DOI 10.2478/sbe-2021-0055

SBE no. 16(3) 2021

RISE AND FALL OF HUMAN RESEARCH AND THE IMPROVEMENT OF TALENT DEVELOPMENT IN DIGITAL ECONOMY

SÁNCHEZ-BAYÓN Antonio

Universidad Rey Juan Carlos, Spain

TRINCADO AZNAR Estrella

Universidad Complutense de Madrid, Spain

Abstract:

This is a critical paper (based in knowledge review & constructivist proposal), under the global economics & cross-cultural management approach, as a comparative research to have an overview of the complex issue, with a bootstrapping method of analysis and some singular cases to illustrate. It offers a balance of the labour relations development into the welfare state economy and the current fall in post-globalization and digital economy. There is a diagnoses of the transition in progress (with the 4th industrial revolution in digital era), from the human resources departments for replicate-workers in traditional bureaucratic corporations, to the emergence of the talent development areas for creative-collaborators in agile business organizations. Also, there are complementary explanations about the transitional context from the gig economy to wellbeing economics (the new stage of digital economy and new challenges for the collaborators).

Key words: *human resources, talent development, digital economy, knowmads, freeriders*

1. Introduction

After the globalization, social changes have intensified (in all its spheres), as one moves from a dying World to an emerging one: from the controlled rigidity from one World in squares to another in circles, flexible and open. The World in squares (of supposed security and scarcity), refers to the period dominated by the nation-state, which sought to protect all social spheres within its borders, with its rigid rules and institutions, of a directional and bureaucratic nature. The World in circles (of uncertainty and abundance), manifests itself with globalization when the global-village project for humanity is recovered, as announced by the UN Charter of 1945, and its order of international organizations, with a proposal for a network of networks of norms and more flexible institutions. In the face of such changes, a paradigmatic reformulation of how we perceive and manage our reality is urgently needed. Especially, considering that globalization has already ended, after *the 2008 crisis of values* (named for affecting financially and morally, with the moral risk),

giving way to post-globalization (Sánchez-Bayón, 2016a y 2017a). This is the trial period and convergence (Horizon 2030) for peoples to align themselves in the project of achieving the desired *knowledge society* (SC) and its corresponding economy, the knowledge economy or true welfare economy (not of the State and its *welfare state economy*-WSE, but humanity or *well-being economics*-WBE, see later). In the current transitional period, the digital economy (DE) has hatched, after of the 4th industrial and technological revolution, whose current phase is the so-called gig economy (gig), which comprises the combinatorial of the *collaborative/shared & circular economy* (CCE), the *autonomous economy* (AE) and the *orange economy* (OE).

Table 1. Notes on DE in gig phase

a) CCE, is based on social networks, recycling shared goods and services (e.g. Airbnb, Uber);
b) AE, is based on big-data, IoT, IA, RA-RV-RM, among others., articulated through 5G, block-chain, smart contracts and DAOs (e.g. autonomous car fleet investment funds, fintech);
c) ON, is based on talent and creativity applied to experience and entertainment (e.g. gastronomy, tourism, video games, festivals).

Source: own elaboration.

However, if everything changes, should not the academic apparatus with these changes are studied also? Does it make sense to continue reducing the economy to its macroeconomic and econometric study as it has been dominating in the years of splendor of the WSE or should other renewed approaches be considered? Facing the dominant or *mainstream* economic trend (from Keynesians to econometrics and cultivators of game theory or neural networks for modeling), here it is preferred to follow the current renovating proposals such as *Global Economics & Cross-Cultural Management* (GE & CCM). This is the merger of several initiatives that have occurred after globalization, in particular that, operated in the USA with the renewal of studies in Business Schools (e.g. dimensions of Hofstede, management of organizational happiness of Seligman) and the so-called Freshwater Economic School (inland universities and great lakes: Chicago, Northwestern, Michigan, Minneapolis, Carnegie Mellon, Pittsburgh, Minnesota, Cornell, Rochester, among others.). Also for the hermeneutic turn in the Nobel Prize in Economics, since Amartya Sen (1998), the majority have been paying attention to consumer behaviors and labor and organizational relations.

Thanks to the GE & CCM approach, it is possible to hence a micro-cultural analysis of labor and organizational relations, following the transition from an old rigid and bureaucratic HR model (within WSE) to a new, flexible one and creative of authentic welfare (according to DE's talent and happiness management, see supra). In the old model, as if it were a train, one "stood on the rails" in an organization, knowing in advance its route, stops, and the exact day of completion of its journey (or retirement). It makes sense to speak of HR (as replaceable pieces of the system), but since the dawn of globalization (as early as the 1970s), this paradigm entered into crisis, and today it is coming to an end. This assumes that:

- a) the organizations sought the satisfaction of objectives, functioning as well-g geared machinery, in addition to having abundant spare parts (HR);

- b) a mechanistic and bureaucratic vision of labor relations and business organizations, giving way to another more organicist cycle, even diffuse, not only due to its uncertainty but also due to its fading, when the tangible and the virtual coexist.

In the proposal offered here, first a brief history of the development of the HR management paradigm is made, then it is discussed how the transition from the old HR model to the new model of talent and happiness occurs; finally, diagnosis and prognosis of labor relations and business organization in the face of the gig economic phase and the roadmap to WBE are made.

