

BUILDING INTRA-ORGANIZATIONAL TRUST

Abstract

In the era of globalization, state and public organizations must be effective. One of the conditions of this effectiveness is the creation of intra-organizational trust. The author identifies factors, that affect this trust, and formulates a definition of public trust and intra-organizational trust. It was stated among others, that public trust to the organization can be reduced due to lower level of intra-organization trust. It was also stated, that staff willingness to remain in the organization does not depend only on job satisfaction. A lack of willingness to sharing by employees the knowledge and skills with others can be considered as an indicator of the level of intra-organizational trust. A high staff fluctuation can be considered as an indicator of a lack of trust in the organization.

Key words: public organization, trust, public management

Introduction

A competent public administration can add additional value to society. This issue is particularly important in the era of globalization, when governments are looking for cost savings and efficiency in the operation of public institutions. On the contrary, delivery of public services below the quality expected by society and incorrect performance of duties by employees of public organizations leads to disappointment, public dissatisfaction and reduces the level of public trust in the public organizations and the macrostructure – the State.

Taking into consideration that conditions inside an organization can affect the level of public trust to the organization, it is necessary to achieve this trust. The objective of this paper is to identify factors that affect intra-organizational trust. The objective of this paper also aims to systematize the conceptual apparatus related to trust.

The choice of the research topic is a result of the assessment of the social, political, and economic effects caused by lack of intra-organizational trust. Author formulates the definition of public trust. It is worth mentioning, however, that the term – public trust was presented first time in Poland by Kożuch [Kożuch,

Dobrowolski, 2014]. The article was prepared on the basis of the author's own research (observation of 30 public organizations carried out during last five years, analysis of documentation from the organizations mentioned above, interviews with employees from these organizations), the results of previous studies carried out by the author, as well as studies of literature on the matter.

The Concept of Trust

The meaning of trust has been presented by many researchers, as well as its typology, and definitions. Taking into account this fact, the discussion about the definition of trust is limited to the extent, which is necessary to discuss the intra-organizational trust. In a social context, trust has several connotations. Definitions of trust typically refer to a situation characterised by the reaction between the two entities. A trustor is willing to rely on the actions of another party (trustee); the situation is directed to the future and can be based on past experience or without such experience. The trustor cannot fully predict what action will be taken by another. It generates the risk of failure to the trustor [Mayer Davis, Schoorman, 1995; McKnight, Chervany, 1996].

The concept of trust is multifaceted. Trust can be defined from the point of view of sociology, psychology, philosophy, and also from the perspective of economics. From this perspective, it reduces the cost of transactions between parties and facilitates the cooperation. Trust from the perspective of management studies is defined such as an element of social capital, as noted by Putnam; a strategic resource of organization, as noted by Collis and Montgomery. In the opinion of McAllister, trust is the level to which a person is confident and wants to act. Trust is an expectation, as noted by Fukuyama, on the part of the environment for fair, reciprocal, repetitive behaviour, based on commonly adopted standards, which are used by individual [Grudzewski Hejduk, Sankowska, Wańtuchowicz, 2007: 33]. Sztompka in the definition of trust highlights two elements: belief and their expression in practice. Trust is considered as undertaken bet on uncertain future actions of other people [Sztompka, 2007: 69–70].

Trust gives meaning to human activities and causes that employees can better collaborate effectively (Putnam, Prusak, Cohen), reduces transaction costs (Handy), motivates the decision (McAllister), promotes the exchange of information (Earley) encourages, as noted by Dasgupta, to participate in the transaction. Trust is a central component in effective working relationships. Trust is at the heart of all transactions and by a function which is fully considered as capital. It is a unique asset, which is not traded, and it takes time to establish, as opposed to financial capital, which is commercially available and has a value expressed in money. While financial capital is defined as the critical factor without which production would be impossible, whereas capital trust enables collaboration, decision making, creates an atmosphere of openness, transparency, improves communication, motivates and connects people. This makes trust a source of sustain-

able competitive advantage [Grudzewski Hejduk, Sankowska, Wańtuchowicz, 2007: 29, 31, 49].

Fukuyama points to the relationship between the level of trust and the economic and social results. Countries with a low level of trust are achieving lower economic results than the countries with high confidence. Knack and Keefer demonstrated empirically the Fukuyama's hypothesis on the basis of the index of trust derived from the World Values Survey and showed a strong correlation between the attitude of trust in society and its economic growth [Grudzewski, Hejduk, Sankowska, Wańtuchowicz, 2007: 29].

