

Vjekoslav Đaić
Nova TV
Remetinečka cesta 139,
10000 Zagreb, Croatia
vdjaic.ds@unios.hr
Phone +385914324618

Branimir Felger
Nova TV
Remetinečka cesta 139,
10000 Zagreb, Croatia
bifelger.ds@unios.hr
Phone: +385916008384

Gordana Lesinger
Josip Juraj Strossmayer
University of Osijek
Faculty of Humanities
and Social Sciences
L. Jägera 9,
31000 Osijek, Croatia
glesinger@ffos.hr
Phone: +385921824393

UDK: 314.15:331.5/(497.5)(430)
Review article

Received: May 31, 2018
Accepted for publishing: November 27, 2018

This work is licensed under a
Creative Commons Attribution-
NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0
International License



INTEGRATION OF MIGRANTS IN THE CROATIAN LABOUR MARKET - COMPARISON WITH THE GERMAN EXPERIENCE

ABSTRACT

The authors explore the specifics of the socio-cultural contribution of migrants to the Croatian and German economies. The paper looks into the theoretical background of migrant contributions to entrepreneurship by reviewing, comparing and analysing secondary data on the current situation in German and Croatian entrepreneurship with the emphasis on employment and self-employment of migrants and the contribution of their distinct cultures to the economies of the two countries. This is accompanied by some concrete examples of successful or unsuccessful internationalization, multiculturalism of societies, and overcoming cultural challenges in both economies. If we accept that each culture is a “world for itself”, because of its specific features there is no universal model of business behaviour. Every culture must be investigated separately. Is this the case in Croatia?

Keywords: Migrants, economy, employment, organizational culture, Germany, Croatia

1. Introduction

In the second decade of the 21st century, the European Union has faced enormous migration waves of millions of people from third countries. These migrations are not, as opposed to those of the 19th and 20th centuries, driven by job search, but rather by war and inter-ethnic conflicts. This applies primarily to Syria, Iraq, Afghanistan and other Middle East countries. The challenges that the European Union is facing are at several levels: economic, political, and societal and have become the platform for the deficit of multicultural openness.

During the years 2015 and 2016, hundreds of thousands of migrants from third countries have passed through the Republic of Croatia. They were mostly headed towards Western countries, primarily the Federal Republic of Germany. A relatively small number of asylum seekers in the Republic of Croatia were more than enough to confront the government and the civil sector with a series of unknown problems and challenges of political, economic, humanitarian and intercultural nature. While Germany has a relatively elaborate migrant acceptance plan, Croatia has only started to confront the challenge.

Following the explanation of goals and methodology, the first part of the paper will present historical and geopolitical reasons and impacts of mass migration from the Middle East towards the European Union. It will also clarify the European Union's policy towards the acceptance and integration of migrants and the context in which the European Union is changing its acceptance and employment policy faced with its own demographic problems and inadequate competitive tools when it comes to the growing global trend of attracting workers with desired qualifications and skills who can add to the colourful basket of corporate cultures. In the second part of the paper, the state of German policy will be presented with the current data and statistics on admittance and employment of migrants, with special emphasis on the cultural challenges of the German economy in the context of the migration wave. In the third part, the authors will present data on the migration crisis, transit, acceptance and the response of Croatia and its economy to requests for asylum and employment of migrants.

In order to document and correctly cite the data, this paper will further present secondary sources, primarily from a representative survey on the occurrence of discrimination and xenophobic attitudes in Croatia during 2017 carried out by the Centre for Peace Studies. Finally, there will be a comparison of cultural conflicts in organizations arising from the differentiated qualifications, culture and work experience of migrants in the receiving country.

2. Purpose and Objectives of the Paper

The basic purpose of this paper is to survey the relevant literature from the area of enterprise organization, cross-cultural management and contemporary business communication, using secondary sources of data and research results in Germany and the European Union, pointing to the importance of opening a German society for "cultural goods" from migrant countries and comparing the obtained data with the current situation in Croatia. There is a common opinion that working with people is the hardest thing. Whether difficult or easy, complex or simple, modern science and business have evolved and are developing the best structures within the organization to influence the employee's behaviour to help achieve the goals of an organisation. However, what about the states and their response to the more aggressive migration processes in Europe?

This paper will analyse and compare the absorption power and willingness to accept and integrate migrants into the Croatian economy with the situation in Germany.

3. Methodology

Given the above objectives, several critical methods will be used for a successful review of the state of integration of migrants in the labour market in Germany and Croatia and in the organizational culture of the companies in these two countries. For the theoretical part of the work, the descriptive, explicative and causal analysis and synthesis, descriptive and compilation methods are used. In order to give a more credible presentation of the theoretical conclusions, an inductive - deductive method will be used, and the key argumentation is presented through the statistical method.

4. Migration Crisis - Historical Reasons, Geopolitical Impacts and European Response

Tatalović and Malnar (2015: 23) report that the US response to the terrorist attack was the cause of the emergence of a global counter-terrorism coalition and US support in the war on terrorism. Consequently, military action started in Afghanistan and Iraq, with the engagement of vast military forces of the United States and the allied countries. Europe has thus become a magnet "for the migration of the socially oppressed, but increasingly also the object of their hatred (Brzezinski, 2004: 118). Although Europe has a rich political and socio-cultural experience with refugees and migrants, the increasing numbers of refugees and migrants and new ways of their movement have caused a growing unwillingness of some European countries to face this problem (Tatalović, Malnar, 2015: 24).

