

## NATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL IN THE VALORIZATION OF HUMAN RESOURCES: DILEMAS AND PERSPECTIVES

Liliana Gabriela ILIE

Ph.D. Univ. Assistant

Faculty of Philosophy and Social-Political Sciences

"Alexandru Ioan Cuza" University, Iași

[ilielili2000@yahoo.com](mailto:ilielili2000@yahoo.com)

**Abstract:** *As a result of the radicalization of the globalist rhetoric, the decrease of the interests for the curricular projection of the educational offers in compatibility with the national development projects, revealed a practical paradox: instead of internationalizing the prosperity at global level, the process of globalization has contributed, indeed, to maintaining the traditional asymmetries between rich countries and poor countries. In response to the supporters of globalization, we support the imperative rethinking the process of training human resources in national frameworks, by curricular reform of educational systems, not by diminishing the ethnic parameter, but by complementing the national dimension, the educational offerings, with the international parameter. In this article we plead for the inclusion in the educational offer of the study disciplines in the countries where multinationals operate, of all the theoretical subjects and of the laboratory work necessary to train the set of competences that they need. It is possible, on these coordinates, to form public-private collaboration relationships, with beneficial effects for both employers and employees, provided that the multinational corporations obtain the right to disseminate the licenses of the technologies that the multinationals in this case need. On these coordinates, the migratory flows could be kept under control and the stability of the work force / human resource could be more motivated and efficient in all the fields of activity. By globalizing skills, prosperity can be globalized, but through work, not through charitable acts (illusory) of the already prosperous, and eager, exclusively, to increase their profits.*

**Key words:** *human resources; job opportunities; education supply; vocational reconversion; human potential.*

### Thesis

The return of Romania after December 1989 to the capitalist system of human resources management has generated controversies (Zamfir et al., 2000) that have ignited the relationship between the curricular structure of educational offers and the ways of structuring the labor market.

The adult generation, which entered the labor market until December 1989, argues (with very few exceptions), that placing graduates through government departments on the labor market would be the only way to avoid unemployment and to fully use human resources for national development, while

the supporters of the Western model are, in consequence, in favor of the definitive renunciation of the paternalistic formula of the use of the national human potential, with the argument that in the new European formula of the situation of Romania, that of a member of the European Union, maintaining the national monopoly of the use of human resources, it is no longer possible, but neither legitimate (Pasti, 2000: 21): human resources are European, and their free movement cannot be restricted, without harming the fundamental human rights.

Beyond the ideological, inevitable, sociologically speaking connotations there is a difference of managerial options: under the conditions of a centralized state, such as Romania until December 1989, the education system was designed as a "tool of national development" in order to ensure the "labor force" necessary to achieve the objectives of the "single development plan", each graduate to be have a workplace for an indefinite period of time; the stability of the workplace of was ensured, and the promotion at the job was guaranteed as a result of the option, individual, of improvement through professional courses designed for the specific profile.

The results are historically verifiable: from the late Middle Ages stage, that of an eminently agrarian country, Romania has evolved to the stage of an industrial-agrarian country, with export potential not only of agri-food products, but also of industrial equipment from many fields of activity, until December 1989 (Murgescu, 2000: 35).

### **Arguments**

Under the conditions of the postdecembrist pluralist system, in which the social-economic space is shared between the state and the Romanian private companies, as well as between the multinational companies with private capital, the governmental distributions have become impossible, because the employment correlates with the development programs of the employers, not with the government programs of the national state. Companies with private capital have only the obligation to pay taxes owed to the Romanian state, they do not have the obligation to absorb all the resources generated by the school programs, at all levels from Romania. In this context, the asymmetry between the structure of the educational offers and the structure the labor market in our country is impossible to solve regardless of the political orientation of the government formulas, at one time or another, in government. Consequently, unemployment is inevitable.