In taken conceptualization of the concept of trust, taking into account the impact of trust on the relationship between people, trust can be defined, from a point of view of management science, as the willingness of stakeholders to work together. This definition also fits to the term – public trust, which is discussed below.

Definitions of trust (presented above) are shown in the table below:

Table 1

Definition of trust	
Author	Definition
Putnam	An element of social capital
Collis, Montgomery	A strategic resource of organization
McAllister	The level to which a person is confident and want to act
Fuluyama	An expectation that behaviour will be fair, reciprocal, and repetitive
Sztompka	As undertaken bet on uncertain future actions of other people
Dobrowolski	as the willingness of stakeholders to work together

Source: based on the list of literature presented in the article.

A definition of public trust is well known and can be found in dictionaries. Public trust is considered as a phenomenon and a condition necessary to promote public welfare and not for the benefit of one or more individuals¹. Public trust in business is the degree to which the public believes that business will act in a particular manner because the business has included the public's interest into its own. Public interest can be defined as the collective well-being of people, which create the community. It is a critical ingredient for social cooperation and market efficiency and a cause for deep concern when it is absent or threatened².

¹ <http://www.businessdictionary.com/definition/public-trust.html#ixzz2dQuYviTJ> [access: 29.10.2013].

² <http://lexicon.ft.com/term?term=public-trust-in-business> [access: 29.10.2013].

It is belief, that assets and income will benefit the general public or a large group of the general public³. American Public Trust Doctrine refers to a common law doctrine creating the legal right of the public to use certain lands and waters⁴. Taking into account the definition presented above, public trust can be considered, as the degree to which the public believes that decision-makers will act in a such manner, which enables the best realization of public interest. Public trust from the point of view of law doctrine refers to belief, that legal norms are established to achieve the public interest, and that, they facilitate the predictive of the individual's behaviour, by determining, which activities are illegal. Public trust is confidence in the honesty or integrity of a public officer, and public organization.

It seems, that the universal definition of public trust can be formulated in this way. Public trust is the willingness of stakeholders to work together. The intra-organizational trust can be defined, as a network of behaviour, competences and goodwill of employees and their superiors, who mutually complement each other to achieve their organizational objectives.

It is worth mentioning, that trust in government has been based in fiduciary relationships. Thomas has noted, that the fiduciary trust is based on well know principal-agent relationships, which are asymmetrical. In such relationship the agent is morally obligated to act in the best interest of the principal. Realization of the public interest by public servants creates some requirements. They must guide their actions by the moral norms of justice and beneficence. The term “beneficence” should be considered as an act of doing good, and it requires a standard by which the goodness of an act can be judged. Parallel to fiduciary trust the mutual trust may be discussed. Mutual trust is between individuals and creates the basis for interpersonal relationship. Both of two types of trust, mentioned above, create social trust – the glue holding the society together [Feldheim, Wang, 2003: 64].

Building Intra-organizational Trust

In order to achieve the target of increasing trust in government, the government should think and act like a private organization and treat the general public as its customers. This concept is not new. Although it was formulated decades ago, it still has proponents. A private business will not survive if customers are not willing to buy and use its products. The business has to earn customer trust. Trust in government works the same way [Hamid, 2007: 124]. It should be noted, however, that the glorification of the private sector, without further justification, may not be fully correct. In the private sector, profit is the driving force. Buying goods or services of a particular manufacturer may be the result of confidence in its products. However, buying goods or services can also be the result of chance, lower prices, or the result of an advertising campaign. Therefore, there are too

³ <http://thelawdictionary.org/charitable-trust/> [access: 29.10.2013].

⁴ <http://definitions.uslegal.com/p/public-trust-doctrine/> [access: 29.10.2013].

many variables to compare the private sector with the public sector in an easy way, as mentioned above.

As mentioned in the introduction of this article, a competent public administration can add additional value to society. On the contrary, delivery of public services below the quality expected by the society and incorrect performance of duties by employees of public organizations leads to public dissatisfaction and reduces the level of public trust in the public organizations and the macro-structure – the State. This fact is noticed, among others, by Nye, Zelikow, King, Vigoda-Gadot, Yuval [Hamid, 2007: 124; Nye, Zelikow, King, 1997]. Taking into account this fact, the summarization may be formulated, that conditions inside an organization – including its culture – can affect the level of trust in the public organization.

