

SÁNTA, TAMÁS

tamassanta70@gmail.com

social policy expert (European Youth Research, Organisation Developing and
Communication Centre, Szeged, Hungary)

Youngsters Who Are Not in Employment, Education or Training

(About the NEET in a Hungarian Perspective)

Abstract This paper primarily focuses on the NEET (Not in Employment, Education or Training) phenomenon in Hungary, and also on the target group designated by the term. The study tries to walk around the concept of the NEET, and also this problematic phenomenon because this is a less published area in Hungary although the international literature on the subject is copious. The study designates the target group, it seeks to provide a definition of the concept, and it separates the NEET community from those who suffer from similar problems in Hungary but do not fall under the definition of NEET. In the second part of the work, data will be presented about the size of the NEET group. The study draws on current international data but also presents data on the size of the Hungarian NEET population. Comparing these statistics highlights the vulnerability of this special group. In the final part, the study seeks to demonstrate the importance of researching and tackling NEET issues from a Social Policy and Social Psychology point of view. During the study, besides the relatively few Hungarian literatures, I relied on papers written in the English language where the topic is presented, the definition is made, the target group is defined and also where the theme is generally introduced.

Keywords NEET; vulnerable youth; unemployment; education; training

DOI 10.14232/belv.2016.2.9 <http://dx.doi.org/10.14232/belv.2016.2.9>

Cikkre való hivatkozás / How to cite this article: Sánta, Tamás: (2016): Youngsters Who Are Not in Employment, Education or Training (About the NEET in a Hungarian Perspective). *Belvedere Meridionale* vol. 28. no. 2. 120–131. pp

ISSN 1419-0222 (print) ISSN 2064-5929 (online, pdf)

(Creative Commons) Nevezd meg! – Így add tovább! 4.0 (CC BY-SA 4.0)
(Creative Commons) Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International (CC BY-SA 4.0)

www.belvedere-meridionale.hu

1 Introduction

1.1 Definition of NEET:

The NEET is an acronym which means: Not in Employment, Education or Training. That is a group of young people who are currently not working, basically unemployed although they are among the active population, are not studying or they are not taking part in any training. Reading together the initials of the English phrase the concept of NEET is given (HOUSE OF COMMONS 2010).

The acronym was coined in the United Kingdom (Social Exclusion Unit 1999), however the concept shortly became known worldwide from the UK through the western European countries to Taiwan (CHEN 2009). The concept of NEET indicates in which systems the focus group is not active, that is what they are not doing but, not visible form, the concept designates the age characteristics of the NEET group as well. The NEET is therefore, a separate, clearly defined and statistically measurable cohort whose members are aged between 15–24 years, and who are unemployed, they are not in the education system or taking part in any training.

The aforementioned age parameters are generally accepted internationally and commonly used in Europe (EUROPEAN COMMISSION 2012). However, different countries, although slightly, can narrow or broaden the circle of the NEET group. In the UK the concept includes the 16–24 age group because the compulsory education system, just like in Hungary, lasts till 16 years of age (SISSONS–JONES 2012; see also: DCSF. 2009; DWYER–SHAW 2013). However, in Japan, for example, the concept includes the 15–34 age group, those who are unemployed, are not homemaker, are not enrolled in any type of school and are not taking part in any training and are not searching for jobs (RAHMAN 2007; See also: BOKÁNYI–SZABÓ 2016).

In this paper – although it is clear for me that the borders of the concept is flexible and expandable which in many cases does not only depend on the law(s) of a given country but on their culture as well – the NEET is defined as a special group of young people whose age is between 15–24 years and who are unemployed, are neither member of any educational institutions nor taking part in any training.

1.2 Etymological approach of the concept:

The English phrase, and the use of that, provides further opportunity to analyse the concept of NEET etymologically. There are some documents where the meaning of NEET is the shortened version of the ordinary *Not in Employment, Education or Training* phrase (BRITTON et al. 2011; SEE ALSO: SISSONS – JONES 2012; MINISTRY OF BUSINESS, INNOVATION & EMPLOYMENT 2013; OECD 2013; EUROPEAN COMMISSION 2013, 2014; CHZHEN 2014).

