Aldona Małgorzata Dereń, Jan Skonieczny

Wrocław University of Science and Technology
e-mails: aldona.deren@pwr.edu.pl; jan.skonieczny@pwr.edu.pl

SOCIAL RESPOSIBILITY OF ORGANIZATION TOWARDS NEW AND RADICAL MARKET ACTORS

ODPOWIEDZIALNOŚĆ SPOŁECZNA ORGANIZACJI WOBEC NOWYCH I RADYKALNYCH GRACZY RYNKOWYCH

Summary: The purpose of the article is an attempt to outline the problems related to the participation of new and radical social communities in the market game, such as: Internet communities, members of the precariat, refugees, immigrants and terrorists. These communities have not been the object of thorough research and analysis related to the theory of management yet. Most of the radical market actors were developed in a spontaneous manner or as a result of globalization processes taking place in the contemporary world. This is a specific challenge for organizations, especially for those which implement a strategy based on social responsibility. Our recommendation includes social communication and co-existence as the basis and framework for an organization which is socially responsible. These are frameworks making it possible to shape an individual business ecosystem in which it is necessary to establish specific relations even with the most radical actors of the contemporary market.

Keywords: social responsibility, market actor, Internet community, precariat, refugee, immigrant, terrorist.

Streszczenie: Celem artykułu jest próba zarysowania problematyki uczestnictwa w grze rynkowej nowych i radykalnych zbiorowości społecznych, takich jak: społeczności internetowe, prekariusze, uchodźcy, imigranci i terroryści. Zbiorowości te nie były jak dotąd obiektem wnikliwych badań i analiz z zakresu teorii zarządzania. Większość radykalnych graczy rynkowych wykształciła się w sposób spontaniczny lub jako rezultat procesów globalizacyjnych, zachodzących we współczesnym świecie. Dla organizacji jest to swoiste wyzwanie, szczególnie dla tych, które realizują strategię opartą na społecznej odpowiedzialności. Nasza rekomendacja obejmuje komunikację społeczną i koegzystencję jako podstawy i ramy współcześnie rozumianej odpowiedzialności społecznej organizacji. Są to ramy pozwalające na ukształtowanie swoistego ekosystemu biznesu, w którym konieczne jest nawiązanie określonej relacji nawet z najbardziej radykalnymi graczami współczesnego rynku.

Słowa kluczowe: odpowiedzialność społeczna, aktor rynkowy, społeczność internetowa, prekariusz, uchodźca, imigrant, terrorysta.

1. Introduction

The market is not only a place to exchange goods and services between manufacturers and buyers but it is also a process constituting all relations taking place between various political, business and social entities which participate in it. Therefore, the contemporary market may be perceived as all communication-cooperation interactions, as a unique game between its participants. This is a repetitive game in which the entities follow their own preferences, motives, traditions, standards and moral values as well as financial capacities. On the one hand, these conditions define the rules of the market (social) game existing at a given moment and on the other hand they model them. In general, we may say that the game, as a social interaction, depicts a specific mutual relation between a variety of parties its participants resulting from the conflict of interests. As a result, certain participants of the game often pursue their interests at the expense of others.

The purpose of the article is an attempt to outline problems related to participation in the contemporary market game for new, active and radical social communities, such as: Internet communities, members of the precariat, refugees, immigrants and terrorists. These communities have not been the object of thorough research and analysis in management sciences so far. The authors distinguished them due to their extremely active presence in the functioning of societies and states in the contemporary world. The authors do not intend to characterize them from the sociological or anthropological point of view in detail, but they wish to analyze their presence and activities as the addressee of postulates from organizations related to social responsibility. The complexity of these problems and their controversial nature lead to a deeper reflection at the same time because the social activity of these groups performed by means of modern information technologies makes it possible to treat them as possible stakeholders (allies, active partners, enemies etc.) for an organization which is socially responsible. This activity is the obvious result of complex social, political and economic processes related to globalization which determines the new frames for the functioning of an organization in the 21st century.

2. New market actors in the 21st century

The market game may be described with the following elements:
- specification and characteristics of the game's participants,
- specification of the possibilities in which each actor behaves (binding and possible rules of the game),
- description of information available to the actors,
- objectives defined as precisely as possible to which the players aspire. [Malawski et al. 2004, p. 13]

The parties of the market game include not only units acting individually, but also their sets or entire communities. From the sociological perspective, a social community

is a group of people with certain mutual characteristics and generating specific social bonds. It is characterized by similar behaviour, spatial contact and mutual actions. These general criteria make it possible to describe various configurations of social communities.