Surprised by the disappointments of some of the Romanian analysts, very worried that the western model adopted by our country after the change of the ideological paradigm of 1989 causes unemployment, some western teachers (Ruegg, 2001) mentioned that unemployment is a sign of the socio-economic development of a country: namely, the country has saturated the level of employment of labor force in all areas and the development continues on the

component of services, the number of population employed in the field of services being a parameter of the degree of development of the respective country. Thus, if more people work in services (the tertiary sector), it means that the primary sector (agriculture and energy) and the secondary sector (industry and manufacturing) are so productive that they provide the necessary social space. The available population can find, freely, a form of professional expression in the tertiary; services, in the broad sense of the word.

The "underuse of the" labor force" (Stiglitz, 2003) is no longer possible now, as in the last century in which only the work carried out with physical effort provided forms of expression on the labor market. Here is the paradox: unemployment is a proof of development of contemporary social spaces.

We reserve the right not to comment on the slightly apologetic tone of the afore mentioned paradox.

With the express intention to alleviate the pressure exerted on the governments for the increase of unemployment, at European level it has been passed to the "Bologna system" of management of the educational offers, through which after the three years of initial formation, the possibility of professionalization through master's degrees is offered and who aspires to the level of expert, follows doctoral studies, the title of doctor conferring the quality that expert and the legitimacy to carry out expertise in the respective field of doctoral qualification.

After a few cycles of graduates, the analysis of the results is not encouraging: at the end of the three years, the graduates, however, claimed jobs on the labor market, contributing to the increase of unemployment. The initial program according to which out of the total of the graduates of initial training (the three years), 50% will follow the masters and 25% will follow the doctorate, has proved to be very attractive theoretically, but not functional in practical relation. The initiative, although well-intentioned, has proven to be not a solution, although mobility at the continental and international levels has remained open. A rethink of the effort to explore possible solutions to the problem of unemployment, (Isărescu, 2000) remains a challenge for the present, but also for the indefinite future; the western model also has its limits.

The idea that globalization can be a solution to the problem of more efficient use of the available labor force, at the planetary level (Wallerstein, 2008: 12) due to the freedom of professionalized individuals to obtain job opportunities, should be viewed with some circumspection, because the competition between the national human resources and the ones coming from outside the national area has not been proven so far to give spectacular results. This experiment has ended, and the search must continue.

The experts in the educational sciences from the West, have come to us many times in Romania to give courses focused on increasing the compatibility between the structure of the educational offers in pre-university and university education, but they could not answer the following question: "If, in fact, you have

miraculous solutions, why in your Western European countries unemployment was not liquidated, with the solutions you offer us?"

The reproach that we, those in the East, have a "democratic deficit", somewhat believable through the 1990s, is now completely devoid of credibility and is beginning to be perceived as propaganda and the mobility of students and teachers through Tempus-Erasmus programs (which have lived and been active for a time in the developed capitalist countries, with a "consolidated" democracy) the apprehensions regarding the acceptance of the "good practices" of the reduction of unemployment exclusively through the contribution of the education system have increased.

The practice of "structural reform" of the Romanian social space has shown that social reform is not a technical problem: it is not possible to replace one component of the social space with another, as is done in the ethnic system where everything can be made after a certain standard, because in the social space the role of the collective mind has a determinant that cannot be standardized. The educational system and all its correlations with the global social space cannot be standardized; at most, only some components that prove their compatibility can be grafted. So, the only selective takeover (Buzărnescu, 1998: 154) of good practices in line with our collective mind can have some success.

In this context, we formulate the following hypothesis: exploring our development potential through correlation with the European market can contribute, decisively and pragmatically, to the formulation of more attractive educational offers and greater chances of being placed on the labor market in Romania and on the continent. The big mistake of the curricular programs would be the underestimation of the national interests, because the local development needs qualified social actors for the jobs in the national economy, obviously and by using the technologies that our country cannot produce, which is why our school programs, at all levels, may include specialized courses, in profile, from Western Europe; it is really a priority, provided that the owners of these technologies allow it.

Now, after three decades since the abolition of vocational schools and specialized high schools in our country, it became evident the error of the decision-makers from the post-December period of authority, because the need for qualified personnel in all fields of activity, especially in executive activities, is acute.

