

HANNA MAMZER

Adam Mickiewicz University, Poznań

mamzer@amu.edu.pl

## THE ROLE OF TRUST IN MULTICULTURAL WORLD

### INTRODUCTION

In this text I try to describe why trust has a profound meaning in contemporary world dominated by change. I analyze the context of contemporary Western Cultures with a special emphasis on globalization and the changes which it creates. I try to show the consequences of globalization reflected in the erosion of trust. In the end of this text, I propose to look at contemporary multicultural corporations from a new angle, emphasizing their ability to create small communities.

### GLOBALIZATION AND ITS CONSEQUENCES

One of the main various challenges that the contemporary world faces us with is: change and changeability. Traditional societies focused on preserving, maintaining and reproducing tradition; never experienced radical and dynamic changes. Their development was slow and changes occurred rarely. On the contrary: postmodern societies are basically based on change: today we often say: "The only thing that is 100% sure is, that everything will change". Moreover: the more dynamic the change is, the better. In a way, one could say that change creates frame for contemporary life. This is visible in fashion, in design, in cuisines, products that we use and the life styles that we choose. One can see very well that the concept of change is overwhelming, although to some extent hidden. The job advertisements encourage perspective employees to join "young and dynamic team", they promise "constant development" and "challenges at work". They often require: flexibility, adaptability and ability to travel and work under stressful conditions. We participate in change not only at home and at work, but also during our holidays: nowadays, those who prefer to stay for holidays at home are perceived as strange creatures: there is a must of traveling: the further – the more exotic – the better. Even our news-

papers constantly confront us with NEW types of cars that YOU HAVE TO HAVE, or “must have’s clothes”, that change every season. This context of dynamic life is strengthened by at least two important factors: globalization and increasing multiculturalism.

### GLOBALIZATION

Globalization – the process that is rooted in Marshall’s Plan originating in 1948 – is often misunderstood as a recent concept. In fact globalization started over half a century ago, as a result of Marshall’s plan: America’s concept of supporting Europe after WWII considered at first the transfer of various goods that would improve the quality of the life of Europe’s citizens. Based on Jalta Agreement, the biggest part of this support was granted to so called Western European countries, while Eastern ones remained under the Soviet Union’s “protectorate”. Some goods however were transferred also to the Eastern Block’s countries. Another one later followed this first stage of help, opening branches of American corporations in Western Europe. The moment when American corporations decided to open branches in Western Europe started dynamic movement of people – a movement needed to run services and production processes offered by companies. Those employees, by traveling and living in foreign countries, exchanged their values and norms regulating behavior: they had to confront other countries’ cultural realities. At the same time they have created change by promoting their own values. Probably this moment could be considered the beginning of the process of globalization in the form known to us today. In many aspects this is the process that should be seen as a positive one: it allows to try new cultural backgrounds, provides learning opportunities, allows to learn about one’s own culture in relation to others. On the other hand, globalization has also negative results – those are emphasized by alter-globalists and anti-globalists (Klein 1999). Those views are regarded often as radical ones. It is necessary to mention here Zygmunt Bauman and his numerous works. They illustrate very well, that the author went through the process of transition: from apologetic books on globalization (Bauman 1998) to the ones with negative opinions (Bauman 2004). Bauman claims, that one of negative consequences of globalization is the process of creating creates borderlines: between those rich, who can afford to fully participate in the globalized world, and the poor ones, who cannot participate in it at all. Since globalization is considered by the general public opinion as a positive process, Bauman notes, many of us tend to do a lot to be able to “taste” globalization and to join the elite. At the same time, we try to isolate ourselves from those poor ones, whom we treat as somewhat unwanted company. This is why, according to Bauman, we build closed living areas and ex-

clusive private clubs, where poor ones have no access. Therefore the required condition to be able to participate in globalization is, in fact, high economic status.