According to the European Commission estimates, on 1 January 2017 there were 511.8 million inhabitants in the European Union, while on 1 January 2016 there were 510.3 million people living in the Union. During the year 2016, the number of births and deaths in the European Union was 5.1 million. This means that the impact of natural growth on the number of inhabitants was neutral. The increase in the number of inhabitants, or 1.5 million more people, has come about, the Commission con-

cludes, due to net migration (European Commission, 2017)¹.

In the course of 2015 and 2016, the European Union faced an unprecedented level of refugees and migrants. More than a million people arrived in the European Union, most of who escaped from war and terror in Syria and other countries. According to the European Commission's data, a total of EUR 17.7 billion has been allocated from the EU budget to address the migration crisis in the period from 2015 to 2017. The European Union has adopted a series of measures to address this crisis. These include trying to resolve the root causes of the crisis as well as greatly increasing aid to people in need of humanitarian assistance. Steps are being taken to relocate asylum seekers already in Europe, resettle people in need from neighbouring countries and return people who do not qualify for asylum. The EU is improving security at borders, tackling migrant smuggling and offering safe ways for people to legally enter the EU (European Commission, 2017)².

According to Eurostat data, Germany reported the largest number of immigrants in 2015, followed by the United Kingdom, France, Spain and Italy (Eurostat, 2017)³.

Table 1 EU member states with the highest number of registered immigrants in 2015

COUNTRY	NUMBER OF IMMIGRANTS
GERMANY	1 543 800
UNITED KINGDOM	631 500
FRANCE	363 900
SPAIN	342 100
ITALY	280 100

Source: Eurostat, 2017

In these data there is no distinction between the so-called forced migrants and economic migrants, but the numbers are certainly indicative. As compared to the size of the resident population, the highest rates of immigration have been recorded in Luxembourg in 2015 or 42 immigrants per 1000 inhabitants.

Malta follows with 30 immigrants per 1000 people and then Austria and Germany, both with 19 immigrants per 1000 people (Eurostat, 2017)⁴.

5. Challenges in Recruiting Migrants in the European Union

The European Union's labour market faces "a shortage of workforce, despite high unemployment. The reasons are numerous: on the one hand, we have different preferences, qualifications and regional disparities between supply and demand for work and on the other, there are dominant demographic trends in the European Union. To overcome this problem, there are two options, to increase the inflow of migrants, both high and low skilled, or increase the mobility of domestic workers" (Penava, 2011: 340). Although European countries are suspicious of migrants, some research suggests that immigration can lead to labour market gains and reduce tensions if migration policy is rationally and transparently regulated (Penava, 2011: 337).

All EU member states agree that recruiting migrants from the last refugee wave is a key part of the process of integration into the socioeconomic and cultural processes of the host country. Although timely labour market integration can give to the European Union specific skills, employment rates of migrants are still below the average employment rates of nationals of host countries. More than 40% of third-country workers with higher level of education are working in mid-rate or low-skilled jobs compared to 20% of host country nationals (Eurostat, 2016)⁵. Migrant workers are, therefore, often re-qualified for lower-ranked jobs offered in Europe. "They are asked to work more hours on physically more demanding jobs, while at the same time facing the risks of lack of health and retirement insurance" (Pajnik, 2012: 154). Migrants are faced with the inability to prove their skills and getting their qualifications recognized because they do not have the necessary documented evidence of their earlier education (Ministry of the Interior, 2016)⁵. Even if they provide legitimate licenses, discrimination often forces them to restrict their activity within their own ethnic community or other subordinate minorities (Mesić, 2002: 367). Historical experiences in the middle of the 20th century were different. Many European countries opened up their labour markets for economic migrants who came to work on completely different terms. More details on this will be provided below.

6. German Labour Market and Absorption of Migrants

Recruiting migrant workers in Western Europe reached its peak in the early 1970s. After World War II, Germany decided on one of the two distinctive migratory models, the so-called model of temporary, circulating migrants, or *Gastarbeiter*. The second model was British and focused on colonial immigrants and worked towards their permanent immigration and integration into British society (Mesić, 2002: 95). Žarić explains that the German model, unlike the British, counted with labour market flexibility and perceived it as temporary, assuming that workers would return from where they came from. But it has been sixty years since the so-called *Gastarbeiter* came into the country, which in the meantime has become home to them and their descendants. This presence was a new experience for German citizens, as it cannot be compared to workers' migrations in the past. The arrival of foreign workers and their families was not typical immigration, where people intend to settle permanently in the destination country. *Gastarbeiter* were like a pendulum, always intending to return to their homelands, even if this was put off to some indefinite future (Žarić, 1997)⁶. German politics, according to Žarić, at that time persistently denied the fact that Germany had become an immigrant country, although all migrants, refugees and guest workers in public opinion were merged into a group "alien" (Žarić, 1997)⁷. But Ayşe Demir, deputy chairman of the Turkish community in Germany, points out for Deutsche Welle: "Migrants are contributing a lot through their intellectual work here. It is thanks to migrants that the "multi-kulti" way of thinking has become more and more normal for many Germans. This is evidenced, among other things, by 1.8 million marriages between Germans and foreigners, according to statistics for 2010, and that number is growing (Deutsche Welle, Taube: 2012)⁸. Turks, with 2.9 million, are the largest group of migrants in Germany. Many of them belong to families of so-called *Gastarbeiter* who came in the wave in 1961. The so-called economic miracle, the recovery of Germany after the war, would not have been possible without foreign workers (Deutsche Welle, Taube: 2012)⁹. According to Modood and Werbner (1997: 81) "Germany, which for a long period was an important country for emigration, became an immigrant country as far back as the end of the nineteenth century."