However, I have also studied some source material in which the concept of NEET was interpreted as follows: *Not in Education, Employment or Training* (AUDIT COMMISSION 2010; see also: DCSF 2008; DCSF 2008; COLES et al. 2010; DE & DWP 2014; NAO & DE 2014; DE 2014; SLOMAN 2014). These were primarily published in the UK.

Although I could not find explicit reference for the different use however I think, taking into account the studies guidelines, the deviation was the result of a conscious use.

In the first form of expression the *work – education – training* trend can be observed. This probably means that the job-creation stands in the first place in order for the target group to be supported. The central aim of the scheme is to re-integrate the youngsters who are NEET into the labour market. Inasmuch the skills and education level of some members of the group is not enough to reach the main goal so these members would be redirected by the targeted programs

into the education and training system by which resulting the re-integration into the labour market may become easier. A good example of this approach is the work of Paul Sissons and Katy Jones (SISSONS – JONES 2012).

In the second form of expression where the education stands in the first place, I think, it may refer to a variety of targeted programs. In this approach to the concept a combination of *education – work – training* receives the main emphasis. This approach is applied by those studies which, according to my assumptions, suggest new guidelines for the makers of complex projects in order for the members of NEET who are at risk to be supported. That means, greater emphasis is placed on education as a means of tackling NEET issues under this approach. In these papers the research has already distinguished within the NEET two different age groups: 16–17 year olds and 18–19 years of age (DE & DWP 2014; NAO & DE 2014). It suggests that the importance and effectiveness of education is maybe able to significantly reduce the number of the NEET group. In the second place in the concept is the employment, more precisely the lack of it. It could indicate appropriate and successful teaching can effectively lead to the integration of the different members of the NEET into the world of work.

The final word of the phrase, according to my experiences, may indicate that the specifically specialised training is needed by which a young people would be able to get a position successfully. This approach is indicated in the following studies of the Department for Children, Schools and Families: *Reducing number of young people not in education, employment or training (NEET) The strategy furthermore, NEET Toolkit Reducing the proportion of young people not in education, employment or training (NEET)*.

In summary, I suppose that the differentiation within the concept of NEET is a result of a conscious use which probably shows on one hand the main emphasis of the guidelines, on the other hand, it may indicate the definite direction of solutions.

One direction of the complex solutions can be providing work-places and/or integrating into different education/training systems in order to relieve the problem of NEET.

While the other direction may suggest that a high standard of the education system is able to ensure easier transition into the world of work, after that the system, with specialised training, will ensure the possibility of staying longer at work.

1.3 Characteristics of the NEET group:

The NEET group is not considered as a homogeneous group (AUDIT COMMISSION 2010). Fundamental differences are needed to be considered in order to get a more precise demarcation.

On one hand young people in the NEET group are not identical with the group of young people who are unemployed even if significant overlap can be found between them. On the other hand, it needs to be distinguished from those who are at a considerable risk, and those who are not at risk (or less at risk) within the NEET group, and also the sub-groups of the former one.

Although the NEET group and the group of young unemployed are inter-related concepts yet there are important differences between the two (SISSONS–JONES 2012). In Hungary there are two known concepts for defining unemployment and those can be connected in two different measurement procedures.

Since November 2005 the National Employment Services has used the registered jobseeker instead of registered unemployed (National Employment Services; called NFSZ in Hungary). Registered jobseekers are those who cooperate with the competent offices, and are also registered by these offices (NFSZ). The competent office is usually called Employment Centre (called MK in Hungary).

However the Central Statistics Office (called KSH in Hungary) derives the number of unemployment from a survey which was taken in the general population. That is, while the National Employment Services can measure the group as registered job seekers who were included in the database of the competent offices (MKs), the Central Statistics Office works with a larger coverage when processes the questionnaires from the general population but within a certain margins of error.