Whether we evaluate globalization as a positive or negative process, it is a fact that we are nowadays living in a global village, where anonymity is much bigger than in any other moment in our history. Paradoxically, we call our living space a "global village", but we are aware that there is no "village" specificity in our contemporary world: neighbors do not know each other, they are often afraid of each other and they avoid contact with each other. The "village" lost its meaning. Traditionally village is characterized as a strong community glued by positive, friendly relationships among its members. We no longer live in such world. Using the "village" metaphor in relation to our globalized world seems to reflect nostalgia and the fact that we are missing "those old times". But what are we in fact missing?

Before I answer this question, there is one more consequence of globalization that is worth being commented on: and this is culture's homogenization. This trend is widely criticized (Baudrillard 1994, Bauman 1998) as the one destroying local cultures. Quoted authors perceive globalization as a dominating force that does not allow to develop cultural diversity while it allows the domination of global brands created by Western cultures. This is true to a certain extent. Yet, despite of the negative consequences, global brands give us something that is really precious today. They guarantee a sense of security and stability: Big Mac is supposed to taste the same around the Globe, Volvo is treated as synonym of safety, Bosh means good German quality and reliability. Perhaps, this could be one of the explanations for the growing popularity of branded products: the brand has become an indication of quality and. At the same time, branded products are more expensive than those "no name" ones.

Last but not least, globalization causes also one more serious effect: increasing multiculturalism. The dynamic technological development of the 19<sup>th</sup> century industrial revolution soon brought effects in forms of inventions that revolutionized human life: telegraph, telephone, later on radio and television, and today the Internet. All these means have improved the strength of human links (although, as Herbert Marshall McLuhan states, they have also changed the sense of those links). Another sense follows this first meaning of the notion of "communication": communication in the sense of transferring from one place to another. This is also something that we face today with incredible dynamism: the development of communication means allows crossing oceans in a couple of hours and allows experiencing different cultures in the widest range. This movement of people transferring from one place to another creates the situation in which one can nowadays really experience almost all cultures around the Globe. Many of us benefit from this, and this process has

a lot of advantages (in my own opinion many more than disadvantages). But there are also some negative aspects of this phenomenon; and the one that is especially important in the context of this essay is the erosion of trust.

### TRUST

The notion of trust, according to P.Sztompka (1999), can be understood as the characteristics of an individual, as the characteristics of certain relations and as a characteristic of a given culture. Those three options of looking at trust show that the notion of trust belongs to the category of complex notions.

As characteristic of the individual human being, trust should be understood as one of the basic qualities created in early childhood. According to Erikson (1994) basic trust is built in the earliest stages of human development and is based on the relation of the child to his/her mother. The relation child-mother has at least a double meaning: it fulfills the needs of both parties. Mother cares after child by providing him food and taking care of his physiological needs. Child's presence, on the other hand, fulfills Mother's need of caring about the child. This close relation is based on mutual fulfillment. Child learns that mother always comes back, even if she has to leave for short time periods. Based on this positive early experience, in later human relations we do not fear that significant other may disappear, Erikson notes. Therefore basic trust allows creating happy and long lasting relations in adult life. The sense of trust is generalized from mother on other significant others, and also on unknown persons. Erikson sees analogies between creating this type of trust and trust understood as the characteristic of culture.

As the characteristic of culture, trust is seen by many researchers as a necessary quality needed for the creation of a rich and happy society. Those working within the framework of social sciences indicate in their findings (see: Fukuyama 1995), that at a certain moment of societal development, trust is a necessary value that creates added value and allows to reach a higher level of development and welfare of the state. Research conducted for example in Italy (taken as an example of low level of trust culture- see Fukuyama 1995) indicates that lack of trust blocks options of using expertise level of various competencies. The main criteria of searching for co-workers and employees are the links with employer and his/her friends. If the person has a positive reputation, he will be hired in the company, although his/her competencies may be weaker than those of someone unknown to the employer. The main criteria of hiring someone are the social reputation, which allows or does not allow to trust this specific person.

