

59. PwC Romania (2020). HR Barometer: Romanians opted for job security in 2020. Staff turnover in Romanian companies decreased to 17.2%. <https://www.pwc.ro/en/press-room/press-releases-2021/hr-barometer--romanians-opted-for-job-security-in-2020--staff-tu.html> (Accessed 19 December 2021)
60. Römisch (2020). Covid-19 effects on Central Europe. WiiW, Vienna.1-16.
61. Stachova, K., Stacho Z., Raišienė, A.G. & Barokova, A. (2020). Human resource management trends in Slovakia. *Journal of International Studies*, 13(3), 320-331. doi:10.14254/2071-8330.2020/13-3/21
62. Svetlik, I., Barisic, A. F., Kohont, A., Petković, M, Aleksić Mirić, A., Slavić, A., Vaupot, Z, & Poór, J. (2010). Human Resource Management in the Countries of the Former Yugoslavia. *Review of International Comparative Management*, 11(5), 807-832.
63. The World Bank , Unemployment total (% of total labor force(national estimate)- Bosnia and Herzegovina, <https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/SL.UEM.TOTL.NE.ZS?end=2020&locations=BA&start=2020> (Accessed 02 February 2022)
64. UBB-FSEGA (2022). COVID-19 - Romanian Economic Impact Monitor. <https://econ.ubbcluj.ro/coronavirus/> (Accessed 14 February 2022)
65. UNCTAD (2019). World Investment Report-2019. Geneva-New York: UNCTAD.
66. UNCTAD (2020). World Investment Report-2020. Geneva-New York: UNCTAD.
67. Valoria (2020). HR tendencies and challenges (In Romanian). https://valoria.ro/wp-content/uploads/2020/12/Tendinte-si-provocari-in-HR-2020_ALL_RO.pdf. (Accessed 19 December 2021)
68. Vojtovič, S. (2006). Personnel Management (In Slovak). Bratislava: Iris. ISBN 80-89018-98-X.
69. WIFO. Internationale Konjunktur https://www.wifo.ac.at/jart/prj3/wifo/widat/Wirtschaftsdaten/d/1.1_d_out.pdf?r=91FD (Accessed 02 January 2022)
70. WKO. Finanzielle Hilfen für Unternehmen.<https://www.wko.at/service/corona-hilfspaket-unternehmen.html>. (Accessed 19 January 2022)

2 CHARACTERISTICS OF THE ORGANISATIONS AND RESPONDENTS SURVEYED (ARNOLD TÓTH & BOTOND KÁLMÁN)

“The wise man does not expose himself to unnecessary danger, for there are few things he cares enough about; but in great crises he is willing to lay down even his life - knowing that in certain circumstances it is worth sacrificing everything.” Aristotle

Compared to previous surveys, this report has allowed us to analyse international data. Descriptive statistics on these are presented in this chapter.

2.1 OWNERSHIP (MAJORITY) STRUCTURE OF THE ORGANISATIONS IN THE SAMPLE

In our survey, we processed questionnaires from nearly 965 respondents from the six countries surveyed. Almost three quarters of respondents (72%) were public or private organisations with domestic ownership (Table 5). This can be observed both overall and in individual countries. The importance of the form of ownership in a crisis situation is clearly indicated by the importance of public orders (Keynes, 1965) and measures in crisis management.

Table 5: Distribution of respondents by type of ownership (%)

Ownership	Austria (AT)	Bulgaria (BG)	Bosnia-Herzegovina (BIH)	Hungary (HU)	Romania (RO)	Slovakia (SK)	Total
State or local authority-owned	15.3%	19.2%	34.2%	20.8%	6.3%	14.2%	16.1%
National private	56.9%	42.3%	34.2%	48.4%	72.3%	64.4%	56.8%
Foreign or joint stock	22.2%	32.7%	28.9%	26.6%	18.9%	18.9%	23.5%
Non-profit organisation	1.4%	5.8%	2.6%	4.2%	2.4%	2.6%	3.3%
Other	4.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	.3%
Total n=	72	104	38	312	206	233	965
Total (%)	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

2.2 ORGANISATIONAL SIZE

The size of responding organisations was analysed according to two criteria (number of employees and turnover).