2. Development of HR model: rise & fall

The disdain for the innovative proposals of labor relations and business organization (such as the one proposed by Owen, Trincado & Santos 2018), led to the delay (until the 2nd industrial rev., in the 1880s), to implement the HR model, and from a perspective of technical productivism, especially in the USA (taking advantage of the great migration from the countryside to the city, which led to the industrial boom, mass recruitment, and the awakening of Labor Law). This is when engineers as F.W. Taylor design the organization of work, standardizing it, within the framework of a production chain, measuring and adjusting tasks and times, as if it were a piece of large machinery (Taylor 1911). Thus the so-called Taylorism and/or Fordism is developed. Current historiography seems to insist on differentiating approaches (as some Ford biographers, as Hounshell 1985, Brinkley 2003). Nevertheless, both characters converged on business goals as well as personal and institutional connections. Ford applied Taylor's management principles, not only by reading it (co-authored in his writings with S. Crowther 1922, 1926, and 1930), but also benefited from his studies at *Bethlehem Steel Co.* for the manufacture of the Model T (Paxton 2012), in addition to their connection via *American Society of Mechanical Engineers* (ASME), and *The Franklin Institute*.

The combination of proposals from Taylor and Ford, led to increased production in the manufacture of automobiles (achieving their massification), at the same time as the establishment of one of the first most successful HR models, known as the scientific organization of the work for chain production: based on scientific methods of that time, that is, with positivist methods, with measurement and experiment of trial and error, where a typified relationship of the worker with production is proposed to maximize its results. In contrast to artisan production, which was intuitive, peculiar and reduced (each artisan gave his touch, varying in each piece and the times to make it), on the other hand, with industrial production the specialized division of tasks was intended, under the model that Adam Smith advanced in 1776, subdividing them into other more simple and repetitive ones in interaction with the machinery, and adjusting to some times and several of results on which the remuneration depends (Rosenberg 1965, Trincado 2019). In this system, in the eyes of its critics, it seems that the workers were reduced to mere labor, mechanical executor of tasks already designed, with no place for creativity (as stated by Marx, 1867-94). This mechanistic system (in which the worker has a minimum qualification in a dependent employment relationship, leasing his effort and time in exchange for a salary), is corrected

and increased with the interwar period bureaucracy (Weber, 1922) when the differentiation between the blue-collar and white-collar worker (Wright Mills, 1956), reaching its zenith with WSE after World War II (Sánchez-Bayón 2016b, 2017b, 2019a, Sánchez-Bayón, et al., 2018). It follows that every mechanistic system (as the old HR model) has a limited cycle (lacking self-regenerative capacity), suffering from crisis, and its final expiration. This can be seen in the 4th industrial revolution and digital transition (approx. 2008-2030, Worldwide): thanks to the internet, programming (especially with *block-chain*) and mobile (as an integrated office), the era of social networks, *apps* & *ewc* or virtual continuous marketing, giving the return of the professional (*knowmads v. free riders*), who can be a commission agent, biller, affiliate, among others. (New formulas for the regulation of mixed labor relations emerge, e.g. *click-pay*, *flexicurity*, part-time jobs mix). It is also the period of the emergence of *smart contracts* & DAOs (smart contracts in the form of codes in the cloud, whose parts are artificial intelligence, which operates from the Stock Market to driving without a driver). In this way, it is not only transited to the phase gig of DE, but it is also outlining the new stage of capitalism, such as talentism, promoted by *happiness management* (Sánchez-Bayón, 2019b).

Hence, the fact of having fulfilled objectives and having completed cycles, should not be seen as a weakness, as precariousness and mourning for the rigid and safe world in expiration, nor is it a threat of volatility and fragility due to the continuous and accelerated changes. Rather, if the *postmodern veils of confusion* are removed (hereinafter only veils, Sánchez-Bayón, 2017b), and the available knowledge, its authenticity, meaning, and scope are critically analyzed, with its paradigmatic reformulation, aiding in the process of strengthening *the technology of information and communication* (ICT, and beyond, such as augmented reality, virtual reality, among others.), in addition to having the opportunity offered by the revaluation of talent and professionals, then, you will be in a position to achieve the desired transit to the knowledge society. Concerning the area of talent development (future of HR), this implies having motivated collaborators, with a more creative and autonomous performance, in mature organizations, not because of their seniority, but because of their adaptation to new paradigms, and oriented to a model of happiness.

To take stock of the development of industrial relations, and with them, also of HR, it is not necessary to return to their background¹, it is enough to evaluate the last century and a half, since the second industrial revolution, as has already mentioned. Even when it comes to HR, it is enough to return to the 1990s, given the aforementioned crises, transitions, and new cycles. Given the veils extended, it is not surprising that today a critical and revealing (re) vision is urgent. It is an attempt to recover the management of the authentic, rational, and real (via *logos-ethos*), abandoning at once the ideological, discursive, and emotional (via *pathos-mythos*). For this, it is advisable to re-graduate the view in terms of the paradigm used, such as intellectual glasses, to better perceive and manage the underlying reality, solving its problems and challenges, in addition to recognizing the ground on which is stepped. Now that post-globalization is in progress,

¹ Possibly, talent-based labor relations arose in western civilization from cathedral builders, being the only itinerant and reputation-dependent guild, forerunner of the Liberal Arts, i.e. medicine, advocacy, journalism.

