Exploring correspondence between social culture, and employees' subjective well-being: A mystery revealed!

Mohammed Khalis ^(a) Hind Hourmatallah ^(b)

^(a,b) Cadi Ayyad University, Marrakech, Morocco

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 06 October 2021

Received in rev. form 27 Oct. 2021

Accepted 30 Oct 2021

Keywords:

Well-being; social culture; Cognitive experience; Emotional experience

JEL Classification:
O15, P36

ABSTRACT

Wondering about, «what does 'A happy workplace' mean? », has always been a rhetorical question. Be that as it may, this study examined the underlying implicit correspondence between social culture and employee subjective well-being. Previous research studying well-being predictors and constraints has failed to propose a precise model that exposes the different determinants of employee subjective well-being. To address this gap, this paper considers cultural dimensions, as subjective well-being predictors, and it considers individuals' emotional and cognitive experiences, as mediating factors. Online surveys were administered to 500 participants, and the structural equation model (SEM) was used to analyze the data. The astonishing results have revealed that people operating in organizations with higher power distance are less likely to have well-being, on the other hand, employees at workplaces dominated by an Individualistic mindset are more prone to have a fulfilling work life.

© 2021 by the authors. Licensee SSBFNET, Istanbul, Turkey. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

Introduction

During the past years, the topic of employee subjective well-being has received increasing attention at macro, and micro levels (Andresen, Bradshaw, & Kosher, 2019; Rees & Dinisman, 2015). For occurrence in 1990, one hundred articles about SWB were enlisted within the Web of Science, and that volume has expanded to 410 in 1998. Afterward, by 2008, that number has tripled to 1240. Finally, since 2011, over 1500 studies on SWB have been published on different scientific databases. This incremental interest in workers' well-being is often viewed as a result of the expansion of the new paradigm "positive institutions" prefigured initially by (Seligman and Csikszentmihalyi's, 2014), following this perspective Schulte and Vainio, (2010) argued that the benefits of workers well-being, go far past the individual, and the organization itself. In their argument, they considered caring about employee well-being as a mechanism that helps the development of the individual and organizational efficiency and eventually contributes to the productivity of the country, thereby this cycle ends up influencing the well-being of the society as a whole.

Regardless of that huge effort made by numerous scholars, the lack of agreement over a unified theoretical conceptualization remains an impediment to the progress as well as the precision of well-being sciences. (Hone, Jarden, Schofield, & Duncan, 2014). Such gaps in points of view among experts have critical implications regarding identifying well-being predictors, alongside with specifying the possible measures that preserve employee well-being and increase it (Ben-Arieh, al., 2014; Casas et al, 2014). For instance, in various publications, factors like management styles, economic, social, and cultural beliefs have been addressed as potential predictors of employees' subjective well-being (Joshano et al., 2019). This appears to be true, but it is certainly inaccurate, because by following these perspectives, researchers have ignored the influence of individual cognitive and emotional experiences on their well-being, as well as the impact of the cultural context on their personal experiences (Kern et al., 2016).

This paper represents an attempt to examine the presupposed implicit relationship between cultural contexts and employee subjective well-being throughout, using employee emotional and cognitive experiences as mediating factors. Before exposing this relationship in detail, we will review the current literature on well-being by answering these questions: how "well-being" is best defined? How it

* Corresponding author. ORCID ID: 0000-0002-9564-2668

can be promoted? How can cultural differences impact it? And finally, the possible relationships between personal experiences and well-being?

Literature Review

Theoretical foundation and hypotheses building

Initially, organizational culture and employee well-being association remain an unexplored topic for several reasons: primarily the unavailability of unified definitions for both concepts (well-being, culture), moreover the lack of reliable measures and scales, finally the absence of a valid theoretical framework. To solve that issue and expose this ambivalent relationship, we have considered the work of the German scholar Geert Hofstede who referred to culture as a common collection of values, beliefs, or behaviors that distinguishes one society from another (Hofstede et al., 1991). Matusitz and Musambira, (2013) pointed out that culture is profoundly ingrained in the unconscious minds, which reflect that, those common values and beliefs are not always rational.

On the contrary, subjective well-being as a standalone topic has always been a central subject in psychological research, traditionally; several conceptualizations have been suggested (Bakker and Demerouti, 2008). Unfortunately, none of them appears to be sufficient (Diener, 1984), since all these traditional approaches have focused fundamentally on repairing what damages human well-being instead of what develops it. By adopting this paradigm at that time psychologists were qualified as pathologists (Martin Seligman, 2012), who seeks only to identify and cure mental illness and well-being diseases (Charzynska, 2014).