The classic literature on organization management distinguishes competitive forces in the sector as communities. For example, M.E. Porter [1992, pp. 23-46] indicates such five forces: competitors in the sector, substitutes, new entrants, suppliers and buyers. In turn, R.M. Grant [2011, pp. 127-129] supplements Porter's model with the sixth force – complementary goods. Complementary goods are juxtaposed to substitutes that reduce the value of the product, while complementary goods increase this value.

Both, the first and the second proposal does not include other important actors, such as state institutions [Steinmann, Schreyögg 1998, p. 132] and the representatives of various groups of interest operating in the social space and influencing the centres of power in the state as well as influencing the citizens' public life. [Ćwiklińska 2016] In addition, the traditional perspective ignores new communities (new actors) which as it seems begin to play a more and more active role, and even a leading role in market processes. These new social communities, which the authors even perceive as radical, include: Internet communities, members of the precariat, refugees, immigrants and terrorists. This is not a closed and exhaustive list of all contemporary market actors but only of the most active and radical ones who have a substantial influence on shaping the contemporary social-political and economic reality.

These communities referred to are internally diverse and heterogeneous, unpredictable in a sense and irrational in their actions from the point of view of organizations already operating on the market. Each of these radical communities is a unique "melting pot" of various interests and pursuits which are not organized by traditional rules of the market game and classic strategies. On the contrary, what connects them is subjectivity, meaning that they may be interested or not interested in cooperation with organizations already operating on the market thus affecting their behaviour. That is why we claim that these new communities should be in the circle of interest pf operating organizations, which should be expressed in observation and research aiming at identifying the opportunities and threats as well as the risk resulting from conducting current and future activities.

As a principle, the literature related to management does not characterize radical communities as a partner or a market actor for organizations. Consequently, the instruments for creating and controlling a game in which these communities are participants are not described either. These communities are usually treated in the proposed descriptions as homogenous communities, and there are no attempts to differentiate between them as separate partners or market actors. In our opinion, each of these communities should be perceived as a separate and strongly individual entity and a participant of the game (in terms of its values and pursued objectives). Having assumed this, it is necessary for the organization to develop a customized strategy towards each of the distinguished communities. This requires the organization to

identify, even in general, these communities which will make it possible to prepare proper instruments to control the market game through effective communication channels and cooperative actions. The development of such a strategy requires the organization to cooperate with other business and social organizations towards the creation of an ecosystem of socially responsible business. The basic feature of such a ecosystem is "social responsibility" as a prerequisite for the survival and development of all organizations forming this ecosystem. The business ecosystem's social responsibility understood in this way is different than the responsibility of a single organization because this organization as a leader of this system may define the standards of behaviour. These standards need to be based on a dialogue and the development of solutions that will permit mutual coexistence with respect for values mutual for all entities in the socially responsible business ecosystem.

One of the most dynamically developing new communities at present is the so-called Internet community.[1] The Internet community is, in general terms, a set of people related by joint features and interacting via the Internet. This set has many features joint with the community of interests but any signs of people's activity take place only on the Internet. This is not a community which is restricted or closed, on the contrary – the unlimited possibilities of the Internet and the growing technological progress make it possible to regularly create new types of human activities within the already existing Internet community.

Research on Internet communities shows that their participants are seeking, first of all, a quick, effective and continuous communication as well as a dialogue. Another type of bonds established on the Internet is a situation in which people with similar interests establish contact via the Internet to develop it later in the offline world. A similar phenomenon is the so-called *flash mob*, defined as a group of people unknown to one another which meets at a specific time and in a specific place to organize a joint event, e.g. a birthday party. After the event ends, the *ad hoc* community spreads without a word in different directions, usually arousing confusion and even interest from enforcement officers.

An interesting analysis of Internet relations was presented by M. Maffesoli [2008] who wrote about the so-called new tribes in the age of the Internet. These are Internet communities the members of which feel satisfaction from "being together". As opposed to traditional communities (tribes), "the new tribes" are characterized by their *ad hoc* nature, transience, dispersion and self-control over involvement in their functioning.