Considering the subject of this paper it means that the surveyed NEET group rate by the KSH is presumably larger than the NEET group rate measured by the MK. Because there can be some members of the NEET group who are not (or did not want to be) registered in the database of the MK therefore the National Employment Services does not count them. However, in the KSH's database they are included.

Furthermore, the early leavers from education and training are not necessarily classed as NEETs, despite the fact that this can be typically a NEET issue too. The concept is defined by the topic expert that the early leavers from education and training are those who are aged between 18 and 24, they do not have secondary education, and four weeks preceding the survey the members of this group do not take part in education or training (SZEGEDI 2014). The experts particularly separate the two groups from each other when they claim that "the indicator of the NEET group try to estimate the size of those who are «in trouble». Because there are some who cannot find jobs although they have qualifications but there are others who work without qualification" (SZEGEDI 2014). And indeed among the NEET group there are some who completed their education, they have qualifications, even high degrees, but they do not have jobs and do not turn towards education or training systems in order for them to improve their situation.

Therefore, those who deal with young unemployed, they approach the problem from the side of the labour market and employment policy. Those who deal with early leavers from education and training, they approach the problem from the side of the education policy. But those who deal with the NEET group, and try to change their situation, they, at the same time, take into account employment policy and education policy as well when they work on different strategies.

Within the NEET group we can differentiate the members based on the degree of threat. Among the NEETs there are some members who are less at risk while there are some who are at high-risk category.

In the NEET group I consider those members less vulnerable who have, for example, completed their secondary education and they have made a successful entrance examination in a higher education institution, and expect to continue their studies. This includes those also who have successfully completed their secondary or higher education studies, and have already successfully applied for a job however they are in a transition position until they can begin their occupations. During this short period of time they are members of the NEET group but certainly are not in danger. Furthermore, it also includes those who completed their studies but they do not wish to work yet. Although they have opportunities to obtain jobs but they do not want to. This transition period, which was consciously accepted by them, has been filled, for instance, with some travelling combined with learning new experiences.

A study, published by The University of York (COLES et al. 2010), provides detailed group-breakdown those who are NEET and are in a high-risk position. The authors listed the key risk factors for 16 to 18 year olds. However, I think that list can be applied to the entire NEET age group. According to this study those young people are particularly at risk (COLES et al. 2010. 6.) they:

- have parents who are poor or unemployed;
- live in a deprived neighbourhood near schools with poor overall average attainment;

- are or have been in care;
- become pregnant and a parent in their mid-teenage years;
- have a disability, special educational need or learning disability;
- are young carers;
- are homeless;
- have a mental illness;
- misuse drugs or alcohol;
- are involved in offending;
- have experienced pre-16 educational disaffection (truancy and/or school exclusion);
- have poor or no qualifications at age 16 plus;
- have dropped out of post-16 education attainment.

The degree of risk can also be distinguishable by the time factor, age and gender. Researchers claim that at greatest risk are those who stay within this vulnerable group for six months or more (COLES et al. 2010; see also: AUDIT COMMISSION 2010).

Further research has shown that the NEET rates increase with age. Furthermore, rates are higher for men than women. COLES et al. (2010) illustrates this in their paper by showing the following trend: the 16-year-olds boys 6,3%, the 17-year-olds boys 9,5% however, the 18-year-olds boys 17,7% were in the NEET group the period under review. For the girls this figures changed as follows: the rate increased from 3,9% to 9,5%, and by the age of 18 the rate reached the 15,3%.

Thomas Spielhofer and his colleagues in their study (2009) divided the NEET group into three categories which involve the degrees of risk as well. The paper suggests that the first category should be called sustained NEET. According to their research this sub-group includes those youngsters who have a specifically negative experience from their former schools, suffered from bullying or were excluded from them, furthermore have behaviour problems, special educational needs, learning disability, and they felt under a considerable pressure. These young people probably do not have sufficient qualifications and low school performance is likely among them.

The second category, which is called open to learning NEET group, includes those who are more likely to believe in the importance of higher qualifications. The name of this category shows the members of it are opened to learn and eager to gain more experience.