humanity is at a crucial point and it is not only urgent to rediscover our reality, social and natural, plus the virtual in growing, but also the kind of paradigm to use in this regard. In this sense, this article offers some critical and refreshing notes on HR, plus its diagnosis and prognosis, so that it is possible to become aware of where you are and where you are going (see table 2)

Table 2. Revelations of paradigmatic changes and labor relations in companies

OLD PARADIGM (WSE)	NEW PARADIGM (DE: gig to WBE)
Industrial and material economy (mechanistic)	Economy of Knowledge and experiences (quantum)
Male (hierarchical, competitive)	Feminine (holocratic, communicative) Virtual and abundant (mobile, connections, exper.)
Tangible and scarce (factory/office, goods)	Humanization (welfare, leisure, talent, orientation to people: motivational measures)
Reification (money, overtime, qualification, results in orientation: hygienic measures) Workers: uniforms, Secondary sector, subordination (salaried, straight)	Collaborators: diverse, tertiary and quaternary sector, choice (autonomy, responsibility)
Syst. closed: rigid and poor (bureaucratic, for a position)	Syst. open (autopoietic): flexible and abundant (creative and changeable)
Competition (repetition –partition ratio–, business / multinational concentration: rails) Macroeconomic study. and econometric: main agent SP	Collaboration (Innovac. –Westminister–, coworking: elephants and ants world)
Simple, one-way relationships (B2C), single-business L / P, and limited FPP (fixed costs) Atom (size and location of offices, warehouse stock, number of employees)	Microeconomic study. and CCM: main entrepreneurial agent
Manufacturing (value added by the transformation of goods)	Complex and multiple relationships (B2C, B2B, P2P, among others.), multi-business C / P, variable FPP (heuristics)
Control management (correct and monopolize inf.)	Bit (speed and ewc, on-demand, collaborators talent)
Results for pressure and decisions for fear (dismissal)	Mindfacturing (qualified service –concept/experiences– and higher value)
	Delegation/coach management (rules and information sharing)
	Results. for projects and achievements, and decisions for love (to what I do, with whom, m-v-v)

Source: own-elaboration.

To make a true balance of the evolution of labor relations and the HR area, the first veil to be removed is that of the socialist epic in this regard: the progress achieved is not a monopoly of any party or union, but it is a convergent institutional synergy of reform (in the interwar period), which starts from the International Labor Office of the League of Nations (later the International Labor Organization in the United Nations), passing through the state parliaments at its various levels, up to the implementation guidelines within companies, with the participation of company committees and other intervening agents. Hence –and once again–, everything starts with the second industrial revolution, applied to the primary sector, when a good part of the traditional agricultural and energy trades disappear, in addition to promoting the secondary sector, with the development of industries with chains of production, and with them, the emergence of new labor relations. Thus there is a migration from the countryside to the city, with an endless number of socio-cultural changes, not exempt from conflict and the urgency of planning in this regard.

Hence, the true is launched of Labor Law (relating to salaried employees and in a

dependent relationship), has its peak in the aforementioned interwar period, with the minimum common framework given by the ILO, developed by national parliaments, and made in each company. The said framework was revised and expanded in the postwar period, with the boom in the tertiary sector and to leap WSE and its diversity: with private workers employed by others (Labor Law) and their own (Commercial Law), work services and society (Civil Law), public employees (Administrative Law), among others. In this interwar period, H. Fayol (1930) and E. Mayo (1924) contributed to the theory of positive administration, studying the efficiency of managers in organizations. Mayo (1924) studied labor relations from the theories of economist V. Pareto and showed that time and incentive systems did not affect productivity. He was more affected by social factors, such as moral and satisfactory relationships in a workgroup, that is, feelings, attitudes, and motivational complexity. By contrast, since 1930, Helson's behaviorism experimentally showed that man adapts his happiness to the institutions in which he lives: even his perception of grayscale is identical, regardless of the illumination that comes to him (Helson and Judds 1930, Edwards 2018). In this sense, even the theory of perception must be reformulated, because the appropriation of colors also depends on time and the illusion of the future (Trincado 2019).

It should be noted that neither the denomination nor the inspiration of the WSE is social democratic (rather, much criticized by it in the beginning, VV.AA. 1971). Its name comes from the opposition to the war economy (instead of war-state, it was passed to welfare-state), being driven by liberals, Labor and Christian Democrats (e.g. Lord Beverage, Lord Keynes, Adenauer, De Gasperi, Schuman). After the interwar period, there was a shift from HR focused on hiring industrial workers for others, low-skilled and undifferentiated (hence the perception as interchangeable parts of the system), to the qualification of human capital (a term used on the Pacific coast) and Personnel Administration (a term used on the Atlantic coast). This required specific attention to the specific positions and the most suitable people for their performance. Nonetheless, despite the qualitative transition, the mechanistic and bureaucratic vision is maintained, even increased: since, after the devastation of World War II, only the public sector has the muscle to reactivate the economy, it proceeds to hybridize politics and economy in the WSE model, nationalizing the leading companies in strategic sectors (e.g. France: *France Telecom*, *Air France*, *Renault*; Spain: *Telefónica*, *Iberia*, *SEAT*). In this sense, the Personnel Administration operates in the same terms as the rest of the Public Administrations: public calls for contracts via selection systems close to the competition-opposition, hierarchizing and standardizing employees, among others