This way of acting was effective in traditional societies where members of a given social group knew each other and when sophisticated skills were

not necessary yet. In contemporary big urban societies this is not a case anymore: first of all, people hardly know each other. Secondly, high level of expertise is more and more often needed and it requires searching for specialists far away, sometimes even in different countries. The rational criteria for employee selection are based on skills evaluation. This kind of judgments and evaluations in some culture is however very difficult to be done due to low trust level.

Low trust level characterizing a given society can be analyzed as a cultural trait created by specific history of the nation. The very good example of such culture is Poland, which in many surveys and polls takes last places in terms of trust level towards others (Czapinski 2009). In case of Poland, sociologists try to explain the influence of historical factors on the present situation. In 1918 Poland had gained back the independence after 123 years of partition between neighboring countries that basically divided Poland among themselves. Soon after winning independence WWI and WWII came, again with a strong impact on the socio-cultural situation of the Polish nation (this undesired and negative influence was caused mainly by the very unfortunate geographical location of Poland, being placed between Russia and Germany – two strong empires). Last but not least, the end of WWII was followed by Jalta Agreement, on whose basis Poland was “taken in protectorate” by Russia/Soviet Union. Communists ruling in Poland for almost five next decades have created the regime of fear, control and terror. In all those situations trusting others had to be limited by the self-defense instinct of those who wanted to survive: in the world of spies it was better to avoid trusting others. It benefited much more than trusting others (according to the concepts of Putnam and Fukuyama, who do not analyze situations of occupation but the situations of free choice).

The third aspect of trust is to understand it as an element connected with a specific type of relation: the same person may trust in one situation and may also demonstrate distrust in other situations. Certainly this fact is based on the previous experiences of a given human being. But it is also based on the assessments of the current situation conducted in the process of “ad hoc” analysis. In fact Sztompka (1999) states that trust is a form of bet about the future consequences of given relations. And it always involves elements of calculation in a certain form. Trusting others in a situation of increasing anonymity and in a world changing dynamically and rapidly is not easy task. However all quoted authors, namely Sztompka, Fukuyama and Putnam, point out that trusting others is the necessary social skill that may lead to the economic success of a given state. Moreover, they claim, that it is possible to build the culture of trust. Therefore the important question of “How to create trusting cultures” imposes itself.

## CULTURE OF TRUST

Sztompka (1999) argues that it is possible to create a culture of trust. He analyzes the concept of trust in relation to the specificity of the contemporary world – nowadays we live in unpredictable, heterorganic and dynamic societies, where options of successful prediction of the future are very low. Therefore automatically the level of trust demonstrated towards other participants of interactions, decreases dramatically. Sztompka argues that the level of trust that we demonstrate towards others can be illustrated by concentric circles, similar to the concept proposed by (Hall 1973). In Hall's theory referring to the personal space, human beings allow to cross distances depending on emotional closeness towards specific persons. Sztompka says that the same can be applied to the trust level that we demonstrate: the more we trust, the closer distance can be reached (in both senses: emotional one and physical distance).

Further in his theory, Sztompka differentiates between three types of expectations regarding behaviors demonstrated by others. These three types of expectations relate to: expectation of effectiveness (the subject assumes that partner in interaction intends to act in an effective way), axiological expectations (that partner shares the same values and ethical norms) and altruistic expectations (both partners take care of each other's well being and interest and demonstrate a certain level of altruism). If all partners of the interaction share the same above-mentioned expectations towards themselves and towards others, the level of trust increases.

Each subject participating in social life, has his/her own scope of trust (persons, situations, relations to whom s/he trusts or not). Profound meaning in creating this scope of trust is based on the experiences that subject participated in. This is the area of individual experiences. But at the same time, the area of the socio-cultural background has to be considered: socio-cultural rules regulating trusting others may have very specific and selective form. They can indicate situations in which one should/could trust and also persons not/worth to be trusted. Those socio-cultural norms are derived from three groups of factors:

1. historical heritage and present structural context (which consists of normative stability, transparency and stability of social order)
2. the fact that power is controlled by law
3. privileges and duties are executed.

According to Sztompka, creating the culture of trust can be based on historical values and experiences or on individual epistemological assumptions made by given subjects. In Sztompka's opinion, both trust and distrust have the functional meaning that is important in everyday relations. What is important however is that they are rooted in solid epistemological bases.