While the concept of culture can be considered in an anthropological sense, in an organizational sense, culture can be viewed as the assimilation or development of normative values manifested in the behaviour of people. In the normative and axiological sense, culture is the sum total of norms, rules and values from human activities. Culture can be considered as artefacts. Sikorski noted that organizational culture should be considered as internalized norms and value systems that have become drivers of certain behaviours. Organizational culture is a social category. This means that the behaviour of people in organizations is subject to certain common patterns and models. Zieleniewski states that organizational culture should be measured as the degree to which a hierarchy of objectives is reflected in consciousness and operation of elements of the organization. Pietkiewicz states that organizational culture is reflected by the organizational climate, the way of management, the system of incentives, and interpersonal relationships. In addition, according to Bratnicki, Kryś and Stachowicz, organizational culture includes patterns of categorizing of reality, schematics of decision, and procedures of ignoring or interpreting anomalies, which may affect the reference system. Dobrowolski has noted that one can conceptualize, the organizational culture as a set of standards and values that stimulate and regulate the behaviour of members of the organization, relevant for the specific goals [Dobrowolski, 2008: 167–168].

Organizational culture:

- 1) allows participants to understand the mission and strategy of the organization;
- 2) enables integration of participants and agreement as to how and with what resources the organization can and should work;
- 3) provides participants with uniform measurement methods and criteria for assessing the implementation of the objectives;
- 4) allows the organizations to change and helps determine how to improve the organization [Czermiński, Czerska, Nogalski, Rutka, Apanowicz, 2001: 585–608, Dobrowolski, 2008: 168].

An organization's culture will affect the attitudes and behaviours of individuals in the public service. In organizations where the culture promotes trust, employees

are more likely to perform better. In contrast, in organizations where the culture promotes suspicion, threat and fear, employees focus mainly on protecting themselves [Dobrowolski, 2009: 103–116]. A positive work culture that is supportive of employee needs would lead to an increase in job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Furthermore, employees being engaged in their tasks will better provide service to public customers. Clearly an organization's culture can affect the level of public trust to the public organizations. Lack of trust in relations between people formalizes the communication process. People are becoming wary and they base their relationships using specific formal procedures. The scientists (Hosmer, Burke, Black) have underlined, that public trust is influenced by behaviours that display integrity, openness, loyalty, competency and consistency in administration. These determinants exist both in relation between entities and are necessary in internal communication [Feldheim, Wang, 2004].

There can be an interaction between public organizations and public trust. For example, when public trust is high and there is high level of customer satisfaction with service quality, the satisfaction of public employees involved in realization of their duties will also be high, which in turn has a positive influence on culture. Moreover, satisfaction of public consumers and public employees as well as satisfaction with the policies and procedures attached to the services plays a role in increasing trust to public organizations and macrostructure – the State overall [Hamid, 2007: 126].

From the perspective of consumers of public services, it is important not only how the public service is provided, but also the public perception of the organization by customers and by the employees of these organizations. If these organizations are properly managed, this can be a tangible example that public funds derived from taxes are not wasted. Summarising, the proper management of human resources in public organizations is essential to the creation of public trust. As discussed earlier, a theoretical generalization can be formulated, and this increase in the quality of services provided by public organizations leads to an increase in public trust.

There are many factors that can affect the quality of service of public administration organizations including the knowledge and professionalism of staff. Building and maintaining a knowledgeable and professional staff can be achieved through good person-job fit (PJ), as well as person-organization (PO) fit. Good PJ and PO fit can also help in increasing the overall knowledge base of the organization through better knowledge management. To sum up, the right people need to be hired for certain public duties. This is a change from the traditional KSA (knowledge, skills and ability) approach that organizations have relied on to a focus on selecting employees whose work values are compatible with the organization's values. Researchers: Kristof, Sekiguchi note, that PJ fit can be considered as the compatibility between a person's characteristics and that of the job that is performed at work, while PO fit is the compatibility between the person and the entire organization, whereby one entity will provide what the other needs or at least share similar fundamental characteristics. Westerman, Vanka note, that PO fit is based on the assumption that the attitudes and behaviours