Regarding human capital, it is worth paying attention to the positive feedback between the US and Japan, although it also ends up reaching other Asian tigers: South Korea, Singapore, Hong Kong, and Taiwan. Unlike the European bureaucratic and directional model (sometimes with US funding, e.g. German *Ordo-liberalism*, French *Gaullism*), the Asian variants aim to go further, giving rise to the peculiar corporate bureaucracy of family conglomerates favored by the state (e.g. South Korean chaebols: LG, Lotte, Daewoo, Samsung, Hyundai). In these variants, the bureaucracy is not so much due to the valued processes, since it seeks to lighten them decisively and expeditiously, but rather to the psychosocial hierarchies and ties on which they are based (it is a

bureaucracy not of suitability, but identification mission-vision-values). Thus, expressions such as:

- Toyotism (also known as ohnoism): if an engineer and consultant as Taylor formulated the scientific organization of work, successfully applying it by an industrialist as Ford to lay the modern foundations of chain production and HR with selection and training of labor for large factories, in Japan it was two distinguished engineers who made toyotism a reality, going further (Gronning, 1997). On the one hand, Kiichiro Toyoda (son of the textile industrialist, but who made a reconversion of the company towards the automobile sector); on the other hand, Taiichi Ohno, who would learn from the practices of the US Army deployed in his country (e.g. TWI training programs), combining them with his cultural approaches, especially Taoism and Buddhism. In this way, he implemented the kaizen model of improvement, for quality management and without waste. It is continuous improvement, with a reduction of waste (materials left over from the production process), warehouse stock (both raw materials and production), schedules, and employees (with shift rotation and equipment), among others. Thus was born Toyota Production System (TPS). After the energy and the industrial crisis of 1973, when the expectation of developing mentalism and full employment fades, Americans assimilate the TPS model, replacing chain production with just in time or adjusted, on-demand, and cost reduction. This response was influenced by the ideas of Schumacher (1973) who, in his bestseller, *Small is beautiful*, criticized the inhuman way of work that automation brought, and appealed to work as a place of fulfillment, to an "economy Buddhist" in which work allowed the development of personality. Society, he said, needed equipment that was: cheap enough to be available to everyone, on a small scale, and compatible with man's creative ability. Most of the progress of the economy was pointing in the direction of quantification at the expense of understanding quantitative differences - because quantifying is easy, but understanding difficult. And in a way, Toyotism seemed to meet many of its demands. Besides, it promoted other management proposals, such as the replacement of the push system (or sales forecast) by pull (or replacement, the base of the current supermarket retailer), improvement teams, as well as other non-waste-oriented (e.g. production leveling, quick die changes, one-piece flow, flexible job assignments, removing non-value-added work). With this transplant, the corporate deinstitutionalization and certain job insecurity will begin.

- Kaizen Nissan (literally: good change in Japanese): This is an updated version of TPS, intensifying a flexible and agile model of joint production. It was driven by another Japanese car company (Nissan), which is distinguished in the 80s by expanding internationally and surpassing the American GM - not only for its HR management but for being a pioneer in the production of fewer cars pollutants. Its model is based on the selection of agile workers and collaborators, even in a transversal way, combining workshop and office, at the same time, decisive and expeditious. One of its operational rules is 2x2: after detecting a problem in production, an interdisciplinary team called quality circles is formed, inspired by K. Ishikawa, who has two days to find the solution and implement it in the chain before two hours (Feuery Lee 1988)

- Lean (it is a loan from Japanese, translated into English, and is usually understood as an agile and adjusted system): it refers to innovative production since the 90s, which not only

does not worry about not wasting production as TPS focused. It also integrates the agility of response from kaizen-Nissan, in addition to seeking to improve the customer experience, offering more suitable solutions: intuitive proposals, greater comfort, and others. The proposal was born in American business schools, with doctoral theses such as J. Krafcik's at Sloan-MIT (1988), then going on to consultants, like those of Womack (who stopped being a professor at MIT to found the Lean Enterprise Institute in 1997, and Lean Global Network in 2007). Thus, a business culture of improvement is promoted, adding to all of the above a vocation of heuristics based on challenges and the proactivity of collaborators, achieving greater motivation, in addition to perfecting and streamlining the value chain (Womack et al. 1990, 2003 and 2014).

Thus began the rigid deinstitutionalization of typical WSE work, to move to another flexible DE, of collaborative and mobile workers (Zwick, 2018). Such a transition has not been easy or pleasant, but rather problematic:

- a) Due to cultural differences: Southeast Asia began its westernization in the XIX century, intensifying after the Second World War, but it is an unfinished process and in many ways only formal, so transplants can fail. Accordingly, as an example of cultural difference - and its difficult transfer to the rest of the West -, the case of Japan, where strikes have not only been of stoppages and pickets but also zeal and overproduction: by producing more, it subverts the Toyota system. Even another variant is flooding the market for free goods or services: from automobile overproduction and dairy products in the 1980s to recent cases in May 2018, such as the Okayama bus strike, which offered transportation without charge. Perhaps the most striking manifestations, which prove the problems of cultural transplants, are the *karoshi* cases - death by work: 200 cases a year, approx. (Frank, 2014); *karojisatsu*. Suicide by labor relations: about 2000 cases per year, (Amagasa et al, 2005); *hikikomori* -social isolation of young people who made telework-: about 500,000 cases (RosenthalyZimmerman, 2012), and others.
- b) By those responsible for his transplant and its veils of confusion and by the request of mature organizations committed to change. With the cultural wars (1960-80), The New Left emerged at the university. Reference is made to the Fourth Socialist International or Situationism, such as the anti-protest movements, such as the hippies, which inspired the university revolts of the 1960s, especially in the United States (influenced by Marcuse, Adorno, Bloch, and others) and France (Sartre, Derrida, Foucault, and others.). But the approaches of these authors were not very credible in economic terms, until they hybridized with the nationalizing visions of Keynes, highlighting such popular authors as Galbraith from Harvard¹
- c) In addition to the spread of organizations as the Club of Rome since 1968, with the support of researchers from Harvard, MIT, and others. In this way, political demands for awareness and debureaucratization were mixed with the approaches of the WSE and the problems of quality of life - even population problems, growth, and its externalities, plus its impact on nature (Meadows et al. 1972). The fact is that, as happened with the hippies, who later became yuppies, the New Left and its New Economy hybridized and needed their nemesis: New Liberals. Upon reaching power as a generation, social,