Sztompka's approach (but also the one proposed by Fukuyama and Coleman) transfers the main focus of interest from individually created and expressed trust, towards social and cultural aspects of trust. All mentioned authors seem to emphasize the social aspects and social meaning of trust. To the contrary, Erikson's classical concept, for example, tended to focus much more on the individual subject. This transfer of interest is probably caused by the general switch in human sciences focusing much more on communities, social life and widely defined changes in contemporary cultures – especially Western culture. Here trust is analyzed not only as a profound element of individual competencies, but also as a key element in social capital that can be transferred into economic capital. This becomes especially important as the chance of adequate evaluations of situations and relations are very low: not only because we experience change, but also because we deal with various persons, sometimes having very different values than our own ones. Complex roles and statuses of various individuals create situations in which many interpretations appear and are extremely difficult to be judged as probable or not.

It is also important to emphasize that the contemporary Western world is interpreted as a world of risks (Beck 1992). Those risks are real and realistic (for example increasing ecological risks, some of the war conflicts also create very realistic risks of physical extermination, etc). On the other hand, some of the risks are "invented", especially by politicians, and strengthened by media. They serve mainly political purposes and they are sometimes used to create the general sense of anxiety, which influences voters' choices.<sup>1</sup> Public opinion that is sensitive towards this kind of "invented" risks is therefore often manipulated. In such situations it becomes quite clear that trusting others becomes more and more difficult.

Certainly, as Sztompka claims, culture of trust can be built based on positive individual experiences that the subject participated in. To a certain moment however, the subject has no control over those experiences (for instance, Erikson's basic trust is built despite of the subject's actions). In later stages of life/development, the subject is able to influence intentionally his own experiences: therefore s/he can shape his/her own "trust-building-history". This history of one's own trust level can be shaped by conscious participation in certain types of events and experiences.

Some of the recent concepts on building trust and related to the trust sense of ontological safety underline the profound meaning of positive self-esteem and trust in one's own competencies and skills (Giddens 1991, Mamzer 2008). According to those concepts today we can observe a shift of trust: from trusting others, to trusting oneself. As mentioned at the beginning of the text, traditional societies living according to the natural rhythm of nature, allowed to

---

<sup>1</sup> For example: creating a sense of terrorist fear makes public opinion more positive towards increased expenses on national defense systems.

predict, quite precisely, the order and sequences of various events and changes. It was therefore, relatively easy to expect certain things to happen. Today those expectations are unrealistic and impossible to fulfill. Therefore: the subject, that is not able to trust the outside world, has to trust itself. Here we observe following situation: since the world is changing, things are mixing and people change their minds; the subject, aiming at getting some sense of stability, has to trust his/her own skills, abilities and competencies. This approach, however, in radical form, would lead to the destruction of culture. Culture, which is based on inter-subjective symbolic communication, always requires reason for communicating. One could easily imagine quite radical situations in which trusting one's own skills only, participants of social life lose the necessity of contacting others. This is a quite extreme situation though one could imagine at least one more different method of increasing the trust level.

This method is rooted in Emile Durkheim's thinking (Durkheim 1997), and quite surprisingly it can be linked with multiculturalism understood as the intense presence of representatives of various cultures.<sup>2</sup> Emile Durkheim had seen corporations, and especially those involving representatives of various cultures, as a remedy for reducing anomie in industrial and later post-industrial societies. Durkheim distinguished two types of social organization, which he called "mechanical solidarity" and "organic solidarity." Mechanical solidarity, typical for traditional societies, was based on the homogeneity of individuals: performing similar work, going through similar education and participating in a similar religion; it creates links based on the similarity the life-styles. This type of solidarity exists in traditional, but also in small societies, based on simpler structures. On the contrary, in more complex, bigger societies one can observe a different form of solidarity: the organic one. This organic solidarity is rooted in interdependence that arises from specialization of work and the complementarities between people. Although citizens perform different tasks, often have different values and interest, the order and very solidarity of society depends on their reliance on each other to perform their specified tasks. The term "organic" refers here to the interdependence of components that cannot exist separately. Solidarity in organic form can be created based on conscious movement towards creating various forms of unions and structures. One of these is corporations.