and other individual outcomes result from the relationship between the person and the work environment. The compatibility of the person to the job, organization or the environment is important in making the employee feel comfortable in the workplace, and at the same time encouraging the employee to be willing to contribute and be committed to the organization, including knowledge sharing. Finally, Hamid quotes the views Werbel and DeMarie that a good PJ and PO fit emphasizes the importance of compatibility between the employee and work, as well as creating an organizational identity through the formalization of values that exist in the organization's culture. Hamid aptly notes that ensuring that there is a match between personal and organizational value is important in obtaining and retaining appropriate staff for public tasks [Hamid, 2007: 127; Werbel, DeMarie, 2005: 247–262; Westerman, Wanka, 2005: 409–420, Sekiguchi, 2007: 181–131]. It should, however, add to the above argument, that organization-person fit (OP) is also important. The organization must meet the needs of employees. The declared objectives of the organization must be consistent with the objectives in practice. For example, in the field of professional development. It is worth mentioning in particular about vertical promotion. Is there a possibility of obtaining a higher position, or is there a “glass ceiling” in the organization that in practice prevents some employees from being promoted above a certain level?

The literature suggests that the annual assessment is a tool for motivation of employees. Czerska points out, that such performance assessment encourages employees to improve their work, shapes appropriate relationships, and discourages an atmosphere of envy. However, the author of this article, being not only a theorist, but also “being inside” public administration for more than 21 years, cannot share such a view. The statement formulated by Czerska would be correct if the annual assessment were reliable, based on evidence, and if it were not influenced by mutual sympathies and antipathies.

An employee's assessment is often not based on objective criteria. Of course, an assessment will never be completely objective, but the information that I obtained using interviews, as well as numerous observations carried out in public organizations, showed that quite often a manager's antipathy or sympathy to an employee influences their assessment. In addition, often an assessment is influenced by the extent to which a manager views the employee as a “threat in the future” – as a potential competitor. Assessments should be made in writing by the person current supervising the employee's performance of assigned tasks. Evaluators should demonstrate the ability to formulate a precise justification of the evaluation, and to communicate that justification clearly, by using the principle of feedback. The employee should be entitled to provide written statements to be included in the assessment [Dobrowolski, 2008: 187]. Employees in some public organizations may appeal only to negative appraisals. This means that in situations where the assessment is lower than good or very good, but higher than a negative rating, the employee cannot appeal the annual assessment. This can create a situation where employees who received assessments lower than very good, or good, but higher than negative, may be at a disadvantage when applying for a higher position in the organization. This may occur when the appraisal result-

ing from the annual assessment is strongly considered by the selection board and on the basis of this appraisal, candidates for senior positions are chosen. The use of this approach is unfair, in that it can eliminate all competitors of the current managers from the competition. As a result, an employee trust in organizations decreased more than about two-thirds. However, more research on this issue is needed, the research above was based only on 12 randomly selected employees in one public organization and 20 employees from a second public organization.

The promotion of employees based on a fair and transparent promotion process can be an important motivational tool in that it helps to : 1) meet the need for recognition; 2) increase the initiative and the desire of employees to improve their skills; 3) enhance the motivation of other employees and create a pro-effective culture of the organization.

The promotion of employees carried out in an irregular manner, on the basis of “shadow” agreements and informal networks, can negatively affect the attitude of the staff. It can deter other employees from taking initiative, create the feeling, that a “culture of the glass ceiling” exists, and that everything can be achieved through having the right connections – “it’s not what you know but who you know that matters.” In such situations employees can lose interest in building an effective team.

Researchers have identified various ways or criteria used in promotion processes to make selections including “career planning”, “searching for pearls”, and “the invisible hand”. Dobrowolski has identified other criteria or approaches that can be used [Dobrowolski, 2008: 191–192]:

- “Place of residence” – in organizations , that have headquarters and field units, a basic criterion for promotion is “place of residence” of the candidate for higher position. For example, a person from a smaller town will not be a candidate for a managerial position in an institution located in Warsaw, Berlin, London, due to the prosaic reason – an unregulated housing situation and the lack of funds to buy a home. Additional and relatively small in the case of public organizations, a salary increase resulting from the post of executive will not compensate for the increased cost of living in a big city. Persons living in the city where headquarters is located or close to this city will apply for position.
- “Mediocre but loyal” – is based on the assumption, that it is better to promote staff with an education that does not allow him/her to find another job with such a high salary. The promotion of such an individual is viewed as not causing any problems for senior management. At the same time, such a person is not a threat to his/her senior managers in this sense, that he/she may pose a threat in the future, and may achieve a better position. Such a person carries out all decisions without any objection.
- “Game of chess” – a policy of promoting employees to management positions who already are in management positions, has some advantages. These people are already familiar with the requirements relating to the duties of the executive and have had some experience that increases the probability of success in completing the tasks in the new post. Such a policy