There is no doubt that migrants have contributed to the multiculturalism of society and the reduction of xenophobic attitudes. But, Deutsche Welle quotes Thilo Sarrazin, former financial senator of Berlin, who said that the Germans would become extinct over the next century. Penava reports on studies by Bonin, who perceives a statistically significant negative impact of immigration. The results suggest that a 10% increase in the share of migrant workers reduces domestic workers' wages by up to 1% and does not increase unemployment (Penava, 2011: 344). However, this is not upheld by the latest Eurostat data, according to which almost one and a half million asylum seekers have arrived in Germany during the past year and a half, and only 30,000 found a job. Despite the fact that the rate of unemployment in the country is 4.2%, which is significantly below the European average of 10.1%, by the end of 2016, about 350,000 asylum seekers were unemployed (Eurostat, 2017)¹⁰.

However, according to the latest study of the Bertelsmann Foundation (2016)¹¹, immigrants to Germany have created two million working places through self-employment or as employers. In the last ten years, the number of entrepreneurs – self-employed or employers – has increased by 24%, from 570,000 to 709,000. "There is no representative data on the qualification of these asylum seekers. Information gathered from the asylum seekers themselves, taken by random sample and delivered voluntarily by the interviewees, indicates that about 20% have a professional education; about 30 to 40% of them have practical work experience (of at least one year) which can be adapted to the German labour market" (Bertelsmann Stiftung, 2016: 29)¹².

According to Bertelsmann's study, by the end of 2015, most of the 16 German federal states had launched their own programmes and measures to support the labour market integration of asylum seekers and refugees. There are different types of programmes and measures: language courses, measures for an early skills and needs assessment, job coaching for asylum seekers, to legal information and support of employers who are willing to employ asylum seekers and refugees (Bertelsmann Stiftung 2016: 30)¹³. But, according to Borker et al. (2018: 2) "the arrival of more than a million refugees and migrants clearly left its marks on German politics and society. All levels of administration, from local communities to regional and national authorities,

faced unprecedented challenges, while the question of social equity and burden sharing rose to the fore.“

7. The Republic of Croatia and the Management of Migrants

The document published on 22 July 2016 by the Central Bureau of Statistics “Migration of population of the Republic of Croatia, 2015“¹⁴ contains data on international and internal migration of the population of the Republic of Croatia. In the document it is stated that in 2015 there were 11,706 persons that immigrated to the Republic of Croatia and 29,651 persons that emigrated from it. The Republic of Croatia had a negative net migration with foreign countries that amounted to -17,945.

Table 2 Balance of migration in the Republic of Croatia in 2015

IMMIGRANTS	11 706
EMIGRANTS	29 651
NET MIGRATION	-17 945

Source: Central Bureau of Statistics, 2016

The same type of report “Migration of population of the Republic of Croatia, 2016“¹⁵ published on 21 July 2017 states that in 2016 there were 13,985 persons that immigrated to the Republic of Croatia and 36,436 persons that emigrated. The balance of migration with foreign countries was again negative.

Table 3 Balance of migration in the Republic of Croatia in 2016

IMMIGRANTS	13 985
EMIGRANTS	36 436
NET MIGRATION	-22 451

Source: Central Bureau of Statistics, 2017

Another document¹⁶ published on 20 July 2018 states that in 2017 there were 15,553 persons that immigrated to the Republic of Croatia and 47,352 persons that emigrated from it. The Republic of Croatia had a negative net migration with foreign countries, which amounted to -31,799.

Table 4 Balance of migration in the Republic of Croatia in 2017

IMMIGRANTS	15 553
EMIGRANTS	47 352
NET MIGRATION	-31 799

Source: Central Bureau of Statistics, 2018

In 2016, there were 55.3% of Croatian citizens and 44.7% of foreigners who immigrated into the Republic of Croatia. But official immigration data do not specify how many of these are forced migrants. It is only in 2016 that 339 people from Asia and 58 people from Africa moved to Croatia (Croatian bureau of statistics, 2017)¹⁷. However, this does not imply that they are connected with the migration wave caused by the refugee crisis in the Middle East. Researches on external migration of the Croatian population are based on the data collected by the Ministry of the Interior. The statutory obligation to register and cancel one’s residence is based on the Permanent Residence Act (Official Gazette, 144/12 and 158/13)¹⁸ whereas the Aliens Act (Official Gazette, Nos. 130/11 and 74/13)¹⁹ stipulates the conditions of entry, movement, residence and employment of foreigners in the Republic of Croatia.

All employers who employ foreigners, besides obtaining a work permit for their foreign employees, are also obliged to regulate their temporary stay in the Republic of Croatia with the Ministry of the Interior. All those employers who apply for a work permit for daily migrants are obliged to notify those workers that they had regulated the temporary residence at the Police Administration at the place of temporary residence (Regos, The Central Registry of Affiliates, 2017)²⁰.

According to the data of the Ministry of the Interior, the statistics of applicants for international protection according to citizenship and sex in 2017 show that from 1 January 2017 till 30 June 2017 a total of 1,136 persons applied for asylum in the Republic of Croatia. Most of them were from Afghanistan, 395. There were 162 asylum seekers from Pakistan and 130 from Syria (Ministry of the Interior, 2017)²¹.

