

THE EVOLUTION OR INVOLUTION OF POLICIES TO COMBAT YOUTH UNEMPLOYMENT?

Ștefania Cristina GHIOCANU*

Abstract

A current problem that Romania is facing is high unemployment among young people. Despite the implementation of policies to fight it and improve some of them, this problem is still present on the agenda of the public institutions at the national level and those of the European Union. In Romania, companies that hire inexperienced youngs in force receive from the Romanian state, through European funds between 200-300 euros / month per employee. A boost for companies to increase employability among youth.

A first question that arises here is: this policy does not discriminate, directly employability among adults, creating consciously or not, unemployment among them?

By the present research I wanted to provide an overview of public policies implemented in this area, showing both the negative aspects which could lead to a deeper issues that are behind it: discrimination of adults in employment and those positive could lead to a clear evolution in this area. The aim is to demonstrate whether the policies implemented in Romania to fight youth unemployment represented an evolution or involution more in this regard? Reported for purpose, targets are those that require to define the concept of young and category directly concerned by these policies, according to Union legislation, to present a concrete statistical data on youth unemployment since 2002 until now, because in 2002 was taken the first private assumption of companies, as simulation of modules for youth employment and analysis of public policies implemented in this field.

A final proposed target It is to follow the results of the policies implemented in these years and demonstrate that led to an evolution or involution, including the negative aspects that stood in the way of fulfilling expectations and the proposed actions. To achieve these objectives, the method proposed for research is the analysis of legislation and documents.

Keywords: *unemployment, discrimination, public policies to combat unemployment, employability of young, development of policy.*

Introduction

This article aims to evaluate the impact of social policies for youth employability. It has as its starting point a common problem not only at national but also at European level and at the EU level; namely aggressive growth in unemployment among young people.

The main purpose of this article is to show whether legislation on combating youth unemployment was an evolution or involution in this regard. As targets proposed in this article are: to identify the weaknesses of legislation in the field of fighting youth unemployment, analyzing their discriminatory effects and to identify the important elements that Romania has not taken into account after its adoption.

As a way of responding to these goals we chose to document and analyze the legislation. Article does not intend to make a comprehensive analysis in this area, but to identify weaknesses in the legislation that would be improved by a new public policy in the field.

I think that is one issue under research: real, actual, present both in Romania and at European level and affects a category big enough and important for the future of any country and any society. Youth unemployment, respectively, reducing their level of employability is a real problem and concrete, because, as I said earlier, the youth unemployment rate is 25,7% in Romania and 23,4% the

European Union; It presents a problem because even the European Union considered it a major problem.

Public policies on youth integration in the labor market have undergone many changes, with a significant dynamic and an end that would have to be found to reduce unemployment among this target group. I would not say that this goal was achieved or that the problems in this area have seen an improvement, at least in the short term. Thus, in 2002 youth unemployment stood at 23,9% in 2006, youth unemployment was 23,3%. In 2007, 23,6% in 2008 youth unemployment was 18,7% knowing the biggest decrease in adult of 34,65%. Four years later, in 2012 youth unemployment was 22,5% and 43,1% among adults and youth unemployment is currently around 25,7% and 41,69% among adults according to the National Institute of Statistics and the National Association of Employment.

In this case Romania is ranked 7 on youth unemployment in the European Union, higher percentages recorded in Greece, Spain, Italy, Slovakia, Portugal. We chose 2002 as the reference point because this year was adopted, the Law no.76 / 2002 on the unemployment insurance system and stimulation of employment. Before presenting a brief analysis of these data, I consider it necessary to clarify the concept of "young", according to

* PhD, first year, The University of Bucharest, Faculty of Social Work and Sociology, Specialization: Sociology.

European regulations and legislation of our country to combat unemployment among this category.

In this respect the European Union considers "young" person aged 18-30 years, specifying that by 2012 "young" was considered a person aged 16-25 years. Based on these data I will try to answer several questions arising from such percentages, quite large and worrying.

The first question that I believe arrives in anyone's mind when he has to face such data that speak of a subject quite important in human life: work and able to support themselves financially, at least at the stage of subsistence to a stage environment - it is natural: What is the cause of rising unemployment among young people and not only at a rate so high in the last 3 years, given the legislation adopted and improved to fight it? Another question that arises from these data would be: Why Romania improved legislation on fighting youth unemployment if it led to an improvement in its only until 2008?

