

Justyna Łukaszewska-Bezulska

Instytut Polityki Społecznej, Uniwersytet Warszawski¹

*Trust and migrations:
in search of mutual dependences and interactions*

Summary

This article discussed interactions between spatial mobility and migrations abroad for economic reasons. On the basis of overview of the literature and empirical studies, it was shown that trust depends on the broader socio-cultural context, and there is a strong interactions between migrations abroad for economic reasons and trust. Generally, spatial mobility contributes to a lower level of trust, both in its generalised and individual dimension. Nevertheless, if migrations abroad for economic reasons are based on strong migrational networks, they have a positive influence on the generalised level of trust. Everyday activities, such as looking for work (including in informal economy), or sharing a place to live with other migrants play an important role in this context.

Key words: migrations for economic reasons, trust, trust culture, social capital, Poland

¹ Instytut Polityki Społecznej UW, ul. Nowy Świat 67, 00-927 Warszawa; adres elektroniczny autorki: j.lukaszewska@uw.edu.pl

Introduction

The purpose of this article is to identify connections and interactions between migrations abroad for economic reasons and trust² between persons, and, to a much lesser extent, between persons and institutions. It has been assumed that these phenomena are interrelated, and the direction of the influence depends on a larger socio-historical context.

The first part of this paper will review selected theoretical concepts of the categories of trust, especially in the context of social mobility. The second part of the article will comment on own empirical studies of mutual interactions between international migrations abroad and trust. Their aim was to answer the question whether persons sharing similar migration experience have a comparable definition of trust. Moreover, it was undertaken to define what assumptions on trust were made by the respondents, i.e. whether they deem that the general attitude towards other people should assume trust or the lack of trust. It has also been examined how, in the respondents' opinion, migrations affect the level of trust and in which situations related to travelling abroad the trust towards others plays the most important role, and the forms it adopts.

For the purpose of this article, we adopted S. Eisenstadt's definition of migration as a "physical transition of an individual or a group from one society to another. This transition normally involves abandoning one social setting and entering another, and different one" (Eisenstadt 1953, in: Górny, Kaczmarczyk 2003, p. 5), with the reservation that entering this new social setting need not be permanent or final. The economic nature of migration, in turn, is mainly a result of the main reason for migration, that is, "usually to improve the social standing of migrants and their families, generally in their place of permanent residence, and the main objective is to find employment that gives greater economic benefits (salary-related or not) than the one in the current living place" (Jończy 2010, p. 30).

Trust and migrations: selected theoretical concepts

The state-of-the-art review demonstrates three basic approaches to trust. The most popular one is the so-called "encapsulated interest", assuming that the it is profitable for the trustee to stay in relationship with the truster, which, in turn, is an incentive to stay trustworthy. It is then a three-way relationship, assuming the presence of a "truster", "trustee" and the question the trust is about (A trusts B to fulfil X or act in connection with X) (Hardin 2009, pp. 25–27). Therefore, the key elements of trust are the resulting benefits, therefore, it is not an autotelic value. The remaining two theories explain the trustworthiness of the trustee through moral obligation or psychological inclination to be trustworthy (Hardin 2009, p. 25).

² This article will only discuss the relationships between trust and international economical migrations, with no reference to other types of migration and other migration motivations which may influence the level of trust. Verification of the hypothesis on interdependencies of various types of spatial mobility and trust requires separate empirical research.

Therefore, trust is most of all involved in future, unsure situations, and is rarely related to current matters. According to this Polish sociologist, trust is a “bet made on unsure, future actions of other people” (Sztompka 2007, pp. 69–70). It is therefore composed of two ingredients: beliefs and their practical expression (action). It is of active nature, it is something more than a passive assessment of future possibilities. P. Sztompka demonstrates the three dimensions of trust, which may be analysed as a personality trait of a single individual, as a cultural rule and as a feature in social relations³. The mere fact of being “trustworthy” is the important social capital of an individual or an institution. According to P. Sztompka, trust is a form of answer to the perceived risk level. As the author observes, a solidaristic community with strong ties could not exist without trust, both horizontal (among the community members) and vertical (between community members and political institutions (Sztompka 2007, p. 50).

P. Sztompka also introduces the concept of “trust culture”, i.e. a system of rules, norms and values that regulate giving trust, fulfilling expectations and returning trust. Five macro-social conditions are required to be met for this culture to develop in a given community. There are, namely:

- normative cohesion (normative order of social life);
- sustainable social order (tradition, continuity of identity);
- transparent social organization (with access to information on its functioning, sense of security and predictability);
- familiar setting (whether the new setting is similar to the one that the individual is used to, no sense of threat);
- other people’s responsibilities (standards) (Sztompka 2007, p. 223).

