RECRUITMENT LYING AND TRUST IN AN ORGANIZATION

Wojciech PAWNIK

AGH University of Science and Technology, Faculty of Management; wpawnik@zarz.agh.edu.pl,
ORCID: 0000-0001-5048-5438

Purpose: The presented article raises the importance of recruitment lie for the functioning of the organization as a whole. According to the author, the presented issue should fill the theoretical gap that has arisen as a result of the interest of theoreticians and practitioners of organizational life in the concept of trust management.

Design/methodology/approach: The article will present interdisciplinary perspectives on the study of lying and its rationalizations from the worker's point of view. The author conducted a secondary analysis of the quantitative and qualitative research found.

Findings: The author's thesis is that the recruitment lie is the result of the progressive phenomenon of relativism, anomie and the process of changing the meaning of culturally defined concepts.

Research limitations/implications: The cited research requires a broader empirical context and consideration of cultural changes occurring in the organization's environment.

Practical implications: The so-called social trust capital is of vital importance. It is an element of the organization's environment. Therefore, organizational procedures alone cannot generate the right level of trust in an organization.

Social implications: According to the author, in Polish conditions, the importance of the concept of trust management is overestimated while the recruitment lie is an effect of the progressive phenomenon of relativization of phenomena - including social norms, which corresponds to the phenomenon of chaos of the axionormative order. The connotation of concepts related to the concept of truth is also changing.

Originality/value: The article challenges the concept of trust management by pointing out its epistemological limitations in management science. It emphasizes the importance of the social context of organizational functioning.

Keywords: organization, social capability management, trust management, lie, recruitment.

Category of the paper: Research paper.

1. Introduction

The conviction of the prevalence of lying in human relations can be found in philosophical, sociological, anthropological or historical literature. It can be assumed that lying has accompanied us since the beginning of human history, although it itself undergoes various transformations (Campbell, 2002). In philosophical terms, we encounter the issue of interest already in the classics: by Plato (Dąmbska, 1979, p. 121 et seq.), or Socrates (Witwicki, 1958, p. 17). "The most worthy and capable of knowing the truth according to Plato are the philosophers. The wisest should rule in the state - people who are capable of knowing the truth about reality. The persons who are closest to the truth in Plato's projected community are philosophers. Thus, according to the accepted findings, they are better persons (instrumentally) than non-philosophers. Thus, they are also better (more efficient and more effective) liars and it is to them that Plato gives the privilege of lying in the state, a kind of "right to deceive others" (Kucharski, 2014, p. 34). According to St. Augustine, a lie is a statement promulgated with the intention to mislead. A statement is a lie when it is false and has been formulated with the intention of deceiving the recipient (Piechowicz, 2009, p. 32). The sociological perspective has pointed to its importance for interpersonal relations, or social relations more broadly (Goffman, 2008; Tönnies, 2008). Cultural or social anthropologists have also hinted at - albeit in a sort of collateral way - the problem of interest (Malinowski, 2002; Metcalf, 2002). Interestingly, the field of psychology is dominated by a quantitative approach in the study of the phenomenon of interest (DePaulo, 2008; Vrij, 2009). This is an analysis that includes the motives, manifestations and frequency of lying, taking into account the dependence of demographic or personality traits. The psychological perspective abstracts from the cultural context, which, in my opinion, narrows the cognitive perspective especially in the context of organizational life. I assume that organizational culture is derived from "attitudes and commonly accepted values, norms and ways of doing things, embedded in the broad tradition and culture of a given society" (Hampden-Turner, Trompenaars, 1998, pp. 115-25). Susan Blum's observation (Blum, 2007, p. 14) that "(...) people in many societies lie, but they lie under different circumstances and have different opinions about this lying and deception" is confirmed by the research of many other authors (e.g. Robbins, 1998; Gesteland, 2005; Hall, 2009; Hofstede, Minkov, 2011, emphasizing the importance of cultural conditions for organizational life processes. It is difficult not to agree with the statement that lying occurs in the relationship between people, and is therefore socially and culturally conditioned and subject to various transformations in time and space (Surmiak, 2014, p. 204). As such, it occurs in the process of communication while this process can be understood as transmission, understanding, interaction, linking, interaction, exchange and a component of the social process. The main differences in its perception concern its scope, effectiveness and direction of transmission. For the purposes of this analysis, I assume that lying is an intentional communicative action aimed at inducing in

