

Article

Not peer-reviewed version

Employee Well-being in the Perspective of Positive Psychology and of the Job Demands-Resources Theory. The Role of Trust Within the Organization

Agnieszka Czerw , [Damian Grabowski](#) , [Agata Chudzicka-Czupala](#) , [Katarzyna Stapor](#) , [Marta Żywiołek-Szeja](#) *

Posted Date: 2 March 2023

doi: 10.20944/preprints202303.0041.v1

Keywords: Well-being; Positive psychology; Organizational psychology; Job demands-resources



Preprints.org is a free multidiscipline platform providing preprint service that is dedicated to making early versions of research outputs permanently available and citable. Preprints posted at Preprints.org appear in Web of Science, Crossref, Google Scholar, Scilit, Europe PMC.

Copyright: This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Article

Employee Well-Being in the Perspective of Positive Psychology and of the Job Demands-Resources Theory. The Role of Trust within the Organization

Agnieszka Czerw ¹, Damian Grabowski ², Agata Chudzicka-Czupala ², Katarzyna Stapor ³ and Marta Żywiołek-Szeja ^{2,*}

¹ Faculty of Psychology in Poznań, University of Social Sciences and Humanities, Kutrzeby 10, 61-719 Poznań, Poland

² Faculty of Psychology in Katowice, University of Social Sciences and Humanities, Techników 9, 40-326 Katowice, Poland

³ Faculty of Automatic Control, Electronics and Computer Science, Silesian University of Technology, Akademicka 16, 44-100 Gliwice, Poland

* Correspondence: mzywiolek-szeja@st.swps.edu.pl

Abstract: The aim of this article is to present the results of studies investigating the relationship between trust in supervisor and in co-workers and trust in the organization as an institution on the one hand, and employee well-being on the other hand. The presented research project was carried out from the perspective of building a positive organization with employee well-being as one of the major goals. The research covered 1,113 individuals, employed with various organizations across Poland. The sample consisted of 48% women and 52% men. Trust was measured using the Trust in Supervisor Scale, Affect- and Cognition-Based Trust, concerning trust in co-workers, and the original Trust in the Workplace Questionnaire. The Eudemonic Well-Being in the Workplace Questionnaire was used to measure well-being. Canonical correlation analysis was used to assess simultaneous associations between sets of measured variables. The results prove that trust, including trust in co-workers, in supervisor and in the organization as an institution, promotes employee well-being in all its dimensions.

Keywords: well-being; positive psychology; organizational psychology; job demands-resources

1. Introduction

The issue of trust within the organization and of creating an environment conducive to employee well-being is related to the creation of what is referred to as a positive organization. As part of the process of building such positive organization, the need to create an ethical organizational climate is emphasized. This climate is characterized, among other things, by the ethical behavior of leaders and by the employees' readiness to trust the leaders and the organization [1]. Research findings show that trust in managers and employee well-being can be a consequence of applying human resource practices based on corporate social responsibility (CSR) assumptions [2]. This is why it seems that discussions and studies dedicated to positive and socially responsible organizations should focus both on trust within the organization and on employee well-being. The study presented in this article fills a gap that exists in research as it addresses the possible relationship between these two variables. It is also novel as it covers various aspects or dimensions of trust, like trust in co-workers, in supervisor, and in organization.

1.1. Employee well-being and its determinants

Since the time when work psychology began to draw on the findings of positive psychology, employee well-being has become one of the major concepts and objects of interest for psychological research and practice in this area [3]. Positive work and organizational psychology seeks to explain how to strive to build an environment conducive to employee well-being within the organization

from two important perspectives: hedonic and eudemonic [4,5]. The hedonic perspective seems to prevail here. Most research and interventions aim to diagnose and increase work satisfaction and positive experiences. Well-being is also often understood as the reduction of stress or the ability to cope with it better and more effectively [6]. Studies of employee well-being conducted in a eudemonic context appear to be less numerous. This is probably due to the fact that eudemonia is not precisely operationalized. As opposed to hedonia, all of whose indicators are known to us (namely the experienced emotions and satisfaction), no such clearly defined manifestations are present in the eudemonic approach. While the eudemonic perspective seems to be dominated by three concepts: Carol Ryff's Psychological Well-Being [7], Alan Waterman's Eudemonic Identity Theory [8], and Richard Ryan and Edward Deci's Self-Determination Theory [9,10], the literature contains many more examples of defining eudemonia. Various authors consider, for example, self-actualization, maturity, openness to experience, value congruency, commitment, personal growth, purpose in life, engagement, meaningfulness and others aspects as indicators of eudemonia [10,11]. It is worth noting that in the international literature on work and organizational psychology, it is difficult to identify specific, recognized theories, described as eudemonic, that would provide the basis underlying empirical research in this area. It is therefore not surprising that authors of texts referring to various indicators of eudemonia do not explicitly use the concept of well-being as a key variable in their research [12,13].

The research problem presented in this article uses an original model of eudemonic well-being in the workplace [5]. The model is based on the assumptions of two internationally recognized theories of well-being, concerning the general context and not focusing on the area of work and organizational psychology. These are the theories of Psychological Well-Being [7] and Social Well-Being [14]. According to this model, eudemonic well-being in the workplace consists of four subjective feelings associated with being a member of the organization. Firstly, it assumes that employees with high well-being accept their organization and feel that the way in which it functions is appropriate, reliable and favorable to them. Secondly, such employees feel that they perform tasks in line with their competencies and capabilities, and that they are in the right place at the right time. In addition, employees with high well-being rate their relationships with co-workers as helpful and kind, and feel that they are valuable to their organization and that their competence can support the latter in its development [5].

