------------------|------------------|------------------|----------------|
| 1.  | Impression Management                 | 4                | 130              | .992           |
| 2.  | Self-Awareness                        | 4                | 130              | .991           |
| 3.  | Social Relationship                   | 4                | 130              | .993.          |
| 4.  | Grievance Management                  | 4                | 130              | .991           |
| 5.  | Less Grievance                        | 4                | 130              | .991           |
| 6.  | Employee Bonding                      | 4                | 130              | .992           |
| 7.  | Organizational Climate                | 4                | 130              | .993           |
| 8.  | Leadership                            | 4                | 130              | .990           |

SPSS Result Output 2019

Table 2:.. Ccorrelation Matrix for Impression Management and Workplace Harmony

|                       |                     | Impression Management | Man-Less Grievance | Employee Bonding |
|-----------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|--------------------|------------------|
| Impression Management | Pearson Correlation | 1                     | .964**             | .945**           |
|                       | Sig. (2-tailed)     |                       | .000               | .000             |
|                       | N                   | 130                   | 130                | 130              |
| Less Grievance        | Pearson Correlation | .964**                | 1                  | .965**           |
|                       | Sig. (2-tailed)     | .000                  |                    | .000             |
|                       | N                   | 130                   | 130                | 130              |
| Employee Bonding      | Pearson Correlation | .945**                | .965**             | 1                |
|                       | Sig. (2-tailed)     | .000                  | .000               |                  |
|                       | N                   | 130                   | 130                | 130              |

\*\* . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

In the table 2 above correlation of hypotheses one and two; the hypothesis one shows a significant correlation at  $r = .964^{**}$  where P-value = .000 ( $P < 0.001$ ). This implies a strong and significant relationship between both variables at 95% level of confidence. We therefore reject the null hypothesis ( $H_{0:1}$ ), and restated, thus, there is a significance relationship between impression management and less grievance in the health sector in Rivers State. The hypothesis two shows a significant correlation at  $r = .945^{**}$  where P-value = .000 ( $P < 0.001$ ). This implies a strong and significant relationship between both variables at 95% level of confidence. We therefore reject the null hypothesis ( $H_{0:2}$ ), and restated, thus, there is a significance relationship between impression management and employee bonding in the health sector in Rivers State.

Table 3. Correlation Matrix for self-awareness and Workplace Harmony

|                  |                     | Self-Awareness | Less Grievance | Employee Bonding |
|------------------|---------------------|----------------|----------------|------------------|
| Self-Awareness   | Pearson Correlation | 1              | .989**         | .957**           |
|                  | Sig. (2-tailed)     |                | .000           | .000             |
|                  | N                   | 130            | 130            | 130              |
| Less Grievance   | Pearson Correlation | .989**         | 1              | .965**           |
|                  | Sig. (2-tailed)     | .000           |                | .000             |
|                  | N                   | 130            | 130            | 130              |
| Employee Bonding | Pearson Correlation | .957**         | .965**         | 1                |
|                  | Sig. (2-tailed)     | .000           | .000           |                  |
|                  | N                   | 130            | 130            | 130              |

\*\* . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

The table 3 correlation of hypotheses three and four; the hypothesis three shows a significant correlation at  $r = .989^{**}$  where P-value = .000 ( $P < 0.001$ ). This implies a strong and significant relationship between both variables at 95% level of confidence. We therefore reject the null hypothesis ( $H_{0:3}$ ), and restated, thus, there is a significance relationship between self-awareness and less grievance in the health sector in Rivers State. The hypothesis four shows a significant correlation at  $r = .957^{**}$  where P-value = .000 ( $P < 0.001$ ). This implies a strong and significant relationship between both variables at 95% level of confidence. We therefore reject the null hypothesis ( $H_{0:4}$ ), and restated, thus, there is a significance relationship between self-awareness and employee bonding in the health sector in Rivers State.