the recipient of a message, a judgment that is inconsistent with the judgment held by the sender (Kucharski, 2014, p. 117). In the context of the concept of trust management in an organization, the recruitment lie acquires special significance not only for theorists but also for practitioners. In the literature, trust has been given the status of "technical" reality. It is assumed that trust can be managed in the same way as all other resources of the organization are managed: human, financial, physical, material, etc. In this way, we make its unjustified reification. What follows is the conversion of an abstract concept into a tool that can be used to maximize profits using certain management procedures. I therefore do not share the belief that trust can be managed (Bugdol, 2010, pp. 11-25). My views are closer to the institutional economics analyses (Wilkin, 2016). Trust is an expression of subjective judgment, a kind of derivative thought process based on the information, knowledge and experience possessed. It is based on the assumption that the person we trust will behave in a manner consistent with our expectations. Trust is a certainty, hope, belief (set of beliefs), predisposition, situational, structural, interpersonal or fiduciary relationship variable (Lewicka-Strzałecka, 2003, pp. 195-207). Like lying, the concept of trust is a relationship characterized by relativism and ambiguity. The question of whether trust can be managed is also a question about the cognitive limits of managing the social potential of organizations and management science (Pawnik, 2016, pp. 291-305). Of course, it is important to keep in mind the socio-cultural context of the phenomenon analyzed here. Francis Fukuyama argues that a country's prosperity and ability to compete economically depend on the level of trust in the society under study (Fukuyama, 1997). It has an instrumental value - by acting as an informal norm it reduces the cost of economic transactions (control, contracting, dispute settlement or enforcement of formal agreements (Inglehart, 1997). In this case-in my opinion- the institutions of public life (including the economic sector) are rather dominant. The literature on managing the social potential of organizations indicates that a new paradigm called trust management in the modern enterprise is emerging. Trust is seen as one of the most important resources of an organization. Shapes the awareness of objective and critical self-examination of the actions taken by the organization's actors. The results of the research contained in the report "Global Generation 3.0: A study of trust in the workplace" conducted on the basis of declarations from three generations: "baby boomers" (51-68 years old), generation X (35-50 years old), generation Y (19-34 years old) and generation Z (16-18 years old) indicate that the "baby boomers" generation declares the highest level of trust in the employer (51%), supervisor (52%) and team (53%). In contrast, the lowest level of trust is represented by Generation X (41%). According to 53% of respondents, the main reason for distrust in the employer is unfair pay. 48% emphasize unequal treatment, both in terms of pay and promotion. For 46%, the problem is lack of leadership. Subordinates do not trust their superiors because they are not open and in communication, do not appreciate the work they do, and rarely communicate with their subordinates. Lack of qualification, willingness to cooperate and open communication are the most frequently cited reasons for lack of trust in co-workers (EY Report "Global Generation 3.0: A survey of trust in the workplace", https://www.prawo.pl/kadry/ey-zbadal-poziom-

zaufania-w-miejscu-pracy-wsrod-przedstawicieli-roznych-pokolen,286528.html (15.04.2022). The presented report is based on the belief that generation is primarily an age category. However, from a sociological perspective, a generation is a collection of individuals singled out due to a specific type of social ties linking people of roughly the same age, (having similar life experience). Belonging to a generation is formed on the basis of generational experience (a kind of rite de passage), which determines the subsequent perception of reality. The so-called theory of generations by William Strauss and Neil Howe (1992) described the cultural and social reality of the US. Therefore, it is difficult to find a rational justification for the tacitly accepted thesis of its universal nature.