If employee well-being is treated in a broad way, both hedonic and eudemonic, ample evidence can be found in the literature of its relationship with various aspects of the work environment. A meta-analysis of studies investigating the association of organizational resources, understood as leadership style, social support or collaborative climate, with employee well-being operationalized in various ways, points to the existence of significant, moderate positive correlations between these variables (mean $r = 0.29$) [15]. Similarly, analyses conducted from an HRM practice perspective point to the possibility of enhancing employee well-being by shaping appropriate working conditions. A review of research carried out on this matter [16,17] indicates that the conditions for improving the well-being of people employed in organizations can be linked to several areas. The first one involves the physical and economic aspects of work, such as physical security or adequate and fair remuneration. Another area involves interpersonal relationships, including social support, friendly relations, cooperation, or supportive feedback. The third area involves procedures that foster the perception of one's work as autonomous, competence-developing, important, and meaningful.

The highlighted areas can be related to the Job Demands-Resources Theory [18], well-established in psychology. This concept emphasizes that in a work situation, in addition to demands that burden the employee, resources can always be indicated that are available to the organization. These resources should make it possible to reduce the job demands or to cope with them more effectively. In this manner, job resources improve employee well-being, while job demands can reduce it. The model does not indicate a closed list of resources, but the most commonly identified ones include the following [19]: social resources, such as social support, cooperation, work resources, e.g. a sense of influence and control over work, participation in decisions, organizational resources, e.g. transparent

and effective communication, trust in supervisor, and developmental resources, such as supportive feedback and career prospects.

Many studies on professional well-being point to the particular role of the leader, of their behavior and leadership style [20,21]. Since the relationship with the leader is significant also for the perceived trust in the latter, this context of well-being determinants seems particularly relevant.

1.2. Trust within the organization and its dimensions vs. employee well-being

The psychosocial factors that can determine employee well-being include trust and its different types. Trust as a general concept can be defined as a personal and individual expectation concerning the reliability, trustworthiness as well as fairness of other people's behavior, and the expectation that they will act a way that does not harm the individual [22,23]. Trust understood in this manner involves an assessment of two aspects of the relationship between the two parties: risk as well as interdependence. Risk is conceptualized as an existing likelihood of loss, the perceived possibility of loss experienced by a party trusting others. Interdependence, on the other hand, assumes that the interests of one party cannot be satisfied without the active involvement or at least acceptance of the other party. Benevolence assessment can be added to the set of these two factors, i.e. the conviction that the other party's behavior will be helpful and favorable, or at least harmless.

Two kinds of trust experienced in a work situation can generally be distinguished, namely interpersonal and impersonal trust [24]. Interpersonal trust includes trust in co-workers (lateral trust) and trust in supervisor (vertical trust), while trust in the organization as a formal institution represents impersonal trust [22]. Trust can therefore be analyzed at all levels: the individual, the team, and the organization [25]. Interpersonal and impersonal trust can be assumed to be closely linked, but according to Haynes and colleagues [26], they are separate variables.

The manifestation of interpersonal trust by the employee is determined by three characteristics of the other person, i.e. their ability, benevolence, and integrity [24]. In this approach, ability include skills, competence and personal qualities that allow the individual to properly perform certain activities in a specific area of work and within the organization [22]. Benevolence is the willingness to behave in a helpful and friendly manner. Integrity, also presented as reliability, is the tendency to behave in a fair manner towards others [27].

In turn, trust in the organization as an institution is determined by the employee's perception of the organization, by the belief in its reliability and in the integrity of the procedures in force within it [22,24]. Reliability is related to the assessment of the organization's ability to cope with complex, difficult situations and the possibility of using its resources in specific situations. This also concerns believing in the skills that the managers have and evaluating their actions, as well as the ways in which they make decisions and the consequences of the latter. In addition, it is important to convince the employees about the organization's stability, technological reliability, and market competitiveness. The organization's integrity, on the other hand, reflects its human resource management practices, the righteousness of its managers' behavior, as well as adequate and transparent communication that does its job.

While trust in the organization depends on the employees' subjective feelings, worldview and values, their rational assessment of whether the organization is trustworthy and fair is also important. Each employee repeatedly assesses, when performing their duties, whether the organization that employs them can and should be trusted. The employee's trust in the organization thus depends to a large extent on the practices they have experienced within the organization over a long period of time, both as the subject of those practices and by witnessing different ways in which other employees were treated [22].

Among other things, job resources in the Job Demands–Resources Theory [18,19] include trust in supervisor. Trust within the organization is understood differently by different researchers, most often as trust in individuals, usually in supervisors [4,28-30], but sometimes also as trust in the organization as an institution [31]. It is worth mentioning that many studies indicate the role of trust as a mediator of the relationship between leadership style and well-being [28,30,32,33], or other work or organizational qualities on the one hand, and well-being on the other hand [31].

Jaskeviciute and colleagues [22], on the basis of their meta-analysis, argue that research into the relationships between trust and organizational well-being points to the existence of positive correlations between these variables [29,34]. This research demonstrates that as trust increases, employee well-being improves. On the one hand, trust improves the effectiveness of action and gives one a sense of control, thus increasing satisfaction and making one feel good, as well as improving well-being. On the other hand, trust relying on friendship and support, which is associated with positive emotions, directly improves positive workplace atmosphere and employee satisfaction [24].

Our review of the literature provides grounds for the following research hypotheses:

H1. The higher the level of trust in co-workers, the higher the level of employee well-being,

H2. The higher the level of trust in supervisor, the higher the level of employee well-being,

H3. The higher the level of trust in organization, the higher the level of employee well-being.