However, facing this critical situation we have adopted in our conceptual model a new well-being approach inspired from a newborn field called positive psychology, in opposition to traditional perspectives, positive psychology aims to bring out the best in people, it's about positive institutions, it's about quality of well-being not pathologies (Anic, 2013). Positive psychology considers human beings as complex creatures, which pursue the good life in various ways. Therefore, empirical and theoretical integration has become an obligation (Goetzel et al., 2014; Mattke et al., 2013). To achieve this integration, Martin and al, (2008) proposed a multidimensional theory of well-being regarded as PREMA. This novel frame of reference seeks to understand how different factors work together to give rise to the good life that all human beings supposedly seeks (Diener et al. 2010; Huppert and So 2013; Keyes 2007; Ryan and Deci 2001; Ryff 1989; Seligman 2012). The fundamental idea behind this theory is that most people around the world pursue the same factors because they found them naturally rewarding (i.e., intrinsically motivating); these factors are (Positive emotions, engagement, Positive relationships. Meaning and achievement).

More specifically, in our conceptual model *figure.1*. We have measured social culture using three of the Hofstede dimensions (Diversity acceptance, Power distance, Collectivism & Individualism), and employee well-being by using PREMA theory variables. Also, we have mediated this relationship by using employees cognitive and emotional experiences (P Lu, J Oh, KE Leahy, WJ Chopik, 2021).

The power distance concept was developed by Hofstede in his cultural dimension theory (Geert Hofstede, 1991). As mentioned by Chen and Starosta, (2005), the dimension of power distance dictates the degree to which culture adapts to the unequal distribution of power in relationships and organizations. This implies that workers within companies with high power distance are less likely to have positive emotional and cognitive experiences and by extension, they would be more prone to have less well-being compared to workers inside organizations with weak power distance (Weipeng Lin, Lei Wang 2013).

Figure 1: Conceptual Model

Additionally, this relationship between power distance and employee experience has been confirmed by (Kirkman, Chen, Farh, Chen, & Lowe, 2009) when they proved in a large sample study that power distance within organizations shapes workers cognitive interpretation process of events which subsequently determines their emotional state.

Hypothesis 1 (H1): *Weak power distance impact positively employees' cognitive experiences inside the organization.*

Hypothesis 2 (H2): *Weak power distance impact positively employees' emotional experiences inside the organization.*

Diversity acceptance and Individual experiences.

The second component of social culture in our conceptual model is diversity acceptance. This variable reflects differences in any characteristic(s) based on which organizational members differ or consider themselves to be different from others (Guillaume al.2014). Additionally, according to Shemla, (2016), diversity is divided into two categories: surface diversity, which refers to variation in readily identifiable demographic characteristics, such as gender or age. On the other hand, advanced diversity, which reflects differences in knowledge educational/functional experience, or organizational tenure, several scholars consider this type of diversity to be a highly important organizational setup (Pelled,1996, Webber 2001 , and Donahue 2001).

In addition, (Acar, 2010), (Harrison et al. 2002), and (Kundu,2002) all argued that interpretations of truth matter more than reality itself. Therefore, diversity is a deterministic factor of employees' cognitive experiences, since people react and respond to events following their background (ethnicity, education, and age). As a further matter beyond the cognitive outcomes of diversity, several authors have focused on the affective implications of it precisely regarding well-being (Warr and Inceoglu, 2012). They proclaimed that diversity had a direct effect on employee well-being (Graves and Elsass, 2007). They suggested that within a work environment where people surface and deep differences are taken into consideration, they tend to feel more positive emotions and have better relationships and overall satisfaction and vice-versa (Triana, al 2010).

Hypothesis 3 (H3): *Diversity acceptance influences positively employees' emotional experiences in the organization.*

Hypothesis 4 (H4): *Diversity acceptance influences positively employees' cognitive experiences in the organization.*

Individualism and Individual experiences

According to Judith A. Okely, al (2017) high level of well-being is strongly associated with the dimension of "individualism/collectivism." The reason behind this assumption is that within Individualist organizational environment, people tend to prioritize their interests, and positive emotions, as well as consider negative experiences to be harmful and undesirable (Wierzbicka, 1994). In contrast, collectivist work environments push people to worry more about others aspirations and needs, in consequences so much of that can sabotage and influence negatively their well-being (Matusitz and Musambira ,2013). Moreover, comparing Individualist and collectivist societies has revealed that employee's well-being in the first type of organizations is most strongly linked to self-esteem and a sense of personal accomplishment, whereas in the second type, well-being is most strongly related to interpersonal aspirations and the ability to escape social conflict (Uchida & Oishi, 2016).

Hypothesis 5 (H5): *Individualism impacts positively employees emotional experiences within the organization.*

Hypothesis 6 (H6): *Individualism impacts positively employees cognitive experiences within the organization.*

Lastly, as previously stated, the relationship between cultural dimensions and employee well-being is indirect; it is mediated by the workers cognitive and emotional experiences. (Van Knippenberg and Schippers, 2007; Milliken and Martins, 1996).