2.2.1 NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES

The classification in Table 6 is based on the same classification used in the European Union (European Commission, 2015). Firm size is worth considering because it is an important determinant of the response to the crisis and its effectiveness in a number of ways. Indeed, the micro, small and medium-sized enterprise (SME) sector is characterised by a rapid response and concern for employees, but also by a lack of financial reserves. This is why 17,600 businesses closed down in April-May 2020, the low point of the first wave in Hungary. In the same period, 11,000 new self-employed were registered, most of them forced self-employed people “fleeing” unemployment (KSH, 2021). The larger, capital-intensive firms have remained. They have been much slower to respond to the crisis, but have achieved stable results (Széles et al., 2020).

Table 6: Distribution of respondents by number of employees

Number of employees	Austria (AT)	Bulgaria (BG)	Bosnia-Herzegovina (BIH)	Hungary (HU)	Romania (RO)	Slovakia (SK)	Total
No employee by the organisation	0%	3.9%	0%	2.2%	2.9%	6.4%	3.3%
1-9	2.8%	23.3%	7.9%	23.4%	33.0%	44.6%	28.4%
10-49	4.2%	21.4%	21.1%	23.7%	27.2%	24.9%	22.9%
50-250	22.2%	26.2%	31.6%	20.5%	19.4%	12.0%	19.4%
251-500	26.4%	5.8%	23.7%	9.0%	8.7%	4.7%	9.4%
501-2000	16.7%	12.6%	15.8%	10.9%	4.4%	4.7%	8.8%
over 2000	27.8%	6.8%	0%	10.3%	4.4%	2.6%	7.7%
Total (100%) n=	72	103	38	312	206	233	964
Total (100%)	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

In Table 7 we have looked separately at the share of atypical employment. The definition of atypical employment is rather broad and malleable (Blanchflower, 2000). Larger organisations tend to have proportionally fewer atypical employees (1.5%), while firms with fewer than 10 employees have considerably more (31%). Due to its nature, it was largely outside the scope

of labour legislation and therefore the first victims of redundancies during the pandemic. At the same time, the restrictions may make some atypical forms of work, such as teleworking, more common in the future.

Table 7: Percentage of respondents in atypical employment

Number of employees	Austria (AT)	Bulgaria (BG)	Bosnia-Herzegovina (BIH)	Hungary (HU)	Romania (RO)	Slovakia (SK)	Total
No employees by the organisation		56.3%	26.3%	30.5%	53.2%	35.8%	37.0%
1-9	25.0%	20.4%	42.1%	31.2%	24.9%	40.2%	30.8%
10-49	31.9%	11.7%	23.7%	16.4%	14.6%	13.5%	16.3%
50-250	18.1%	7.8%	7.9%	12.2%	6.3%	6.6%	9.4%
251-500	15.3%	1.0%		4.2%	1.0%	2.2%	3.3%
501-2000	4.2%	1.9%		3.5%		.9%	1.9%
over 2000	5.6%	1.0%		1.9%		.9%	1.4%
Total (100%) n=	72	103	38	311	205	229	958
Total (100%)	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

2.2.2 TURNOVER

The turnover categories are shown in Table 8, which includes data from five countries.

Table 8: Turnover (in five countries)

Turnover	Austria (AT) (2019)	Bulgaria (BG)	Hungary (HU)	Romania (RO)	Slovakia (SK)	Total
----------	---------------------	---------------	--------------	--------------	---------------	-------

up to 2.5 billion Ft (8 million Euro)	22.2%	81.4%	69.3%	80.8%	82.5%	72.8%
2.51-25 billion Ft (8-80 million Euro)	30.6%	11.3%	17.7%	14.1%	11.4%	15.6%
25.1-120 billion Ft (80-400 million Euro)	27.8%	2.1%	5.7%	3.0%	4.8%	6.3%
over 100 billion Ft (400 million Euro)	19.4%	5.2%	7.3%	2.0%	1.3%	5.4%
Total (100%) n=	72	97	300	198	229	896

Bosnia is included in a separate table (Table 9), as only 2019 data are available in the statistics, it was not considered appropriate to include these in a table with more recent data. Based on the data (Bosnia data converted to €), we can say that almost three quarters of the responding companies were in the smallest turnover category (€ 80 million).