As this has not yet been the subject matter of empirical research, an exploratory research question was additionally put forward, as to whether the dimensions of each type of trust are related to multidimensional employee well-being, and if so, which ones (Research Question 1).

2. Materials and Methods

2.1. Participants

In order to check the nature and strength of the potential relationships between the components of trust in supervisor, in co-workers and in the organization as an institution, and employee well-being within the organization, 1,113 people working with different organizations across Poland were surveyed. Sample A included 538 women (48% of the sample) and 575 men (52% of the sample). The respondents were working people aged between 18 and 77. The mean age of the respondents was nearly 45 ($M=44.8$; $SD=14.08$). Most of the respondents, 599 (54% of the sample), had higher education, including engineering and bachelor's degrees, others had secondary education (431 respondents, 39% of the sample), vocational (71 respondents, 6%), and elementary education (12 respondents, 1%).

The survey covered 241 respondents working in microenterprises employing up to 9 people (22% of the sample), 304 working in small businesses employing up to 49 people (27% of the sample), 238 working in medium-sized businesses employing up to 249 people (21% of the sample), and 330 working in large enterprises employing over 250 people (30% of the sample). The study included representatives of different professions involving working with people, things, ideas, and data (information). The majority of the respondents (957 people, 86% of the sample), worked under a full-time contract of employment. The remaining 156 respondents (14% of the sample) were employed under civil law contracts, contracts of mandate, and contracts of specific work.

A group of 734 persons included employees of private businesses (66% of the sample), 319 persons were employed in state institutions (29% of the sample), 31 in cooperatives (2.7% of the sample), and 29 persons in NGOs (2.3% of the sample). The mean length of service of the respondents was just over 22 years ($M=22.14$; $SD=14.74$). The respondents included 273 people holding managerial positions (24.5% of the sample).

The research was conducted in compliance with the ethical standards in line with the provisions of the Declaration of Helsinki. The Departmental Research Ethics Committee of the authors University approved the research proposal and the consent procedure (approval number 2020-29-11). The respondents agreed to participate voluntarily, they were informed about the purpose of the study, assured about its complete anonymity, and obtained information about the possibility of withdrawing from it at any time. The data was collected using an online survey, conducted by a professional research firm. The study was conducted in 2021.

2.2. Measures

The Eudemonic Well-Being in the Workplace Questionnaire [5] was used for well-being in the organization diagnosis. The questionnaire consists of 43 statements grouped into four scales. (1) Positive Organization (Cronbach's $\alpha = 0.94$, McDonald's $\omega = 0.94$) - the sense of acceptance of the

characteristics of the organization, the feeling of general agreement with the style of functioning of the organization, the ability to notice the strengths and advantages of the organization as dominant. Example item: "My company is a positive workplace." (2) Fit and Development (Cronbach's $\alpha = 0.94$, McDonald's $\omega = 0.94$) - satisfaction with the performance of one's professional role, the perception of their development in that role, the feeling that they perform the appropriate tasks to their ability and aptitude. Example item: "My job allows me to develop." (3) Positive Relations with Co-workers (Cronbach's $\alpha = 0.96$, McDonald's $\omega = 0.96$) - the perception of the quality of relationships with others in the context of the work performed and the sense of having good, kind and open relationships with co-workers at the same level of hierarchy in the organization. Example item: "I have a good relationship with co-workers." (4) Contribution to the Organization (Cronbach's $\alpha = 0.94$, McDonald's $\omega = 0.94$) - the assessment of one's self-worth in the context of the organization, including the employee's belief that they play a major role within the organization as a member thereof. Example item: "I believe that my company needs my competence in order to operate."

Trust indicators were provided by the results of three tools related to interpersonal trust (supervisor and co-workers): and to impersonal trust (organization).

The Trust in Supervisor Scale [35], measures trust in supervisor on two scales and on 20 statements. (1) Skills and competencies (Cronbach's $\alpha = 0.92$, McDonald's $\omega = 0.92$) the employee's belief that their supervisor makes the right decisions, motivates others appropriately, solves problems effectively, manages to achieve goals, and is knowledgeable about the aspects they deal with at work. Example item: "My supervisor is very knowledgeable about the area they deal with." (2) Kindness and integrity (Cronbach's $\alpha = 0.92$, McDonald's $\omega = 0.92$) - the belief that the supervisor is honest, open, sincere, and fair, and that they keep their promises. Example item: "My supervisor is honest with me in our conversations."

Affect- and Cognition-Based Trust [36], in the Polish language version [37], is a questionnaire used to measure trust in co-workers. It consists of 11 items, grouped into two scales. (1) Affect-based trust (Cronbach's $\alpha = 0.95$, McDonald's $\omega = 0.95$) - the respondent's belief that there is a person in the workplace with whom they have a relationship based on honesty, with whom they can talk freely about the difficulties they experience at work, who will be willing to listen to them attentively, and who will approach their problems constructively. Example item: "We would both feel a sense of loss if one of us was transferred and we could no longer work together." (2) Cognition-based trust (Cronbach's $\alpha = 0.86$, McDonald's $\omega = 0.88$) - belief that the person with whom we share duties performs their work professionally and with dedication, about whom there are no doubts in terms of their competence and preparation for the profession. Example item: "This person approaches his/her job with professionalism and dedication."