Hypothesis 7 (H7): *Emotional experiences mediate the relationship between cultural dimensions and Employees well-being.*

Hypothesis 8 (H8): *Cognitive experiences mediate the relationship between cultural dimensions and Employees well-being.*

Research and Methodology

Sample and data collection

The data for this study were gathered through an online survey administrated to active employees resident in the Casablanca region. The survey was carried out by sending an email to panels with a guide to help them participate in the study. Furthermore, respondents were selected based on three criteria: 1) activity: all participants are active in the private sector, 2) Gender: half of the populations are males and the other half are females, 3) location: all respondents located in Casablanca. As a result, 500 samples were obtained. The following are the distribution main characteristics: first, there was a close gender ratio between males (50%) and females (50%), and their ages ranged from 21 to 62. Moreover, the length of participant work experiences varied from a period of fewer than three years to more than 10 years.

In short, through this study, we intended to collect samples with a wide range of characteristics to have representative data (see Table1).

Table 1: Characteristics of the population.

	n (%)
Total	500 (100%)
Gender	
Male	250 (50%)
Female	250 (50%)
Age	
20-30	155 (31%)
30-50	200 (40%)
Above 50	155 (29%)
Length of experience	
Less than 3 years	225 (45%)
Between 3 -10 years	125 (25%)
Above 10 years	150 (30%)

Source: SPSS V15

Scale & Measurements

Survey questions were created and updated based on the available body of knowledge. Items were rated using a five-point Likert scale. Additionally, to get reliable responses, each participant was given the possibility to answer the questions anonymously, if he/she wanted to.

Practically, the well-being construct was measured using the five components of *Prema theory*: *positive emotion, engagement, meaning relationships accomplishment*. (Seligman, 2012). and Cultural dimensions concepts were rated using *autonomy, level of democracy, trust, collective activities and events, control, collective decisions, loyalty and conformity with social groups, inclusion, leadership, and acceptance* (see Appendix. A) (Markus Kemmelmeier, 2018). Finally, the individual experiences was measured employing *happiness, stress, conflict, perceived engagement, perceived democracy, and perceived connectivity* (Xuebing Dong 2017).

Analytic Procedure

The analysis was conducted under the following steps: Primarily we started with exploratory factor analysis (EFA) to evaluate the internal validity of measurements, followed by reliability analysis. Second, confirmatory factor analysis was performed. Finally, an SEM test was used to examine the established hypotheses (Bentler, 2003). Following Ulman, (2003) SEM theory, we have excluded categorical and control variables like gender and occupation from the model, we have focused only on continuous variables, since this selection provides advantages regarding confirming measurement and factor robustness, as well as it helps to describe complex connections between the factors (Ullman, 2003). Precisely, in this study, cultural dimensions such as individualism, power distance, diversity acceptance, was used as exogenous variables, while the individual emotional and cognitive experience were organized as a mediator, and employee well-being was considered an endogenous variable (see Figure 2).

Figure 2: Structural model exposition

Result and Discussion

Exploratory & reliability factor analysis.

The EFA and reliability analysis was used to verify the validity and reliability of the measurements (see Table 2). The EFA was analyzed using the principal axis factoring method (PAF) and varimax rotation. The sum of six variables formed the total of 20 items, with three exogenous variables, two mediators, and one endogenous variable. The factor loadings for each variable were greater than 0.5. Additionally, the Eigenvalues were greater than one, proving the measurement capacity to explain the factors to be appropriate. Also, scholars considered a 0.7 or higher as Cronbach's alpha value to be sufficient (Osborne, J. 2005) in this research, all of the variables intersected scored more than 0.7.

Table 2: Exploratory and reliability factor analysis (EFA).

Category	Measurements	FL	α	KMO	BS
Social Culture	Power Distance	Employee satisfaction with the level of autonomy	0.775	0.897	0.000.
		Employee satisfaction with the level of democracy	0.772		
		Employee satisfaction with the level of trust	0.767		
	Diversity Acceptance	Evaluating leadership style	0.656	0.815	
		Evaluating level of control	0.641		
	Individual Collectivism	Evaluating level of differences acceptance	0.751	0.801	
		Participation in collective events	0.854		
		Participating at collective decision making	0.658		
		The level of loyalty and conformity the each employee social group	0.548		
		Measuring the amount of happiness	0.895		
Employee Experience	Emotional Experience	Measuring the amount of work stress	0.871	0.799	
		Measuring conflicts intensity	0.817		
	Cognitive Experience	Appraise workers perceived engagement	0.781	0.854	
		Appraise workers perceived engagement	0.866		
		Appraise workers perceived democracy	0.722		
	PREMA THEORY	Quantifying the intensity of positive emotions	0.864	0.821	
		Quantifying the strength of relationships between employees	0.788		
		Quantifying the amount of meaning in employee daily activities	0.781		
		Quantifying degree of engagement	0.857		
	Employee Well being	Quantifying sense of Accomplishment	0.759		