Table 5 Number of applicants for international protection by citizenship and gender in 2017

CITIZENSHIP	MEN	WOMEN	TOTAL
AFGHANISTAN	337	58	395
ALBANIA	4		4
ALGERIA	41		41
BANGLADESH	29		29
WITHOUT CITIZENSHIP	4		4
BELARUS	1		1
BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA	7		7
DOMINICAN REPUBLIC	1		1
EGYPT	7	1	8
ERITREA	8		8
ETHIOPIA	1		1
GHANA	1		1
INDIA	1		1
IRAQ	33	11	44
IRAN	40	4	44
YEMEN	2		2
CAMEROON	3	1	4
KOSOVO	11	1	12
CUBA	18	8	26
KUWAIT	1	1	2
LEBANON	1		1
LIBYA	7		7
MACEDONIA	4	2	6
MOROCCO	27	1	28
NIGERIA	6	1	7
PAKISTAN	162		162
PALESTINE	3		3
RUSSIAN FEDERATION	2		2
SYRIA	94	36	130
SOMALIA	2	4	6
SERBIA	3	2	5
SRI LANKA	8		8
TUNISIA	10	2	12
TURKEY	100	22	122
UZBEKISTAN		2	2
TOTAL	979	157	1136

Source: Ministry of the Interior, 2017

Out of the total number of applicants, asylum was granted to 231 people. According to the obligation of the Republic of Croatia deriving from the Dublin Agreement, the statistical indicators for the period from 1 January 2017 until 30 June 2017 show that Croatia received 162 refugees, most of them from Syria and Afghanistan.

The fundamental principle of the Dublin Convention is that examining of an asylum application is primarily the responsibility of the Member State that had the most prominent role in the entry and residence of the applicant in the European Union. The Member State in which the asylum seeker first enters is obliged to regulate the asylum application on behalf of all other Member States, unless there are legitimate reasons for another Member State to carry out the procedure. This is to avert the possibility of multiple asylum applications (Esterajher, 2015: 21). Croatia had its first experience with a massive refugee wave during 2015 when it came to the migration crisis. From the beginning of the crisis until 1 January 2016 there were 607 404 migrants that passed through Croatia. Foreigners in transit did not seek refugee status or asylum, except for several people, but were trying to continue their journey towards other EU members (Ministry of the Interior, 2016)²².

The migrant help system in Croatia was able to respond to the needs of thousands of migrants per day who were in transit. The accommodation capacities for about 800 people are sufficient judging by the long-standing trends of accepting asylum seekers. The costs of hosting refugees and migrants were about HRK 2 million per day, while the total cost for one and a half months was HRK 70 million, including transportation, accommodation, food, health care, costs of people in various support systems, etc.“ (Esterajher, 2015: 21).

7.1 Employment of Migrants in the Republic of Croatia

Encouraging economic trends were recorded in Croatia in 2016. Gross domestic product growth was 2.9% compared to moderate growth of 1.6% in 2015. An encouraging trend is shown by all the basic economic indicators, from industrial production, construction, tourism, trade to the labour market (Croatian employment service, 2016)²³. According to the data of the Croatian Employment Service there were 916 foreigners, 124 asylum seek-

ers and three persons under subsidiary protection in their Register in the first half of 2017.

Table 6 *Foreigners registered in the Croatian Employment Service 1 January 2017 – 30 June 2017*

01/01/2017-30/06/2017	REGISTERED	EMPLOYED
FOREIGNERS	916	448
ASYLUM SEEKERS	124	36
SUBSIDIARY PROTECTION	3	1

Source: *Croatian Employment Service, 2017*

Out of that number there were 448 foreigners, 36 asylum seekers and one person under subsidiary protection who were employed. Migrants, therefore, did not affect the growth of employment in Croatia.

8. Disadvantages and Obstacles to the Integration of Migrants in the Republic of Croatia

The Centre for Peace Studies has determined a number of causes for the low rates of employment among foreigners and asylum seekers. According to the Centre for Peace Studies (2016)²³ the process of achieving international protection lasts for six months, but can be extended for another nine months. Because of the length and uncertainty of the process, many people leave Croatia and go to other countries with a more developed refugee reception system. Also, the CPS states that the Republic of Croatia does not offer Croatian language courses but that teaching is conducted by non-governmental organizations and volunteers. Persons who are in the process of applying for international protection obtain financial help of 100 HRK per month whereas persons with an approved international protection, if not employed, are entitled to 800 HRK of cash assistance. The system of recognition of educational and vocational qualifications is underdeveloped. Additional education or vocational training for asylum seekers is paid by themselves or provided by civil society organizations through short-term projects (Centre for Peace Studies, 2016)²⁴.

The labour market does not recognize migrants as a vulnerable group to whom it should open the way

to employment and training (Centre for Peace Studies, 2016)²⁵. The Peace Studies Centre looked into this issue by interviewing refugees residing in the Republic of Croatia. For example, in Afghanistan, practical vocations are gained in craft workshops immediately after elementary school; so many people do not obtain the certificates of completed secondary vocational schools. Accordingly, there are persons with long-term practical experience in the labour market, but the lack of a diploma (which does not exist in their countries) prevents them from further work. In African countries there are systems of elementary and secondary education, as well as higher education, but the problem is that diplomas were left behind in a hurry or stolen on the way. One person shared a specific experience when soldiers in Libya took away his diploma by putting a gun to his head (Centre for Peace Studies, 2013)²⁶.

9. Migrant Entrepreneurship

However, in such conditions, which are not too different in Croatia from other countries in the EU, there are concrete examples of migrant entrepreneurship in the European Union. "Migrants are attracted to cities by both opportunities in terms of work and accommodation as well as by existing communities of other migrants. Such areas are also characterized by a heterogeneous society that further promotes creativity and innovation. Therefore, some migrant studies suggest that migrants are often assumed to be more entrepreneurial than natives. This is based on the argument that migration itself is a risky activity and reflects a certain risk attitude, also important for entrepreneurs" (Marchand, Siegel, 2014: 3)²⁷.