Table 9 Turnover

Turnover	Bosnia (2019)
up to 32000 CM*	2.6%
32000-46000 CM	5.3%
46000-240000 CM	10.5%
240000-8 million CM	34.2%
8 million-80 million CM	44.7%
80 million-400 million CM	2.6%
Total (100%) n=	38

**Bosnia-Herzegovina convertible mark=CM*

2.2.3 MAIN AREA OF ACTIVITY (SECTOR, INDUSTRY)

The EU classification of economic activities (Eurostat, 2008) was used to classify the main activities carried out by the organisation (Table 10). This is relevant because each economic sector has a winner or a loser in the pandemic (Coldiretti, 2020; Forbes, 2020; MSZÉSZ, 2020; Taskinsoy, 2020). Therefore, a given respondent's answers also depend on the economic sector in which he/she operates (Coldiretti, 2020; Forbes, 2020; MSZÉSZ, 2020; Taskinsoy, 2020). The distribution of our sample is fairly even, with only the

share of trade (15.3%) and consulting and accounting firms (12.1%) larger than 10% of the total sample. The exception is Bosnia, where 40 percent of respondents were from the public administration or finance sector. This is probably explained by the small number of returned questionnaires (38).

*Table 10: Distribution of respondents by field of activity**

Industry	Austria (AT)	Bulgaria (BG)	Bosnia-Herzegovina (BIH)	Hungary (HU)	Romania (RO)	Slovakia (SK)	Total
Agriculture, hunting, forestry, fishing, mining and quarrying	1.4%	3.8%	2.6%	3.2%	4.4%	7.3%	4.4%
Manufacture of food products, beverages, textiles, wood and paper, petroleum and related products	2.8%	0.0%	13.2%	4.5%	6.8%	10.7%	6.2%
Manufacture of chemicals, cosmetics, pharmaceuticals, medicinal chemicals and toiletries	5.6%	1.0%	2.6%	1.3%	0.0%	0.0%	1.0%
Manufacture of fabricated metal products, plastics, glass and other non-metallic mineral products	6.9%	2.9%	0.0%	4.2%	4.9%	2.1%	3.7%
Manufacture of computer, electronic and electrical products	1.4%	2.9%	0.0%	3.2%	2.4%	2.1%	2.5%
Manufacture of machinery and equipment	9.7%	1.9%	0.0%	2.9%	1.0%	2.1%	2.6%
Manufacture of transport equipment	4.2%	0.0%	0.0%	2.9%	1.5%	.9%	1.8%
Other manufacturing	2.8%	5.8%	2.6%	2.2%	7.8%	6.0%	4.8%
Electricity, gas, steam and water supply, waste management	2.8%	1.0%	0.0%	4.5%	1.9%	3.0%	2.9%
Construction	5.6%	3.8%	5.3%	6.1%	10.2%	7.7%	7.0%
Wholesale and retail trade	6.9%	7.7%	5.3%	16.3%	19.9%	17.6%	15.3%
Transport and storage, transportation	1.4%	1.9%	0.0%	8.3%	6.8%	9.0%	6.6%