Participation in Internet communities allows their members to mutually confront their situation. In this sense, this space plays the role of a public sphere. Internet communities realize the similarity of the situation which they all face and take actions in order to make a social change in the reality outside the Internet. "Co-existence" and "mutual knowledge" are the basic terms for the occurrence of any community. They

---

[1] Internet communities are created by different groups. The basis of their differentiation is the range (virtual and real network) and way of financing (business and social network). [Gustowski 2007, p. 18]

also facilitate mutual communication and cooperation as part of the community. The sense of fellowship and bonds between members of the Internet community are also strengthened by the use of characteristic language developed together. The knowledge of language rules determines the affiliation to a given fellowship. [Krzysztofek 2007]

The next community we have distinguished are members of the precariat. According to G. Standing [2016], members of the precariat are a group with a mutual identity, a mutual sense of threat and lost control over their own future. This not an unwanted subclass but a desired effect of global capitalism which needed a flexible class that could adapt to the variable supply of work. One becomes a member of the precariat immediately after the university but the members do not have a specific age. They may be over 50 as well – this is an age in which employers often replace older employees with younger ones, with lower requirements and a lower salary. It is equally difficult to find a job when you are older as it is difficult to find a job consistent with your education immediately after the university.

Members of the precariat are a group which is heterogeneous in social, economic and political terms. They are connected by a sense of social injustice, the lack of stability and specific social exclusion. Members of the precariat do not blame themselves for this situation, because they believe that they are better educated than their parents and grandparents. In turn, they believe that this is a system problem for which the political class is to blame not only on the national scale but also in the global scale, because they cannot or do not want to find proper solutions for their difficult situation in life. [Standing 2016]

Refugees are people who are forced to leave a territory they live in, due to threats to their lives, health or freedom. This threat is most often related to wars, armed combat, natural disasters, religious persecution, racial or political harassment.

The international law defines the notion *refugee* by the Refugee Convention from 1951, the so-called Geneva Convention [*Konwencja dotycząca...*] subsequently altered with the New York Protocol from 1967. [*Protokół dotyczący...*] These documents define a refugee as a person who stays outside the country of his/her origin, with justified fear of persecution in this country with regard to race, religion, nationality, political views or affiliation to a given social group. Granting the refugee status regulates only the legal personality but there still are unresolved problems regarding permanent residence within the area of a foreign, new country, among others, not knowing the language, customs, culture and tradition of the new country as well as the lack of relatives and friends. In addition, it is necessary to have a job and an income to function normally. A frequent additional difficulty is also the lack of adequate education and qualifications, experience as well as the maladjustment to the needs of a given job market. This all results in the fact that refugees as a social community emerge as new actors [Pluta 2016] in the majority of countries. This community is not a self-defining phenomenon but, in a sense, is the product of the social, economic and political situation in the 20th century. [Pluta 2016] Refugees are people whose "natural" bond with their place of birth and thus also with the culture, ethnic identity

and all that would allow them to live, was interrupted. Therefore, this bond should be re-established by repatriation. [Hammond 1999, p. 229] In the opinion of UNHCR, there are three final solutions to the refugee issue: repatriation, integration with the receiving society and resettlement to a third country. [UNHCR 2006, p. 6] Each of them is an attempt to bring the refugee back to the national order of things. However, before this can be done, we should take control over the refugees, start a dialogue with them, initiate social communication with them and cooperate.

At present, the community of immigrants is also an entity of the market game. The notion of immigrant comes from the Latin word *immigro*, namely to settle. This means the arrival of a single human being (or a larger group of people) and the settlement in a foreign country due to economic, political and social reasons. An interesting analysis of migration movements was presented by P. Scheffer [2010, p. 97, pp. 99-107] who indicates that this is not a local or an isolated problem. Referring to the history of the United States, he writes that even the country which deals with assimilation as no other country in the world has seen social unrest, religious tension, acts of intolerance and violence, visible especially where there are divisions in ethnically segregated cities, due to the large inflow of population. Immigrants form their own "ghettos" which are pushed more and more towards the edges of the cities; white children disappear from schools in which 30% are the children of immigrants. According to the author, all this officially is the result of Huntington's "clash of civilizations" action for the good of all. Spatial segregation was to reduce conflicts between social groups and facilitate control over them. Meanwhile, immigrants are trapped by poverty in subsequent generations and their economic opportunities diminish. The community of productive, working natives and the minority of unemployed immigrants living from unemployment benefits are polarized. This leads to increasing frustrations and violence which, in turn, lead to further racial and class restrictions (today, ethnic criteria are replaced by economic ones) during the selection of arriving immigrants.