Table 4 Correlation Matrix for Social Relationship and Workplace Harmony

|                     |                     | Social Relationship | Relation-Less Grievance | Employee Bonding |
|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|-------------------------|------------------|
| Social Relationship | Pearson Correlation | 1                   | .932**                  | .881**           |
|                     | Sig. (2-tailed)     |                     | .000                    | .000             |
|                     | N                   | 130                 | 130                     | 130              |
| Less Grievance      | Pearson Correlation | .932**              | 1                       | .965**           |
|                     | Sig. (2-tailed)     | .000                |                         | .000             |
|                     | N                   | 130                 | 130                     | 130              |
| Employee Bonding    | Pearson Correlation | .881**              | .965**                  | 1                |
|                     | Sig. (2-tailed)     |                     |                         |                  |
|                     | N                   | 130                 | 130                     | 130              |

|  |                 |      |      |
|--|-----------------|------|------|
|  | Sig. (2-tailed) | .000 | .000 |
|  | N               | 130  | 130  |

\*\* . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

The table 4 correlation of hypotheses five and six; the hypothesis five shows a significant correlation at  $r = .932^{**}$  where  $P\text{-value} = .000$  ( $P < 0.001$ ). This implies a strong and significant relationship between both variables at 95% level of confidence. We therefore reject the null hypothesis ( $H_{0:5}$ ), and restated, thus, there is a significance relationship between social relationship and less grievance in the health sector in Rivers State. The hypothesis six shows a significant correlation at  $r = .881^{**}$  where  $P\text{-value} = .000$  ( $P < 0.001$ ). This implies a strong and significant relationship between both variables at 95% level of confidence. We therefore reject the null hypothesis ( $H_{0:6}$ ), and restated, thus, there is a significance relationship between social relationship and employee bonding in the health sector in Rivers State.

**Table 5. Correlation Matrix for Grievance Management and Workplace Harmony**

|                      |                     | Grievance Management | Man-Less Grievance | Employee Bonding |
|----------------------|---------------------|----------------------|--------------------|------------------|
| Grievance Management | Pearson Correlation | 1                    | .979**             | .946**           |
|                      | Sig. (2-tailed)     |                      | .000               | .000             |
|                      | N                   | 130                  | 130                | 130              |
| Less Grievance       | Pearson Correlation | .979**               | 1                  | .965**           |
|                      | Sig. (2-tailed)     | .000                 |                    | .000             |
|                      | N                   | 130                  | 130                | 130              |
| Employee Bonding     | Pearson Correlation | .946**               | .965**             | 1                |
|                      | Sig. (2-tailed)     | .000                 | .000               |                  |
|                      | N                   | 130                  | 130                | 130              |

\*\* . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

The table 5 correlation of hypotheses seven and eight; the hypothesis seven shows a significant correlation at  $r = .979^{**}$  where  $P\text{-value} = .000$  ( $P < 0.001$ ). This implies a strong and significant relationship between both variables at 95% level of confidence. We therefore reject the null hypothesis ( $H_{0:7}$ ), and restated, thus, there is a significance relationship between grievance management and less grievance in the health sector in Rivers State.

The hypothesis eight shows a significant correlation at  $r = .946^{**}$  where  $P\text{-value} = .000$  ( $P < 0.001$ ). This implies a strong and significant relationship between both variables at 95% level of confidence. We therefore reject the null hypothesis ( $H_{0:8}$ ), and restated, thus, there is a significance relationship between grievance management and employee bonding in the health sector in Rivers State.

For the multivariate analysis, the partial correlation technique was used in testing the moderating effects of organizational climate and leadership.

**Table 5 Partial Correlation For The Moderating Role Of Organizational Climate**

| Control Variables  |                                 | Social<br>gengce | Intelli-Workplace<br>Harmony | Organizational<br>Climate |
|--------------------|---------------------------------|------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------|
| -none <sup>a</sup> | Correlation                     | 1.000            | .990                         | .931                      |
|                    | Intelli-Significance (2-tailed) |                  | .000                         | .000                      |
|                    | Df                              | 0                | 128                          | 128                       |
|                    | Correlation                     | .990             | 1.000                        | .900                      |
| Workplace<br>mony  | Har-Significance (2-tailed)     | .000             |                              | .000                      |
|                    | Df                              | 128              | 0                            | 128                       |

|                 |                    |                                 |       |       |       |
|-----------------|--------------------|---------------------------------|-------|-------|-------|
|                 |                    | Correlation                     | .931  | .900  | 1.000 |
|                 | Organal Climate    | Significance (2-tailed)         | .000  | .000  | .     |
|                 |                    | Df                              | 128   | 128   | 0     |
|                 |                    | Correlation                     | 1.000 | .956  |       |
|                 | Social Intelligene | Intelli-Significance (2-tailed) | .     | .000  |       |
|                 |                    | Df                              | 0     | 127   |       |
| Organal Climate |                    | Correlation                     | .956  | 1.000 |       |
|                 | Workplace Harmony  | Har-Significance (2-tailed)     | .000  | .     |       |
|                 |                    | Df                              | 127   | 0     |       |

a. Cells contain zero-order (Pearson) correlations.