The Trust in the Workplace Questionnaire was prepared for the purpose of the study discussed here and measures trust in the organization as an institution. It consists of 40 statements, compiled into two scales. (1) Organizational transparency and kindness (Cronbach's $\alpha = 0.98$, McDonald's $\omega = 0.98$) is a 30-item scale used to measure the belief about the organization's positive attitude towards its employees, its care for them, and the appreciation of open communication in both day-to-day and difficult situations. Example item: "If something out of the ordinary happens, my company tries to explain it to its employees." (2) Organizational certainty and ethics (Cronbach's $\alpha = 0.95$, McDonald's $\omega = 0.95$) -, a scale composed of 10 items. It concerns the sense of fair and equal treatment of the employees and the recognition of their efforts and competence. Examines the belief in the fairness of the supervisors' procedures and behavior towards the employees, preference for organizational cooperation and mutual respect. Example item: "My company has failed me many times." Since all items have a negative meaning, the score on the scale is inverted.

Confirmatory factor analysis conducted on this sample using the JASP 0.14.1 software (Mplus emulation, ULS estimator - it was assumed here that the questionnaire response scales were ordinal scales) showed that the Impersonal Trust in Organization Questionnaire obtained good measures of fit of the two-factor model to the data, comprising 30 items and 10 items on both scales: $\chi^2(df) = 1139.09(739)$, RMSEA = 0.022, sRMR = 0.031, CFI = 0.999, NFI = 0.997, GFI = 0.997, AGFI = 0.997.

3. Results

Correlation coefficients between the variables were calculated to verify the hypotheses. In turn, canonical analysis was carried out to answer the research question concerning the potential relationships between all measures of trust and multidimensional employee well-being. The statistical analyses were performed using the SPSS statistical package version 27, JASP 0.14.1, and Statistica 12.0.

3.1. Preliminary analysis

The first step of the analysis involved calculating the correlations coefficients between the studied variables. Table 1 contains the descriptive statistics, correlations and intercorrelations between the studied variables.

Table 1. Descriptive statistics, correlations and intercorrelations between components of trust and dimensions of well-being in organization.

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1. Skills and competencies (supervisor)	—									
2. Kindness and integrity (supervisor)	.90	—								
3. Affect-based trust (coworkers)	.40	.41	—							
4. Cognition-based trust (coworkers)	.46	.47	.75	—						
5. Organizational transparency and kindness	.74	.75	.44	.41	—					
6. Organizational certainty and ethics	.62	.56	.19	.30	.63	—				
7.Positive Organization	.73	.74	.46	.44	.90	.63	—			
8. Fit and Development	.56	.58	.51	.50	.70	.41	.81	—		
9. Positive Relations with Coworkers	.62	.64	.62	.62	.72	.44	.80	.78	—	
10. Contribution to the Organization	.48	.50	.48	.50	.60	.35	.71	.81	.78	—
M	38.37	31.58	17.52	21.69	99.07	32.61	41.60	36.60	48.18	29.91
SD	9.74	7.98	4.24	4.32	25.32	9.42	9.43	7.70	9.11	5.66

All correlation coefficients are significant at the level of $p < .001$.

According to Table 1, the components of the following variables: trust in supervisor, trust in co-workers and organizational transparency and kindness, as well as organizational certainty and ethics correlate positively, averagely and highly, with the components of the employee well-being variable.

Both indicators of trust in co-workers are positively related to all scales of well-being in the workplace. The strongest correlation ($r > 0.6$) appeared in the context of the Positive interpersonal relationships dimension. This result was expected due to the definitions of both scales. The remaining scales of the Eudemonic Well-Being in the Workplace Questionnaire (EWWQ) are also positively related to trust in co-workers. This makes it possible to confirm Hypothesis 1.

Similarly, both indicators of trust in the direct supervisor are positively related to all scales of well-being in the workplace. In this case, the strongest correlation ($r > 0.7$) appeared in the context of the Positive organization dimension. The remaining scales of the EWWQ Questionnaire are also positively related to trust in co-workers. This makes it possible to confirm Hypothesis 2.

When analyzing the correlation coefficients between organizational well-being and impersonal trust, two clear patterns can be noticed. Firstly, all dimensions of well-being in the workplace correlate more strongly with the Transparency and organizational kindness scale (even $r > 0.8$) than with the Organizational certainty and ethics scale. Secondly, the highest correlations of both scales of

impersonal trust in the organization were recorded for the Positive organization dimension, a result in line with the scale's definition. This is because all scales of the EWWQ questionnaire are positively related to impersonal trust in the organization. This makes it possible to confirm Hypothesis 3.

3.2. Canonical analysis

In order to examine the relationship between all dimensions of trust simultaneously with all dimensions of employee well-being within the organization, canonical analysis [38] was applied, performed using the Statistica 12.0 statistical package. Canonical analysis makes it possible to determine the extent of the simultaneous influence of a set of independent variables, taking into account the relationships between the variables in that set, on a set of dependent variables, taking into account the relationships between the variables also in that latter set. Thus, canonical analysis identifies the multiple determination structure of the individual variables, examined together, pointing to the most significant variables. The dimensions of trust (left set) were treated as independent variables (predictors) for the components of well-being in the workplace (right set).

Table 2 contains the results obtained from the canonical analysis. The total redundancy for the set of dependent variables (dimensions of well-being in the workplace) was 62.26%. This means that 62.26% of variance in terms of well-being in the workplace can be explained with the set of predictors – trust dimensions taken into account (by all canonical variables).

Table 2. Summary of the canonical analysis: factor structure and factor loadings, separate variances and redundancies.