When an individual decides to migrate, it appears hard to maintain normative cohesion. Multi-ethnic communities, consisting of many groups of different origins, each of which have their own set of rules, are an exception. The new environment that the emigrants enter is often characterized by a very different set of values they have to face, which, in turn, may result in identity crisis or a feeling of alienation, also of axionormative nature. The migrant is, after all, a “stranger” in the receiving community, and at the same time, ceases to be “one of us” in the community of origin. Spatial mobility often results in having to choose between various values (e.g. being attached to one’s family and providing them with decent living conditions. Lack of sense of security and predictability, both in the context of having to adapt to new living conditions abroad and finding oneself in a new social situation also hamper creating trust culture. Apart from that, for the trust culture to form, it is necessary for a community to have a certain range of common resources, among which a major role is played by social networks. First of all, they are a fertile ground for a generalised inclination to trust, and also have a positive impact on the level of trust by increasing the sense of stability, security, solidarity and possible support in difficult

³ R. Hardin argues with this approach, noticing that Sztompka’s definition is contrary to the common understanding of trust, according to which it is reasonable to state that I trust someone even where there is no chance of trying this trust out in everyday life. The trust mechanism is a “potential action” (Hardin 2009, p. 42).

life situations. According to P. Sztompka, an existing network of contacts also influence showing trust to persons outside these networks (Sztompka 2007, p. 288). Therefore, migration networks may prove to be a positive resource for trust culture. Their meaning will be described in more detail in the following part of the article.

Family plays an important role in developing the trust culture. It is especially important in creating general attitude and opinions on trust, and is also a place to test it every day, and the family support enables placing risky “bets” (Sztompka 2007, p. 289). Migrations may disturb its sustainability and stability. Consequently, the amount of trust and support given by family members may decrease. Positive or negative migration experiences of an individual, including those related to trust, may strongly influence the attitude of other family members, therefore contributing to enlarging or diminishing the reach of trust circles.

Stability of life situation, durability and continuity of living conditions are also important conditions for trust culture to exist (Sztompka 2007, p. 388), which is especially difficult in migration conditions. Spatial mobility seems therefore to be completely unfavourable for the presence of trust culture. In its very definition, migration stands for movement, change, lack of continuity. Meanwhile, a minimal level of stability is crucial for trust culture to develop. In this context, trust culture can be considered one of “insider-advantages” (Fischer, Holm, Malmberg, Straubhaar 1998).

R. Putnam, in turn, analyses the question of social trust, that is generalised trust shown to other people, fulfilling the generalised reciprocity norm in practice. According to them, trust is the key ingredient of social capital (Putnam, Leonardi, Nanetti 1995, p. 264) and at the same time, in its specific form. It is not an individual resource, but a particular, generalised “cooperation climate”. According to R. Putnam, social capital and trust are inseparable: “people who trust others are all-around good citizens, and those more engaged in community life are both more trusting and more trustworthy. On the contrary, the critically disengaged believe themselves to be surrounded by miscreants and feel less constrained to be honest themselves” (Putnam 2000). In R. Putnam’s theory, trust is therefore both cooperation catalyst and its effect (Putnam, Leonardi, Nanetti 1995, p. 136). R. Putnam defines two types of trust: thick, embedded in personal relationships, and generalised (thin), showing towards strangers, and therefore, of particular importance in a migration context (Ziółkowski 2008, p. 14). Generalised trust is considered more worthy and meaningful and therefore can be defined as social trust. R. Putnam claims that trust belongs to the category of resources “that grow with use and decays with disuse. The more two people trust each other, the more trustworthy they become” (Putnam 2008, pp. 262–263). According to Putnam, lack of trust is self-fulfilling, while trust needs to be fostered and confirmed in everyday interactions, which means that migrations that cause absence in the community of origin affect this resource negatively. Regular contacts and mutual obligations cause individuals to develop personalized trust. Migration may influence the “double absence” (Sayad 2004), eradicating the individuals from their communities of origin, and at the same time, only involving them in the life of the receiving community to a small extent. In this context, spatial mobility should be considered detrimental to mutual

trust. After all, in a stable social system, trust is confirmed in subsequent interaction, leading to system closure. As a result, trust appears and “soaks up” all contacts, including potential ones, and the ability to give trust (trustworthiness) becomes an important social norm (Działek 2011, p. 18). Trust and reciprocity are therefore a result of immediate relationships between individuals that know each other and maintain their mutual relationships, which may be more difficult in case of increased migrations. According to R. Putnam, trust has two sources: reciprocity norms and/or civic engagement networks, and trust and social capital reinforce each other: persons that have bridging capital thanks to trust in others are more at ease establishing ties, and therefore they have more friends and acquaintances, which in turn encourages them to trust more and be more active, and it may in particular influence a decision to go abroad, and further on, facilitate the adaptation process in the country of destination.