In table 6: The zero-order partial correlation between social intelligence and workplace harmony shows the correlation coefficient where organizational climate is not moderating the relationship; and this is, indeed, both very high (.931) and statistically significant (p-value (=0.000) < 0.05). The partial correlation controlling for organizational climate however is (.956) and statistically significant (p-value (=0.000) < 0.05.). The observed positive "relationship" between social intelligence and workplace harmony is due to underlying relationships between each of those variables and organizational climate. Looking at the zero correlation, we find that both social intelligence and workplace harmony are highly positively correlated with organizational climate, the control variable. Removing the effect of this control variable increases the correlation between the other two variables to be .956 and it is significant at  $\alpha = 0.05$ , therefore we reject the null hypothesis and conclude that: organizational climate significantly moderates the relationship between social intelligence and workplace harmony of health sector in Port Harcourt, Rivers State.

**Table 7: Partial correlation for the moderating role of leadership**

| Control Variables  |                    | Social Intelligence             | Intel-Workplace Harmony | Leadership |
|--------------------|--------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------------|------------|
|                    | Correlation        | 1.000                           | .990                    | .986       |
|                    | Social Intelligene | Intelli-Significance (2-tailed) | .                       | .000       |
|                    |                    | Df                              | 0                       | 128        |
|                    |                    | Correlation                     | .990                    | 1.000      |
| -none <sup>a</sup> | Workplace Harmony  | Significance (2-tailed)         | .000                    | .          |
|                    |                    | Df                              | 128                     | 0          |
|                    |                    | Correlation                     | .986                    | .972       |
|                    | Leadership         | Significance (2-tailed)         | .000                    | .000       |
|                    |                    | Df                              | 128                     | 128        |
|                    |                    | Correlation                     | 1.000                   | .813       |
|                    | Social Intelligene | Intelli-Significance (2-tailed) | .                       | .000       |
|                    |                    | df                              | 0                       | 127        |
| Leadership         |                    | Correlation                     | .813                    | 1.000      |
|                    | Workplace Harmony  | Significance (2-tailed)         | .000                    | .          |
|                    |                    | df                              | 127                     | 0          |

a. Cells contain zero-order (Pearson) correlations.

In table 7, the zero-order partial correlation between social intelligence and workplace harmony shows the correlation coefficient where leadership is not moderating the relationship; and this is, indeed, both very high (.986) and statistically significant (p-value (=0.000) < 0.05). The partial correlation controlling for leadership however is (.813) and statistically significant (p-value (=0.000) < 0.05.). The observed positive "relationship" between social intelligence and workplace harmony is due to underlying relationships between each of those variables and leadership. Looking at the zero correlation, we find that both social intelligence and workplace harmony are highly positively correlated with leadership, the control variable. Removing the effect of this control variable reduces the correlation between the other two variables to be .813 and it is significant at  $\alpha = 0.05$ , therefore we reject the null hypothesis and conclude that: leadership significantly moderates the relation-

ship between social intelligence and workplace harmony of health sector in Port Harcourt, Rivers State.

#### 4. Results and Discussion of findings

This study uses cross sectional survey design and inferential statistical methods in investigating the demographic characteristics of the respondents, while Pearson Moment Correlation Coefficient was used in investigating the relationship between social intelligence and workplace harmony of health sector in Port Harcourt, Rivers State as well as the moderating role of organizational climate and leadership. The findings revealed a positive and significant relationship between social intelligence and workplace harmony using the Pearson Moment Correlation Coefficient tool at a 95% confidence interval, using statistical package for social science (SPSS) version 20. This findings support the idea of Goleman, (1998), when he asserted that, the people who have amazing social intelligence know how to switch and channel their own and others' sentiments and spirits. In same vein, the study findings also support to the idea of Edward Thorndike (1920), who stated that, the capacity to understand and manage men and women and girls, to act wisely in human relations is social intelligence.