¹ Schumpeter (and his disciple Samuelson) had already been doing it, but it did not reach university students the same (Lindbeck, 1971).

ethnocultural, gender problems, and others increased, as well as the level of indebtedness that consumed the wealth of subsequent generations, in addition to the greatest devastation of the environment, postulating an eugenic new-maltusianism against climate change. Since the 80s, when the cultural transplantation of the models proposed to the rest of the West became general, due to the urgency of reconversion and not due to full conviction, it turns out that those in charge of this work were the *baby-boomers* and the X generation, already yuppies of direction. This extended accumulation of veils on flexible¹ deinstitutionalization, which thus became precarious for the following generations (the generation and the millennia - known as the *mileuristas*/thousanders: 1,000 euros rent per month).

Flexibility, as a physical condition, is defined as what allows materials to deform under pressure (such as crises) without breaking and recovering later. But crisis after crisis and given the deinstitutionalization promoted, the new generations, despite their higher qualifications, enjoy fewer rights, having to know how to negotiate their labor benefits in each new professional experience (beyond the emotional salary). To the risk of rejection of cultural transplantation and its inadequate operation, as indicated, we must add the requirement of mature organizations: those focused, no longer on mere production and benefits, but people and sustainability, based on a Model of happiness and well-being. Please advance the following point: until globalization, both Psychology and Psychiatry approached the human mind from negativity (e.g. the diagnosis of disorders such as those collected in DSM and CIE), so a So typical New York Jewish psychologist Martin Seligman began a hermeneutical turn toward self-help and finally, the application of a truly positive approach: how to be happy. Professor of Psychology at Cornell University and Univ. Pennsylvania (later director of the Department of Psychology), he used his contacts and publications (Seligman, 2002 and 2011), to become President of the American Psychological Association-APA in 1998 using this platform to postulate the paradigm shift, from education to work.

In this balance, it is necessary to add the criticism expressed by the unexpected Cultural Studies, of neo and post-Marxist style, which are echoed by the Business Schools, and which postulate the following synthetic formula (on the evolution of RR. HH.): In the 1960s, a uniform male paradigm dominated, of a competitive-developmental nature - growth at all costs. Its leading sector was the automobile sector, with large factories and offices, and aimed at the normalization of workers, usually from the area, selected for educational degrees and uniformed accordingly. After globalization, there has been a transition to a feminine multi-paradigm, collaborative-possibility, where companies are no longer valued for their production and properties, but their talent and transformative capacity. In this, the leading sector is technology (e.g. GAFA: Google, Apple, Facebook,

¹ To the university students of '68, it alienated that their lives were already clearly designed, so they allowed themselves a hippie sabbatical and wanted to dismantle the system (its deinstitutionalization). Until then, being a university student gave access to a position in a company indefinitely, knowing exactly how much to charge and what to do every day until retirement (like a train located on some rails until the final stop). Paradoxically, by focusing the objective on themselves, they took away from the company its social dimension, as a project of people and goods to achieve common objectives, focusing only on the profit motive, which they despised as much as they practiced, making it speculative and, hence, contrary to the company's subsistence (Sánchez-Bayón 2017b & 2019a. Sánchez-Bayón et al 2018).

Amazon), with diverse collaborators (in nationalities, ethnic groups, gender, among others.) and creative (with initiative and original approaches).

Table 3. Balance of labor relations: from hygienic measures (emerging organizations) to motivational (mature organizations)

a) Productivity and incentives (1910's): - Rewards and punishments; - Money moves the worker (bonus)				
b) An ergonomics and PRL (1990): - Improve environment and climate (common areas); - Prevent accidents (prevention plan)				
c) Up to quality (of life, 2000's): - Improve processes and job design - Care for worker-family (health insurance, childcare)				
d) Ethics and CSR (1950's - alternative to WSE): - Participate in decision making and mission - From image enhancement to org. healthy				
e) Motivation and happiness (1999 Seligman) - Care for a collaborator as a client; positivity - Promote healthy habits, personal d ^o				

Source: own-elaboration.

Consequently, the changes in HR approaches, from hierarchical and long-term rigidity to transverse and short-term flexibility (discussed in table II), are before the exhaustion of WSE, with its bureaucracy and directionism, only that all of which is aggravated by the crises of globalization. Thus, a new paradigm for post-globalization is urgent and necessary. To know the current state of affairs, diagnosis and prognosis of labor relations are offered below in the framework of the gig phase of DE, introducing novel notions related to collaborators (e.g. knowmads, flexicurity, part-time jobs mix), and organizations (e.g. wellness & happiness model).