It is necessary to ask a question about the real meaning of the trust management paradigm attributing an important role in the HRM management processes in Poland. In 2013, the report "Trust in the company" (https://www.procontent.pl/2013/01/polacy-nie-ufaja-szefom/, 16.04.2022) showed that in the group of professionally active Poles, almost half suspected their superiors of manipulating information and concealing the truth. Second among the reasons for distrust in employers was the lack of or too infrequent communication between management and employees. 14% of respondents had no formed opinion on the issue of trust in the employer. 24% of respondents did not trust their supervisor The least trust in their workplace was shown by people over 35, and the most by young people starting their first job. The message of the supervisor was mostly believed by those aged 19-24 and 24-34. Trust towards employers decreased with age (life experience). Subordinates with higher education constituted the largest group that believed in the honesty of the message conveyed (34%). Of those expressing a negative attitude toward the reliability of the information provided, almost 1/3 were people with primary, junior high or vocational education. Nearly half of white-collar workers trusted their superiors. More than 20% of blue-collar workers were convinced that their own company had cheated them in past cooperation. The results of the survey on workplace satisfaction seem interesting (Hays Poland Survey, Real Aspects of the Workplace 2019, https://hrnews.pl/satysfakcja-ktora-zatrzymuje-pracownikow, 20.04.2022):

1. Work atmosphere, organisational culture 72%.
2. Level of remuneration 58%.
3. Relationship with the superior 54%.
4. Relations with colleagues 50%.
5. Professional development 44%.
6. Work life balance 42%.
7. Location of work (distance from home, travel time) 40%.
8. Degree of independence in performing duties 38%.
9. Stability of employment 34%.
10. Flexible working 36%.
11. Challenges at work 30%.
12. The level of position held 28%.

13. The scope of responsibilities 26%.

14. Recognition of superiors or colleagues 25%.

15. Work environment (office standard etc.) 24%.

16. **Trust in the company and management 22%.**

17. Cooperation at all levels of the company 20%.

18. Good image of the employer 18%.

19. High quality of services and products offered by the company 16%.

20. Additional benefits offer 15%.

21. Free days/vacation 10%.

22. Other 2%.

Trust ranks 16th among the 22 indicated by respondents. It is likely that the attitude of employees is a result of the formalization and omnipotence of organizational procedures (the system "thinks for the man") and the overall level of trust that co-creates the organization's environment. The so-called synthetic trust index in Poland, which expresses generalized attitudes in social relations (containing appropriately recoded and aggregated declarations of shared beliefs on the issue of adopting a trusting or distrustful attitude in social relations) indicates that 64% of respondents express an attitude of distrust towards others while openness in relations with others is declared by 25% of respondents (CBOS, 37/2022). The results presented above suggest quite unambiguously the phenomenon of transferring the orientation towards trust from the organization's environment to the logic of its functioning. Actors of organizational life in Poland emphasize its importance to a far lesser extent than the number of publications devoted to the issue of trust management would suggest. In September 2002, the complexity of the issue was evidenced by representative - in the author's opinion - statements (Tumiłowicz, "Why doesn't the Polish capitalist trust his employees and they trust him?", https://www.tygodnikprzeglad.pl/dlaczego-polski-kapitalista-nie-ufa-swoim-pracownikom-jemu/, 17.04.2022).

Prof. Antoni Rajkiewicz, states that "(...) some are trusted and others are not. It depends on the pedigree of the capitalist and the representatives of the workers. In general, those who gained wealth through honest work, in my opinion, trust their employees more, and more easily establish a dialogue with representatives of the workforce. Those, on the other hand, who came to wealth not very legally, not infrequently come into contact with bribed union representatives, who also participated in the looting of the social good. Knowing the path to property helps explain the reasons for distrust. An owner who is loyal to the treasury is better able to influence the atmosphere in the plant, to counter the lack of trust, because he also knows how to respect the laborer's toil, which also makes the employee respect the employer. Prof. Andrzej Blikle is of the opinion that many employers "(...) certainly do not trust their employees. I do, but in my company I try to implement a system of global quality management, in which human relations and mutual trust are the basis. In order to gain trust, far-reaching reevaluations related to our ideas about human beings are necessary. For the time being, the prevailing quite common belief