Left set of variables	Canonical variables		
	U1	U2	U3
Trust in supervisor - Skills and competencies	.81	.02	.49
Trust in supervisor - Kindness and integrity	.81	.06	.03
Affect-based trust in coworkers	.52	.73	.16
Cognition-based trust in coworkers	.50	.79	.06
Trust in organization - Organizational transparency and kindness	.99	-.07	-.12
Trust in organization - Organizational certainty and ethics	.69	-.29	.31
Separate variances	.547	.209	.079
Redundancies	.456	.066	.000
Canonical correlations	.91	.56	.10
p-value<	.001	.001	.021
Total redundancy		62.259%	
Right set of variables	Canonical variables		
	V1	V2	V3
Positive Organization	.99	-.03	-.09
Fit and Development	.78	.34	-.34
Positive Relations with Co-workers	.83	.55	.07
Contribution to the Organization	.68	.42	-.54
Separate variances	.689	.149	.117
Redundancies	.574	.047	.001

Of the pairs of canonical variables obtained, the first three ((U1,V1), (U2,V2), (U3,V3)) were found to be statistically significant for the linear relationship between the sets of trust and employee well-being dimensions. A factor loading structure was used to determine the size of the contribution

of the individual dimensions of trust and well-being to the canonical variables forming the given pair. These loadings are a measure of the correlation of a given dimension with a given canonical variable ("factor"). It was assumed that loadings greater than 0.4 would be indicative of a significant relationship between the given dimension and the canonical variable (factor).

According to the data in Table 2, on the independent variables (trust dimensions) side, the first pair (U1,V1) includes the canonical variable U1. The following dimensions demonstrate the highest positive correlations with this canonical variable: organizational transparency and kindness (0.987), trust in supervisor: benevolence and integrity (0.814), trust in supervisor: competence and skills (0.812), organizational certainty and ethics (0.689), affect-based trust in co-workers (0.516), and cognition-based trust in co-workers (0.498). It was decided to call this factor, i.e. canonical variable U1, "full trust in organization".

The pair discussed is formed together with full trust in organization by canonical variable V1, which can be described as "full organizational well-being". In fact, the positive organization dimension correlates most strongly with this variable. The other dimensions of well-being in the workplace also display strong correlations.

The canonical pair discussed (U1,V1) explains 54.7 per cent of variance in the set of predictors – trust dimensions and 68.9 per cent of variance in the set of workplace well-being dimensions. With regard to the respective canonical pair of full trust in organization – full organizational well-being, the set of predictors, i.e. trust dimensions, makes it possible to explain over 57% of variance in the set of well-being dimensions. The relationship in this canonical pair, i.e. between the linear function of trust dimensions and the linear function of well-being dimensions, is very high and amounts to 0.913.

In summary, it can be concluded that employees experiencing well-being in the organization also have trust in organization, in supervisor, and in co-workers, but trust in organization and in supervisor come to the fore here, being the most significant.

In the second pair (U2,V2) of canonical variables, the relationship between the linear function of trust dimensions and the linear function of well-being dimensions is lower and amounts to 0.563. Canonical variable U2 could be called "trust in co-workers", as the dimensions that have the highest positive correlations with it are cognition-based trust in co-workers (0.792) and affect-based trust in co-workers (0.729), with a simultaneous weak negative correlation with certainty and ethics (-0.289), which means that trust is put in people on the same level within the organization.

On the other hand, the second canonical variable in this pair, V2, is most strongly correlated with the dimension of positive interpersonal relationships (0.548), indicating good relationships with co-workers, and the dimension of contribution to the organization, i.e. the employee's belief that they play an important role in the organization as a member thereof (0.425), which makes it possible to call this factor "satisfaction with relationships with co-workers and with the contribution to the organization". The fit dimension also correlates positively and weakly (0.339) with this factor, indicating that satisfaction with the relationship with co-workers may be related to the sense of fit with the organization.

The canonical pair discussed (U2,V2) explains 20.9% of variance in the set of predictors – trust dimensions, and 14.9% of variance in the set of well-being dimensions. With regard to this canonical pair, using the set of predictors – trust dimensions only makes it possible to explain 4.7% of variance in the set of well-being components.

In the third pair of canonical variables (U3,V3), the relationship between the linear function of trust dimensions and the linear function of well-being dimensions is very low and amounts to 0.097. Canonical variable U3 could be called "trust in the supervisor's competence and skills", as it has the highest positive and average correlation with the dimension of trust in supervisor based on their competence and skills (0.492), with a simultaneous weak positive correlation with organizational certainty and ethics (0.315), which means that trust is put in people on a higher level within the organization.

The second canonical variable in this pair, V3, is most strongly and negatively correlated with the contribution to the organization dimension (-0.543), indicating the employee's belief that they play an important role in the organization as a member thereof. Said variable correlates at the same

time weakly and negatively with organizational fit (-0.340), making it possible to call this factor “sense of weak contribution to the organization”.

The canonical pair discussed (U3,V3) explains 7.9% of variance in the set of predictors – trust dimensions, and 11.7% of variance in the set of well-being dimensions. With regard to the respective canonical pair, using a set of predictors – trust dimensions, it is possible to explain very little, i.e. less than 1%, of variance in the set of well-being components. This result means that, in the organizations covered by the research, higher trust may be found in the supervisor’s competence and skills, with the employee’s weaker sense of having competencies or qualities important for the organization.

Taking into account the analysis of all three canonical pairs, the U1–V1 pair was found to best explain the relationships between the groups of variables from the left and right set. On the basis of this canonical pair, the following answer to the research question can be assumed: trust in all its dimensions, including trust in co-workers, in supervisor and impersonal trust in the organization as an institution, promotes employee well-being, also in all its dimensions.

4. Discussion

The aim of the study presented in this paper was to find out whether and how all aspects of trust in organization are linked to employee well-being. The analysis of the results showed that full trust in organization concerning its three levels: trust in co-workers, trust in supervisors, and trust in the organization as an institution, promotes employee well-being within the organization. It should be kept in mind that well-being in this study is also understood in a multidimensional manner, i.e. as the feeling that the organization is a positive workplace, satisfaction with one’s professional role and with the opportunities to develop within it, as well as the evaluation of interpersonal relationships as supportive and kind, and the perception of one’s own contribution to the organization as important.