Studies of trust require taking into account a wider historical and cultural context. This aspect is underlined by R. Inglehart, who claims that interpersonal trust is a relatively persistent quality of a given community; it reflects the given nation’s overall historical experience, consisting of economical, political, and other factors (Inglehart 1997, in: Frykowski 2005, p. 37) The category of trust plays a particularly important role in a changing, heterogeneous world, one that migrant social setting usually is. The post-modern communities are mobile, based on strong variability and a conviction that nothing is certain. In these conditions, it is hard to develop trust, as the individuals do not fulfil one, predictable plan of action, making choices and modifying the world around them instead. In this context, fluid migrations are symptomatic. Moreover, the strengthening migration processes and more and more unconstrained population flow between cultural, administrative or language boundaries are strongly favourable to the increasing level of social diversity. These conditions increase diversity in a person’s socio-cultural environment, which presents a serious challenge for trust culture (Mamzer 2011, p. 11–12). At the same time, it must be observed that like social capital, trust can be excluding. Then, trust’s internal functionality (for partners and groups they immediately belong to) does not coincide with trust’s external functionality (Sztompka 2007, p. 327). As P. Sztompka observes, trust acquires a specific feature, concentrating mainly on exclusion and establishing strong boundaries between “us” and “them”. As a result, “sectarian solidarity” emerges (Misztal 1996, in: Sztompka 2007, p. 327). At the same time, it must be observed that this situation may lead to the individuals enclosing in their own group, which, in turn, may hamper the integration process. For individual that have bonding capital resources, we can also observe feedback between trust and social capital, yet of a different nature. Lack of trust towards “strangers” causes individuals to limit their contacts to a narrow group of family and acquaintances, and such a network reinforces the individual’s belief that only the people one is close with may be trusted completely (Putnam 2008, pp. 262–265)⁴.

⁴ R. Putnam’s concept has encountered criticism, especially from non-institutional trust theory partisans. For example, D. North assumes that trust or the lack of it is a result of the individuals’ rational decision on less or more efficient functioning of the existing institutions, including political

The role of migration networks is one of the key concepts analysed in the context of mutual relationships between spatial mobility and migration. The research on this question was conducted by, among others, Ch. Tilly⁵. While observing the migration choices in Mexico, he noticed that those who were the first to succeed abroad, bring other people from their locality. Mutual trust plays an important role in this process. This type of situation leads, in effect, to creating settlements of people of common origin (Tilly 2005, in: Sztompka 2007, p. 261). P. Sztompka claims that trust chains convert into closed, exclusive trust networks, ethnic ghettos (Sztompka 2007, p. 261). This phenomenon may have two assessments: on one hand, the increasing trust is a positive effect of spatial mobility, on the other, the exclusivity of networks cause them to be closed, exclude people from outside of a certain group (e.g. non-migrants, persons of other ethno-cultural origin or coming from different waves of migration), which may, among others, hamper integration or exchange of information and experience. Trust and lack of trust may therefore be considered extreme degrees of a continuum. It is worth noticing that these two states are not mutually exclusive. Specific types of social capital (bridging and bonding) are coupled with, respectively, with trust and lack of trust (Growiec 2011, p. 100). Trust is a necessary condition to form social ties with persons from outside one's primary group (Growiec 2011, p. 122). At the same time, distrust towards "strangers" is a typical attitude. Nevertheless, it should always be clarified who is considered the "stranger". The situation is even more complicated for migrant groups. Migrants are perceived with a large dose of distrust, especially by representatives of the receiving community. The reasons for this state of affairs are cultural differences and fears of potential competition in the employment market.

Trust and migrations: the Polish example

The following part of this paper will review the results of empirical studies on the relationship of trust and spatial mobility. Those studies were conducted with the methods of non-participant observation and structured individual in-depth interviews with migrants and experts, i.e. persons with knowledge of local community specifics or involved in social problems because of their profession, i.e. representatives of local authorities (mayor), non-governmental organizations and employees of Local Social Welfare Centre. Twenty-two individual in-depth interviews with migrants⁶ and 7 expert interviews were conducted.

ones. The manner of purposeful shaping of the institutions has consequences for effective functioning of authorities and the trust citizens have for public institutions (North 1990, in: Poławski 2004, p. 63).