The third category is called undecided NEET group. The members of that are those youngsters who are not staying on the path for a prolonged period of time because of their indecision. This malfunction is probably due to the lack of information about their possibilities, and it may be due to insufficient financial support (SPIELHOFER et al. 2009). One of the key conclusions of this paper was: "The majority of young people who were NEET wanted to work in order to earn money. However, one of the main barriers young people come across when looking for work was their lack of experience. They were unable to get a job until they had experience, but could not get a job to get that experience in the first place." (SPIELHOFER et al. 2009. 11.) This is a typical 'catch 22' which makes it very difficult for them to obtain a suitable occupation. That can lead to a feeling of disappointment which, in turn, can lead to a lack of motivation and, ultimately, long term NEET membership.

2 Information about the extent of the NEET group

The paper separates three sub-groups in this section. Firstly the data of the UNICEF, the EUROSTAT and the OECD are presented about the NEET group. After that the size of the NEET

group in Hungary is presented by the data of the same informants. Finally the local research data will be discussed.

With the presentation of data my aim is to give a comprehensive picture about the size of the NEET group, thus demonstrating the importance of the problem.

2.1 International data about the NEET group:

According to The UNICEF Office of Research: “7.5 million young people aged 15–24 – roughly the total population of Switzerland – were not in employment, education or training (referred to as ‘NEET’) across the European Union in 2013. In Greece alone it was one in five, nearly a quarter of a million young people” (CHZHEN 2014).

According to the EUROSTAT, the average NEET population across the European Union was 13.2 percent in 2012. The organisation determined the minimum and maximum points as well. The NEET population was the lowest in Holland (4.3%), while the largest population was measured in Bulgaria, 21.5 percent (EUROPEAN COMMISSION 2013).

The next year, in 2013 the data of the published report was a slightly modified. The European Union was expanded by a new member, Croatia, and although the NEET population in the Union decreased slightly, the rate of the two endpoints increased. The average of the NEET group was 13 percent and this was divided between Luxemburg (5%) and Italy (22.2%) (EUROPEAN COMMISSION 2014).

The Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) also collected statistical data of the NEET in respect of its members. However, the data was divided into two age groups, the 15–19 years of age and the 20–24 years of age. This method seems to follow the method of the latest British researches. The data presented by the OECD showed that those classified as NEET accounted for 8.25% of the 15–19 age group in 2005, with this number falling to 7.1% by 2013. However, the rate was significantly higher in the 20–24 age group – in line with earlier observations concerning the positive correlation between age and NEET rates. The OECD NEET average in this age group was 17.5% in 2005, rising to 18.21% by 2013 (OECD, 2015). The data therefore shows a dramatic increase in NEET rates above 19 years of age.

2.2 International data about the size of the Hungarian NEET group:

EUROSTAT presents statistical data for Hungary connected to the NEET group as well (European Commission, 2013, 2014). This data measured the percentage of the NEET population across the 15 – 24 age group between 2001 and 2012. According to the statistical data, the NEET population in Hungary was 14.6% in 2001. This then fell slowly but steadily to 11.3% by 2007. But then a new rise occurred and, by 2012, the rate reached 14.7%, that is, the total was 0.1% point higher than in the baseline year data (EUROPEAN COMMISSION 2013).

However, in the next year 2013, the EUROSTAT data showed a further significant increase, with the rate of the NEET group within the 15–24 age range jumping to 15.4% (European Commission, 2014). This rate was 2.4 percent higher than the European Union average (European Commission, 2014).

The Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) also published NEET statistical data for Hungary (OECD, 2015). As noted above, the OECD analyse two age groups separately; 15 – 19 and 20–24. From 2005 to 2013, the rate of the 15–19 age group decreased from 6.42% to 5.95% (OECD, 2015). However, the 20–24 age population showed a dramatic increase in this period, from 18.93% in 2005 to 26.07% in 2013 (OECD, 2015). That means, apart from the fact that these number are very high, the same trend can be observed in Hungary as

internationally. The rate of younger people within the total 15 – 24 year-olds population is much lower than the rate of the older population in the NEET group.