It is impossible to stop immigration until the economic differences in the global scale are high – claims P. Scheffer. [2010, p. 141] Western entrepreneurs benefit from this situation because the labour costs of immigrants are lower. Therefore, they and the governments of emigration countries benefit from the contemporary migration of peoples in economic terms. The latter benefit due to cash flows which are directed to the countries of origin. The citizens lose, because they bear the costs of immigration and they are the ones who revolt against immigrants, as it is seen in the contemporary societies of Western Europe which were once tolerant and today are overwhelmed with xenophobia and aversion towards immigrants who irreversibly change the image of contemporary cities.

The last community of market actors by the authors (specific anti-actors towards organizations) are terrorists. The notion of terrorism comes from the Latin words *terror* (fear, terrible news) and *terrere* (terrify). This notion was popularized in European languages due to the French Revolution and the terror period (French *terreur*), namely the use of mass crime, reprisal and murder in order to induce common fear and panic.

In practice, it is very difficult to differentiate between terrorism and phenomena or processes more or less related to it, e.g. terror, *guerrilla*, guerrilla warfare, fight-war of independence-national liberation, irredentism, separatism etc. We often deal with a situation in which the word terrorism defines a number of various attitudes and behaviour, starting from anarchist or revolutionary actions, to criminal deeds. It is frequent and, at the same time, hazardous and incorrect to equate terrorism and Islamic fundamentalism and other notions. Defining terrorism is also hindered by the diversity and multiplicity of terrorist scenarios, as well as methods and measures used during terrorist attacks.

The lack of an unambiguous definition of terrorism is not an obstacle for the general characteristics of terrorist actions. They are characterized by the glorification of power as the only and the most effective method of political struggle as well as cruelty and the lack of moral scruples in undertaken actions which, on the one hand, is to show the power and determination of terrorists and, on the other hand, strengthen the fear of terrorists, inducing a strong and common sense of threat by intimidation not only towards the political elites but also the entire society, gaining publicity and presence in mass media, political blackmail and enforcing specific political changes. Acts of violence crimes are not always aimed at overthrowing the authorities and taking the power over, but in many cases they are to prepare a revolutionary situation, namely the anarchization of public life, the intimidation and moral corruption of state officers, the demonstration of the terrorists' power, the instigation of reprisal and the limitation of civil liberties by the state in order to popularize rebellion attitudes. [Cesarz, Stadtmüller 1998]

Radical social communities indicated by the authors are definitely new actors operating in the market space of the 21st century whose behaviour should be the subject of cognitive reflection deeper than previously. Management literature abounds in the descriptions of strategies and tactics used in games by traditional business actors. A contemporary organization needs to participate in a new game, with new rules, and with new and radical actors. This requires other actions or strategies from the organization consisting, among others, in reconfiguring the previous system of the game which is an interactive social activity, constantly subject to dynamic changes. The question is how the organization can manage such a system of the game with new, radical, strong and determined actors.

3. Managing the market game system involving new and radical market actors

In general, managing the game system is the organization's pursuit to achieve specific objectives as well as to perform the intended mission and tasks. A.K. Koźmiński and D. Jurczak-Latusek [2011, pp. 76-79] claim that due to the high level of uncertainty, the game should be controlled. "Controlling the game manifests itself in three types of behaviour: determining and changing rules binding for all actors, including the

controlling person, arbitration of disputes between actors (when the selection criterion for settlement is the result for the course of the game) and the distribution of resources between the game's participants." [Koźmiński, Jurczak-Latusek 2011, p.76] We should agree with the authors that controlling the game is a game itself. However, in the case of new market actors referred to in this paper, characterized by a high lack of homogeneity, the possibility to control the game is highly limited. In this case, we should search for new management instruments based on communication and cooperation. This is also significant due to the fact that new and radical actors are focused, first of all, on their own interests, ambitions and preferences. They strive to achieve their objectives using social space controlled by them and they form various networks, often competitive towards the already existing networks (e.g. the network of suppliers, sellers) to fully implement their intentions. These formally operating networks in the classic market game are created on the basis of constitutive rules [Matysiak 1999, p. 90], created by state institutions and guaranteed with non--economic obligations. However, the constitutive rules, although they define the forms of communication and cooperation, do not determine the method of conducting market games, especially those in which new and radical actors participate, to which we included Internet communities, members of the precariat, refugees, immigrants and terrorists.

The role of constitutive standards in selecting the method of organizing participation in the market game is limited. There are no standards prescribing cooperation, but there are standards banning cooperation as part of the market game. This ban refers to a situation when the game may change into a domination of specific entities over others. Due to the limited role of constitutive rules, it is necessary to refer to regulative rules which exist independently of them. Regulative rules are created by the mental characteristics of the actors and the culture itself. They define the forms of behaviour and the method of playing the game. The game may become cooperative when its participants may enter into binding contracts with a guarantee of the execution of assumed obligations, or become competitive (competing) when it is impossible to enter into binding contracts, or when the undertaken obligations are not met. Additionally, depending on the specific nature of relations between the actors playing a given market game, or their position on the market, it is also possible that these two methods overlap.