is that a person is fundamentally lazy and dishonest, so he should be watched, looked at, or he will stop working. This is, unfortunately, a self-fulfilling prophecy, because when an employee is treated in this way, it does not build in him a relationship of loyalty to the company, but precisely a lack of trust. This leads to the phenomenon that the imposed work is unpleasant, and such a person adopts defensive behavior perceived as laziness. These are typical management mistakes brought up from old ideas of what capitalism is like". President of the Polish Employers Federation Andrzej Malinowski is convinced that "(...) we do not trust employees only when they act against the interests of the employer, build structures in their companies based on mistrust. This is what happens when post-communist views prevail, and employees consider themselves owners to whom everything is due from the company. Unfortunately, there has not been a change in consciousness, we still have a socialist labor code that is not adapted to the conditions of economic transformation and market economy. This is the reason for much controversy. And it is necessary to ask the employees if they do not trust their employers". Dariusz Adamski, chairman of the Inter-company "Solidarity" Committee of Stocznia Gdynia SA, expresses his belief that the view that in general "(...) there is no trust between the owner and the crew, is wrong. Not all employers act equally. Applying this to the shipyard, the issue of distrust on the union side seems quite natural. However, we need to cooperate with each other, even though we can't fully trust, in order not to be led astray. The modern capitalist in Poland operates according to complicated rules of the game. Various decisions made under the banner of restructuring hit the worker, so also the reactions of workers and trade unions stem from incomplete trust in the pure intentions of the parties. However, one cannot understand only one's intentions, because this leads to a full fracture. We trade unionists are only seemingly on the opposite side of the barricade from the company's management, because at the end of the process it may turn out that the barricade is shared. If there is no company, there will be no employees, no unions, neither them nor us". According to Ryszard Bugaj, the problem exists, and its "(...) sources are complex. The first are of a historical nature - too many observe how the owners came to their money under circumstances that are either ambiguous or unambiguous, but reprehensible. The second is that, contrary to perceptions, asset managers do it incompetently. They manage poorly, and their employees - relegated to the status of labor force - are resented by employers who do not countenance control and accountability at all. Owners are also often convinced of the very low quality of the Polish workforce, in which there is also a grain of truth. The positive image of Polish managers and owners has been seriously exaggerated by the dominant media, which has created the employer as the demiurge of our times, independently producing wealth, giving jobs and so on. Many have come to believe this and reject partnerships. Thus, both sides are very resentful of each other, which has a bad effect on workplace relations. All this together creates additional costs for employers and generally worsens the competitiveness of the Polish economy". Prof. Juliusz Gardawski, a sociologist, points out that employees trust and distrust. "In a large part of enterprises there are unwritten agreements in operation between the employer and the

employee, who agrees to bypass the labor code in order to receive more money without "usurpation". There is no strong antagonism on this issue, rather paternalistic relations prevail. However, studies show that tension is created in the relationship between employer and employee. The employer is aware that employees are calculating him every penny - what he took for himself, what he spent on wages, what he spent on investments, and so on. Many owners even try not to disclose their place of residence. Nonetheless, there seems to be a complex intertwining of relationships of limited trust in smaller and medium-sized companies, a peculiar combination of paternalism and common overreach, and a lack of employee representation. These are not pure and clear-cut situations, but they may change over time. If an employer wants valuable employees with specialized skills, he can't despise them, he must take care of them, not just grimly exploit them". As you can see, not much has changed in this area after two decades.

2. Recruitment lying in Poland, or why do people lie during a job interview?

I assume that a recruitment lie is a deliberate, intentional and intentional communication action aimed at causing the recipient to make a judgment inconsistent with the judgment held by the potential employee. A 2020 study conducted by LiveCareer (How and why we lie at job interviews, https://mlodziwlodzi.pl/blisko-polowa-polakow-klamie-na-rozmowie-o-prace-wyniki-badania-livecareer/, 20.04.2022) found that more than 42% of Poles openly admitted to lying during job interviews. Employees in the food service (63%), government (53%) and business and finance (51%) are the most likely to lie. Most often, they related to high interest in the job offer (41.94%), less often - motivating factors for the job (34.13%) and the relationship with the previous supervisor (31.38%). More than 31% of respondents admitted to giving a false reason for leaving their previous job. One in three cited a desire for professional development as the reason for changing jobs, while one in six cited low chances for promotion. More than 15% of people in this group gave false information about a layoff by reporting a massive downsizing at their previous job. Nearly 29% overestimated the level of skills they possessed. Nearly 27% of respondents admitted to having higher knowledge of a foreign language than they actually did. 18% of respondents lied about their education, while 17% signed off on the professional achievements of others (or the entire team). The most frequently cited reasons for lying were: long periods of unemployment (more than 24% of respondents. This claim was most often accepted by food service workers (over 40%) and government employees (36%). Nearly 18% of respondents (aged 18-39) indicated that they did not meet all the requirements stated in the job offer. 17% of respondents cited the stress of a job interview as the main reason for lying. More than 1 in 10 respondents would be capable of lying to get a higher salary than offered. More than 7% of respondents would be able to do so in order to