Internal consistency and reliability

Cronbach alpha has confirmed the internal consistency of our data. However, we have calculated CR as well because some scholars suggested that it represents a greater measure of internal accuracy (Costello, A. 2005). All constructs composite reliability (CR) values were greater than 0.7 reflecting strong internal consistency of the overall data. Subsequently, two validity measures were used: *Convergent validity*, which reflects to which extent two constructs are related. And *discriminant validity*, which verifies whether variables are unrelated to each other. According to Hair and al. (2014). Convergent validity is respected when the values of the average variance extracted score are more than 0.50, $(AVE) \geq 0.50$. The AVE value for all variables in this analysis was between 0.534 to 0.763, indicating strong convergent validity, as shown in Table 3.

Confirmatory factor analysis & Hypotheses testing

Finally an SEM analysis was carried out in this study by creating a structural model to test the hypothesis. The model fit was determined before this particular analysis (see Table 4), the levels of all goodness fit indicators were found to be satisfactory.

Table 3: Constructs' reliability and convergent validity

Category	CR	AVE
Power Distance	0.932	0.621
Diversity Acceptance	0.884	0.598
Individual Collectivism	0.851	0.712
Emotional Experience	0.941	0.699
Cognitive Experience	0.887	0.775

Table 4: Model Goodness of fit

Indicators	Chisq/df	RMR	GFI	AGFI	NFI	RFI	IFI	TLI	CFI
Model fit	1.98	0.01	0.98	0.97	0.91	0.95	0.92	0.96	0.93
Criteria	<3	≤0.05	≥0.9	≥0.9	≥0.9	≥0.9	≥0.9	≥0.9	≥0.9

Note. Chisq/df (Chi Square/degrees of freedom); RMR (Root Mean square Residual); GFI (Goodness of Fit Index); AGFI (Adjusted Goodness of Fit Index); NFI (Normed Fit Index); RFI (Relative Fit Index); IFI (Incremental Fit Index); TLI (Tucker-Lewis Index); CFI (Comparative Fit Index)

Figure 2: Evaluating structural model; *Source: Amos, V25*

Hypotheses testing

The PLS-SEM method was used to test the proposed hypothesis. The blindfolding method was used to determine the values of Q2, these values should be greater than 0, according to Hair and al. 2014; Henseler and al. (2009). All the endogenous constructs of our model have scored a Q2 value greater than zero, reflecting strong model validity. In addition, as indicated in Table 5, the path coefficient, p-value, and t-statistics were utilized to accept or reject the hypothesis. A strong association between variables is indicated by path coefficient when its values across +1, and vice versa (Hair and al. 2016). The hypothesis validity was measured using p-values and t-statistics. The conceptual model in this study incorporates eight hypotheses. Table 5 summarizes the findings regarding hypothesis test.

H1: proposed that power distance has a negative effect on employees emotional experience, which was accepted ($\beta = -0.611$, $p < 0.006$, $t = 3.137$); H2 : suggested that power distance has a negative effect on employees cognitive experiences, which was accepted ($\beta = -0.501$, $p < 0.000$, $t = 5.655$); H3 : proposed that diversity acceptance has a positive impact on the employees emotional experiences, which was accepted ($\beta = 0.566$, $p < 0.111$, $t = 4.085$); H4: implied that diversity acceptance has a positive impact on employees cognitive experience, that was accepted ($\beta = 0.145$, $p < 0.000$, $t = 2.135$); H5 : advocated that Individualism has a positive impact on employees emotional experience, which was accepted ($\beta = 0.613$, $p < 0.000$, $t = 1.365$); H6 : indicated that Individualism has a positive impact on employees cognitive experiences, which was accepted ($\beta = 0.421$, $p < 0.000$, $t = 2.415$); H7 : proposed that emotional experiences intermediate the relationship between cultural dimensions and employees well-being, which was accepted ($\beta = 0.201$, $p < 0.000$, $t = 4.111$); finally H8 : suggested that cognitive experiences intermediate the relationship between cultural dimensions and employees well-being, which was accepted ($\beta = 0.577$, $p < 0.000$, $t = 5.159$). As the studies show, cultural dimensions (Power distance, Diversity acceptance, individualism) have a significant impact on employees' emotional and cognitive experiences within the organization and by extension their well-being.

Table 5: Hypotheses testing results.