The contribution of migrant entrepreneurs to total employment over the years has risen in Spain, Italy, Austria, Germany and the Netherlands (Kekuš, 2017: 15)²⁸. Only recently, economists began exploring the contribution of immigrants to economies, and they argue that immigrants increase overall productivity and innovation (Stilin, 2016: 43). Furthermore, Stilin affirms that immigrants are more inclined to self-employment in order to avoid lower paid jobs or jobs with low promotion chances. Other researchers point out the cultural characteristics of the country they originate from: if the tendency for self-employment in the country of origin is more pronounced, it is more likely that an immigrant will become an entrepreneur in the host country.

There is some research on foreign workers in Croatia. Božić et al. conclude that more than 50% of respondents have come to Croatia for greater profitability, although their income is much lower than the Croatian average (Božić et al., 2013: 379). Nevertheless, these studies do not specify forced migrants in their statistics.

10. Cultural Contacts - an Opportunity for Economic Growth and Intercultural Misunderstandings

Following the above mentioned research, foreign workers in Croatia have the greatest number of social relations in the workplace and the feeling of acceptance is under the great influence of relations at work (Božić et al., 2013: 401). Therefore, it is also crucial to investigate the communication cultural processes within the organizational structures in which foreign workers, including migrants from the last crisis wave, are employed. Namely, cultural contacts sometimes show dramatic and often conflicting forms (Jagić, Vučetić, 2012: 22) in society and, similarly, in companies.

Organizational culture is defined as a system of meaning shared by members of an organization which differentiates it from other organizations (Robbins, Judge, 2010: 573). Sikavica defines it as a system of values, beliefs, ethics, lifestyles, personality and character of the company (Sikavica, Novak, 1999: 596). Bennett, in turn, defines the organization culture as a set of its members, their customs, forms of behaviour and attitudes to work and the organization itself (Bennet, 1994: 101). Robbins and Judge, however, warn that organizational culture refers to how employees perceive the characteristics of an organization's culture and not their preference with regard to these characteristics (Robbins, Judge, 2010: 575).

But the prevailing perception of employees does not mean that some cultures cannot have subcultures. Thus the dominant culture is the one which is perceived in the same way by the majority of the members of the organization. If the dominant culture is extensive and if the members of the organization support it, then the organization has a strong culture (Brčić, 2002: 1050).

Consequently, customer oriented cultures employ service-oriented people who know how to listen and are willing to go beyond the descriptions of their jobs and do everything they can to meet their cus-

tomers' needs. These cultures clarify their employees' roles, minimize rules and regulations and thus free them to meet the changing customer needs and give them a lot of discretion in decision-making regarding their jobs (Robbins, Judge, 2010: 590). Also, Robbins and Judge state that in the contemporary understanding of organizational culture, more and more organizations emphasise the importance of spirituality in the working environment. There are certain characteristics of enlightened organizations such as a strong sense of purpose, a focus on individual development, mutual trust and respect, humane work practices and toleration of employee expression (Robbins, Judge, 2010: 593-594).

But the postulate of modern organizational culture theory is a barrier to vulnerable groups, including migrants. So there are numerous misunderstandings in organizations. According to Lalić Novak and Kraljević, misunderstanding or lack of understanding in the communication process is primarily the result of message coding and decoding since the meanings attributed by two persons to the common communication symbols are not the same. Differences in the lifestyle, education, attitudes, previous experiences, approaches to work and leadership, body language, manner of expression, culture and level of communication skills are most likely to cause misunderstanding or inaccurate interpretation of other people's messages, thoughts behaviours (Lalić Novak, Kraljević, 2014: 86).

Therefore, for the selection of workers from vulnerable groups of different cultures it is necessary to include experts in the field of migration, in order to avoid secondary trauma and other adverse effects that the conversation can trigger in vulnerable groups, as well as language mediators, who should maintain a professional attitude (Lalić Novak, Kraljević, 2014: 93).

Cultural differences can be a major obstacle in communication. According to Kovačević, 'contact' cultures are found in the Middle East, Indonesia, Latin America, South and East Europe and are characterized by a high level of closeness, while non-contact' cultures, where people maintain a certain distance during communication, are characteristic of North America, North Europe and parts of Asia (Kovačević, 2006: 12). Some features of high-context cultures are deep connections between people, easy flow of information, appreciation of tradition, and reliance on hierarchy and authority. On the other hand, the characteristics of low-context cul-

tures, to which Germans also belong, are a highly individualized approach and superficial connection between people (Lalić Novak, Kraljević, 2014: 133). When there are members of different cultures in the organization, one must not overlook various taboos and demands of particular religions, e.g. Muslims do not consume pork, they avoid alcohol, Muslim women have a “unique” status and many of them observe the dress code (Kovačević, 2006: 7).

11. Prevalence of Discrimination and Xenophobic Attitudes in the Republic of Croatia 2017

Due to the major linguistic, cultural, religious and other differences between migrants and the native population, in the conditions of an increased number of migrants Croatia has experienced an increase in xenophobia and racism, and the strengthening of extreme right currents (Tatalović, 2006: 129).

This is confirmed by the results of the research of discrimination and xenophobic attitudes conducted by the Centre for Peace Studies in the Republic of Croatia in 2017. The Centre compares the data from 2017 with the results of the 2013 survey (Centre for Peace Studies, 2017)²⁹.