⁵ The concept of migration networks has been widely discussed in the state-of-the-art. Ch. Tilly was one of just a few researchers to draw attention to the relationship between the networks and trust, therefore, his concept will be expanded on in the following part of the article.

⁶ The sample was non-representative. Amongst the respondents from the Podlasie region, 50% were Catholic, 50% Orthodox, and among those from the Opole region, 50% were of migrant origin, and the other half being of local origin.

The empiric research analysed here was conducted in two localities, in Opole and Podlaskie voivodships, respectively. Their selection was purposive: selected places were to have a population that was greatly⁷ varied in terms of ethnicity and culture and experienced intense migration processes. The strength of spatial mobility was defined using unpublished Main Statistical Office data on the extent of temporary migrations abroad for over 3 months. Due to considerable inexactitude of these data, phone calls were conducted with the employees of Vital Record Offices of the selected gminas on the declared and estimated actual number of migrants. After the analysis of the data above, Leśnica in Opolskie voivodship and Siemiatycze in Podlaskie voivodship were selected for empirical research.

As it is rightfully observed by R. Hardin, most surveys assume that trust is a concept of which an understanding is shared by the majority of people. Therefore, if the studied individuals have their own, differing definitions of this concept, the results obtained in such a study cannot be compared directly (Hardin 2009, p. 68). That is why the interview survey contained the question on the respondent's definition of trust. Both its general and individual angle has been included in the analysis of the level of trust. The question of generalised trust⁸ is taken from M. Rosenberg's classic questionnaire on faith in people⁹ (Rosenberg 1956).

Two groups of respondents from different regions of Poland took part in the research, which is analysed in the following part of the article. Although their experiences were similar in terms of timing and migration forms, their opinions on the levels of trust were significantly different. The inhabitants of Podlaskie voivodship, both from the minority and the dominant group, had a relatively high level of declared generalised trust. It is telling that respondents from this group adopted a "trust assumption", that is, generally trusted other people as a rule, unless somebody seriously undermined their trust. They often declared that "if people didn't trust each other at all, their lives would probably be poor. It should be a rule to treat every person with some trust that they're good, they have good thoughts, we don't expect anything bad from them" (PE3). On the other hand, respondents from the Opole region declared not to trust strangers and adopt a "distrust assumption", fostering the attitude that it is safer to keep some distance rather than run the risk of losing trust in other people. One of the interviewees said exactly: "It's better not to trust [anyone] — you'll be safer" (OE3), while another one added: "It seems to me you should first keep your distance from someone before you get to know them better, right? You trust those that you know well" (O9). As it was underlined by the Opole voivodship inhabitants, their trust had to be earned, one had to prove to be worth it. Therefore, it is not given for granted, but attained: "to trust someone, it's not like

⁷ Namely, the "majority" group could not constitute over 70% of inhabitants.

⁸ Generally speaking, would you say that most people can be trusted or that you can't be too careful in dealing with people?

⁹ This question constitutes a part of numerous surveys, such as the Social Diagnosis and World Values Survey, although there has been empirical evidence of it being hardly accurate (Miller, Mitamura 2003).

that I see you for the first time and I trust you” (OE3). The Podlasie respondents also drew attention to the various dimensions of trust and its gradual nature; therefore, it can be shown as a continuum, with trust and complete distrust as extremities. For most respondents from the Opolskie voivodship, in turn, trust is two-dimensional, one-spot, that is, either someone is trusted or not, there are no levels in between. Much more often that the Podlasie residents, the Opole interviewees declared not to trust strangers as a rule. Persons with origin in the immigrant population in the Opole Voivodeship had a particularly high level of distrust. For instance, one of the respondents stated explicitly: “You have to know how to trust, but I don’t trust anyone. I only trust myself. You have to do everything yourself and only trust yourself” (O1). Indigenous residents were much more likely to only declare trust in persons from their ethnic group than the migrant ones. It is most of all a result of close proximity and strong ties of common origin among native Silesians. For example, one of the respondents recalled: “trust here maybe has something to do with that most people here are autochthons, and if know the other one inside out, there’s more, or better, you’ve got this trust and you just come up to someone and do something, just like that. If the group is mixed, it’s completely different” (O10).