It seems that trust in the organization as an impersonal institution and trust in supervisor are responsible to the largest extent for the sense of well-being of employees. Particularly relevant is the Transparency and organizational kindness dimension (canonical loading well above 0.9). The importance of transparent communication within the organization has been highlighted for a long time, but it seems to have become even more crucial at the time of the COVID-19 pandemic. Research conducted in that period showed, for example, that corporate symmetrical communication increased trust in organization, and subsequently also employee well-being [39]. The results obtained in this study confirm that appropriate, transparent communication is a direct indicator of trust in organization. In addition to the formal, procedural aspects of communication in the organization, practical, direct communication with the management is also important. The direct supervisor is the natural, obvious representative of the organization as an institution. Therefore, it is not surprising that trust in supervisor is equally important for employee well-being as trust in the organization as an impersonal institution (canonical loading over 0.8). Other studies conducted recently, during the COVID-19 pandemic, have also confirmed the results obtained here. For example, the results of a study conducted among nurses showed that trust in supervisor is significantly related to their well-being [40].

It is worth emphasizing that the COVID-19 pandemic context should be taken into account when analyzing the results of the study presented here. Although employees were not asked about any aspects of their specific functioning at work during this time, the crisis related to the pandemic can be expected to be linked to the results of the study. Perhaps it was the pandemic that caused trust in the institution and trust in supervisor to be more important in building well-being than trust in co-workers. In the case of this trust dimension, the canonical loadings are the lowest (around 0.5), although obviously still significant. This may be due to the significant reduction in opportunities to meet with co-workers face to face, often on a casual and unplanned basis. This is known to have been a time when remote work was commonly introduced or the number of employees present in offices was significantly reduced, and it was recommended that the number of face-to-face meetings be limited. This reduction of interpersonal contacts may have resulted in a difficulty in estimating the level of trust in co-workers or in underestimating the importance of this form of trust for the quality

of professional functioning, or directly for the level of well-being at work. The more formal aspects of functioning at work came to the fore at that time. It became more important whether the employer had provided appropriate work tools, adapted the work rules to the new situation, taken care of the employees' health, etc.

In this context, it is also worth recalling the significant relationships shown in this study between the different types of trust felt by employees in the organization. It turns out that trust in the organization as an institution is linked to the largest extent to trust in supervisor, which obviously depends on the managers' behavior and on their leadership style – this is described as vertical trust [22]. In terms of building trust in organization, this trust is more relevant here than trust in co-workers, i.e. horizontal trust. It would certainly be worth checking whether in a situation other than a pandemic crisis, the relationship between the different aspects of trust would be the same. should discuss the results and how they can be interpreted from the perspective of previous studies and of the working hypotheses. The findings and their implications should be discussed in the broadest context possible. Future research directions may also be highlighted.

In conclusion, it is worth noting that well-being in the work situation is treated here as an explained variable, while in many studies it is also included as an explanatory variable, linked for instance to employee health. For instance, a meta-analysis of the relationship between job satisfaction and mental and physical health indicators [41], found a positive relationship between these variables at the mean level (mean $r = 0.31$). This gives rise to an important practical conclusion. Employee absenteeism, related to sickness, is extremely important for the organization, also in an economic context. This is why caring for the organizational environment, conducive to employee well-being, assumes great importance. From this point of view, the findings of the research presented here show that it is worth looking after a high level of trust within the organization, in each of its aspects. Both interpersonal and institutional trust is important. Moreover, in a crisis situation such as the COVID-19 pandemic, trust in the organization as an institution seems to gain importance over interpersonal trust.

The importance of the phenomenon of trust in organizations is noticed particularly in the context of major scandals (e.g. the Enron scandal) that undermine trust or result from a lack thereof. Since then, regular measurements of trust in the organization have been recommended and assumptions about the multidimensional and multilevel nature of trust in the organization have been made [42]. The operationalization of trust in organization obviously represents a certain challenge in this context. The model of personal and impersonal trust in the organization as an institution [22,24] seems to be a good solution, as it meets the requirements of being multidimensional and multilevel, as postulated by Paine [42]. We believe the study presented here fits precisely within this model.

4.1. Limitations of the study and directions for further research

With this study's unique findings in mind, there are several limitations. The first one is related to the self-descriptive nature of the study. It is worth noting, however, that in the COVID-19 pandemic situation, it was difficult to design the research using different, direct indicators of employee functioning. We are aware that although the respondents were guaranteed anonymity, their answers may have been falsified due to the seeking of public approval. This may have affected the final results of the study. However, efforts were made to counteract this phenomenon by giving appropriate instructions and assuring the respondents of full data confidentiality. Care was also taken to use accurate and reliable tools.

In addition, the survey was conducted only online, which may have limited the available number of potential respondents. Paradoxically, however, the situation of the epidemiological crisis and the need for widespread use of remote working solutions may have contributed to the extension of the range of people able to take part in a study conducted in this format.

Other limitations include the cultural context of the study, narrowed down to one country, i.e. Poland. The generalization of the results may be limited by the fact that Poles in general are characterized by rather low levels of interpersonal and social trust compared to representatives of

other nations [43]. We are therefore aware that only a cross-cultural study would make it possible to compare the responses of Polish employees with the attitudes of people from other countries.

5. Conclusions

Despite the limitations indicated above, the findings of the presented study may be useful for the design of what is referred to as a positive organization. Such an organization should be characterized by a high level of employee trust, not only in the interpersonal aspect, i.e. trust in co-workers and in supervisor, but also in the practices and procedures applied within the organization, which would be conducive to enhancing the professional well-being of all individuals involved in achieving the organizational goals. The goals pursued in such an organization should also meet the requirements of corporate social responsibility.