boost their self-esteem while for 5% of respondents having the belief that they would not be caught lying. The results presented for employees of the state administration (53%) and the sphere of business and finance (51%) undermine the myth of intellectual formation inherent in higher education and allow us to pass the question of its shape and quality due to the functioning of institutions of public trust. As the above analysis shows, the phenomenon of recruitment lies correlates with indicators of the level of public trust co-creating the environment of the organization. Therefore, the answer to why we so easily decide to recruit lies should be sought in the cultural and social context of its functioning. In my opinion, it is formed by:

1. The phenomenon of relativism.
2. Social anomie.
3. The process of changing the meaning of concepts.

I find the beginning of the social reception of relativism in Albert Einstein's theory, which took a different shape than its creator himself would have expected: the concepts of time and absolute length lost their original meaning. The motions of the spheres were no longer certain. In the early 1920s, the belief spread that any absolutes of time, space, good and evil, knowledge and value ceased to exist despite the fact that the creator of the general theory of relativity devoted his entire life to the search for truth and certainty. The problem of relativization of epistemology emerged - the essence and value of cognition of reality Richard McKay Rorty stated explicitly that the concept of theory of cognition is completely meaningless because it is based on an empirically questionable assumption, and that the process of cognition itself is a reflection of reality (Rorty, 1997). However, when studying human behavior, it is important to remember that processes are determined by the structure of the natural world and have nothing to do with the practices inherent in the social world. They are various events that are the consequence of human decisions - a function of the interaction of intelligence and the environment. And therefore, although various human affairs are characterized by a certain degree of regularity, they are not determined by the immutable laws of nature. However, if the notion that "everything is relative" is perpetuated in the social consciousness, then also the attitude towards lying (taking into account the cultural context) facilitates its acceptance. Moreover, cognitive relativism rationalizes moral relativism and ethical relativism. The analysis of the destruction of the foundations of the axionormative order at the end of the 19th century initiated a discussion of the social, political and economic consequences of the phenomenon of anomie. This phenomenon is now considered in terms of objective states of society and subjective states of individual consciousness. For Durkheim, anomie is a state "(...) in which the normative system loses coherence and turns into chaos. Signposts of action - goals and means - become vague, ambiguous. People lose their sense of what is good and what is bad, what is worthy and what is unworthy, what should be pursued and what should be avoided, what methods are allowed and what are forbidden. Disorganization of normative culture means disorientation of members of the collective" (Sztompka, 2002, p. 275). It should be borne in mind that the essence of anomie understood in this way is the sudden deprivation of rules and

restrictions that have hitherto determined the possibilities and ceiling of an individual's aspirations. Another understanding of anomie is related to the concept of the welfare state. The extensive offer of goals to be pursued with universal satisfaction of the possibilities of their satisfaction becomes insufficient for individuals and social groups - their expectations exceed the proposals of the system. The realization of subjectively irrelevant goals is deprived of a sense of social gratification (Simon, Gagnon, 1976). I make the assumption that language determines the way and orientation of thinking. In other words - it shapes our perception of the world around us (Sapir, 1978; Whorf,, 2002). The existential context today co-creates the so-called knowledge society. The euphemism of the knowledge society revealed in the form of the world risk society is a situation in which "(...) we are dealing with a society of ignorance in a certain very strict sense: it cannot be overcome - like pre-modernity - by more extensive and better knowledge, more extensive and better science, but conversely, more extensive and better science just produces it. In a global risk society, Dr. Ignorance rules. Living in an environment of manufactured ignorance consequently means seeking unknown answers to questions that no one can clearly ask" (Beck 2012, p. 171). This is why the concept of post-truth (a situation of social acquiescence to the creation of substitute information that does not always conform to reality) and the phenomenon of fake news, i.e. information relating to (or describing) circumstances in which objective facts exert less influence on the formation of public opinion than emotions and personal beliefs, have gained social acceptance. In other words - emotions are more important than objective truth. The social consequences of lying were pointed out by Wojciech Chudy, among others (Chudy, 2003, pp. 201-221):