The Opole region residents declared both a low level of generalised and individual trust. Much more than the Podlasie residents, they were likely to declare that they only slightly trust their neighbours. Meanwhile, for the Podlasie voivodship respondents, individual trust is a basis for successful family life and good relationships with acquaintances and neighbours. The respondents also declared that inter-confessional marriages are an example of a far greater trust towards the potential spouse than the confessionally homogeneous ones. Respondents from Opole region consider the trips abroad in terms of the mutual trust of the spouses. According to the respondents, making a decision to leave (especially for one of the partners) is only possible in case of complete confidence in each other. At the same time, to a part of respondents, long-term migrations have a negative impact on the level of trust in the relationship. As one of the female respondents said: “I think that later, after a longer trip, this trust is kind of disappearing (...) falling in, because it gets a little bit smaller” (OE1).

It is much harder for persons of immigrant origin to trust their neighbours, even if they come from the same ethnic and cultural groups, as they rarely keep in close contact with them, and often they do not even know them. Foreign migrations also have an important impact on this. These persons do not either feel rooted in their place of origin, their trips are much more often long-term and they do not stand for frequent visits in the country. As a consequence, this uproots the migrants from their local community. For example, when asked whether he trust his neighbours, one of the respondents answers: “I don’t know. I don’t know them, because I wasn’t here. I think I trust those on the left, and those on the right, I don’t know them, because I wasn’t there when they moved, so I don’t know them at all” (O2).

The Podlasie residents stressed very firmly that the level of trust towards someone else is completely regardless of this person’s religion. The respondents underline expressly that they both trust Catholics and Orthodox Christians, and do not consider religion in

determining whether a person is trustworthy or not. What is important, those interviewed stressed that thanks to the migration experience, their level of trust towards believers of other faiths, considered more “exotic”, such as Islam or Buddhism. Building trust resources among the migrants from Podlasie is promoted by living together during the stay abroad. In the case of Opole region, different levels of trust are observed depending on the ethnic and cultural background of individuals. Both among the population of immigrant origin and autochthons, the level of trust in members of their own group is considerably higher, even if the members of other groups are, for example, neighbours: “So far, I’ve lived in my family home since I was born, so I’ve known these neighbours for over twenty years and I trust them, at least those that I grew up among. I have a huge trust in them. However, the foreigners, because such people are here, on my street at least, the trust is a bit limited, well. But generally, as I said, there is a trust, but not complete one. I have to be honest with you, I will tell you that this is the way it is, I think that in Silesia, you divide people into your own and not your own. So if you are Silesian, you’ll trust another Silesian more than a non-Silesian. And it is for sure true for me. I was raised in this culture and my parents kind of instilled this upon me, and so I think it stayed this way” (O4). Even though they themselves were in the migration situation and experienced the resulting sense of alienation, respondents of autochthonic Opole region origin still divided their fellow residents into “their own” and “strangers”. As one of the respondents claimed: “of course it is easier to mentally communicate with people, are from the same group, I would say, yes, that the autochthons appreciate each other more there maybe” (O6). However, it must be said that persons of immigrant origin trust each other much less trust than is the case for the autochthons. In addition, some Opole region residents declare that while they themselves, when assessing trust in other people, do not use the criterion of origin, they are aware that most people do it and the divisions of trust degree by this criterion are prominent. The indigenous population also drew attention to the fact that among the migrants, the level of trust is much lower than in their own. All in all, not migrations *per se*, although their role is also important, but most of all, a wider historical and socio-cultural context have a critical influence on the level of trust in the discussed local communities.

According to the respondents, trust and integrity are very important in the day-to-day life of a migrant, particularly when looking for work and a place to live. In the case of both surveyed localities, the spatial mobility had the form of chain migration. This is expressed not only by the manner of making one’s decision to leave and its subsequent implementation, but mainly in the forms of employment searching. Migrants mostly got their first job “by recommendation”, via family or friends. After a period of time, they themselves became a source of knowledge of potential places of employment and manners of employment-seeking for those who arrived later. Migration networks are especially important for Podlasie residents, for whom the aim of the travel is primarily accumulating money. As a result, they try all the possible ways to acquire the best, i.e. best paid work. Because it is a key resource, information on it starts to come with a price. In addition, most conflicts between Poles working illegally are about work, e.g. unfair