Accommodation, food service activities, tourism and related activities	2.8%	1.0%	0.0%	4.8%	10.7%	7.3%	5.9%
Publishing, broadcasting, newspaper and magazine publishing, media activities	5.6%	3.8%	0.0%	1.0%	1.5%	.9%	1.7%
Telecommunications, computer and other information service activities	6.9%	18.3%	7.9%	8.0%	8.3%	5.2%	8.4%
Financial and insurance activities	6.9%	7.7%	26.3%	3.5%	1.5%	4.7%	5.0%
Accounting, management, architectural, engineering, scientific research, consulting and other administrative and support service activities	13.9%	24.0%	5.3%	11.5%	9.7%	10.3%	12.1%
Public administration and compulsory social security	1.4%	7.7%	23.7%	4.5%	1.0%	5.2%	4.8%
Education, culture, arts and performing arts	4.2%	7.7%	2.6%	9.6%	3.9%	4.7%	6.3%
Human health activities, Residential care activities, Social work activities, Child protection activities, Childcare activities	1.4%	2.9%	0.0%	6.7%	2.4%	4.3%	4.1%
Police, defence, civil protection, disaster prevention	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.3%	0.0%	.4%	.5%
Other	5.6%	2.9%	2.6%	3.8%	7.3%	4.3%	4.7%
Total	100.0%	108.7%	100.0%	114.4%	113.6%	115.9%	0.0%

** The total is more than 100% because there were some who named more than one field of activity.*

2.2.4 COMPLEXITY OF RESPONDING ORGANISATIONS

In this research, the concept of organisational complexity refers to the

characteristics of an organisation, whether it operates independently or as part of a parent company. One important consequence is the amount of financial resources available, which can be a key to survival in a crisis. The other consequence, which we have also examined, is that the preparation and updating of HR contingency plans is usually also the responsibility of the parent company. This lack of autonomy can also be a disadvantage: downsizing and liquidation usually start with the subsidiary, and the exploitation of economic opportunities also requires the permission of the parent company. Accordingly, the answers to the questionnaire of the organisation in question are differentiated (Table 11).

Table 11 Breakdown of responding organisations by complexity (site or whole organisation)

Independent organisation	Austria (AT)	Bulgaria (BG)	Bosnia-Herzegovina (BIH)	Hungary (HU)	Romania (RO)	Slovakia (SK)	Total
Yes	91.7%	41.0%	84.2%	43.9%	23.3%	30.3%	41.2%
No	8.3%	59.0%	15.8%	56.1%	76.7%	69.7%	58.8%
Total (100%) n=	72	100	38	303	202	221	936

In the present survey, the respondent organisations in Austria and Bosnia are dominated by stand-alone companies, while subsidiaries dominate in the other four countries. The ratio of independent to non-independent organisations in the total sample is also roughly 2:3. This is also the case in Hungary.

2.2.5 PANDEMIC PREPAREDNESS

The economic effects of the coronavirus have drawn attention to the fact that crises “do not care” about the cyclical nature of economic processes (Grinin et al., 2016; Schumpeter, 1939). A pandemic can erupt at any time, i.e., a typical “black swan” event (Taleb, 2007, 2008). However, the current COVID-19 outbreak was expected, yet no one was prepared for it (WHO, 2019).

Preparedness can be a lifesaver for the survival of a company. This is why we considered it important to ask in our questionnaire about the existence and up-to-datedness of pre-established contingency plans (Table 12). 15.7%

of the respondents do not have an emergency plan and do not feel the need to have one, even in the light of what has happened, and are the most vulnerable. Just over half of the organisations surveyed (51.2%) did not have a crisis plan prepared in advance but prepared one as a first response to the outbreak, mostly at an accelerated pace. Such plans are up-to-date but generally less well-established, which can have an impact later. The proportion of firms that had a plan but needed to change it varies between 10 and 25 percent depending on the country (we exclude the 68 percent in Bosnia because of the small number of responding organisations). Only less than one tenth of responding firms (7.5 percent) had a pre-prepared and up-to-date plan at the start of the pandemic.