The first and second hypotheses show that there is a strong positive relationship between impression management and the measures of workplace harmony of less grievance and employee bonding in the sample of selected hospitals in Port Harcourt, Rivers State. The finding support the idea of Schneider (1981), when he pointed out that, impressions may be managed by means other than self-presentation. He sighted that impressions of an individual may be managed by a third party. Some theorists have suggested that self-presentation involves not only people's attempts to manage the impressions others form, but also efforts to control their impressions of themselves as well, which is a major tasks for health workers.

The third and fourth hypotheses show that there is a strong positive relationship between self-awareness and each measures of workplace harmony of less grievance and employee bonding of which the significant is based on  $\rho=0.989$ ;  $p= 0.000 <0.05$  and  $\rho=0.957$ ;  $p= 0.000 <0.05$ ., at 95% confidence interval leading to the rejection of the null hypotheses three and four stated in the chapter one, and restated thus; there is a significant relationship between self-awareness and less grievance and employee bonding in the sample of selected hospitals in Port Harcourt, Rivers State. This finding support the research conducted by Brown, and McConnell, (2009), who asserted that, our level of self - awareness and degree of accuracy is strongly influence by the psychological state we are in at the time. And this, in turn, is largely determined by our context or situations. This is because such things as the tasks that we are engaged with, our goals for the moment and our level of arousal will affect the aspects of the self-concept that is made salient or that becomes accessible. For instance, if performing well in the face of difficulty is salient, our approach will be guided by different aspects of the self-system. By and large, individuals can be encouraged or discouraged from an active consideration of the self by situations cues.

The fifth and sixth hypotheses show that there is a strong positive relationship between social relationship and each measures of workplace harmony of less grievance and employee bonding of which the significant is based on  $\rho=0.932$ ;  $p= 0.000 <0.05$ ., and  $\rho=0.881$ ;  $p= 0.000 <0.05$ ., at 95% confidence interval leading to the rejection of the null hypotheses five and six stated in the chapter one, and restated thus; there is a significant relationship between social relationship and less grievance and employee bonding in the sample of selected hospitals in Port Harcourt, Rivers State. This finding support Gordon and Hartman (2009), which according to them, asserted that spending so much time at work, leads to development of friendships among people at the workplace. They observe further that individuals are likely to have more workplace friendships than any other kind of relationship in the workplace. This is as a result of constant interface between individuals at workplace on a daily basis.

The seventh and eighth hypotheses show that there is a strong positive relationship between grievance management and each measures of workplace harmony of less grievance and employee bonding of which the significant is based on  $\rho=0.979$ ;  $p= 0.000 <0.05$ ., and  $\rho=0.946$ ;  $p=0.000 <0.05$ ., at 95% confidence interval leading to the rejection of the null hypotheses seventh and eighth stated in the chapter one, and restated thus; there is a significant relationship between grievance management and less grievance and employee bonding in the sample of selected hospitals in Port Harcourt, Rivers State.

The partial correlation coefficient result indicated that organizational climate of organizations significantly moderate the relationship between social intelligence and workplace harmony. The moderation support the study of (Mullins, 2010), who asserted that, organizational climate has a significant impact on the wellbeing of employees that has a direct influence on quality and quantity of work done in the organization. The moderation support the study of Mullins when in his opinion asserted that, today's organizations need effective leaders who understand the complexities of the rapidly changing global environment. If the task is highly structured and the leader has good relationship with the employees, effectiveness will be high on the part of the employees. The study further revealed that democratic leaders take great care to involve all members of the team in discussion and can work with a small but highly motivated team.

#### 5. Conclusion

The ability to understand oneself and get along properly with others and get them to cooperate with you is one significant success of social intelligence at work. Because the workplace comprises of so many people with different behaviour, understanding this differences enhances effective workplace harmony through less grievance and employee bonding at the workplace. However, conflict is inevitable, and it is expected at every gathering that warehouse two or people. It might occur as a result of individual differences and goals incompatibility. Therefore, the ability to manage these differences through the dimensions of social intelligence of impression management, self-awareness, social relationship and grievance management enhances the measures of workplace harmony of less grievance and employee bonding. This study examined the relationship between social intelligence and workplace harmony of selected hospitals in Port Harcourt, Rivers State. Accordingly, the study strategy and methodology were designed in a way that points towards the achievement of the study objectives. The study concludes that social intelligence through the use of impression management, self-awareness, social relationship and grievance management significantly influences less grievance and employee bonding.