Recently promoted, the initiative to re-establish the technical network for training young people in our country is a very good opportunity to build a modern logistics, in public-private partnership, for the preparation of qualified human resources in accordance with the national need, but also with the need for employers from multinationals. In this way one could avoid delaying national economic objectives due to the lack of labor force, but would also support multinationals who reproached, upon their arrival in Romania, that they do not have such a well-qualified workforce to contribute, immediately, to maximize the

profits of their investments, without period, naturally, adapting to their new technologies.

Here is the possible solution: financial support of training programs for their future employees that our education system can train according to the requirements of multinationals, in order to avoid, in this way, training to adapt to their workflows.

From another angle, it is possible to avoid the dissemination of messages with negative impact on the image management of the identity profile of our education system. In this case, I refer to the impressions, not at all favorable to the Romanians, of the first "foreign investors" who, seeing the little compatibility of the abilities of the Romanian engineers and workers with the integrative requests of the new technologies specific to the multinationals in question, drew, superficially, conclusions on the precarious quality of our specialists, putting pressure on the permanent reform of our educational system. The truth is another: our specialists, for example engineers, even in IT from the Polytechnic University of Iași, Bucharest, Timișoara, or Cluj, have found jobs in many countries in Europe, and have integrated seamlessly there, obviously due to their competitive educational offers of the Romanian vocational training system. If the reproaches previously mentioned came from well-intentioned people, the explanation is another: our workers and engineers had not worked, until that moment, on the technologies with which the multinationals came, but after a very short training, the integration into their flow of activities was even performing; which means that our educational investment in Romania was good.

All the rhetoric of the immediate reform of our education system has proved counterproductive, because the abolition of vocational schools and specialized high schools was not the priority, but their re-technologicalization, through the contribution of Western technologies. This is the perspective of vocational training, provided that all the inertial moments of the multiple "conditioning" imposed by the Western European partner demands for Eastern European countries are eliminated.

Another part of the solution would be the curricular compatibility of the educational offers on a continental scale. Similar to scientific research, an area where a single, European area of scientific research was established, the promotion of a unique, curricular, vocational training space in which some percentages are compulsory, European (may be 50%), and other percentages (50%) to be reserved for the curriculum with national coverage, so as not to underestimate the national development projects); something similar to a subsidiary that exists in other fields of activity.

On these coordinates, the asymmetry between the expectations of the multinationals and those of the employees could be diminished; it is not expected to eliminate all these asymmetries.

As for the role of the education system on unemployment, we make it clear: the training system does not generate unemployment.

The school, as an institution and profession, has the role of teaching educators how to write, read, calculate / count, and round them with some skills and abilities, that is, a profession, by which they can relate, qualified to the world of work. Job training and financing is the attribute of government formulas within the authority range of leadership and multinationals. Who else thinks of the logic of a "full" compatibility between the structure of educational offerings and the structure of occupations in the "field of work", as it was in the centralized planning system, means that he did not understand anything about the change that occurred in December 1989; the capitalist social system is not one of centralized planning.

It is not the duty of sociology to make a comparative assessment, but only to explain what is the cause of unemployment; not the school generates unemployment, but the nature of the macro-social management instituted at the level of the social space, in this case the government formula that is in power. The school has done its duty, according to its potential for training and qualification, but if the institutional structure, i.e. the functioning regime of the community social space uses only partially the human resources available, it is no longer the responsibility of the education system. If some very vocal politicians hold the school accountable as a training institution, this rhetorical exercise is based either on sociological uncultivatedness, on the escape of responsibility of political decision-makers, or both. The solution of unemployment, even if unemployment is alarmingly growing, cannot be exclusively the competence of the school institution in the generic sense of the word, implicated also in the "dual formation" that is now presented to us as an absolute novelty, in the field.

Known as a "job qualification" where the employee was doing an apprenticeship, after which, after an examination he was titled in the specialty in which he did the apprenticeship, this training also worked during the socialist period of our country for all the young people who did not they were able to pass the examination for high school, but also for the adults without occupation, in a somewhat obligatory regime, because every citizen was obliged to enter, somewhere, in a work place, the unemployment being completely forbidden; so impossible.