Table 12 Existence of a developed pandemic/virus contingency plan

Existence of an action plan	Austria (AT)	Bulgaria (BG)	Bosnia-Herzegovina (BIH)	Hungary (HU)	Romania (RO)	Slovakia (SK)	Total
Even before the current pandemic situation, which we are using as it stands	6.9%	9.8%	13.2%	7.1%	4.9%	8.6%	7.5%
Even before the current pandemic situation, which needed to be modified	23.6%	13.7%	68.4%	14.5%	13.2%	12.9%	16.5%
Did not exist before, but developed due to the pandemic situation	54.2%	61.8%		58.8%	65.9%	30.9%	51.2%
None, but planned	6.9%	8.8%	13.2%	7.1%	6.3%	14.2%	9.1%
None, and we do not see the need	8.3%	5.9%	5.3%	12.5%	9.8%	33.5%	15.7%
Total (100%) n=	72	102	38	311	205	233	961

	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
--	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------

A further question was asked about who prepares the contingency plan (Table 13). While nearly 60 percent of respondents belong to the group, only 37 percent of respondents receive ready-made contingency plans from their parent company, which we do not consider to be a very good policy on the part of the company management.

Table 13 Who prepared the pandemic/virus contingency plan

Creator	Austria (AT)	Bulgaria (BG)	Bosnia-Herzegovina (BIH)	Hungary (HU)	Romania (RO)	Slovakia (SK)	Total
Prepared centrally by the parent/owner, following the guidelines set out	68.2%	34.7%	71.1%	36.8%	23.5%	33.1%	37.0%
Developed/worked out in-house	31.8%	65.3%	28.9%	63.2%	76.5%	66.9%	63.0%
Total (100%) n=	66	95	38	261	183	154	797
No answer	6	9	0	51	23	79	168
Total	72	104	38	312	206	233	965

2.3 CHARACTERISTICS OF HR ORGANISATIONS/JOB

70% of the organisations surveyed are sole proprietorships, micro-enterprises or SMEs. We were therefore surprised to find that almost half of the firms (49.5%) have a separate HR organisation (Table 14). The highest proportion is found in Austria, where 70 percent of respondents were from large companies. The highest proportion (68.3%) is in Bulgaria.

Table 14 Existence of a Personnel/Human Resources department

HR department?	Austria (AT)	Bulgaria (BG)	Bosnia-Herzegovina (BIH)	Hungary (HU)	Romania (RO)	Slovakia (SK)	Total
Yes	93.1%	68.3%	65.8%	52.0%	49.3%	22.1%	49.5%
No	6.9%	31.7%	34.2%	48.0%	50.7%	77.9%	50.5%
Total (100%) n=	72	101	38	304	205	231	951
No answer	0	3	0	8	1	2	14
Total	72	104	38	312	206	233	965

Nearly half of Bulgarian firms have only one HR department (Table 15). It is likely that the head of the company carries out HR tasks himself, the question is at what level. HR has now reached an academic level even in Eastern Europe (Pieper, 2012) - at least there is scope to apply state-of-the-art knowledge and findings.

Table 15 Size of the HR organisation

Employees	Austria (AT)	Bulgaria (BG)	Bosnia-Herzegovina (BIH)	Hungary (HU)	Romania (RO)	Slovakia (SK)	Total
No HR	6.9%	31.7%	34.2%	48.2%	50.7%	77.9%	50.5%
1-5	41.7%	48.5%	50.0%	28.4%	37.6%	14.3%	30.9%
6-10	15.3%	7.9%	13.2%	8.6%	6.3%	3.5%	7.5%
11-30	22.2%	4.0%	2.6%	10.6%	2.0%	2.2%	6.5%
over 30	13.9%	7.9%	0.0%	4.3%	3.4%	2.2%	4.5%
Total (100%) n=	72	101	38	303	205	231	950
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

2.4 REFERENCES TO CHAPTER TWO

1. Blanchflower, D. G. (2000). Self-employment in OECD countries. *Labour Economics*, 7(5), 471–505. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0927-5371\(00\)00011-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0927-5371(00)00011-7)
2. Blanchflower, D. G. (2000). Self-employment in OECD countries. *Labour Economics*, 7(5), 471–505. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0927-5371\(00\)00011-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0927-5371(00)00011-7)
3. Coldiretti. (2020, November 18). Covid, il Natale senza turismo costa