Hypotheses	Path Coeff.	p-Values	t-Values	Decision
Power distance → Emotional Cognitive experience	-0.611	0.006	3.137	Supported
Power distance → Cognitive experience	-0.501	***	5.655	Supported
Diversity acceptance → Emotional experience	0.566	0.111	4.085	Supported
Diversity acceptance → Cognitive experience	0.145	***	2.235	Supported
Individualism/collectivism → Emotional experience	0.613	***	1.356	Supported
Individualism/collectivism → Cognitive experience	0.421	***	2.415	Supported
Emotional experience → Employee well-being	0.201	***	4.111	Supported
Cognitive experience → Employee well-being	0.577	***	5.159	Supported

Discussion

Primarily, the dimensions of the dominating culture inside the organization were found to have an indirect effect on employees' well-being. This relationship is mediated by workers cognitive and emotional experiences. Previous studies have also shown the same relationship between these constructs (Peiqi Lu1, Jeewon, ; Holt-Lunstad, 2021, Leary et al., 1995). More specifically, power distance was found to have a negative influence on employees' emotional and cognitive experiences. One of the reasons behind this relationship is that individuals in institutions and organizations with huge unequal distribution of power were found to be victims of various substandard behaviors such as abusive supervision, negative relationships and destructive leadership (Weipeng Lin, Lei Wang, 2012, Tepper, 2000).

In addition, the variable of diversity acceptance was found to have a significant positive impact on employees' emotional and cognitive experiences, since workers operating in companies where they feel included, and not judged based on theirs (gender, color, sexual affiliations, activities level of education) they tend to have more pleasant experiences (Akanksha Jaiswal, LataDyaram 2019). Precisely firms that infuse diversity policies and practices in their overall strategy, help their staff to strain interpersonal trust between each other, and to feel integrated, which certainly have a direct impact on workers daily experiences (Dwertmann and al., 2016; Guillaume and al., 2013; Jackson and al., 2003). Moreover, according to Guillaume and al., (2017) workers inside firms with a high level of exclusion based on cultural aspects (Gender, color, education.) cannot have a positive work life, this theory is found to be valid in another research as well (van Dijk and al., 2017).

Furthermore, the third implication of this study is that individualism has a positive impact on employees' emotional and cognitive experiences. Because a work environment that obliged its workers to be a part of collective activities creates unpleasant social experiences, such as social pressure and involvement in unwanted activities. (Aaron C. ahuvia 2001, Z Aycan, B Schyns 2013.). On the other hand, the staff operating in work places with Individualist aspirations tends to have better social experiences since all their actions are driven by their thoughts and interests (Schyns, 2013, Watkins and Liu, 1996). And this deduction has been validated in previous researches (Bulmahn, 2000, Desmond J. Leach and Peter B. Warr, 2006, Zijlstra et al, 1999).

Finally, the mediating role that employees' emotional and cognitive experiences play between cultural dimensions and employee well-being was already proven to be true by the work of (Diener, Shigehiro Oishi, 2002, DeNeve & Cooper, 1998, Lucas & Fujita, 2000). Specifically, employees' cognitive experiences are positively correlated to their level of well-being, otherwise personnel with more positive cognitive experiences are more likely to have a higher level of well-being in comparison to workers experiencing some negative cognitions, and the same reasoning goes for the emotional experiences, employees within an organization that preserves their emotional stability, and stimulates good emotional experiences such as solidarity, cohesions inclusion, are expected to have better mental health. As a result, our paper appears to be as complementary article to the available body of literature.

Conclusions

This study represents a revolutionary milestone in the field of human resources management. Since it suggests a new research paradigm that emphasizes the idea that personnel mental health has a direct impact on workers' behavior, commitment, and productivity on the job. Human-capital, well-being, and work behavior equation are well understood by highly effective organizations. In sum, this research conceptualizes human capital to play a vital role in determining a firm's ability to perform and compete in the global economy, we believe that employees drive every aspect of the organization's operations, from research development and product design to distribution networks and service delivery, employees provide creative and innovative ideas; these intangible contributions are rarely reflected in financial statements, as well as we assume that human resources, unlike financial capital, is never truly owned by the company, unless businesses develop ways to keep employees who can walk out the door at any time. In consequence, for the organization to be able to attract and preserve the most talented employees, it needs to implement some efficient human resources practices such as good training programs, rational career promotion strategies, and imperatively they need to care about personnel mental health and well-being.

Additionally, this article provides a description of the overall factors that nowadays incite business leaders to develop, set up processes and strategies to promote personnel well-being inside the company. We have argued that caring about people's satisfaction

is a win-win deal for the employer and the employee. Because from a worker's perspective, having a sense of happiness inside the firm will undoubtedly have a positive and valuable impact on their careers. The same is true for organizations: having employees with a high degree of well-being brings many benefits, including performance increase, reduced absenteeism and lower medical costs.

Specifically, this study was limited particularly to introducing cultural dimensions as well-being predictors since we operated the need and lack of that type of research, especially in a context such as Morocco. However, the results were strong in terms of external validity because we have used a big sized sample combined with a reliable analytical process, SEM. This unquestionably implies that the outcomes of this research can be generalized to other contexts, more precisely contexts with strong cultural similarities to the Moroccan one.