E. Durkheim proposed corporations as an institutional remedy for anemia and as the element linking the state and society. Corporations based on free will and autonomic decisions of individual subjects, who either decided to participate or not, may create relatively strong communities in which partici-

---

<sup>2</sup> This understanding of the notion of „multiculturalism“ is far from Will Kymlicka's (1990) interpretation of multiculturalism, therefore I state clearly here, that by multiculturalism I do not mean specific type of policy, but the description of certain state of society, in which multiple cultures meet.

pants do not only depend on each other, but they *choose* to depend on each other. In such understanding, corporation becomes an independent creature that serves multiple purposes: very practical ones (like obtaining a certain income level) and more abstract: normative ones (like providing sense of belonging to community). In those terms corporations, and especially multicultural corporations, may provide common platform that can be used in order to develop trust. What is typical for this kind of corporations is focus on the practical goal. This has been already proved by social psychologists that focus on the shared task helps to fight stereotypes and prejudices- enables multicultural cooperation.

### **CAN MULTICULTURAL ORGANIZATIONS HELP IN CREATING A CULTURE OF TRUST?**

Each day billions of dollars flow across national boundaries in countless transactions. Major corporations and governments no longer care whether they raise money in New York, London, Tokyo or Hong Kong. Further, if companies do not like the political or economic climate in one nation, they can switch their investments to another country. The internationalization of the world economy and the rise of multinational corporations have given a new dimension to economic power. Since World War II, multinational corporations have played a growing role in structuring of the division of labor within the world economy. The process of redefining work is strongly connected with changes within organization. Those changes raise a need of redefinition: for both organization and work.

#### **Changes in the organization**

The basic change in nowadays world is the way organizations and companies function. Organizations search for highly qualified specialists. They employ employees from many various countries, and select them in terms of their skills, experience and knowledge. Those persons represent various systems of values coming from different cultures; they speak different languages and have different work habits. This requires a lot of tolerance in the company and ability to understand the ways of their behavior. On the other hand, it is necessary to introduce general rules, which direct the process of work. This means that although in the organization people from many different countries work, they must have some common things, which let them work together. The process which is basic in such a case is a communication. In multicultural organizations it practically means: one language is necessary. Mostly it is English, but more and more often one can meet persons who speak fluently

a couple of languages. The process of communication can be successful only if all employees can respect and understand each other's behavior. If this exists, they can start solving different problems together (beside professional tasks, there are also those which normally appear in traditional organization). In conclusion there are necessary some general rules, but they have to leave the space for preserving one's identity.

Branches of corporations spread around the globe show the new tendency. Multicultural companies are organized in different ways today: they usually do not have many big offices. They have one headquarter and many small offices (subsidiaries) placed around the world. Those offices represent the company in their region, but what is important here, is that very often they practically consist of laptop and mobile phone. Small computers allow taking the office with all data and information everywhere they are required. Mobile phones let for data transmitting and receiving and in fact there is no need to have any more equipment. This fact increases flexibility and ability for traveling without losing contact with the organization. There is no more need to have fully equipped offices, and even more, those traditional offices often disturb, as they tie employee to stay in one place. Possibilities of connecting people thanks to mobile phones and computers imply that no matter where a person is, s/he can be found by others (which of course has also disadvantages, especially when one needs to relax).

### **Changes in work definition**

As organizations look for highly qualified employees, to work in the company means: to perform one's duties on the highest level. The better and better education of new potential employees causes high level of competition. This situation forces employees to re-educate and broaden the knowledge, develop skills and experience. "To work" means to create new solutions and for that is necessary the open mind and ability for analytical thinking and observing the market. As organizations look for people who are specialists in their field they look for people who are difficult to be replaced. Thanks to this, if one has exact knowledge in certain field, s/he can easily get a job.