can be conducive to stimulating loyalty. However there are drawbacks. It can limit the number of candidates from which an organization can choose. This can reduce the chance that the organization acquires new staff, which maybe be more valuable for the organization. In this “chessboard”, those who are on the board remain on it, but in different positions. This can discourage other employees from developing their skills and may lead to the loss of the most talented who have more professional aspirations than their colleagues – “regular” employees. This situation is particularly dangerous. It can create a “glass ceiling” effect. In theory, each employee can be promoted to higher positions within the organization, if he/she meets certain requirements, which in turn creates a culture of “hypocrisy”. It lowers the level of intra-organizational trust. Because staff do not live in a vacuum but operate in an environment, reduction of intra-organizational trust can reduce external trust to the organization.

- “According to the key” – is a situation in which promotion decisions are based on the support of the wishes of politicians rather than on the actual skills of candidates.

Employee job dissatisfaction can affect the entire organization even if it is felt by a particular employee. A dissatisfied individual employee may question the goals of the organization, undermine the legitimacy of managerial decisions and negatively influence other employees. Steinmann and Schreyogg underlined the following consequences of satisfaction and dissatisfaction with the work: 1) An increase in the level of dissatisfaction increases the level of staff fluctuation; 2) The higher job satisfaction, the lower the level of absenteeism (2–3 days); 3) Staff more satisfied with their job carry out their duties more accurately and with greater attention; 4) Job satisfaction affects life satisfaction; 5) With increasing the level of annoyance, the level of aggression and alienation increase [Steinmann, Schreyogg, 1995: 254–255, 420–423].

It has been suggested, by Wheeler, Buckley, Halbesleben, Brouer, Ferris, that if job satisfaction increases, the intention to leave the organization decreases, which means that if the government employees are happy with the workplace, they will continue to stay within the organization rather than look for employment elsewhere [Hamid, 2007: 128]. However, this view is subject to question and it may be a bit too optimistic. Taking into account results of observation of public organization and interviews with employees (carried out by author of this article), it is worth underlined, that staff willingness to remain in the organization does not necessarily mean that they are satisfied with their work and/or the organization in which they are employed. Some employees remain in the organization because they cannot find an equally well-paid job or other work at all. While this study included a small population – employees from small towns – and the study was carried out when the unemployment rate was quite high, it does raise the point that there are too many variables that can affect employee turn-over and more research is needed.

Based on previous arguments, the generalization can be formulated that in the absence of the threat of unemployment, or if such threat is low, there is a cor-

relation between the stability of employment in the organization and the level of job satisfaction, as staff gladly remain in the workplace when they feel job satisfaction.

The issue of lack of PO, OP fit can be viewed only through the prism of the public organization. This issue can also be considered more broadly. The employees of the public organizations are involved in various training courses financed by public funds for the purpose of acquiring knowledge and skills. As correctly observed by Harman, the knowledge and skills resulting from such training does not just belong to the individual, or to the organization that pays their wages, but to society as well – as it is society that has invested in the training infrastructure. It has provided the education and development of the individual and the framework within which both the individual and the organization exist and operate. Incorporating the idea of the social ownership of knowledge and in knowledge transfer becomes particularly relevant when considering the legitimacy of transferring knowledge of employees between nations [Harman, 2007: 120]. Loss of staff due to errors in the recruitment and selection of the wrong person or because the organization did not fulfil employee expectations, is a waste. Emigration of educated citizens to another country is an economic loss. It can be viewed as an indicator of a lack of trust in the state and the government. In the micro scale, high staff fluctuation is an indicator of a lack of trust to the organization. Further studies are needed to determine the relationship between the level of employee turnover growth and a reduction in the level of trust in the organization. The costs of improper management in micro and macro scale is borne by society.

Hamid aptly notes and cites the views of other researchers (Mavin, Bryans; Van den Hoof, De Ridder), that one of the main assets of an organization is the knowledge and skills of the employees and it is important not only that the employees are willing to stay within the organization so that the knowledge and skills are retained, but that the employees want to share the knowledge and skills with others. Much of an individual's knowledge and skills have their own value, and it is this which makes each employee unique and valuable to organizations and society as a whole [Syed-Ikhsan, Rowland, 2004]. Decision-makers are increasingly recognizing that the emergence of knowledge-based economies has profound implications for the determinants of growth. It has an influence on the level of employment. In today's competitive world, macrostructures and public organizations have to constantly acquire new investments to replenish capabilities of their state and local economies. They have to fulfil social expectations stemming from electoral promises. Simultaneously, a knowledge-based economy creates some implications for public organizations. Better educated citizens expect more from decision-makers. Organizations expect that employees will share their knowledge with others for the common benefit [Hamid, 2007: 131].