3. Discussion: diagnosis & prognosis about labor relations in digital economy

As has been pointed out, the gig phase of DE brings together manifestations such as CCE, AE, and OE. Its name comes from an American expression, related to tours or artistic bowling: a professional offers his services for a performance and, if he likes, repeats. Something similar works the gig economy: a professional must be on social networks and platforms, pending the call for his performance, which is valued and it depends on whether he continues to provide this service in his area, even in other places (Steward 2020, Zwick 2018). Then what are the pros and cons of the economic phase gig?

a) In favor: it allows ordinary people from all over the world to start businesses and participate in markets without intermediaries and respecting the environment by sharing, recycling, and renting, stopping the planned obsolescence and destination of

electronic waste that, when discarded, hurts the environment. One is your boss, managing your time and income; each one knows his talent and puts it at the service of others; there is not so much bureaucracy and directionism, but rather, the risk becomes an opportunity and experience, which is also shared with others, generating collaborative intelligence, adding even more value to the work done (also being a first milestone on the road to the SC).

- b) Against: when virtualized, that is, operating via the internet, the offices and camaraderie disappear, making it difficult to organize and defend labor rights. Since hardly any taxes or contributions are paid, there is almost no labor protection, disappearing paid vacations, unemployment or sickness benefits, retirement, among others.

As there is not so much control of the markets or the jobs, it is very difficult to control them by the public authorities. This has set off alarm bells and led to restrictions, as is the case with the so-called "cryptocurrencies" (which detract from confidence, which is ultimately the foundation of the economy). In this way, attempts are made to regulate against new initiatives, such as tourist apartments (e.g. Airbnb, Rentalia), transport vehicles with drivers (e.g. Uber, BlaBlaCar), second-hand bazaars (e.g. Wallapop, eBay, OpenBazaar), among others. And no longer because they escape its burden, but because of the lack of influence in its future, and restrictions, such as licenses, associations, among others cannot be established, which leads to violating the monopoly of the state of the social system (Gwynn 2016. Schor 2016). Citizens no longer need public powers and their notaries for the provision and validation of goods and services, but rather it is the communities of individuals who do it, with resources such as scores, comments and, rankings, as well as technology block-chain, operational in the wake of the 2008 stock crisis. Indeed, that the trend of social networks, platforms, and applications on which the gig economy is based has been one of concentration, as has already happened with the main multinationals in the WSE, but the great difference is the influence of creative destruction with great changes in a short time, a constant heuristic and technological renewal, among others., so that the leaders of the sector, as well as the sectors themselves, are periodically renewed. As an example, the music industry –to continue with the allusion to bowling–, which was reduced to four large conglomerates, giving rise to relationships of elephants and ants (that is, large companies and each of the professionals), but that is seen subjected to constant creative destruction thanks to technology.

The phase gig ends a good part of the bureaucracy and the directionism, restoring a certain autonomy to the collaborator - who is no longer a dependent worker or labor force; Of course, it increases risk and uncertainty, in addition to requiring agility, adaptability and talent (both in the own differential value, as well as in that contributed to the employment relationship). When it comes to HR, the gig economy is affecting above all two types of professionals, at opposite poles: knowmads (highly qualified) and free riders (low qualified).

- a) Knowmads (know+nomads = knowledge nomads: doctors, lawyers, professors, engineers, designers, among others): they are highly qualified knowledge

professionals, open to mobility. As an example, the case of collaborators in holocratic startups or companies (self-managed or without a boss) How to hire the best and then tell them what they have to do, slowing everything down with supervisory barriers? From pioneers as Zappos (shoe company) or Gore (gore-tex clothing), through DaVita (health services), to Valve (video games), Netflix (audiovisual entertainment), Rastreator (search engines and service comparators) or Ternary Software (computer services), and needless to say in sectors renewed by creative destruction, FinTech type. In these companies, everyone can propose and take on projects, without fixed positions or roles, but rather in a hierarchical way (beyond the traditional cooperatives). Thus, it is charged according to participation and results, in addition to demonstrations such as telework from anywhere, the mobile being the office; flexicurity being qualified collaborators, they know their rights and can afford to give up the employment relationship (that is their security). Consequently, the conditions are open to negotiation; part-time job mix, when collaborating in startups to ensure turnover (not salary), you must have a basket of collaborations. Even, the inversion of perception is recommended, starting to consider employers as clients, so that the psychosocial stigma of dismissal disappears, and it is only about looking for another new way of financing (Moravec, 2013).

- b) Free-riders are the lone riders and in the theory of public choice a term that defines those who "travelers without a ticket" who do not face the cost of a public good but enjoy the benefit, taking advantage of the fact that these goods are indivisible, non-exclusive and non-rival. In HR, it refers to low-skilled operators, forced to mobility (delivery men, stockists, security guards, among others.). One of the most illustrative cases is that of Deliveroo or Glovo delivery people. In both companies, there is an open and flexible hiring system, but full of risks and hidden costs: people in an irregular situation can start working immediately (Navajas et al, 2016). Of course, almost without coverage and having to register several distributors under the same account, to ensure compliance with deliveries and their frequency, to remain visible in the service distribution rankings. As a correction to these elephants, alternatives such as *La Pájara*, or specialized distribution ants are emerging (e.g. for consultancies, offices, firms).