1. Acceptance of ideological content without self-acceptance.
2. Deformation of culture, negation of positive values.
3. Subordination of social truth to the principle of profit maximization.
4. Erosion of the basic sense of communication - erosion of personal relationships.
5. Deprivation of the right to truth.
6. Aggression and the desire for retaliation (both sides).

The contemporary existential context outlined above generates the prevalence and acceptance of the phenomenon of lying, including recruitment lying.

3. Summary and conclusions

The presented article analyzes the importance of trust and lies in organizational life. According to the author, in Polish conditions, the importance of the concept of trust management is overestimated while the recruitment lie is an effect of the progressive phenomenon of relativization of phenomena - including social norms, which corresponds to the phenomenon of chaos of the axionormative order. The connotation of concepts related to the

concept of truth is also changing. According to the author, the sociological perspective in the study of trust and lying in organizations should be expanded to include analyses from institutional economics and the issue of social capital. Management science enables interdisciplinary discourse.

Acknowledgements

References

1. Beck, U. (2012). *Społeczeństwo światowego ryzyka. W poszukiwaniu utraconego bezpieczeństwa*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Scholar.
2. Blum Susan, D. (2007). *Lies that Bind: Chinese Truth, Other Truths*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.
3. Bugdol, M. (2010). Zaufanie jako element systemu wartości organizacyjnych. *Współczesne Zarządzanie*, *No. 2*. pp. 11-25.
4. Campbell, J. (2002). *The Liar's Tale: A History of Falsehood*. New York-London: W.W. Norton.
5. Chudy, W. (2003). Kłamstwo społeczne i jego skutki. In: A. Maryniarczyk, K. Stępień, (Ed.), *Błąd antropologiczny* (pp. 201-222). Lublin: Polskie Towarzystwo Tomasza z Akwinu.
6. Dąmbska, I. (1979). Pseudos i pseudes w filozofii Platona. *Roczniki Filozoficzne, No. 1.*
7. DePaulo, B.M. (2008). Różne oblicza kłamstwa. In: A.G. Miller (Ed.), *Dobro i zło z perspektywy psychologii społecznej* (pp. 379-408). Kraków: WAM.
8. Florek-Moskal, M. (2009). Kłamstwo jest w cenie. *Tygodnik Wprost*, *nr 38*.
9. Fukuyama, F. (1997). *Zaufanie. Kapitał społeczny a droga do dobrobytu*. Warszawa-Wrocław: PWN.
10. Gesteland, R.R. (2005). *Cross-cultural business behavior: negotiating, selling, sourcing and managing across cultures*. Copenhagen: Copenhagen Business School Press.
11. Goffman, E. (2008). *Człowiek w teatrze życia codziennego*. Warszawa: Aletheia.
12. Hall, E.T. (2009) *Ukryty wymiar kultury*. Warszawa: Muza.

13. Hampden-Turner, Ch., Trompenaars, A. (1998). *Siedem kultur kapitalizmu. USA, Japonia, Niemcy, Francja, Wielka Brytania, Szwecja, Holandia*. Warszawa: Dom Wydawniczy ABC.

14. Hofstede, G., Hofstede, G.J., Minkov, M. (2011*). Kultury i organizacje*. Warszawa: PWE.

15. Inglehart, R. (1997). *Cultural, Economic, and Political Change in 43 Societies*. Princeton, New York: Princeton University Press.

16. *Komunikat z badań, No. 37*. CBOS (2022).

17. Kucharski, J. (2014). Usprawiedliwione kłamstwo we współczesnej etyce stosowanej. In: A. Gielarowski, P. Janik (Ed.), *Uniwersum philosophiae*. Kraków: Akademia Ignatianum.