- 4,1 mld. Coldiretti. <https://www.coldiretti.it/economia/covid-il-natale-senza-turismo-costa-41-mld>
4. Coldiretti. (2020, November 18). Covid, il Natale senza turismo costa 4,1 mld. Coldiretti. <https://www.coldiretti.it/economia/covid-il-natale-senza-turismo-costa-41-mld>
 5. European Commission. (2015). User guide to the SME definition. Publications Office. https://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/sources/conferences/state-aid/sme/smedefinitionguide_en.pdf
 6. European Commission. (2015). User guide to the SME definition. Publications Office. https://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/sources/conferences/state-aid/sme/smedefinitionguide_en.pdf
 7. Eurostat. (2008). NACE rev. 2. Office for Official Publications of the European Communities. <https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/documents/3859598/5902521/KS-RA-07-015-EN.PDF>
 8. Eurostat. (2008). NACE rev. 2. Office for Official Publications of the European Communities. <https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/documents/3859598/5902521/KS-RA-07-015-EN.PDF>
 9. Forbes. (2020, September 2). The numbers have come out: There is no question who is the biggest winner in the coronavirus pandemic in Hungary. (in Hungarian) Forbes.hu. Forbes, (09). <https://forbes.hu/uzlet/kijottek-a-szamok-nem-kerdes-ki-a-koronavirus-jarvany-legnagyobb-nyertes-magyarorszagon/>
 10. Grinin, L., Korotayev, A., & Tausch, A. (2016). Kondratieff Waves in the World System Perspective. 23–54. In L. Grinin, A. Korotayev, & A. Tausch, *Economic Cycles, Crises, and the Global Periphery*. Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-41262-7_2
 11. Keynes J. M. (1965). *General theory of employment, interest, and money*. (In Hungarian) Economic and Legal Publishing House. <https://www.antikvarium.hu/konyv/john-m-keynes-a-foglalkoztatás-a-kamatés-a-pénz-átlalanos-élelete-158539>
 12. KSH. (2021). Companies. (in Hungarian) Weekly Monitor (Heti Monitor.) November 11. <https://www.ksh.hu/heti-monitor/vallalkozasok.html>
 13. MSZÉSZ. (2020). On the performance of the domestic and international hotel industry — August 2020. (in Hungarian) [Trendriport]. http://www.hah.hu/files/4416/0248/6769/Trendriport_2020._augusztus.pdf
 14. Pieper, R. (2012). *Human Resource Management: An International Comparison*. De Gruyter. https://books.google.hu/books?id=_UlgAAAQBAJ&dq=human+resource+management+in+east+europe&lr=&source=gbs_navlinks_s
 15. Schumpeter, J. (1939). *Business cycles. A Theoretical, Historical and*

Statistical Analysis of the Capitalist Process. New York Toronto London : McGraw-Hill.

16. Széles, Z., Baranyi, A., & Csernák, J. (2020). Changing working conditions during a pandemic in the light of a primary research. Economic protection and financial routes. (in Hungarian) XIV. Sopron Financial Days, XIV. (Soproni Pénzügyi Napok), Sopron. http://publicatio.uni-sopron.hu/1971/1/SPN_2020_Konfkozl-171-186-Szeles-Baranyi-Csernak.pdf
17. Taleb, N. N. (2007). The Black Swan: The Impact of the Highly Improbable. The New York Times, April 22. <https://www.nytimes.com/2007/04/22/books/chapters/0422-1st-tale.html>
18. Taleb, N. N. (2008, April 15). Ten Principles for a Black Swan Robust World. Edge.Org. https://www.edge.org/conversation/nassim_nicholas_taleb-ten-principles-for-a-black-swan-robust-world
19. Taskinsoy, J. (2020). Cost Implications of the Great Lockdown due to the Novel Coronavirus Outbreak. SSRN Electronic Journal. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3604573>
20. WHO. (2019). A world at risk: Annual report on global preparedness for health emergencies (GPMB Annual Report, 48) [Annual report]. WHO Global Preparedness Monitoring Board. https://apps.who.int/gpmb/assets/annual_report/GPMB_annualreport_2019.pdf?utm_source=ottawamatters.com&utm_campaign=ottawamatters.com&utm_medium=referral

3 THE IMPACT OF THE CORONAVIRUS CRISIS