Research downsides and perspectives

Every scientific work contains some downsides and certainly can also open up several perspectives and research pathways. In this study, we have subdivided the downsides into two categories theoretical and empirical: Regarding the theoretical foundation of this research, the first weak point is manifested in the complete absence of an integrating conceptual framework that encompasses the three main concepts of our research object (Employees' well-being, cultural dimension, and employees' emotional, cognitive experiences). The second limit is related to border nuances between each cultural dimension (power distance, diversity acceptance, and inclusion, individualism, and collectivism) because these cultural variables are strongly correlated between each other, which implies that they move toward the same direction with the same proportion, for instance, an organization with the high level of power distance tend to have automatically an orientation toward collectivism as well as they are often characterized by a huge lack of diversity acceptance, Alternately companies with a high level of inclusion are expected to have a predilection towards individualism and weak hierarchical distance between workers and their managers, and so forth. Following up with this fact, this inter-correlation between these dimensions needs to be investigated more as a standalone topic.

Moreover, the main empirical limit of this work is evident in ignoring the relationship between employees' Individualist personality traits and job types, sector, and their well-being level. In addition, we have operated a structural downside related to sample size because taking into consideration the nature of our topic we assumed that the bigger the sample size, the more meaningful the results would be.

On the other hand, this research opens up several perspectives; the first pathway is to question the existence of a causal relationship between an employee's well-being level and the firm's financial performances? Or what are the organizational implications and requirements of caring about workers' well-being? And how firms can create, set up, and develop a culture that is propitious to stimulate employees' mental health? Furthermore, as a second perspective, we suggest studying how employees' cognitive and emotional experiences can impact directly, or indirectly, the firm strategies construction processes? Besides exposing the macro, and micro economic benefits and drivers of focusing on employees' well-being?

Over and above, our final proposition for future research is to carry out the same study in context, where the cultural dimensions are completely different in comparison to the Moroccan context. In particular, in countries where people are more Individualistic and less collectivistic and family-oriented as well as societies with weak power distance, within which, communication between managers and workers is less formal, and individuals are included and they can express more their differences. We believe that path to be the most interesting one, among all the presented perspectives, because according to us studying cultural differences influences on employee's well-being represents complementary research to this one since it will offer us the possibility for contrast outcomes to measure the validity of this research results.

Author Contributions: All of the authors made significant contributions to the overall project. This version of the manuscript has been read and approved by all authors.

Funding: This research received no external funding.

Data Availability Statement: The data is not publicly available, but the corresponding author may make it available upon request.

Acknowledgments: The authors want to thank this project supervisor as well as all LIR-MD laboratory members for all their support, in addition we thank all the editors and the reviewers for their constructive comments that helped improve the current paper.

Conflicts of Interest: There are no conflicts of interest declared by the authors.

References

- Bago, B., & De Neys, W. (2017). Fast logic? Examining the time course assumption of dual process theory. *Cognition*, 158,90–109. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cognition.2016.10.014>
- Acar, F. P.(2010).Analyzing the effects of diversity perceptions and shared leadership on emotional conflict: a dynamic approach, *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 21: 1733-53. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2010.500492>