According to legislation to fight youth unemployment, an important place Law 76/2002, updated in 2015. According to Article 80 (1), "employers who employ, for an indefinite period, graduates of institutions education are exempt for a period of 12 months of paid contributions to the unemployment insurance budget, the related graduates employed, and receive monthly, per period, for each of the graduates: □ one of the minimum gross salary guaranteed payment in force at the date of employment for graduates of lower secondary schools or schools of arts and crafts;

□ 1.2 minimum gross salary per country guaranteed payment in force at the date of employment for graduates of upper secondary or post-secondary education;

□ 1.5 minimum gross salary per country guaranteed payment in force at the date of employment for university graduates.

According to Article 80 (2) employers who employ, indefinite, graduates of disabled people receive monthly for each graduate, amounts in par. (1) for a period of 18 months. Employers who retain graduates employed on the job more than three years, receive, for each year of continued labor relations or service in the next two years, financial aid equal to the amount of social contributions paid by employers for these people (art. 84 (1.2)). "

Also, another law in this area, Law no. 116/2002 updated on preventing and combating social exclusion states in Article 8 (1): "employers who hire young people aged between 16 and 25 years, under a contract of solidarity, will receive a monthly basic salary for the date youth employment, but not more than 75% of the net average wage economy, announced by the National Statistics Institute. Art. 8 (2) states that "if the termination date of solidarity employers will conclude with youth an

individual contract of indefinite duration, they benefit, for a maximum of two years, the monthly repayment of a sum in the amount of 50 % of unemployment benefits due.

Here, therefore, that there is a strong legislation to combat youth unemployment, but this does not mean that cancels the first question that has arisen since the early submission of data What is the cause of rising unemployment, especially among young people and why it exists, or at least is not reduced after some drastic measures both in financial terms for a national budget and quite motivating for any private enterprise.?! Seen from the data presented above, that despite legislation adopted in favor of reducing youth unemployment and submit a phenomenon

that persists even higher percentage than in 2008. This also applies to unemployment among adults. Why?

First there is current legislation discriminates on the public to solve this problem. Unemployment has existed among both youth and adult. Why legislation that solves or just wants to solve the youth unemployment problem and not the adult? Even if young people represent the future of this country and would society, adults who currently maintain this society through work, values and training they give to young people and society further, in a way, of course, indirectly.

On the other hand the law is observed clearly presented solution: offering money (CAS cuts, money given to every employee, etc.) for private companies employing young people with certain conditions set out in law. This solution clearly unfavorable for the second time adult. A company that would be able and could hire both a young conforming to the requirements of the legislation, but equally an adult would choose for which aobține certain financial benefits which are provided by law.

Also in the legislation and solutions adopted have not considered social values, social relations of the two groups: adults and youth. It is a good chance that an adult to take care of a family, be responsible and growth of children, which means that the discrimination that prevents employment, legislation that disregards the problem may be born other social problems, the indirect effect of unemployment among adults dropout, drug, alcohol, high growth of divorces, increased suicide rate, high rate of abandoned children, etc.

Conclusions

Just fault that an adult (in most cases) is not only responsible for the life and well-being but also that of children and the family he has, and unemployment problems among the public may arise other subcategories of social problems. But it would be very serious if all this would be directly responsible adult,

but when there is legislation that discriminates clearly a certain category of people (adults), which has the same problem as another category (youth) and policies public implemented only in solving the problem of the two categories, I think to blame unemployment among adults do not directly damaging impact adults only.

Now to look less and situation of young people. There is a clear legislation passed that favor employment. However there is a percentage of unemployment increasingly grew. Also, based on the subjective side of youth unemployment was not taken into account but only s + emphasized on motivating private companies to hire young people.