The attitudes in Croatia towards multiculturalism in the past four years have not changed appreciably. Similarly to four years ago, the majority of citizens agree with the view that “it is adequate for foreigners who have moved to Croatia to stay connected with their culture and origins”, while there is least agreement with the statement that “foreign immigrants are ready to support Croatia in the event of a crisis” and “I support the immigration of foreigners to Croatia”.

Compared to the results of 2013, an increase in negative opinion and prejudice towards foreign immigrants can be observed, i.e. a lower acceptance rate of their values and cultural heritage. Significantly more citizens believe that foreign immigrants need to embrace Croatian culture as their own; that they should not publicly display their religious and cultural customs, and they should give up on their culture. The only positive change is increased understanding that ethnically diverse areas are invaluable for the Croatian society.

As for the acceptance of the values and cultural heritage of foreign immigrants, a negative trend has also been observed in relation to 2013. Then,

four years ago 20.9% of respondents agreed to some extent with the statement “to be accepted, foreign immigrants should give up their culture”, while today 27.5% of respondents agree with this statement. There is a surprising change of views regarding the argument that Croatia should be open to economic migrants, i.e. people immigrating to Croatia for employment - 51.3% of respondents supported this to some extent in 2017, while only 36.6% of respondents expressed their support in 2013.

As many as 79.5% of respondents think that refugees should go to culturally similar countries, and not to Europe, whereas 66.1% agree to some extent with the statement that a refugee crisis is just a smokescreen for massive and planned settling of Muslims in Europe.

As many as 43.8% of respondents believe that the Republic of Croatia should fully close its border for refugees, and 30.9% think that Croatia should put up a wire or a wall to prevent refugee entry. The areas of these fears are personal security, cultural identity and political loyalty. In other words, prejudices and intolerance towards foreigners are based on the fear that they will jeopardize “our” personal security and security of “our” property, that we will have to change our culture due to their presence, that we will lose our cultural identity, and that they will jeopardize our country’s stability with their lack of loyalty, as they will not care for the benefit of our homeland.

The only perceived shift is in the viewpoint regarding equal rights to employment for migrants. Another positive change refers to agreeing with the claim that foreign immigrants will take jobs from Croatian workers - in 2013 this view was endorsed by 61.3% of respondents whereas today it is endorsed by a lower percentage, i.e. 55.2% of respondents (Centre for Peace Studies, 2017)²⁹.

12. Conclusion

The European Union has been facing the consequences of forced migration over the last few years, mainly due to the current and recent wars and conflicts in the Middle East. Although the institutions of the Union have adopted a series of regulations, directives and action plans of humanitarian, social and economic nature, they have not succeeded to fully integrate the migrant populations into society, meet their urgent needs and ensure their integra-

tion into the labour market. There are several causes for this situation.

A frequent problem is the lack of material evidence of education. Secondly, there are significant cultural differences between migrants and the domicile population. The third reason is that the public perception of migrants is often negative, which is shown by recent research in the Republic of Croatia.

Croatia is not an interesting country for migrants. Its economic and cultural environment is a reason that makes it a transit country to the West. Croatia has granted a negligible number of asylums, and only a small number of these people managed to get a job. Croatia has so much to learn and apply from the practice of Germany, above all in the corporate and organizational culture and the ability of the state and employers to recognize the global changes that bring opportunities for growth.

Despite positive regulations and plans for the integration of migrants into society, it is difficult for them to find employment. Future research should focus on employers and examine whether this is a matter of administrative barriers or just a question of cultural diversity. Likewise, the question remains about how the countries of the European Union, in the upcoming elections for the European Parliament in 2019, will be addressing migrants. It remains to be seen whether the issue of migrants and their integration in society can be a milestone in the development of the European Union. It will also be interesting to track and explore how certain political options will present their policies towards resolving this burning issue as well as how the public will receive and accept messages that will be sent through the political platforms by prospective members of the European Parliament.