2.3 Researches on NEET in Hungary:

During my research I did not find any Hungarian papers that expressly dealt with the NEET group in Hungary or presented local statistical data about the rate of the Hungarian NEET group.

Hungary, as a member of the European Union, outlines goals according to the recommendation of the EU2020. The Government of Hungary made certain aims in the National Reform Program (Reform Program, 2013) in 2013. Among them there are some which relates to the object of this work:

Increasing employment rate up to 75 %.

Decreasing the number of people who live in poverty by 500,000.

Decreasing the rate of the early leavers from education and training by 10%.

A 75% employment rate means full employment in the European Union, and achieving this aim would almost certainly decrease the NEET rate in Hungary. Similarly, NEET numbers would also be expected to fall if the poverty and education targets were met.

Elements of employment policy appear in the new operational programs, and two are important to be mentioned in terms of the main theme of this paper. One of them is called Economic Development and Innovation Operational Program (called GINOP in Hungary). This program has 40 percent out of the total source (7480 billion forints) which means 2719 billion forints. According to the present plan the program can spend 620 billion forints for employment. The elements of this employment policy are: expansion of employment, social inclusion (or social integration), fight against poverty, and also investment in education, skill development and life long learning (MOLNÁR et. al. 2014).

There is another program as well, called: Human Resources Development Operational Program (called EFOP in Hungary). This source has some 885 billion forints which is 11.8% of the total source. The elements of the planned program are: decreasing the social exclusion and poverty and improving employability of disadvantaged groups (MOLNÁR et. al. 2014).

The aims of the two programs are the expansion of employment, educational development and improving the situation of marginalised groups. That means research on the NEET group, program development and effective support and also promoting alternatives can take place in the operational programs. The two programs overlap each other in many ways (MOLNÁR et. al. 2014).

One illustrative example is a new program called: *Youth Guarantee Scheme* which began in 2015. The program tries to support young people who are NEET in different regions in Hungary. The coordination tasks are for the local Employment Departments. (kormany.hu, 2015)

Only a few Hungarian literatures focusing on the subject can be found despite international statistical data being available. It seems research on this topic has not begun yet.

Molnár György and his colleagues published recently a paper, called: *A munkaerőpiac peremén lévők és a költségvetés* [Those who are at the edge of the labour market and the budget] (MOLNÁR et. al. 2014). Although the study did not specifically explore the NEET group, it contained considerable relevant information. The author and his colleagues divided into six groups those who are in the margins of the labour market, as follows:

1. Those in employment but earning minimum wage or less.
2. Those do odd jobs; earning higher than the monthly minimal wage.
3. Unemployed most months.

4. Declared themselves to be inactive in the most months.
5. 16-24 years of age, who are not students, they have never worked and they have qualification up to vocational education.
6. Those who are not belong to 1-5 groups.

In this list the fifth group is highlighted because this category comes closest to the concept of NEET. Although the authors did not mention expressly this concept and the research also did not focus on the NEET group.

Furthermore, it is important to mention that this study made a special group as well, called: “margin-households”. This concept provided some interesting further data to this research. The authors divided the margin-households into three categories as follows:

1. Those where the members are typically employed.
2. Those where the members are typically unemployed.
3. Those which can be called mixed margin-households.

This last one means, margin-household where one of the parents is employed but the other one is unemployed. Molnár et. al. claim, which is important for this study, that the above indicated fifth group occurs in the highest proportion in the mixed margin-households (MOLNÁR et. al. 2014). That means, according to this study a certain group of young people from the NEET group may be come from a household where in one of the parents works but the other one is unemployed.