Managing the market game system involving new market actors needs to be based on two components: social communication and co-existence. Communication is a process where meaning is shared by exchanging information. M. Castells [2013, p. 65] writes that the course of this process is defined by: the technology, the features of the sender and the recipient of the message, their cultural codes, references and communication protocols as well as the scope of the communication process. In the case of new actors, we should speak about social communication, and not interpersonal communication as well as about co-existence based on multiculturalism.

Social communication means identifying the internal, social and cultural coherence of the community, its standards and values which it follows in its interactions. The

organization's identification of these values leads to co-existence, namely the reconciliation of cultural differences (regarding, among others, tradition, heritage, beliefs, values, ethnic origin) and approving ethnic, religious or sexual minorities to equal participation in the cultural and political life of a country. [Burszta 1998, p. 150] Multiculturalism implies "recognizing the equality of all cultures regardless of their geographic, racial or religious origin – there are no higher or lower cultures, there are only different cultures." [Kalaga 2004, p. 147] Multiculturalism, based on cultural relativism, opposes ethnocentrism (including Eurocentrism) which involves the issue of the attitude towards "the other" and intercultural dialogue. A multicultural society is based on the assumption of understanding and accepting the diversity to understand – you need to have knowledge about "the others" and their culture, and when you have this knowledge, then the intercultural dialogue has a chance to succeed. Thus, such great significance is given to schools and universities preparing young people to function in a multicultural society.

4. New market actors and a socially responsible organization

The notion of responsibility has many dimensions. The author of *Filozofia odpowiedzialności XX wieku* points out that the intellect and objectiveness dominated in the age of the ancient paradigm, and the main notion were the truth. The modern age has brought along subjectivity, relativism of assessment, freedom of choice, behaviour and attitudes. The third paradigm of philosophy is the dialogical paradigm, related to the notion of responsibility [Filek 2003], understood as actions and omissions which cause various changes in the reality and in the environment in which the unit and the group operate. A special type of responsibility is the social responsibility of organizations which, in market economy, means the creation of new relations, not only with traditional actors in the market game, but also with the new ones and with the society as a whole. [Dereń 2014, pp. 14, 23]

The literature related to the management of the social responsibility of organizations defines the way in which an organization exceeds in its operations the minimum level of obligations towards its stakeholders, specified in regulations. [Johnson et al. 2010, p. 136] Social responsibility defined in such a way means that the organization needs to abandon constitutive rules and adopt regulative rules in the market game. The new market actors referred to in this paper (Internet communities, members of the precariat, refugees, emigrants, terrorists) are multi-dimensional, multicultural, dynamically changing communities towards which the organization should develop new forms of influence. This means the need to change the previous formula of (traditional) social responsibility. According to the authors, this new formula needs to be based on social communication and co-existence. Examples from the area of Internet marketing prove that communicating with Internet communities leads to strengthening a positive image of the organization, increasing the scope of promotion for products and services, increasing the demand for them, stimulating consumers, expressing opinions

about products and services, the possibilities to combine information-promotional processes with conducting direct transactions, as well as obtaining information about the consumers' specific needs and requirements. Therefore, widely understood social communication may stimulate a multi-directional exchange of opinions and views with new actors in the market game.

The social responsibility of organizations towards new and radical actors of the market game based on social communication may result in a unique co-existence with them. The identification of values as well as the quality of life of various social communities on the market, already operating and the new ones, is the condition for the organization's further functioning. These values may inspire the organization to search for new solutions, rules and tools of market activity and, at the same time, may be used to support its previous operations. Social communication and co-existence with new market actors understood in this way may be the beginning of a future partnership, sometimes leading to close cooperation. Such cooperation will not always be possible, e.g. with terrorists. However, the search for a dialogue, even with the most radical community, is a unique determinant of what we presently define as the social responsibility of an organization.