competition, selling information, etc. (Grzymała-Kazłowska 2001, p. 276). Job trading is considered one of the typical symptoms of migration networks at work. It is considered to be introduced by migrants from Podlasie and in principle, it is only practised by them (Hirszfeld, Kaczmarczyk 2000, p. 35). This type of behaviour was also often mentioned by respondents from Siemiatycze. The vast majority of respondents claimed friends or family members who decided to go abroad earlier helped them find their first jobs. For example, one female respondent, when asked about her job search, declared: "I'm telling you, it's about friends. Because my auntie is also there, and my mum, so you know... So it went quickly" (P3). Another one added: "At the beginning, yes, my sister helped me, and later, we helped each other, somebody recommended you and that's how you got jobs. When it happened, when I had my week figured out, and for example, when one of my girlfriends, or someone in the family, needed hours, then I asked these people, that I can't take it, but I can recommend someone and then I'd give these hours to my girlfriend" (P6). For female migrants from this region working as babysitters and house help, the so-called "swaps", that is, two (or more) people working interchangeably for the same employer are a typical form of work. While one is working, the other one has time off and can return to the place of origin. This form of employment requires strong trust between those who use it, as well as knowledge of other migrants (or potential migrants) who would have agreed to work this way. Temporary selling or lending work is also a common observance, especially for those at the early stage of migration. For example, one of the female respondents recalled: "No, I didn't go as a shot in the dark. I went there, my mother-in-law once worked there and had some jobs she lent me for some time. And for the first time at all I went there to replace her" (P7). In this situation, both parties: the person who is looking for work and the person offering it or intermediating in the search for it, need to trust. "Simply, you know, if you knew someone well, then you were looking, right? And if you knew somebody less, then you preferred, you know, because it's just that later, if someone gives someone else a job, you need this person to be honest" (O5). A similar mechanism occurs in house-seeking. The moment when a migrant leaves a shared flat is particularly interesting. Most often, it is the migrant who searches for a person to take her place. Most of all, this person must be trustworthy, not to expose other tenants to any issues, resulting most of all from the fact that their stay or employment are illegal.

Persons with no support from members of migrational networks much more often have negative experiences of spatial mobility, which, in consequence, cause the level of trust to drop. According to their statements, during the period spent abroad, one should be very wary of, or even distrustful towards both the members of receiving communities and one's compatriots. As one of the respondents claimed: "most of all I learned not to lend money to anyone, that's one thing. That Poles are thankless, that's the other one" (P1), while another one added: "It seems to me that everyone's looking after themselves. When you go after all these jobs, you see that everyone's trying to make it, may even make you trip up, to have something out of it, some, I don't know, advantage, you know (...). You know, there was always some rivalry and some people didn't, let's call it, play

it fair. And yeah, that's what it's like" (O9). "You know, there's people there that, you know, they won't help one another, maybe even do some harm. And yes, it, you know, it influenced me, a lot, because I was always one to trust people. I was like, if somebody told me something, I believed him, all was great. And when I went there, only then you could, you opened your eyes, that even with all the warnings, people have let you down. So, because of this, I keep my distance from everyone, [I don't know] whether this is a friend or someone else, you never know" (O12). "After what I experienced, it's hard for me to trust. Yes, it's hard for me to trust. It all depends on how long you stay with this person, in what situations you find yourself with them. A friend in need is a friend indeed, so they say, right?" (O9). Nevertheless, it should be observed that in the quotes from the Podlasie respondents and autochthonic population of the Opole region, positive declarations on the influence of migrations on trust are prevalent. Therefore, it can be concluded that if migrations abroad for economic reasons are based on strong migration networks, they have a positive influence on the generalised level of trust.

The differences in the level and the ways of perceiving trust in both regions analysed stem from, among others, differences in the shaping of migration networks, as well as from historical factors. In the Opole region, local residents had long had better access to legal work abroad, which was the result of regulations, formerly concerning mostly the access to the German work market, that were more favourable towards the persons of German origin. Consequently, indigenous and migrant residents travel separately, to different places and have a different vision of their travels: the indigenous residents travel "to their own place" and migrant residents travel "for work", which also has a negative impact on the level of trust between the two resident groups. Moreover, the mutual distance was reinforced by the regulations that hampered organisational possibilities of the German minority in the People's Republic of Poland, when the authorities did not recognise that minority group. In the case of persons migrating from the Podlasie region, it is also very important that persons of different ethnic origins are considered "our own" in a migrational context, and these behaviour patterns continue after returning to Poland. Working together when seeking employment abroad (especially swapping, selling or giving away work positions), and most of all, sharing a place to live in the country of economic migration causes pre-existent differences in religion or nationality to diminish, while the importance of shared experiences related to trips abroad increases, as the solidarity of one kind is being built (Bartkowski 2004, p. 270).