Another important contribution to the literature on the subject is Gere Ilona’s study, which is called: *Ifjúsági munkanélküliség: a probléma jellemzése, eddigi intézkedések hatása, további teendők* [Youth unemployment: analyse the problem, impact of actions taken so far, further things to do] (2001). The aim of this paper was to review and analyse the labour market situation of the Hungarian young people in the 1990s. Furthermore, the author examined the supported program whether the result of that is synchronized with the employment directives of the European Union (GERE 2001). The study expressly did not use the NEET term yet it makes important statements connection with the labour market situation of the local 15-24 age group. Moreover, the paper divided the group into two age groups distinguishing the 15-19-year-olds and the 20-24-year-olds. When Gere referred to statistical data, beside data from the OECD and the European Union, she used data from the Central Statistics Office (called Központi Statisztikai Hivatal in Hungary) as well. However, the study as a whole mainly draws attention to youth unemployment and the action to be taken on employment as the paper’s title clarifies. Beside this, it is important to mention that the statistical data focus “only” on the youth unemployed and not on the NEET group, and the study only covers periods up to and including 1999 and it therefore is out of date.

Csoba Judit, in one of her papers (CSOBA 2010), also mentions the 15-24 age group. In this study the author derives the unemployment data from the European Union and the Central Statistics Office. Csoba calls this group as “the generation of heirs” (CSOBA 2010. 122.). Within this age group the author distinguishes those who live in a family whose position is above than the social average and those who live under this average. The members in the first group are the privileged heirs because they will inherit their parents’ social capital. This heritage, when they look for certain jobs, will provide serious benefits for them but their contemporaries who belong to the second group “cannot even dream about that” (CSOBA 2010. 122.; See also: KRÉMER 2014). Without the explicit mention of the NEET and its problem, Csoba draws attention to a

very important aspect of the whole issue: the lower the social capital of the parents of young people who are NEET, the higher the probability that those individuals stay in the NEET group for a prolonged period of time. (CSOBA 2010) SPIELHOFER et. al. (2009) mention similar results in their study to which this paper has already referred earlier.

There are two other papers in Hungarian language that are relevant when discussing the present problem of the 15-24 year-olds age group. One of them called *Az európai fiatalok világa a 21. század elején* [The world of young people in Europe in the early 21st century] (JANCSÁK 2011a) has two parts. The first one contains the European Union Youth Report from 2009 while the other is also a translation of a study summary, called *Ifjúságkutatás Európában* [Youth research in Europe], also from 2009. Both of them contain interesting information about the 15 to 24 age group and mention expressly the concept of NEET (JANCSÁK 2011a). Because the book translated two international works thus the Hungarian NEET problem is just generally mentioned in there, and also when they refer to the Hungarian situation they use statistical data from international surveys to which I have already referred in this section.

The other one is a translation again called *Sebezhető ifjúság* [Vulnerable youth] (FURLONG et. al. 2003). This short study shows the vulnerability of young people in education, in employment and in the European Union (See also: JANCSÁK 2011b). However, the valuable information come also from international surveys, and the study tries to present the European situation and does not expressly reflect on the Hungarian situation.

Finally, in closing this section, three further authors need mentioned – Csoboth, Kopp and Szedmák and their study called: *Fiatalok lelki veszélyeztetettsége*, [Psychological vulnerability of young people] published in 1998. The concept of NEET is not mentioned in this work but it refers to the 16 to 24 age group. The study examines this young age group from the perspective of their psychological vulnerability (CSOBOTH – KOPP – SZEDMÁK 1998). In summary it can be said: belonging to the NEET group may entail exclusion (certainly the feeling of it) and the resulting mental deterioration.

As I have already mentioned Hungarian literature does not abound as much in scope as the international literature and the explanation of that could be that the research on NEET is a quite young discipline among these types of research areas. The NEET research in Hungary is just beginning and hopefully this paper is one of the pioneering works.

3 Why does the research of the NEET group require special attention in Hungary?

The final unit of this paper outlines two approaches in its answer for the question. One of them is Social Policy approach while the other one, closely related to the first one, is Social Psychology approach. I do not separate the two from each other sharply because, I think, it follows directly from one to the other, while the other has a serious impact on the first one. The NEET group can be examined from the point of view of employment policy, education policy, housing policy, health policy or even issue of the pension term. The variety of research areas however mention psychological effects of the issue as well as raise questions connected to social exclusion.