As a result of the balance made, the expiration and paradigmatic change in economics, business, labor, and HR, among others, in the tertiary sector (in the transition to the quaternary), with constant corrections to improve during the current post-globalization, are verified. For this reason, both the diagnosis and the prognosis are less clear than is desirable, since the rigid WSE model and the flexible DE still have to coexist, giving rise to intermediate gray areas of precariousness. What is clear is that WSE is increasingly reduced in importance, with its bureaucratic labor relations and directed dependent employees, exposed to a greater precariousness for not taking the risk of discovering their talent, cultivating it, and offering it to others. Besides, the precariousness that is being talked about is surely not attributable to the fourth industrial revolution and its digital transformation, which destroys so many jobs, as new creates - as it already happened in the other industrial revolutions, but to the bad practice of baby- boomers and gen x at various levels:

- a) Economic: despite being the most benefited from WSE, they have led to its collapse having consumed more wealth than generated, spending that of the following generations, via debt;
- b) Business: they have promoted the deinstitutionalization of companies, from the relocation and dumping of labor –corrected with the digital transformation- to the intensification of precarious work figures, internships -as instead of the internship and apprenticeship contract -, so there is no longer a common project or sustainability, but each one has their own hidden agenda, jumping from project to project (Pérez-Huertas et al, 2013);
- c) Human Resources: at the same time as there has been super-regulation, the fraud of the law has intensified, so that new workers have been hired below their qualification, imposing abusive conditions, under a false promise of Future improvement and that others will come who will bear the overload. Due to the deinstitutionalization, there are no longer job careers to use, occupying a multitasking position as appropriate, since the management is no longer reached by internal promotion, but via talent-hunting. In short, it is the end of WSE and its HR. The gig economy is only one more phase, with errors to correct if you want to achieve the knowledge society; the reason why it is recommendable as soon as possible to learn what the new paradigms are and how to operate on them.

4. Conclusions

The changes announced at the beginning of this text are increasingly manifested in reality: the crisis of values of 2018, now followed by the coronavirus crisis (Covid-19) and the great lockdown and confinement, among others, highlight the urgency to review and reformulate the paradigms, there are more and more problems outside of them, and those few that can be recognized and managed are minimal, although in a deficient way. The failed economic-social policies (health, labor, among others) of WSE in many of the countries of the European Union (especially the Mediterranean block) serve as a concrete example, compared to the chaebols models oriented to the DE of tigers Asians (e.g. Singapore, South Korea, Taiwan). Even these require revision, as they respond to alternative models of the 1960s.

Concerning changes in labor relations and business organization, we have sought to offer here a critical synthesis of its development in the rigid, bureaucratic and directed framework of WSE, paying special attention to its HR model, given the emergence of the talent paradigm and the stimulation of happiness management for post-globalization. Throughout the text, key ideas have been planted, such as the exhaustion of HR due to the fulfillment of objectives and cycle; the balance of the changes from the WSE to the DE, both economic-social, as well as business, from the conglomerates of the automobile sector to the virtual GAFA, as well as of HR, of the management and bureaucratic model of titled employees, replicated to the model of happiness for talented and motivated collaborators; diagnosis and prognosis in the face of the gig economy, with two affected and polarized profiles (knowmads & free riders), among others. It also affects creative destruction itself, as well as the emergence of talent: every mature organization requires

talented collaborators, starting with those who must manage said talent. Today, a person in charge of cultural management and talent development is key, because as a coach, he knows his team, helping in the personal and professional growth of everyone, to "go out to win". As for the cultural part, it not only ensures a good working environment but must promote a participatory and inclusive organizational culture (e.g. redefining and making accessible the mission, vision, and values of the company, the internal regulations of the company, conflict resolution and its prevention). Then, a cultural manager and talent developer must be empathetic and pragmatic at the same time, must follow the 80/20 rule: most of the time supporting collaborators, and as little as possible dedicated to paperwork.