Author Contributions: Conceptualization, A.C., D.G. and A.C.C.; methodology, A.C., D.G., A.C.C. and K.S.; formal analysis, K.S., D.G.; writing—original draft preparation, A.C., D.G. and A.C.C.; writing—review and editing, M.Ż.S., A.C.C. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.”

Funding: This work was supported by the SWPS University of Social Sciences and Humanities, Warsaw, Poland (project No. 8146, Faculty of Psychology Competition 2/2019/2020, entitled “Trust in the organization, conditions and consequences,” project manager: Agnieszka Czerw, Ph.D.)

Ethics approval: This study was approved by the Department Research Ethics Committee of the Institute of Psychology at SWPS University of Social Sciences and Humanities (approval number 2020-29-11).

Informed Consent Statement: Online informed consent was received for all participants in study.

Data Availability Statement: Due to the nature of this research, participants of this study did not agree for their data to be shared publicly, so supporting data is not available.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

References

1. Duane Hansen, S.; Dunford, B.B.; Alge, B.J.; Jackson, C.L. (2016). Corporate social responsibility, ethical leadership, and trust propensity: A multi-experience model of perceived ethical climate. *J. Bus. Ethics* **2016**, *137*(4), 649-662. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-015-2745-7>
2. Pandey, S. An empirical study on socially responsible human resource practices and wellbeing of the employees in SMEs, NCR. *Int. J. Sci. Res. Engineering Dev.* **2020**, *3*, 1-10.
3. Cameron, K.; Dutton, J.; Eds. *Positive organizational scholarship: Foundations of a new discipline*; Berrett-Koehler Publishers, 2003.
4. Alfes, K.; Shantz, A.; Truss, C. The link between perceived HRM practices, performance and well-being: The moderating effect of trust in the employer. *Hum. Resour. Manag. J.* **2012**, *22*(4), 409-427. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1748-8583.12005>
5. Czerw, A. Diagnosing Well-Being in Work Context – Eudemonic Well-Being in the Workplace Questionnaire. *Curr. Psychol.* **2019**, *38*, 331-346. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-017-9614-8>
6. Piao, X.; Managi, S. Long-term improvement of psychological well-being in the workplace: What and how. *Soc. Sci. Med.* **2022**, 114851. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2022.114851>
7. Ryff, C.D. Happiness is everything, or is it? Explorations on the meaning of psychological well-being. *J. Pers. Soc. Psychol.* **1989**, *57*(6), 1069-81.
8. Waterman, A.S. Two conceptions of happiness: Contrasts of personal expressiveness (eudaimonia) and hedonic enjoyment. *J. Pers. Soc. Psychol.* **1993**, *64*, 678-691.
9. Ryan, R.M.; Deci, E.L. Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being. *Am. Psychol.* **2000**, *55*, 68-78
10. Vittersø, J. The most important idea in the world: an introduction. In *Handbook of eudaimonic well-being*; Vittersø, J., Eds.; Springer International Publishing, 2016; 1-24.
11. Huta, V.; Waterman, A.S. Eudaimonia and its distinction from hedonia: Developing a classification and terminology for understanding conceptual and operational definitions. *J. Happiness Stud.* **2014**, *15*(6), 1425-1456. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10902-013-9485-0>
12. Bendassolli, P.F.; Tateo, L. The meaning of work and cultural psychology: Ideas for new directions. *Cult. Psychol.* **2018**, *24*(2), 135-159. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1354067X17729363>