- Ahuvia, A. C. (2002). Individualism/collectivism and cultures of happiness: A theoretical conjecture on the relationship between consumption, culture and subjective well-being at the national level. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 3(1), 23-36. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1015682121103>
- Anić, Petra, and Marko Tončić. 2013. 'Orientations to happiness, subjective well-being and life goals', *Psiholgijske Teme*, 22: 135-53. <https://doi.org/159.947.5.072-057.875>
- Aycan, Z., Schyns, B., Sun, J. M., Felfe, J., & Saher, N. (2013). Convergence and divergence of paternalistic leadership: A cross-cultural investigation of prototypes. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 44(9), 962-969. <https://doi.org/10.1057/jibs.2013.48>
- Bartels, Amy L., Suzanne J. P., and Christopher S. R. (2019). Understanding well-being at work: Development and validation of the eudaimonic workplace well-being scale, *PLOS ONE*, 14: e0215957. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0215957>
- Bulmahn, T. (2000). Modernity and happiness—the case of Germany. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 1(3), 375-399. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1010012331620>
- Bryson, Alex, John Forth, and Lucy S. (2017). Does employees' subjective well-being affect workplace performance?, *Human Relations*, 70: 1017-37. [Google Scholar]
- Costello, A. B., & Osborne, J. (2005). Best practices in exploratory factor analysis: Four recommendations for getting the most from your analysis. *Practical assessment, research, and evaluation*, 10(1), 7. <https://doi.org/10.7275/jyj1-4868>
- Crowder, Marisa K., and Markus Kemmelmeier. 2017. 'Cultural Differences in Shame and Guilt as Understandable Reasons for Suicide', *Psychological Reports*, 121: 396-429. [Google Scholar]
- Czabata, C., & Charzyńska, K. (2014). A systematic review of mental health promotion in the workplace. *Wellbeing: A Complete Reference Guide*, 1-56. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118539415.wbwell041>
- DeNeve, K. M., & Cooper, H. (1998). The happy personality: a meta-analysis of 137 personality traits and subjective well-being. *Psychological bulletin*, 124(2), 197. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118539415.wbwell041>
- Diener, Ed, Derrick W., W. Tov, C. Kim-Prieto, Dong-won, C., Shigehiro O., and Robert B. (2010). New Well-being Measures: Short Scales to Assess Flourishing and Positive and Negative Feelings', *Social Indicators Research*, 97: 143-56. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-009-9493-y>
- Dwertmann, D. J., Nishii, L. H., & Van Knippenberg, D. (2016). Disentangling the fairness & discrimination and synergy perspectives on diversity climate: Moving the field forward. *Journal of Management*, 42(5), 1136-1168. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206316630380>
- Emmons, Robert A., and Ed D. (1985). Personality Correlates of Subjective Well-Being. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 11: 89-97. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167285111008>
- Franke, R.H., Geert Hofstede, and Michael H. B. (1991). Cultural roots of economic performance: A research note A, *Strategic Management Journal*, 12: 165-73. <https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.4250120912>
- Guillaume, Yves R. F., Jeremy F. Dawson, Lilian Otaye-Ebede, Stephen A. Woods, and Michael A. West. (2017). Harnessing demographic differences in organizations: What moderates the effects of workplace diversity? *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 38: 276-303. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2040>
- Harrison, David A., Kenneth H. Price, Joanne H. Gavin, and Anna T. Florey (2002). Time, Teams, and Task Performance: Changing Effects of Surface- and Deep-Level Diversity on Group Functioning, *Academy of Management Journal*, 45: 1029-45. <https://doi.org/10.5465/3069328>
- Hofstede, Geert (1998). Identifying Organizational Subcultures: An Empirical Approach, *Journal of Management Studies*, 35: 1-12. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-6486.00081>
- Huppert, F. A., and Timothy T. C. So. (2013). Flourishing Across Europe: Application of a New Conceptual Framework for Defining Well-Being, *Social Indicators Research*, 110: 837-61. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-011-9966-7>
- Jackson, S. E., Joshi, A., & Erhardt, N. L. (2003). Recent research on team and organizational diversity: SWOT analysis and implications. *Journal of management*, 29(6), 801-830. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0149-2063\(03\)00080-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0149-2063(03)00080-1)
- Jayawickreme, Eranda, Marie J. C. Forgeard, and Martin E. P. Seligman. (2012). The Engine of Well-Being, *Review of General Psychology*, 16: 327-42. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0027990>
- Joshanloo, Mohsen, Veljko J., and Tim Taylor (2019). A multidimensional understanding of prosperity and well-being at country level: Data-driven explorations, *PLOS ONE*, 14: e0223221-e2. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0223221>
- Kesarwani, A. P., Srivastava, G. K., Rastogi, S. K., & Kundu, B. (2002). Solid-phase synthesis of quinazolin-4 (3H)-ones with three-point diversity. *Tetrahedron letters*, 43(32), 5579-5581. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0040-4039\(02\)01140-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0040-4039(02)01140-1)
- Keyes, Corey L. M. (2007). Promoting and protecting mental health as flourishing: A complementary strategy for improving national mental health', *American Psychologist*, 62: 95-108. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.62.2.95>
- Kirkman, Bradley L., Gilad Chen, Jiing-Lih Farh, Zhen Xiong Chen, and Kevin B. Lowe. (2009). 'Individual Power Distance Orientation and Follower Reactions to Transformational Leaders: A Cross-Level, Cross-Cultural Examination', *Academy of Management Journal*, 52: 744-64. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2009.43669971>
- Leary, M. R., Schreindorfer, L. S., & Haupt, A. L. (1995). The role of low self-esteem in emotional and behavioral problems: Why is low self-esteem dysfunctional? *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 14(3), 297-314. <https://doi.org/10.1521/jscp.1995.14.3.297>