REFERENCES

1. Borkert, M., Fisher, K. E., Yafi, E. (2018), "The Best, the Worst and the Hardest to Find: How People, Mobiles, and Social Media Connect Migrants In(to) Europe", *Social Media and Society*, Vol 4, No. 1, pp. 1-11.
2. Bennett, R. (1994). *Management*. Zagreb: Informator-Potecon.
3. Božić, S., Kuzmanović, B., Barada, V. (2013), "Strani radnici u Hrvatskoj: porijeklo, status, orijentacije", *Migracijske i etničke teme*, Vol. 29, No. 3, pp. 367-404.
4. Brčić, R. (2002), "Organizacijska kultura u funkciji djelotvornosti upravne organizacije", *Ekonomski pregled*, Vol. 53, No. 11-12, pp. 1048-1069.
5. Brzezinski, Z. (2004). *Američki izbor – globalna dominacija ili globalno vodstvo*. Zagreb, Podgorica: Politička kultura i CID.
6. Esterajher, J. (2015), "Iskustva zbrinjavanja prognanika i izbjeglica i suvremena izbjegličko-migrantska kriza u Hrvatskoj", *Političke analize*, Vol. 6, No. 23, pp. 15-22.
7. Jagić, S., Vučetić, M. (2012), "Globalizacijski procesi i kultura", *Acta Iadertina*, Vol. 9, No. 1, pp. 15-24.
8. Kovačević, R. (2006). *Kros-kulturno istraživanje i vrednovanje marketing aktivnosti*. Beograd: Srpski ekonomski forum.
9. Lalić Novak, G., Kraljević, R. (2014). *Zaštita izbjeglica i ranjivih skupina migranata*. Zagreb: Hrvatski crveni križ.
10. Mesić, M. (2002). *Međunarodne migracije: tokovi i teorije*. Zagreb: Societas, Zavod za sociologiju.
11. Modood, T., Werbner, P. (1997). *The Politics of Multiculturalism in the New Europe, Racism, Identity and Community*, London and New York: Zed Books.
12. Pajnik, M. (2012), "Migrants as Cheap Labourers in Europe Towards Critical Assessment of Integration", *Migracijske i etničke teme*, Vol. 28, No. 2, pp.143-163.
13. Penava, M. (2011), "Utjecaj migracija na europsko tržište rada", *Ekonomski misao i praksa*, Vol. 20, No. 2, pp. 335-362.
14. Robbins, S. P., Judge, T. A. (2010). *Organizacijsko ponašanje*. Zagreb: MATE.
15. Sikavica, P., Novak, M. (1999). *Poslovna organizacija*. Zagreb: Informator.
16. Stilin, A. (2016), "Suvremeni trendovi u poduzetništvu", *Praktični menadžment*, Vol. 7, No. 1, pp. 39-46.
17. Tatalović, S. (2006). *Nacionalna i međunarodna sigurnost*. Zagreb: Politička kultura.
18. Tatalović, S., Malnar, D. (2015), "Sigurnosni aspekti izbjegličke krize", *Političke analize*, Vol. 6, No. 23, pp. 23-29.

(ENDNOTES)

- 1 EU law and publications (2017). Publications.europa.eu, available at: <http://publications.europa.eu/webpub/com/factsheets/migration-crisis/hr/> (Accessed on: May 11, 2018)
- 2 EU law and publications (2017). Publications.europa.eu, available at: <http://publications.europa.eu/webpub/com/factsheets/migration-crisis/hr/> (Accessed on: May 11, 2018)
- 3 European Commission (2017). „Eurostat, glavne tablice i baza podataka”, available at: http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-explained/index.php/Migration_and_migrant_population_statistics/hr (Accessed on: May 11, 2018)
- 4 European Commission (2016). „Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions: Action Plan on the integration of third country nationals”, available at: https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/sites/homeaffairs/files/what-we-do/policies/european-agenda-migration/proposal-implementation-package/docs/20160607/communication_action_plan_integration_third-country_nationals_en.pdf (Accessed on: May 11, 2018)