13. Gómez-Salgado, J.; Navarro-Abal, Y.; López-López, M.J.; Romero-Martín, M.; Climent-Rodríguez, J.A. Engagement, passion and meaning of work as modulating variables in nursing: A theoretical analysis. *Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health* **2019**, *16*(1), 108. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph16010108>
14. Keyes, C.L.M. Social well-being. *Soc. Psychol. Q.* **1998**, *61*(2), 121–140. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2787065>
15. Nielsen, K.; Nielsen, M.B.; Ogbonnaya, C.; Käsälä, M.; Saari, E.; Isaksson, K. Workplace resources to improve both employee well-being and performance: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Work Stress* **2017**, *31*(2), 101–120. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02678373.2017.1304463>
16. Guest, D.E. Human resource management and employee well-being: Towards a new analytic framework. *Hum. Resour. Manag. J.* **2017**, *27*(1), 22–38. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1748-8583.12139>
17. Pagán-Castaño, E.; Maseda-Moreno, A.; Santos-Rojo, C. Wellbeing in work environments. *J. Bus. Res.* **2020**, *115*, 469–474. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2019.12.007>
18. Bakker, A.; Demerouti, E. The job demands–resources model: state of the art. *J. Manag. Psychol.* **2007**, *22*(3), 309–328. <https://doi.org/10.1108/02683940710733115>
19. Schaufeli, W.B. Applying the Job Demands-Resources model: A ‘how to’ guide to measuring and tackling work engagement and burnout. *Organ. Dyn.* **2017**, *46*(2), 120–132. <https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1016/j.orgdyn.2017.04.008>
20. Kelloway, E.K.; Turner, N.; Barling, J.; Loughlin, C. Transformational leadership and employee psychological well-being: The mediating role of employee trust in leadership. *Work Stress* **2012**, *26*(1), 39–55. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02678373.2012.660774>
21. Tafvelin, S.; Armelius, K.; Westerberg, K. Toward understanding the direct and indirect effects of transformational leadership on well-being: A longitudinal study. *J. Leadersh. Organ. Stud.* **2011**, *18*(4), 480–492. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1548051811418342>
22. Jaskevičiute, V.; Stankevičienė, A.; Diskienė, D.; Savickė, J. The relationship between employee well-being and organizational trust in the context of sustainable human resource management. *Probl. Perspect. Manag.* **2021**, *19*(2), 118–131. [http://dx.doi.org/10.21511/ppm.19\(2\).2021.10](http://dx.doi.org/10.21511/ppm.19(2).2021.10)
23. Mayer, R.C.; Davis, J.H.; Schoorman, F.D. An integrative model of organizational trust. *Acad. Manag. Rev.* **1995**, *20*(3), 709–734. <https://doi.org/10.2307/258792>
24. Vanhala, M.; Heilmann, P.; Salminen, H. Organizational trust dimensions as antecedents of organizational commitment. *Knowl. Process Manag.* **2016**, *23*(1), 46–61. <https://doi.org/10.1002/kpm.1497>
25. Fulmer, C.A.; Gelfand, M.J. At what level (and in whom) we trust: Trust across multiple organizational levels. *J. Manag.* **2012**, *38*(4), 1167–1230. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206312439327>
26. Haynes, S.H.; Leone, M.C.; Keena, L.D.; May, D.C.; Ricciardelli, R.; Lambert, E.G. The association between different forms of organizational trust and correctional staff job stress. *J. Crime Justice* **2020**, *43*(5), 623–639. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0735648X.2020.1734056>
27. Colquitt, J.A.; Scott, B.A.; LePine, J.A. Trust, trustworthiness, and trust propensity: A meta-analytic test of their unique relationships with risk taking and job performance. *J. Appl. Psychol.* **2007**, *92*(4), 909–927. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.92.4.909>
28. Chughtai, A.; Byrne, M.; Flood, B. Linking ethical leadership to employee well-being: The role of trust in supervisor. *J. Bus. Ethics* **2015**, *128*(3), 653–663. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-014-2126-7>
29. Helliwell, J.F.; Huang, H. Well-being and trust in the workplace. *J. Happiness Stud.* **2011**, *12*(5), 747–767. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10902-010-9225-7>
30. Hendriks, M.; Burger, M.; Rijsenbilt, A.; Pleeging, E.; Commandeur, H. Virtuous leadership: a source of employee well-being and trust. *Manag. Res. Rev.* **2020**, *43*(8), 951–970. <https://doi.org/10.1108/MRR-07-2019-0326>
31. Richter, A.; Näswall, K. Job insecurity and trust: Uncovering a mechanism linking job insecurity to well-being. *Work Stress* **2019**, *33*(1), 22–40. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02678373.2018.1461709>
32. Rajput, N.; Talan, A. Interpersonal trust as the mediator of workplace diversity and well-being of employees. *Indian Journal of Health & Wellbeing* **2017**, *8*(7), 668–673.
33. Vieira, P.D.S.; Dias, M.D.O.; Lopes, R.D.O.A.; Cardoso, J. Literature Review on Trust, Psychological Well-Being, and Leadership Applied to the Workplace Commitment. *Br. J. Psychol.* **2021**, *9*(2), 20–37.
34. Jovanović, V. Trust and subjective well-being: The case of Serbia. *Pers. Individ. Differ.* **2016**, *98*, 284–2880. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2016.04.061>
35. Wnuk, M. Skala Zaufania do Przełożonego jako narzędzie do mierzenia zaufania do menedżerów [The Superior Trust Scale as a tool for measuring trust in managers]. *Humaniora. Czasopismo Internetowe* **2020**, *31*(3), 97–115.
36. McAllister, D.J. Affect-and cognition-based trust as foundations for interpersonal cooperation in organizations. *Acad. Manag. J.* **1995**, *38*, 1, 24–59. <https://doi.org/10.5465/256727>
37. Chudzicka-Czupała, A.; Grabowski, D.; Czerw, A.; Stasiła-Sieradzka, M. Assessment of worklife areas, trust in supervisor and interpersonal trust as conditions of severity of stress at work. *Int. J. Occup. Med. Environ. Health* **2022**, *35*(6), 719–730. <https://doi.org/10.13075/ijomeh.1896.01990>
38. Johnson, R.; Wichern, D. *Applied Multivariate Statistical Analysis*. Pearson Prentice Hall, 2007.

39. Qin, Y.S.; Men, L.R. Exploring the Impact of Internal Communication on Employee Psychological Well-Being during the COVID-19 Pandemic: The Mediating Role of Employee Organizational Trust. *Int. J. Bus. Commun.* **2022**, *0*(0). <https://doi.org/10.1177/23294884221081838>
40. Huang, N.; Qiu, S.; Yang, S.; Deng, R. Ethical Leadership and Organizational Citizenship Behavior: Mediation of Trust and Psychological Well-Being. *Psychol. Res. Behav. Manag.* **2021**, *14*, 655–664. <https://doi.org/10.2147/PRBM.S311856>
41. Faragher E.B.; Cass M.; Cooper C.L. The Relationship between Job Satisfaction and Health: A Meta-Analysis. In *From Stress to Wellbeing Volume*; Cooper C.L. Eds.; Palgrave Macmillan, 2013; pp. 254–271. https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137310651_12
42. Paine, K.D. Guidelines for measuring trust in organizations, 2003. Retrieved from https://www.instituteforpr.org/wp-content/uploads/2003_MeasuringTrust.pdf
43. Ortiz-Ospina, E.; Roser, M. Trust. Published online at OurWorldInData.org, 2016. Retrieved from: <https://ourworldindata.org/trust>

Disclaimer/Publisher's Note: The statements, opinions and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of MDPI and/or the editor(s). MDPI and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions or products referred to in the content.