In this case, work becomes specialized. Companies look for specialists, but those must have also an ability to see more general rules and to connect facts taken from different fields. This is difficult especially if those observations come from various countries/cultures where they may mean something completely different. As a consequence work means here to be able to see global rules based on local observations.

As nowadays organizations are more and more multicultural, "work" means also to be able to communicate with co-workers coming from differ-

ent social and cultural backgrounds. Practically this means one should speak other languages and be able to understand and tolerate differences in behavior, way of dressing, feelings and ideas. This aspect of human functioning is especially important: the lack of it creates lots of conflicts and “artificial” tension, which disturbs effective work process.

To be able to communicate which is necessary at work means to be able to use electronic devices, which are the storage of data and the tool for data transmitting. For this reason work means the ability to operate with highly developed technological equipment. The basic thing seems to be the knowledge of Internet and electronic mail. Those let to connect offices placed around the world.

Offices spread around the globe showing the new tendency of avoiding stationary offices prove that work does not mean a presence in a company from 9.00 a.m. till 5.00 p.m. anymore. Work time is no longer regulated this way. No matter how long one works, the most important is result. This means that a lot depends on the individual. As there are no more that strict regulations, one can decide by himself how long he works. On the other hand this is much bigger responsibility than in traditional company, where one works for a certain time and only on given tasks. Independent work requires more flexibility, creativity any psychological stamina, which is necessary in stressful situations created by new, suddenly coming up circumstances. To work in such a situation means to be able to adapt to the new situation and to react quickly and effectively.

### **Changes in defining Identity**

There are many definitions of the term “identity”. From the psychological point of view, which is original for this term, identity means a sense of self-definition” (Lerner, Hultsch 1983, p.604) or an individual’s sense of personal sameness and continuity” (Zajonc 1987, p.592). I could quote a lot of definitions, there are many of them in psychology, they differ in parts from each other but in general their meaning is the same: to have an identity means to feel the self-definition. The issue connected with the term identity is the question: How do people define themselves? Many approaches emphasize that people build their self-definitions by choosing an ideology”. And ideology is: “A set of rules, beliefs, attitudes, values and behavioral prescriptions, usually for a particular role” (Lerner, Hultsch 1983, p. 604). This way each person in a certain period of life builds her or his own definition of self. The same process we can observe on a wider level – on the level of social life. The story repeats: the person looking for her or his social identity chooses a system of rules and beliefs which are important for her or him, and which she or he can accept.

The process of choosing acceptable rules is not simple at all. It is influenced by many factors, but the main one is the system of values important to the whole society (or social group). It means that people analyze and choose social traditions and cultural values and internalize them (this is a very complex psychological process of accepting them, which leads to the belief that they are our own). If we realize these mechanisms we can easily notice that people have usually very strong feelings of belonging to their original social groups. In other words, it means that it is very important to the people to preserve those feelings in the changing world. In this moment, a lot of troubles begin, especially those connected with the phenomenon of globalization.

As I noticed before, people usually have strong sense of belonging to the society and to the culture from which they come. This implies that we cannot ignore it. We have to construct such conditions of life in which people will be able to preserve it. This is not easy at all, especially if we notice that it may cause a lot of divisions and many difficulties in introducing globalization. How can we build global corporations if everybody (as a unit) has its own identity and each society, has its own identity, too?

#### **How can this be done?**

This is not a very easy question but it seems it is possible to find a solution. There are two possible ways of doing this. Bauman proposed the first one. He states that different nations can exist beside each other if all of them know that the rest has a possible power (for example weapon), which can be used against them. In Bauman's opinion, this makes people "tolerant" because they have to be aware if they don't want to evoke their neighbors' attacks. Here is the problem, this is not real tolerance and that is why I put it in quotation-marks. This is not a real value because when the nation loses its power, it loses the privilege to live beside the others in peace. There is no more reason to be aware and to accept it.