Respondents from both studied voivodships underlined that during their trips abroad, they observed that locals trusted each other much more than in Poland, which, in their opinion, results in higher quality of life. As one female respondent stated, "I think that abroad, you trust neighbours more than you do here. They leave all their belongings out there in sight, a guy comes up to do some renovation, they leave him, don't watch on him and sit in the office, and in Poland you don't trust renovation companies, you watch on these guys when they're in your house. I think it's very good, when they come back, they bring these manners with them" (P4). A higher level of trust observed by migrants during their trips is not only a feature of interpersonal relations, but also of the citizen-state

link. The respondents underlined the visible atmosphere of “civic trust” towards public institutions. “I think that living in the West had many, like, exploratory functions, when I acquired certain abilities and knowledge or experience, observing life during these years that, well, after all, the basis of living together well was an open attitude, one that you could feel even in very shallow contacts, in different institutions, different... you know, ones that inspire respect and show mutual trust” (O6). The respondents underlined that they would like to transfer a similar behaviour pattern to Poland, but they do not know how to do it and they find no support in local authorities and other residents. As one of the Opole region respondents claimed, “personally, I would like this trust to be built with greater participation in local matters, that is, as I understand it, for local authorities to listen to what people say, no matter how clever or stupid it is, pretending to trust, because it is not that important to include all the causes, but to listen to all of them and give feedback on them and that’s enough” (O6). Therefore, in this context, migrations and their intermediary import of positive benchmarks can positively influence trust and social capital. At the same time, it should be observed that negative patterns can also be adopted, which was not mentioned by respondents. It requires further research to answer the question whether these actions are not performed or are simply unsaid by migrants, who may also have an idealistic vision of their migration country, the values professed and the rules in force there, and present themselves as reliable citizens.

Conclusion

Both on a personalised and generalised level, trust is a resource that depends on many, mainly historical and socio-cultural factors, such as traditions or the culture of trust. Migrations abroad for economic reasons may be one of them. They are also one of the elements that may influence the ways to define trust and perceive its meaning in the everyday life. Despite similar migration experiences, the respondents from the two studied localities have a different vision of trust and accept different assumptions related to it. These differences are both intra- and inter-group, i.e. significant differences were observed in the declared levels of trust between the studied populations in each voivodships, as well as between the respondents from the Opole region originating from different ethnic groups. For the respondents in the Opole region, it is bipolar in nature (i.e. one can be either trusted or not, with no intermittent states), whereas the studied persons from Podlasie perceive it as a point in a continuum, with trust and complete distrust as extremities.

The state-of-the-art analysis suggests that spatial mobility has a negative impact on trust, both in the process in its social production and the existing resources. Migration-related factors, such as lack of roots, security or stable life, as well as difficulties in maintaining normative cohesion, have a particularly adverse impact on them. Double absence, and as a consequence, also double alienation are alarming for trust to emerge. As a result, individuals finds no support in either of the communities they theoretically are attached to, which, in consequence, may lead to them creating a “trust void”, that is, an

attitude of extreme distance and distrust. At the same time, the empirical studies discussed in this paper demonstrate that mobility based on strong migration networks may have a positive influence on trust resources, mainly on the generalised trust. Social networks are an important token of trust, including trust towards persons from outside their reach. In addition, they cause the resource to reproduce. Networks, including migration networks, are grounds for creating a generalised tendency to trust. At the same time, as both empirical studies discussed in the article and source literature demonstrate, trust is a basic foundation of the migration networks.

The migration — trust relationship is also two-sided, i.e. migration experiences influence a level of trust, but at the same time, a person's wide trust radius, associated with large migrational networks, may influence a decision to go abroad and facilitate the first stage of staying abroad. Everyday activities of migrants, such as looking for work or a place to live, shape the attitude of trust or distrust. Paradoxically, actions in the informal economy, such as illegal residence in the country of destination or working illegally, require particular trust. "Import of trust", both civic, i.e. regarding the relationship between the individual and public authorities, and interpersonal.

As it is demonstrated by analysing source literature, family plays an important role in developing the trust culture. First of all, it is the birthplace for the general attitude of (dis)trust, which determines further behaviour of an individual in a significant way. Affecting the quality of family life, mobility indirectly influences the level of confidence, and therefore, of the trust radius. At the same time, as both empirical studies discussed in the article and source literature demonstrate, an individual migrating is an expression of a high level of trust within a family, especially in the relationship between spouses, as well as a token of taking responsibility for one's closest relatives, both at the stage of making a decision to leave and during the trip.