And then, even now, the obligation to work was criticized on the grounds that work is a fundamental human right, not an obligation. This critical approach is relevant, but if there are no job opportunities, what is the fault of the amateur in the labor market?

To this question, neither sociology nor the school institution is obliged to formulate answers.

Another hypothesis of the use of human resources is the migration flows generated either by the aspiration of the qualified people to sell their labor at a cheaper price in the economically developed countries, or because of the liquidation of the jobs in the Eastern European countries, such as and the case of Romania (Pasti; 2000) or for other reasons of personal choice.

Regarding the price difference of the work submitted in Romania, at the multinationals, and the hourly rates for the same types of activities in the countries from which the respective multinationals originate, there arose a problem that is far from finding any solution: the employees from Romania calls for non-discriminatory treatment. In the face of this challenge, the multinationals have the choice: either to give up this discriminatory treatment, or to leave our country for other countries, where the multinationals in question can continue their activities without diminishing the profits obtained with the current level of pay in our country.

The reality is obvious: the multinationals came to Romania for the profit generated by the very low level of wages practiced in Romania, not from any charitable feeling or for humanitarian reasons. The requests of the Romanian employees to be paid at the same level as the employees of the same companies in their countries of origin (from Western Europe) are not only unpopular, but unacceptable to the managers of the respective multinationals. Asymmetries of waiting horizons initiate a conflict of proportions, with unpredictable denouement.

### **Conclusions**

The professional reconversion, as a solution to solve the problem of unemployment in Romania, where during the period of communist government, job security was guaranteed, in all fields of activity, it proved to be rather a palliative, because the areas in which they were offered professional reconversions, have reduced unemployment insignificantly. In addition, many of those who have completed such courses as hairdressers, cooks, waiters, etc. they left the country to find job opportunities in other countries. In conclusion, although well-intentioned and funded by the government formula in power, the measure of professional reconversion has not proven, in practice, its effectiveness.

Since 1989, we in Romania have been waiting for solutions to the unemployment generated by the adoption of the Western model from the "consolidated democracies" of the Western European, but the growth of the "sovereign debts" of those countries shows that the solutions do not exist in their managerial practice. We hoped that there is a European policy (Cartesian, of course!). For the production and employment to which Romanians, as recently joined the EU, do not yet have access. After 30 years of waiting, our hopes have been shattered and Euroscepticism is threatening us too, those who were the most europhiles in the conditions of accession. If hopes will turn into illusions, what will happen next?

## References

1. Abraham, Moles. (1968). *Sociodinamica culturii*. Bucharest: Științifică și Enciclopedică.
2. Buzărnescu, Ștefan. (2008). *Doctrine sociologice comparate*. Timișoara: de Vest.
3. Buzărnescu, Ștefan. (1998). *Bovarismul instituțional*. Timișoara: Augusta.
4. Brătianu, Constantin. (1995). *Proiectul Calisro*. Bucharest: Universității București.
5. Francois, Ruegg. (2001). *La Est nimic nou*. Timișoara: de Vest.
6. Gorun, Adrian. (2010). *Educația Încotro? Modele de administrare a sistemului educațional*. Târgu-Jiu: Academică Brâncuși.
7. Isărescu, Mugur; Postolache, Tudorel. (2000). *Strategia de dezvoltare a României pe termen mediu*. Bucharest: Centrul Român de Economie Comparată și Consensuală.
8. Murgescu, Bogdan. (2000). *România și Europa. Acumularea decalajelor economice, (1500-2000)*. Iași: Polirom.
9. Pasti, Vladimir. (2000). *Noul capitalism românesc*. Iași: Polirom.
10. Stiglitz, Joseph. (2003). *Globalizarea. Speranțe și iluzii*. Bucharest: Economică.
11. Walerstein, Immanuel. (2008). *Declinul Puterii americane. SUA într-o lume haotică*. Bucharest: Incitatus.
12. Zamfir, Cătălin; Stănescu, Iulian. (2000). *După 20 de ani. Opțiuni pentru România*. Bucharest: ICCV.