5. Conclusion

Dynamic social, political and economic changes taking place in the world, especially the growth of tension and social conflicts, make it necessary to reconfigure the organization's attitudes and behaviour towards various actors of the market game. This particularly applies to new and radical actors joining the game, such as: Internet communities, members of the precariat, refugees, emigrants and terrorists. These are communities which were shaped without the direct participation of state institutions. Most of them were developed in a spontaneous manner or as a result of globalization processes taking place in the contemporary world. These communities have not been thoroughly examined as actors of the market game yet. According to the authors, this is caused by the difficulty in examining these communities, among others, due to their heterogeneous nature. However, we want to face and challenge this problem, which will result in research that will make it possible to develop a co-existence model of a socially responsible organization with new and radical market actors.

References

Burszta W.J., 1998, *Antropologia kultury: tematy, teorie, interpretacje*, Wydawnictwo Zysk i S-ka, Poznań.

Castells M., 2013, *Władza komunikacji*, Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, Warszawa.

Cesarz Z., Stadtmüller E., 1998, *Problemy polityczne współczesnego świata*, Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego, Wrocław.

Ćwiklińska J., *Grupy interesu w semantycznej przestrzeni publicznej*, yadda.icm.edu.pl/bazhum/...dl.../ Zeszyty_Naukowe_SGH-2007-12-21-ö138-147.pdf. (access: 2.08.2016).

Dereń A., 2014, *Odpowiedzialność w działalności przedsiębiorstwa*, [in:] Z. Malara (ed.), *Przyzwoitość w zarządzaniu. Wybrane zagadnienia*, Oficyna Wydawnicza Politechniki Wrocławskiej, Wrocław.

Filek J., 2003, *Filozofia odpowiedzialności XX wieku,* Wydawnictwo Znak, Kraków.

Grant R.M., 2011, *Współczesna analiza strategii*, Oficyna a Wolters Kluwer business, Warszawa.

Gustowski W., 2007, *E-społeczność. Jak budować i wykorzystywać społeczności internetowe w nowoczesnych działaniach e-marketingowych*, Internetowe Wydawnictwo „Złote Myśli”, Gliwice.

Hammond L., 1999, *Examining the Discourse of Repatriation: Towards a More Proactive Theory of Return Migration*, [in:] K. Koser, R. Black (eds.), The End of the Refugee Cycle?, Berghahn Books, New York.

Johnson G., Scholes K., Whittington R., 2010, *Podstawy strategii,* PWE, Warszawa.

Kalaga W., 2004, *Dylematy wielokulturowości*, Kraków.

Konwencja dotycząca statusu uchodźców z 28 lipca 1951 r., [in:] Dz. U. Z 1991 r., Nr 119, poz. 515.

Koźmiński A.K., Jurczak-Latusek D., 2011, *Rozwój teorii organizacji*, Oficyna a Wolters Kluwer business, Warszawa.

Krzysztofek K., 2007, *WEBski świat: mądrość tłumów sieciowych czy zbiorowe nieudactwo?*, [in:] A. Keen, *Kult amatora: jak Internet niszczy kulturę*, WAiP, Warszawa.

Maffesoli M., 2008, *Czas plemion. Schyłek indywidualizmu w społeczeństwach ponowoczesnych*, Wyd. Naukowe PWN, Warszawa.

Malawski M., Wieczorek A., Sosnowska H., 2004, *Konkurencja i kooperacja. Teoria gier w ekonomii i naukach społecznych,* PWN, Warszawa.

Matysiak A., 1999, *Źródła kapitału społecznego*, Wyd. Akademii Ekonomicznej we Wrocławiu, Wrocław.

Pluta, D., *Zarys zjawiska uchodźstwa. Aktorzy zjawiska uchodźstwa a proces kształtowania uchodźstwa*, https://pbn.nauka.gov.pl/polindex-webapp/browse/article/article-5248c009-a185-4c01-8cca-59bacd01aef7 (access 6.09.2016).

Porter M.E., 1992, *Strategia konkurencji. Metody analizy sektorów i konkurentów*, PWE, Warszawa.

Protokół dotyczący statusu uchodźców, sporządzony w Nowym Jorku dnia 31 stycznia 1967 r., Dz. U. z 1991 r., Nr 119, poz. 517.

Scheffer P., 2010, *Druga ojczyzna. Imigranci w społeczeństwie otwartym*, Wydawnictwo Czarne, Wołowiec.

Standing G., 2016, *Prekariat*, Wydawnictwo PWN, Warszawa.

Steinmann H., Schreyögg G., 1998, *Zarządzanie. Podstawy kierowania przedsiębiorstwem. Koncepcje, funkcje, przykłady*, Oficyna Wydawnicza Politechniki Wrocławskiej, Wrocław.

UNHCR, 2006, *The State of the World's Refugees: Human Displacement in the New Millennium*, Oxford University Press, New York.