The members of the NEET group make connections with other members of the same group therefore they somehow isolate themselves from the 'outside world' thus they may have less possibility to leave that group. On the other hand, the group identifies the individual and

vice versa the individual determines him/herself by the group where (s)he feels to be connected to (SMITH–MACKIE 2000). This may cause a spiral which may not allow the members from the NEET to leave it for a prolonged period of time.

COLES et al. (2010) claims that a significant number of members of the NEET group live in inadequate housing and in neighbourhoods with high levels of crime.

Young people with low qualifications are typically among the members of the NEET group who cannot take part in the labour market therefore, their health and mental ability continuously deteriorate (SPIELHOFER et al. 2009; see also: INSTITUTE OF HEALTH EQUITY 2010; SISSONS 2011).

Besides the fact that it is important to examine the NEET group in Hungary in order to find the proper ways out from the issue however, it should also focus attention on the financial issue. How much the NEET group costs and will cost in the future for tax-paying citizens if the numbers in the group increase. This issue can be seen from two approaches.

One of those is to see the issue from the members' point of view of the NEET group. Young people, who are NEET, do not pay any contribution to the budget because they are unemployed. They do not contribute either to the nation's economic growth or pay to the healthcare contribution. The income, which supports them, often comes from the grey or black economy by which they eventually diminish the redistributive total capital that is necessary to maintain the welfare state. Furthermore the growth of the NEET group will jeopardize our already fragile pension system in the future. Related to this the feeling of exclusion may continuously grow, and resulting from this the problem of a vicious circle. The longer someone is a member of the NEET group the less chance to have possibilities to find his/her own way back to the labour market and leave behind the danger of a hopeless life. However, staying in this particular state so long can cause a deterioration of mental abilities and a decrease of physical fitness which makes it increasingly difficult for that person to re-integrate into the world of work and/or education. As it mentioned earlier the members of this community just crave interaction and close cohesion with others as the members of the non-NEET group. And they will find it just inside the NEET group where the majority of the members are likely to permanently lose the motivation to return to society (SPIELHOFER et al. 2009). That is, it is vital to break this vicious circle through external, social support in order to avoid that this generation to be a 'lost generation' (SISSONS–JONES 2012).

On the other hand, the issue can be seen from society's point of view. The government is trying to solve the problem of the NEET group with various allowances that fewer and fewer taxpayers are able to provide. One of the most obvious dangers of being a member of the NEET group is the possibility of physical and mental deterioration (Institute of Health Equity, 2010). And this entails the support of the health system, the system which is vulnerable at the moment in Hungary and that is not supported financially by the large number of the NEET community. Furthermore, within the NEET group there are many young people who committed a breach of the current laws (COLES et al. 2010). The cost arising from these events will be paid by the government, that is, ultimately by the taxpayers.

These view points need to be seen, heard and understood primarily by the decision makers because it is doubtless fact that the embracing of the NEET-problem requires significant financial investment. Even, I think, it cannot be expected that these investment returns in a spectacular way and apparently in a short period of time. But I am sure about that the long term postponement of solving the problem will cause serious damage in the society as well as the national economy. *