Trust is a resource that requires particular care, it needs to be fostered and confirmed in everyday interactions, while distrust is self-fulfilling. With the analysis of empirical studies discussed in this paper, it can thus be said that a minimum degree of rooting in a local community is a prerequisite to the creation of the trust culture, and a high level of trust in a community can be considered one of the insider advantages.

At the same time, it must be observed that excessive trust can be harmful to the development of larger communities, as it may lead to the individuals closing in within their own small groups, including ethnic ones, which, in turn, may have a negative impact on, e.g. adaptation and integration processes.

References

- Działek, J. (2011). *Kapitał społeczny jako czynnik rozwoju gospodarczego w skali regionalnej i lokalnej w Polsce*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego.
- Eisenstadt, S.N. (1953). Analysis of Patterns of Immigration and Absorption of Immigrants. *Population Studies*, Vol. 7, no. 2, pp. 167–180.

- Fischer, P.A., Holm, E., Malmberg, G., Straubhaar T. (1998). *Why Do People Stay? The Insider Advantages Approach: Empirical Evidence from Swedish Labour Markets*. London: CEPR.
- Frykowski, M. (2005). *Zaufanie społeczne mieszkańców Łodzi*. Łódź: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego.
- Górny, A., Kaczmarczyk, P. (2003). *Uwarunkowania i mechanizmy migracji zarobkowych w świetle wybranych koncepcji teoretycznych*. Warszawa: Ośrodek Badań nad Migracjami–Instytut Studiów Społecznych UW.
- Growiec, K. (2011). *Kapitał społeczny. Geneza i społeczne konsekwencje*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Szkoły Wyższej Psychologii Społecznej „Academica”.
- Hardin, R. (2009). *Zaufanie*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Sic!
- Jończy, R. (2010). *Migracje zagraniczne z obszarów wiejskich województwa opolskiego po akcesji Polski do Unii Europejskiej. Wybrane aspekty ekonomiczne i demograficzne*. Opole–Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Instytut Śląski–Uniwersytet Ekonomiczny.
- Mamzer, H. (2011). Zaufanie. Ustalenia metodologiczne. In: H. Mamzer (ed.), *Czy warto ufać obcym?* Poznań: Wydawnictwo Naukowe UAM.
- Miller, A., Mitamura, T. (2003). Are Surveys on Trust Trustworthy? *Social Psychology Quarterly*, Vol. 66, no. 1, pp. 62–70.
- Misztal, B. (1996). *Trust in Modern Societies*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- North, D. (1990). *Institutions, Institutional Change and Economic Performance*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Poławski, P. (2004). Lokalna administracja i społeczeństwo obywatelskie. In: K.W. Frieske (red.), *Utopie inkluzji. Sukcesy i porażki programów reintegracji społecznej*. Warszawa: Instytut Pracy i Spraw Socjalnych.
- Putnam, R. (2008 [2000]). *Samotna gra w kregle. Upadek i odrodzenie wspólnot lokalnych w Stanach Zjednoczonych*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwa Akademickie i Profesjonalne.
- Putnam, R., Leonardi, R., Nanetti, R. (1995). *Demokracja w działaniu. Tradycje obywatelskie we współczesnych Włoszech*. Kraków–Warszawa: Społeczny Instytut Wydawniczy Znak–Fundacja im. Stefana Batorego.

Streszczenie

W artykule omówiono interakcje między mobilnością przestrzenną a migracjami za granicę z przyczyn ekonomicznych. Na podstawie przeglądu literatury i badań empirycznych wykazano, że zaufanie zależy od szerszego kontekstu społeczno-kulturowego i istnieją silne interakcje między migracjami za granicę z powodów ekonomicznych i zaufaniem. Zasadniczo mobilność przestrzenna przyczynia się do niższego poziomu zaufania, zarówno w wymiarze ogólnym, jak i indywidualnym. Niemniej jednak jeśli migracje zagraniczne z przyczyn ekonomicznych opierają się na silnych sieciach migracyjnych, mają one pozy-

tywny wpływ na ogólny poziom zaufania. Codzienne czynności, takie jak poszukanie pracy (w tym w gospodarce nieformalnej) lub dzielenie miejsca zamieszkania z innymi migrantami, odgrywają ważną rolę w tym kontekście.

Słowa kluczowe: migracje zarobkowe, zaufanie, kultura zaufania, kapitał społeczny, Polska