That's why we have to look for the next solution and this is real tolerance: how can we build it? There is another idea, proposed by Richard Rorty (1989). He suggests building tolerance on different bases. According to him, the main one should be looking for the common task for the nations. It means, in the case of globally operating corporations, that all nations should have one (or a couple of) tasks that they can share or concentrate on. This is an essential problem because it will allow us to work together, and what is more important to begin to build a new definition of cultural identity. Which way? This is a main point from which we can look at nations beside us from the new perspective – from the perspective of the friend not competitor. The consequence of using this point of view is that we can ac-

cept others, trust them, we don't have to be afraid of them and finally we can live together because we don't have to emphasize our own difference from others' identities.

### CONCLUSION

Multinational corporations' survival and strategic advantages are not located in any individual person, but in corporations' ability to coordinate and link resources and activities internationally despite of cross-cultural differences. This forces redefinition of work, as well. Work means ability to perform duties at the highest level, to take responsibility, demonstrate flexibility and creativity. Work requires now very good communicational skills and ability to cope with stress and differences of co-workers. Work is a major social mechanism for placing people in the larger social structure and for providing them with identities. In a world without borders this bigger social structure is bigger also. And it requires a completely different way of creating one's identity.

It seems like there is a very big potential in the way which global corporations operate. Building teams of employees consisting of persons with different cultural backgrounds automatically creates the field for communication and dialog (based on Rorty's concept). The situation when teams have their own tasks, which they have to fulfill, gives to the team members something that may be common despite existing differences. Because employees are forced to communicate, they learn about each other. On the other hand, multicultural corporations introduce some procedures, which erase differences. These are one language, precisely described rules of behavior, and a dominant system of values. Those procedures however create something that is called "corporation's culture". On the other hand, it is important to point out, that those corporations involve employees who decide themselves, that they want to be involved. They make their own autonomous choices regarding belonging to the corporation. There is no single human being that is forced to join multicultural corporation. In this sense, corporations allow to create small communities, where people can learn how to trust each other. Choosing to share the same goals, similar values, corporation members are able to create mini-social structures. Those environments may help to build the culture of trust.

### BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Baudrillard J. (1994) *Simulacra and Simulation*. University of Michigan Press.  
Bauman Z. (1991) *Modernity and Ambivalence*. Polity Press in association with Blackwell Publishers.  
Bauman Z. (1998) *Globalization: The Human Consequences*. New York: Columbia University Press.  
Bauman Z. (2004) *Wasted Lives. Modernity and its Outcasts*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

- Beck U. (1992) *Risk society: Towards a New Modernity*. Sage Publications.
- Czapinski J. (2009) *Diagnoza społeczna*. Warszawa: Rada Monitoringu Społecznego.
- Durkheim E. (1997) *The Division of Labor in Society*. New York: Free Press.
- Erikson E.H. (1994) *Childhood and Society*. W.W. Norton.
- Fukuyama F. (1995). *Trust. The Social Virtues and the Creation of Prosperity*. London: Penguin.
- Giddens A. (1991) *Modernity and Self-Identity. Self and Society in the Late Modern Age*. Polity Press Cambridge.
- Hall E.T. (1973). *The Silent language*. Publisher: Anchor.
- Klein N. (1999) *No Logo: Taking Aim at the Brand Bullies*. New York: Picador USA.
- Kymlicka W. (1990) *Contemporary Political Philosophy. An Introduction*. Oxford University Press.
- Lerner R.M., Hultsh D.F. (1983) *Human Development. A Life Span Prospective*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Mamzer H. (2008). *Poczucie bezpieczeństwa ontologicznego. Uwarunkowania społeczno- kulturowe*. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Naukowe UAM.
- Putnam R. (2001) *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community*. Simon & Schuster.
- Rorty R. (1989) *Contingency, irony and solidarity*. Cambridge University Press.
- Schultz D.P., Schultz S.E. (1986). "Psychology and Industry". An Introduction to *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*. New York: Macmillan.
- Sztompka P. (1999) *Trust: A Sociological Theory*. Cambridge University Press.
- Vander Zanden J.W. (1988) *The Social Experience*. New York: Random House.