5. References

- Andreu, A., Sánchez-Bayón. A. (2019). *Claves de Administración y Dirección de Empresas en la Posglobalización*. Madrid: Delta Publicaciones.
- Amagasa, T. et al. (2005). Karojisatsu in japan. *Journal of Occupational Health* 47(2): 157.
- Brinkley, D. (2003). *Wheels for the World: Henry Ford, his company, and a century of progress*. New York: Viking Penguin.
- Coase, R.H. (1937). The Nature of the Firm. *Economica* 4(16):386–405.
- Edwards, J. (2018). Harry Helson's adaptation-level theory, happiness treadmills and behavioral economics. *Journal of the History of Economic Thought* 40(1): 1-22.
- Fayol, H. (1930). *Industrial and General Administration*. New York: Pitman & Sons.
- Feuer, D., Lee, C. (1988): The kaizen connection: how companies pick tomorrow's worker. *Training* 25(5): 23–23.
- Ford, H., Crowther, S. (1922). *My life and work*. New York: Garden City Publishing.
- Ford, H., Crowther, S. (1926). *Today and Tomorrow*. Garden City: Doubleday.
- Ford, H., Crowther, S. (1930). *Edison as I Know Him*. New York: Cosmopolitan Book.
- Frank, R. (2014). Karoshi: death from overwork. *Sherwood Park News* 24: 24–24.
- Gronning, T. (1997). The emergence and institutionalization of toyotism. *Economic and Industrial Democracy* 18(3): 423–455.
- Gwynn, S. (2016). Uber and airbnb suffer growing pains as 'gig economy' matures. *Campaign*, 4:4.
- Helson, H., Judd, D. (1932). A Study of Photopic Adaptation. *Journal of Experimental Psychology* 15(4): 380–98.
- Hofstede, G.H. (1993). Cultures and Organizations: Software of the Mind. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 38(1): 132-34.
- Hounshell, D.A. (1985). *From the American System of Mass Production*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Univ. Press.
- Lindbeck, A. (1971). *The Political Economy of the New Left*. New York: Harper&Row.
- Marx, K. (1867-94). *Das Kapital, Kritik der politischen Ökonomie* (3 vols.). Hamburg: Verlag von Otto Meisner.
- Mayo, E. (1924). Revery and industrial fatigue. *Journal of Personnel Research*, 3:273-81.
- Meadows, D. et al. (1972) *The limits to growth*. New York: Universe Books.
- Mintzberg, H. (1983) *Power in and Around Organizations*. New York: Prentice-Hall.
- Moravec JW (2013) Knowmad society. *On the horizon*, 21(2):79-83.
- Navajas, V. et al. (2016) *Inmigración y emprendimiento en la globalización*. Delta Publicaciones.
- Paxton, J (2012) Mr. Taylor, Mr. Ford, and the Advent of High-Volume Mass Production: 1900-1912. *Economics & Business Journal*, 4 (1): 74-90.
- Pérez-Huertas, J. et al. (2013) Nuevas aportaciones en Teoría económica y empresarial: la escuela de juegos de poder y la evaluación de su desarrollo, *Torre de los Lujanes* 69: 127-51.

- Rosenberg, N. (1965). Adam Smith on the Division of Labour, *Economica* 32(126): 127–139.
- Rosenthal, B., Zimmerman, D. L. (2012). Hikikomori: the Japanese phenomenon, policy, and culture. *International Journal of Mental Health* 41(4): 82–95.
- Sánchez-Bayón, A. (2019a). Una historia crítica de sociología del trabajo y de las organizaciones, *Miscelania* 77(151): 431-51.
- Sánchez-Bayón, A. (2019b). The Spanish B-Schools trouble in digital economy. *JEE* 23(5): 1-8.
- Sánchez-Bayón, A. (2018). Balance de la Sociología tras la globalización, *Eduser* 10: 49-68.
- Sánchez-Bayón, A. (2017a). Revelaciones conceptuales y lingüísticas de la posglobalización, *Carthaginensia* 33(64): 411-58.
- Sánchez-Bayón, A. (2017b). Apuntes para una teoría crítica humanista y su praxis económico-empresarial en la posglobalización. *Miscelania* 75 (147): 305-29.
- Sánchez-Bayón, A. (2016a). Prisma holístico para una teoría social posglobalizatoria, *Cauriensia*, XI: 675-96.
- Sánchez-Bayón, A. (2016b). *Problemas y retos para alcanzar la sociedad del conocimiento*. Madrid: Delta Publicaciones.
- Sánchez-Bayón, A., et al. (2018). Plan de acción frente al consumismo global de la Nueva Economía, *Empresa y Humanismo* 21(1):69-93.
- Sánchez-Vázquez, J.F. et al (2019) "Happiness Management": revisión de literatura científica en el marco de la felicidad en el trabajo. *Retos*, 9(18): 259-270.
- Schor, J. (2016). Debating the sharing economy. *Journal of self-governance and management economics* 4(3):7-22.
- Schumacher, E.F. (1973). *Small is beautiful*. London: Blond & Briggs.
- Seligman, M. (2002). *Authentic happiness: Using the new positive Psychology to realize your potential for lasting fulfillment*. New York: Free Press.
- Seligman, M (2011). *Flourish: A visionary new understanding of happiness and well-being*. New York: Free Press.
- Steward, S (2020) The gig economy. *The Washington Post* 3: 3.
- Taylor, F.W. (1911) *The Principles of Scientific Management*. New York: Harper&Bro.
- Trincado, E, Santos-Redondo, M. (2018). *Economics, Entrepreneurship and Utopia*. London: Routledge.
- Trincado, E. (2019). *The Birth of Economic Rhetoric*. London: Macmillan.
- Valero, J., Sánchez-Bayón, A (2018) *Balance la globalización y teoría social de la posglobalización*. Madrid: Dykinson.
- VV.AA. (1971). *Tras la fachada de las teorías burguesas* (trad.). Moscú: Ed. Progreso.
- Weber, M. (1922). *Economy and Society* (2 vols.), (trad. 1978) Berkeley: Univ. California Press.
- Womack, J., Jones, D. (2003). *Lean thinking: banish waste and create wealth in your corporation*, New York: Free Press.
- Womack, J., Jones, D. (2014). *Lean solutions: How companies and customers can create value and wealth together*. New York: Free Press.
- Womack, J., Jones, D., Roos, D. (1990). *The machine that changed the World: the story of lean production*. New York: Free Press.
- Wright Mills, C. (1956). *White Collar: The American Middle-Classes*. New York: Oxford Univ. Press.
- Zarembka, P. (2003). Lenin as Economist of Production, *Science & Society* 67(3):276-302.
- Zwick, A. (2018). Welcome to the gig economy: neoliberal industrial relations and the case of uber. *Geojournal* 83(4): 679–691.
- (*) Research supported by the research-group GESCE-URJC.