Analysis of responses by employees showed that, employees may not want to share knowledge due to fear that after finishing sharing the knowledge with others, they will not be important to the organization and they will be easily replaced by other employees. Although the interviews (carried out by author of this article) took place with a small number of employees from different public organiza-

tions, and they should be continued on a broader scale, it can be generalized that the level of readiness in sharing knowledge indicates the level of public trust. A lack of public trust decrease the readiness in sharing knowledge.

Building trust inside the organization requires creation of a system to combat ethical collapse in the public organization. This theoretical generalization concerns both PJ, OP and OP. The examination of 20 public organizations has shown that executives and employees in these public organizations are vulnerable to unethical behaviour. Among the determinants of ethical collapse, it can be distinguished among others fear and silence and lack of ethical climate in human resource management. The second determinant was discussed earlier, when irregularities in the annual assessment and promotions employees were presented. Studies have shown that trust among employees was lacking in 6 of the 20 organizations examined. Being aware of irregularities in the organization's activity they keep information about wrongdoing and even fraudulent activity to themselves. They did not use the whistleblowing system because they were afraid of possible connection between their superiors and local government executives. Fear prevented employees from notifying law enforcement institutions. Lack of trust in the organization caused a dichotomy. On the one hand, the employees knew that the actions of their managers were illegal. On the other hand, they did not take any action to prevent it. The critical point in one of organizations that caused that employees decided to prevent these irregularities was the different treatment of employees by their manager during the lunch break. Taking the fear factor and silence into consideration the question might be formulated. What was the reason of changing employees' behaviour? Jealousy or real desire to work for ethical organization? Regardless of the answer, a culture of fear and silence prevented employees for expressing their concerns. A lower trust climate was associated with a greater number of questionable documents, missing or altered documentation, fraudulent activities. The low intra-organizational trust created a spiral of errors and irregularities. The result of such situations are usually the same. In the end, the scale of irregularities was so large that was it was discovered by law enforcement institutions. The perpetrator who took the opportunity to commit wrongdoing or even crime was identified, but the damage to the reputation of public organization was considerable [Dobrowolski, 2009: 103–114].

The system of tackling ethical collapse in public organization requires that policies and procedures are implemented inside the organization to ensure:

- ethical behaviour by organization's leadership;
- fair treatment of employees;
- employees' ability to report wrongdoing are;
- unacceptable behaviour and their outcomes are not tolerated, and
- ethical behaviour is a major factor considered in recruitment, assessment, and the promotion process.

Summary

The author's definition of intra-organizational trust was formulated in this article. It is a network of behaviour, competences and goodwill of employees and their superiors, who mutually complement one and other to realize the organizational objectives. The intra-organizational trust is necessary to create public trust in the organization. This generalization fits to different organizations, including public organization.

In the given conceptualization of the concept of public trust, public trust can be defined, from the point of view of the management science, as the willingness of stakeholders to work together. Public trust can be also defined from the point of view of law doctrine, as a belief, that legal norms are established to achieve and maintain the public interest, and that they facilitate the predictive the individual's behaviour, by determining, which activities are illegal.

The article assumes that, satisfaction of the consumers of public services, public employees, as well as satisfaction with the policies and procedures attached to the services plays a key role in increasing trust in public organizations and macrostructure – the State. It is therefore, that from the perspective of consumers of public services it is important not only how the public service is provided, but also the public perception of the organization by customers and by the employees of these organizations.

There are many factors that can affect the quality of service of public organizations. One of them is professional staff. Building and maintaining a knowledgeable and professional staff can be achieved through good person-job fit (PJ), as well as person-organization (PO) fit. However, organization-person fit (OP) is also important. The organization must meet the needs of employees, and building trust inside the organization requires the creation of a system to combat ethical collapse in the public organization.