#### 6. Recommendations



Based on the discussions and conclusions above, the following recommendations are hereby made:

- i. There is a significant relationship between impression management and the measures of workplace harmony of less grievance and employee bonding. Therefore, leaders of organization should ensure proper usage of impression management because it enhances the impressions people make on others and the implications for how others perceive, evaluate, and treat them, as well as the views of the leaders on themselves.
- ii. That there is a significant relationship between self-awareness and the measures of workplace harmony of less grievance and employee bonding. Therefore, management of organization should apply self-awareness while dealing with employee at workplace, because effective utilization of self-awareness enhances workplace harmony, as the level of self-awareness and the degree of accuracy is strongly influence by the psychological state we are in at time.
- iii. That there is a significant relationship between social relationship and the measures of workplace harmony of less grievance and employee bonding. Therefore, management of organization should encouraged social relationship at workplace as it enhances team participation, and effective individual performance leading to successful workplace harmony.
- iv. That there is a significant relationship between grievance management and the measures of workplace harmony of less grievance and employee bonding. Therefore, management of organization are advised to properly managed grievances at the workplace as they ensure effective organizational less grievance and organizational employee bonding.

## References

- (1) Aquino, K., & Lamertz, K. (2004). A relational model of workplace victimization: Social roles and patterns of victimization in dyadic relationships. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89,(2) 1023–1034
- (2) Babu M, Sameer. (2013). Social intelligence and aggressive behaviour in relation to classroom climate among upper primary school students of Delhi and Kerala. unpublished Ph.d Thesis. Faculty of education, Jamia Millia Islamia, India.
- (3) Brief, A.P. and Weiss, H.M. (2002). Organizational behaviour: Affect in the workplace. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 53(1) 279-307.
- (4) Brown, C. M., & McConnell, A. R., (2009). Effort or escape: Self-concept structure determines self – regulatory behaviour: *Self and Identity*, 8(2) 365 – 377.
- (5) Gordon, J. & R. L. Hartman (2009). Exploration of affinity-seeking strategies & open communication in peer workplace relationships; *Atlantic Journal of Communication* 17(3) - as Quoted in —Workplace relationships, an article from Wikipedia, the Free Encyclopedia.
- (6) Goleman, D. (2006). Social intelligence: The new science of human relationships. New York: Bantam Books.
- (7) Greenwald, A. G., & Breckler, S. J. (1985). To whom is the self-presented? In B. R. Schlenker (Ed.): *The self and social life* New York: McGraw-Hill.
- (8) Honeywill & Ross (2015). Social intelligence is also being able to make important social decisions which can change your life the man problem: Destructive masculinity in western culture, Palgrave Macmillan, New York.
- (9) Lee, H. E. & H.S.Park (2006). Exploration of the relationship between friendship at work & job satisfaction: An application of balance theory; Wikipedia; free encyclopedia; google.com.
- (10) Mullins L., (2004). Management and organisational behaviour, Pearson higher education FT Prentice Hall.
- (11) Neiworth, J. J. (2009). Thinking about me. How social awareness evolved. *Current Directions in Psychological Science* 18(2) 143 – 147.
- (12) Nwinyokpugi P. N., (2015). Employee engagement And workplace harmony in Nigeria civil service. *International Journal of Innovative Research & Development*, 4(2), 199 – 204.
- (13) Ngonyo, C, N & Yazdanifard, R. L. (2014). The impact of social and emotional intelligence on employee motivation in a multigenerational workplace. University of creative technology, Malaysia.
- (14) Ross C., (2004). The employment relations act through the eyes of the media. In E Rasmussen (ed.), Aukland University Press.
- (15) Sparrow, R. T., & Liden, R. C. (2005). Two routes to influence: Integrating leaders- members exchange and network perspective. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 50(3), 505 – 535.
- (16) Schneider, D. J. (1981). Tactical self-presentations: Toward a broader conception. In J.T. Tedeschi (Ed.), *Impression management theory and social psychological research*. New York: Academic Press.
- (17) Tedeschi, J. T. (1986). Private and public experiences and the self. In R. F. Baumeister (Ed.), *Public self and private self*. New York: Springer-Verlag.
- (18) Thorndike, E.L. (1920). Intelligence and its use. *Harper's Magazine*, 140, 227-235.,
- (19) Wilson, T. D. (2009). Know thy-self. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 4(1) 384 – 389.