18. Lewicka-Strzałecka, A. (2003). Zaufanie w relacji konsument-biznes. *Prakseologia, No. 143,* pp. 195-208.

19. Malinowski, B. (2002). *Dziennik w ścisłym znaczeniu tego wyrazu*. Kraków: Wyd. Literackie.

20. Metcalf, P. (2002). *They Lie, We Lie: Getting on with Anthropology*. New York: Routledge.

21. Pawnik, W. (2016). *Zaufanie społeczne – paradoks procesów modernizacyjnych.* Kraków: ZN WSH Zarządzanie.

22. Piechowicz, R. (2009). Kłamstwo, prawda i... In: W. Zuziak, J. M. Byrska (Ed.), *Kłamstwo w życiu publicznym*. Kraków: WN UPJPII.

23. *Raport EY* (2016). *Globalne pokolenia 3.0. Badanie zaufania w miejscu pracy*. Retrieved from https://www.prawo.pl/kadry/ey-zbadal-poziom-zaufania-w-miejscu-pracy-wsrod-przedstawicieli-roznych-pokolen,286528.html, 15.04.2022.

24. *Raport Hays Poland* (2016). *Prawdziwe aspekty miejsca pracy 2019*. Retrieved from https://hrnews.pl/satysfakcja-ktora-zatrzymuje-pracownikow, 20.04.2022.

25. *Raport z badań* (2013). *Zaufanie w firmie.* Retrieved from https://www.procontent.pl/ 2013/01/polacy-nie-ufaja-szefom/, 16.04.2022.

26. *Raport z badań LiveCareer, Jak i dlaczego kłamiemy na rozmowach o pracę.* Retrieved from https://mlodziwlodzi.pl/blisko-polowa-polakow-klamie-na-rozmowie-o-prace-wyniki-badania-livecareer/, 20.04.2022).

27. Robbins, S.P. (1998). *Zachowania w organizacji*. Warszawa: PWE.

28. Rorty, R. (1997). *Filozofia a zwierciadło natury*. Warszawa: Aletheia.

29. Sapir, E. (1978). *Kultura, język, osobowość*. Warszawa: Państwowy Instytut Wydawniczy.

30. Simon, W.J.H., Gagnon, J.H. (1976). The Anomy of Affluence: A Post-Mertonian Conception. *The American Journal of Sociology. No. 2,* pp. 356-378.

31. Straussa, W., Howe, N. (1991). *Generations: The History of America's Future 1584 to 2069*. New York: William Morrow & Company.

32. Surmiak, A. (2014). Antropologia kłamstwa? Badania nad kłamstwem w perspektywie antropologii społeczno-kulturowej. *Kultura i społeczeństwo, No. 4*, pp. 201-224.

33. Sztompka, P. (2002). *Socjologia. Analiza społeczeństwa*. Kraków: Znak.

34. Tönnies, F. (2008). *Wspólnota i stowarzyszenie. Rozprawa o komunizmie i socjalizmie jako empirycznych formach kultury*. Warszawa: PWN.

35. Trompenaars, F., Hampden-Turner, C. (1999). *Riding the Waves of Culture. Understanding Cultural Diversity in Business*. London: Nicholas Brealley Publishing.

36. Tumiłowicz, B. *Dlaczego polski kapitalista nie ufa swoim pracownikom a oni jemu?* Retrieved from https://www.tygodnikprzeglad.pl/dlaczego-polski-kapitalista-nie-ufa-swoim-pracownikom-jemu/, 17.04.2022.

37. Vrij, A. (2009). *Wykrywanie kłamstw i oszukiwania Psychologia kłamania i konsekwencje dla praktyki zawodowej*. Kraków: WUJ.

38. Whorf, B.L. (2002) *Język, myśl i rzeczywistość*: Warszawa: Wydawnictwo KR.

39. Wilkin, J. (2016). *Instytucjonalne i kulturowe podstawy gospodarowania. Humanistyczna perspektywa ekonomii*. Warszawa: Scholar.

40. Witwicki, W. (1958). *Platon, Hippiasz Mniejszy*. Warszawa: PWN.