One of the important tool for motivation of employees and a tool, which may be used to obtain PJ and PO fit is the annual assessment of employees. However, it has to be reliable, based on evidence, and based on the principle of feedback. If this tool is not used properly, it creates a culture of suspicion, threat and fear, where employees focus mainly on protecting themselves. It can affect the level of public trust to the public organization.

Inappropriate promotion processes can create a “glass ceiling” effect and culture of “hypocrisy”. It lowers the level of intra-organizational trust. Therefore it is necessary to ensure, that promotion process is transparent, accountable and reliable. The criteria must be precisely defined.

It was stated, that a lack of willingness to share by employees the knowledge and skills with others can be considered as an indicator of the level of intra-organizational trust. Finally, it was stated, that high staff fluctuation can be considered as an indicator of a lack of trust in the organization, as well as, in macro scale, the emigration of educated citizens to another country can be viewed as an indicator of a lack of trust in the state and the government.

These considerations are not an attempt to formulate a new paradigm. The aim of the author is an indication of the conditions which must be met in order to create trust in the public organization, and an indication of the situations that may show a reduction in the level of intra-organizational trust.

Bibliography

- Czermiński A., Czerska M., Nogalski B., Rutka R., Apanowicz J. (2001), *Zarządzanie organizacjami*, Dom Organizatora, Toruń.
- Dobrowolski Z. (2008), *Organizacja i zarządzanie. Zarys problematyki i metod*, PWSZ, Sulechów.
- Dobrowolski Z. (2009), *Bridging Ethical Collapse in Public Organizations* [in:] Z. Dobrowolski, G. Drozdowski (eds.), *The Art of Human Resource Management. How to Achieve Better Business Management*, PWSZ, Gorzów Wielkopolski.
- Feldheim M.A., Wang X. (2003), *Ethics and Public Trust. Results from a National Survey*, "Public Integrity", vol. 6(1).
- Grudzewski W.M., Hejduk I.K., Sankowska A., Wańtuchowicz M. (2007), *Zarządzanie zaufaniem w organizacjach wirtualnych*, Difin, Warszawa.
- Hamid Z.A. (2007), *Managing Knowledge through Employee Fit for Trust in Government* [in:] *Managing Trust in Government*, United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs, New York.
- Harman Ch. (2007), *Managing Human Resources in the Knowledge Economy* [in:] *Managing Knowledge to Build Trust in Government*, United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs, New York.
- Kożuch B., Dobrowolski Z. (2014), *Creating Public Trust. An Organisational Perspective*, Peter Lang GmbH, Frankfurt am Main.
- Mayer R.C., Davis J.H., Schoorman F.D. (1995), *An Integrative Model of Organizational Trust*, „Academy of Management Review”, vol. 20(3).
- McKnight D.H., Chervany N.L. (1996), *The Meanings of Trust. Scientific report*, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis.
- Nye J.S., Zelikow P.D., King D.C. (1997), *Why People Don't Trust Government*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge.
- Sekiguchi T. (2007), *A Contingency Perspective of the Importance of PJ Fit and PO Fit in Employee Selection*, „Journal of Managerial Psychology”, vol. 22(2).
- Steinmann H., Schreyogg G. (1995), *Zarządzanie. Podstawy kierowania przedsiębiorstwem*, Oficyna Wydawnicza Politechniki Wrocławskiej, Wrocław.
- Syed-Ikhsan S.O., Rowland F. (2004), *Knowledge Management in a Public Organization: A Study on Relationship between Organizational Elements and the Performance of Knowledge Transfer*, „Journal of Knowledge Management”, vol. 8(2).
- Sztompka P. (2007), *Zaufanie. Fundament społeczeństwa*, Wydawnictwo Znak, Kraków.
- Werbil J.D., DeMarie S.M. (2005), *Aligning Strategic Human Resource Management and Person Environment Fit*, „Human Resource Management Review”, vol. 15(2).
- Westerman J.W., Vanka S. (2005), *A Cross-cultural Empirical Analysis of Person-organization Fit Measures as Predictors of Student Performance in Business Education: Comparing Students in United States and India*, „Academy of Management Learning and Education”, vol. 4(4).

<http://definitions.uslegal.com/p/public-trust-doctrine/> [access: 29.10.2013].

<http://lexicon.ft.com/term?term=public-trust-in-business> [access: 29.10.2013].

<http://thelawdictionary.org/charitable-trust/> [access: 29.10.2013].

<http://www.businessdictionary.com/definition/public-trust.html#ixzz2dQuYviTJ> [access: 29.10.2013].