- 5 Ministry of the Interior (2016). „Akcijski plan za integraciju državljana trećih zemalja“, available at: <https://www.mup.hr/public/documents/Europska%20unija/Akcijski%20plan%20za%20integraciju%20odr%C5%BEavljana%20tre%C4%87ih%20zemalja.pdf> (Accessed on: May 11, 2018)
- 6 Žarić, M. (1997). „Multikulturalnost - nastojanje ili himba? Analiza pojma na primjeru Njemačke“, *Revija za socijalnu politiku*, Vol. 4, No. 2, available at: <http://www.rsp.hr/ojs2/index.php/rsp/article/view/398/402> (Accessed on: May 11, 2018)
- 7 Žarić, M. (1997). „Multikulturalnost - nastojanje ili himba? Analiza pojma na primjeru Njemačke“, *Revija za socijalnu politiku*, Vol. 4, No. 2, available at: <http://www.rsp.hr/ojs2/index.php/rsp/article/view/398/402> (Accessed on: May 11, 2018)
- 8 Taube, F. (2012). „Migranti u Njemačkoj su nezamjenjivi“, available at: <http://www.dw.com/bs/migranti-u-njemačkoj-su-nezamjenjivi/a-16253515> (Accessed on: May 11, 2018)
- 9 Taube, F. (2012). „Migranti u Njemačkoj su nezamjenjivi“, available at: <http://www.dw.com/bs/migranti-u-njemačkoj-su-nezamjenjivi/a-16253515> (Accessed on: May 11, 2018)
- 10 European Commission (2017). „Eurostat, glavne tablice i baza podataka“, available at: http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-explained/index.php/Migration_and_migrant_population_statistics/hr (Accessed on: May 11, 2018)
- 11 Bertelsmann Stiftung (2016). „From Refugees to Workers“, available at: http://www.bertelsmann-stiftung.de/fileadmin/files/user_upload/Studie_NW_From_Refugees_to_Workers_Vol1.pdf (Accessed on: May 11, 2018)
- 12 Bertelsmann Stiftung (2016). „From Refugees to Workers“, available at: http://www.bertelsmann-stiftung.de/fileadmin/files/user_upload/Studie_NW_From_Refugees_to_Workers_Vol1.pdf (Accessed on: May 11, 2018)
- 13 Bertelsmann Stiftung (2016). „From Refugees to Workers“, available at: http://www.bertelsmann-stiftung.de/fileadmin/files/user_upload/Studie_NW_From_Refugees_to_Workers_Vol1.pdf (Accessed on: May 11, 2018)
- 14 Central Bureau of Statistics (2015). „Migration of population of the Republic of Croatia“, available at: https://www.dzs.hr/Hrv_Eng/publication/2016/07-01-02_01_2016.htm (Accessed on: September 17, 2018)
- 15 Central Bureau of Statistics (2016). „Migration of population of the Republic of Croatia“, available at: https://www.dzs.hr/Hrv_Eng/publication/2017/07-01-02_01_2017.htm (Accessed on: May 11, 2018)
- 16 Central Bureau of Statistics (2017). „Migration of population of the Republic of Croatia“, available at: https://www.dzs.hr/Hrv_Eng/publication/2018/07-01-02_01_2018.htm (Accessed on: September 17, 2018)
- 17 Narodne novine (2013). „Zakon o prebivalištu“, available at: <https://www.zakon.hr/z/557/Zakon-o-prebivali%C5%A1tu> (Accessed on: May 11, 2018)
- 18 Narodne novine (2013). „Zakon o izmjenama i dopunama Zakona o strancima“, available at: https://narodne-novine.nn.hr/clanci/sluzbeni/2013_06_74_1475.html (Accessed on: May 11, 2018)
- 19 Središnji registar osiguravnika (2017). „Obavijest poslodavcima koji zapošljavaju strance“, available at: <http://regos.hr/default.aspx?id=274> (Accessed on: May 11, 2018)
- 20 Ministry of the Interior (2017). „Statistički pokazatelji tražitelja međunarodne zaštite prema državljanstvu i spolu u 2017. godini“, available at: <http://stari.mup.hr/UserDocsImages/Dokumenti/azil/2017/stat-30-06-2017.pdf> (Accessed on: May 11, 2018)
- 21 Ministry of the Interior (2016). „Obavijesti o prihvatu i smještaju migranata u RH“, available at: <http://stari.mup.hr/main.aspx?id=230152> (Accessed on: May 11, 2018)
- 22 Croatian Employment Service (2016). „Godišnjak 2016.“, available at: http://www.hzz.hr/UserDocsImages/HZZ_Godisnjak_2016.pdf (Accessed on: May 11, 2018)
- 23 Centre for Peace Studies (2016). „Ne-funkcionalna integracija za izbjeglice - Što sve država nije učinila za izbjeglice?“, available at: https://www.cms.hr/system/publication/pdf/81/POLICY_BRIEF_CENTRA_ZA_MIROVNE_STUDIJE_to_dr_ava_nije_u_inila_za_izbjeglice.pdf (Accessed on: May 11, 2018)
- 24 Centre for Peace Studies (2016). „Ne-funkcionalna integracija za izbjeglice - Što sve država nije učinila za izbjeglice?“, available at: https://www.cms.hr/system/publication/pdf/81/POLICY_BRIEF_CENTRA_ZA_MIROVNE_STUDIJE_to_dr_ava_nije_u_inila_za_izbjeglice.pdf (Accessed on: May 11, 2018)
- 25 Centre for Peace Studies (2016). „Ne-funkcionalna integracija za izbjeglice - Što sve država nije učinila za izbjeglice?“, available at: https://www.cms.hr/system/publication/pdf/81/POLICY_BRIEF_CENTRA_ZA_MIROVNE_STUDIJE_to_dr_ava_nije_u_inila_za_izbjeglice.pdf (Accessed on: May 11, 2018)
- 26 Centre for Peace Studies (2013). „Priznavanje kvalifikacija izbjeglicama. Prijedlozi za sustav Republike Hrvatske temeljeni na iskustvu europskih zemalja“, available at: https://www.cms.hr/system/publication/pdf/64/priznavanje_kvalifikacija_izbjeglicama_CMS-27-04-2013.pdf (Accessed on: May 11, 2018)
- 27 International organization for migration (2014). „Immigrant Entrepreneurship in Cities“, available at: https://www.iom.int/sites/default/files/our_work/ICP/MPR/WMR-2015-Background-Paper-KMarchand-MSiegel.pdf (Accessed on: May 11, 2018)
- 28 Centre for Peace Studies (2017). „[MIGRENT] - migrant (social) entrepreneurship as a tool of socio-economic emancipation of migrants“, available at: https://www.cms.hr/system/publication/pdf/92/Publikacija_Migrent.pdf (Accessed on: May 11, 2018)
- 29 Centre for Peace Studies (2017). „Istraživački izvještaj – Zastupljenost i indikatori diskriminacijskih i ksenofobičnih stavova u Republici Hrvatskoj u 2017.“, available at: https://www.cms.hr/system/publication/pdf/98/Zastupljenost_i_indikatori_diskriminacijskih_i_ksenofobi_nih_stavova_u_Republici_Hrvatskoj_u_2017.pdf (Accessed on: May 11, 2018)

Vjekoslav Đaić
Branimir Felger
Gordana Lesinger

INTEGRACIJA MIGRANATA NA HRVATSKO TRŽIŠTE RADA – USPOREDBA S NJEMAČKIM ISKUSTVOM

SAŽETAK

Autori istražuju specifičnosti sociokulturnog doprinosa migranata hrvatskom i njemačkom gospodarstvu. Bave se teorijskom podlogom migrantskih doprinosa poduzetništvu, pregledom, usporedbom i analizom sekundarnih podataka o aktualnom stanju u njemačkom i hrvatskom poduzetništvu s naglaskom na zapošljavanje i samozapošljavanje migranata te doprinosom njihovih različitih kultura gospodarstvima dviju zemalja, kao i konkretnim primjerima iz prakse uspješne ili neuspješne internacionalizacije, multikulturalnosti društava te svladavanja kulturalnih izazova u oba gospodarstva. Jedan je autor rekao da je svaka kultura „svijet za sebe”, ima svoje specifičnosti i stoga se ne može dati univerzalan model poslovnog ponašanja. Svaka kultura se posebno mora istražiti. Je li to slučaj u Republici Hrvatskoj?

Ključne riječi: migranti, gospodarstvo, zapošljavanje, organizacijska kultura, Njemačka, Hrvatska