- Lin, Weipeng, Lei Wang, and Shuting Chen. (2013). 'Abusive Supervision and Employee Well-Being: The Moderating Effect of Power Distance Orientation', *Applied Psychology*, 62: 308-29. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1464-0597.2012.00520.x>
- Lucas, R. E., & Fujita, F. (2000). Factors influencing the relation between extraversion and pleasant affect. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 79(6), 1039. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.79.6.1039>
- Lu, P., Oh, J., Leahy, K. E., & Chopik, W. J. (2021). Friendship importance around the world: Links to cultural factors, health, and well-being. *Frontiers in psychology*, 11, 3568. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.570839>
- Matusitz, Jonathan, and George Musambira. (2013). 'Power Distance, Uncertainty Avoidance, and Technology: Analyzing Hofstede's Dimensions and Human Development Indicators', *Journal of Technology in Human Services*, 31: 42-60. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.570839>
- Milliken, Frances J., and Luis L. Martins. (1996). 'Searching for Common Threads: Understanding the Multiple Effects of Diversity in Organizational Groups', *Academy of Management Review*, 21: 402-33. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1996.9605060217>
- Rees, Gwyther, and Tamar Dinisman. (2015). 'Comparing Children's Experiences and Evaluations of Their Lives in 11 Different Countries', *Child Indicators Research*, 8: 5-31. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12187-014-9291-1>
- Ryan, Richard M., and Edward L. Deci. (2001). 'On Happiness and Human Potentials: A Review of Research on Hedonic and Eudaimonic Well-Being', *Annual Review of Psychology*, 52: 141-66. <https://doi.org/10.1509/jppm.25.1.104>
- Ryff, Carol D. (1989). 'Happiness is everything, or is it? Explorations on the meaning of psychological well-being', *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 57: 1069-81. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.57.6.1069>
- Sarstedt, Marko, Christian M. Ringle, Jörg Henseler, and Joseph F. Hair. (2014). 'On the Emancipation of PLS-SEM: A Commentary on Rigdon (2012)', *Long Range Planning*, 47: 154-60. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lrp.2014.02.007>
- Schyns, B., & Schilling, J. (2013). How bad are the effects of bad leaders? A meta-analysis of destructive leadership and its outcomes. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 24(1), 138-158. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2012.09.001>
- Utriainen, Kati, Leena Ala-Mursula, and Helvi Kyngäs. (2015). 'Hospital nurses' wellbeing at work: a theoretical model', *Journal of Nursing Management*, 23: 736-43. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2012.09.001>
- Warr, Peter, and Ilke Inceoglu. (2012). 'Job engagement, job satisfaction, and contrasting associations with person-job fit', *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 17: 129-38. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0026859>
- Zijlstra, F. R., Roe, R. A., Leonora, A. B., & Krediet, I. (1999). Temporal factors in mental work: Effects of interrupted activities. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 72(2), 163-185. <https://doi.org/10.1348/096317999166581>

Publisher's Note: SSBFNET stays neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

© 2021 by the authors. Licensee SSBFNET, Istanbul, Turkey. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

International Journal of Research in Business and Social Science (2147-4478) by SSBFNET is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

Appendix

Appendix A: Interview questions

We would like to ask you some questions about your well-being at your current job, in particular, how the social culture of your society impacts your well-being. Although some of the following questions may seem similar to one another. They differ in important ways. For each item, please answer using the following scale: 1= very dissatisfied 2= dissatisfied, 3= neutral, 4= satisfied, 5= very satisfied.

Appendix A: Survey used.

Constructs	Measurements	Sources	Scale
Power Distance	Rate your satisfaction with the level autonomy inside the firm?	Starosta (2005)	1, 2, 3, 4, 5
	Rate your satisfaction with the level of democracy inside the firm?		1, 2, 3, 4, 5
	Rate your satisfaction with the level of trust inside the firm?		1, 2, 3, 4, 5
	Evaluate the quality of leadership style at your company?		1, 2, 3, 4, 5
Cultural Dimension	Diversity Acceptance Evaluate the quality of control at your company?	Markus Kemmelmeier (2018)	1, 2, 3, 4, 5
	Evaluate the quality of differences acceptance at your company?		1, 2, 3, 4, 5
	Note the value of your participation in collective events?		1, 2, 3, 4, 5
	Individual Collectivism Note the quality of your participation in decision making?		1, 2, 3, 4, 5
Employee Experience	Rate The level of loyalty and conformity to each employee social group?	Shemla et al(2016)	1, 2, 3, 4, 5
	Emotional Experience Measure how happy you are in your daily activities?	Judith A. Okelv, al (2017)	1, 2, 3, 4, 5
	Measure how stressed you are in your daily activities?		1, 2, 3, 4, 5
	Measure conflicts intensity at your firm?		1, 2, 3, 4, 5
	Cognitive Experience Appraise your engagement?	Xuebing Dong (2017)	1, 2, 3, 4, 5
	Appraise your connectivity with your colleagues?		1, 2, 3, 4, 5
Employee Well being	Appraise level of democracy at the firm?	Martin seligman, al (2012)	1, 2, 3, 4, 5
	Quantify the intensity of positive emotions at your organization?		1, 2, 3, 4, 5
	Quantify the strength of relationships between employees at your organization?		1, 2, 3, 4, 5
	Quantify the amount of meaning in employee daily activities?		1, 2, 3, 4, 5
	Quantify degree of your engagement?		1, 2, 3, 4, 5
	Quantify sense of Accomplishment?		1, 2, 3, 4, 5