There is unemployment among young people, they have taken steps to combat them, measures which discriminate against another group of people, but there is still in force, and yet the problem worsens with larger steps. Underlying measures was not taken into account the willingness of young people to engage in the labor market - even if it's harder to test their desire for personal and professional development, involvement and motivation in the social, professional, social links real solid and other aspects of their lives - family, college, school, liability level of their level of adaptability to new requirements and the new economy. If all these things would have been analyzed, tested and checked before the adoption of this legislation the outcome would have been motivating companies to hire more young people but a solution could come in motivating young people to engage in socio-professional change higher education system, reducing the number of university places commensurate with market requirements, development of schools of arts and crafts at a high level, stronger adoption of legislation on longstanding practice during university studies and programs.

Absenteeism courses in higher education, from high school even, their results within educational institutions, social relationships they create with people they offer education and training I think there are elements that should be considered in implementing any policies to combat unemployment and not just offer money and tax exemption for private companies would be a real solution, as long as these issues were not analyzed, tested and matched. Public policies to combat youth unemployment, but not only, should have been taken bearing in mind a few things: to have a real unemployment (and yes there); will be tested, values the target group; do not discriminate against another group of people who face the same problem; after its results to improve from year to year, otherwise recourse to new regulation.

It is apparent therefore that what it lacks Romania to adapt existing legislation to combat youth unemployment are very real impact studies and analysis of data recorded in this area. Can not improve legislation had no visible results and which gave rise to another problem: discrimination in employment of

adults. From this point of view Romania has not fared in combating youth unemployment and more receded since created another major public issue and has not managed to reduce the original version.

Any public issue born even after an economic crisis can not improve or resolve or partially if: the solution adopted infringing certain social values affect other rights of other persons does not take into account the values of the individual and if not tested social relations between individuals - and social policies have focused more on financial development than on social issues, which can not exist without the latter.

Public policies should be regarded by citizens as an aid, as a boost, as a "holding hands when they go to higher ground," not as a solution supreme defining and to become addicted, and they should create the necessary framework for implementing a solution and then move to direct implementation of it, and if results are what you want from it is necessary replenishment and reinventing action mode and not just improving those who still failed to achieve the intended purpose initial.

In conclusion, I think we can say that the good thing Romanian Government did to increase employability among youth is that it has taken some measures to stimulate the private sector and to support their insertion in the labor market. But what has not been taken into account periodic analysis of results and assess the impact of policy interventions, at least after the first 2-3 years after implementation.

The impact assessment should have been the connecting link between the desired results and those obtained in reality. Another negative aspect that has not been noticed, as I presented above, is the fact that the private sector has taken advantage of this opportunity (the benefits of economic-financial items arranging inexperienced young) and neglected category adulthood, increasing unemployment among them.

On the other hand, private companies have regarded this policy, more like a financial benefit because the tax exemption for a certain category of employees (young inexperienced) and receiving a minimum wage for them. Which favor a much more privately than young unemployed. Why? For an issue to consider for the new assessment of these policies already implemented would be that the private sector has created far fewer jobs than would be needed for all young people with higher education and without experience, at least, which not solve youth unemployment but also creates unemployment and higher among adults.

Therefore, I can say that unemployment among young people and policies against it is the point that would require new impact studies, new evaluation methods and a new strategy for dealing with meaning applicability of policies in this sense.

References:

- Boeri T., Brucker H., “The impact of Eastern Enlargement on Employment and Wages in the EU Member States(Berlin and Milan : European Integration Consostium), 2000;
- Ciucur D., Gavrilă I., Popescu C.-“Economie-Manual universitar” (ediția a II-a), Editura Economică, București, 2001; - Neugart M.,Schomann K., eds., “Forecasting Labour Market in OECD Countries:Measuring and Tackling Mismatches(Cornwall:MPG Books), 2002;
- Samuelson N. – “Economie politică”, Editura Teora, București, 2000;
- Von Misses L.-“Capitalismul și dușmanii săi”, Editura Nemira, București, 1998;
- Visco I., “Ageing Population Economic Issues and Policy Challenges”, , Paris, OECD, 2001;
- Voineagu V. și colectiv-“Teorie și practică econometrică”, Editura Meteor Press, 2007;
- Anuarul Statistic al României, editat de Institutul Național de Statistică, edițiile 2000-2012;
- Legea nr.76/2002 privind sistemul asigurărilor pentru șomaj și stimularea ocupării forței de muncă, actualizată;
- Legea nr. 116/2002 privind prevenirea și combaterea marginalizării sociale, actualizată.