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- AUDIT COMMISSION (2010): *Against the odds. Re-engaging young people in education, employment or training*. London, Audit Commission Publishing Team.
- BRITTON, J. – GREGG, P. – MACMILLAN, L. – MITCHELL, S. (2011): *The Early Bird ... Preventing Young People from becoming a NEET statistic*. Department of Economics and CMPO. University of Bristol. <http://www.bristol.ac.uk/medial-library/sites/compomigrated/documents/earlybirdcmpo.pdf> Download: 2015. 04.01.
- BOKÁNYI, Z. – SZABÓ, Á. (2016): NEET-fiatalok. Egy fogalomnyomában. *Kapocs* 16. évf. 1.sz.28–39. <http://www.ncsszi.hu/kiadvanyok/kapocs-letoltheto--lapszamai/kapocs-2015/163/news> Download: 2016. 02. 10
- CHEN, YU-WEN (2009): *Once 'NEET', Always 'NEET'? Experiences of Employment and Unemployment of Youth Participating in a Job Training Program in Taiwan*. National Taiwan University. http://www.umdcipe.org/conferences/policy_exchanges/conf_papers/Papers/217.pdf Download: 2015. 03. 20.
- CHZHEN, Y. (2014): *EU youth: not in employment, education or training*. <http://blogs.unicef.org/2014/06/18/eu-youth-not-in-employment-education-or-training> Download: 2014. 11. 06
- COLES, B. – GODFREY, CH. – KEUNG, A. – PAROTT S – BRADSHAW, J. (2010): *Estimating the life-time cost of NEET: 16-18 year olds not in Education, Employment or Training*. Department of Social Policy and Social Work and Department of Health Sciences. The University of York.
- CSOBA J. (2010): *A tisztességes munka. A teljes foglalkoztatás: a 21. század esélye vagy utópiája?* Budapest, L'Harmattan kiadó.
- CSOBOTH Cs. – KOPP M. – SZEDMÁK S. (1998): Fiatalok lelki kiveszélyeztetettsége. *Educatio* 7. évf. 2. szám. 248–265.
- DEPARTMENT FOR CHILDREN, SCHOOLS AND FAMILIES (2008): *NEET Toolkit. Reducing the proportion of young people not in education, employment or training (NEET)*. DCSF Publication. Annesley. Nottingham.
- DEPARTMENT FOR CHILDREN, SCHOOLS AND FAMILIES (2008): *Reducing the number of young people not in education, employment or training (NEET). The strategy*. DCSF Publications. Nottingham.
- DEPARTMENT FOR CHILDREN, SCHOOLS AND FAMILIES (2009): *Investing in Potential. Our Strategy to increase the proportion of 16-24 year olds in education, employment or training*. DCSF Publications. Nottingham.
- DEPARTMENT FOR CHILDREN, SCHOOLS AND FAMILIES (2010): *September Guarantee 2010. Guidance for local authorities and partners. (including their Connexions services, schools, colleges, training providers and Young People's Learning Agency)* http://www.dera.ioe.ac.uk/688/1/september_guarantee_guidance2010.pdf Download: 2015. 02. 07.
- DEPARTMENT FOR EDUCATION (2014): *Participation of young people in education, employment or training. Statutory guidance for local authorities*. <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications> Download: 2015. 02. 07.
- DEPARTMENT FOR EDUCATION AND DEPARTMENT FOR WORK & PENSION (2014): *Working together to support Young People Not in Education, Employment or Training (NEET). Information for DWP Operation and local authority services for young people*. <http://www.gov.uk/government/publications/working-together-to-support-young-people-need> Download: 2015. 03. 19.
- DWYER, P. – SHAW, S. (2013): *An Introduction to Social Policy*. London, Sage Publication Ltd.
- Elindult az ifjúsági garancia program*. <http://www.kormany.hu/hu/nemzetgazdasagi-miniszterium/munkaeropiaci-es-kepzesi-allamtitkarsag/hirek> Download: 2015. 02. 20.
- Empirikus ifjúságkutatási publikációk Magyarországon 1995–2003*. https://ifjusagsegito.hu/belvedere/empirikus_publikaciok.pdf Download: 2014. 08. 28.
- EUROPEAN COMMISSION (2012): *EU Youth Report*. Publications Office of the European Union. Belgium.
- EUROPEAN COMMISSION (2013): *Youth Unemployment*. www.ec.europa.eu/europe2020/pdf/themes/21_youth_unemployment.pdf Download: 2015. 03. 03.
- EUROPEAN COMMISSION (2014): *Youth Unemployment*. http://www.ec.europa.eu/europe2020/pdf/22_youth_unemployment_02.pdf Download: 2015. 04. 09.
- FŐVÁROSI SZABÓ ERVIN KÖNYVTÁR (2010): *A Hazai Ifjúságkutatás Irodalmából. 2000-2010. Válogatott bibliográfia*. SzocioWeb. <https://www.fszek.hu> Download: 2015. 02. 18.

- FURLONG, A. – STALDER, B. – AZZOPARDI, A. (2003): *Sebezhető ifjúság. Sebezhetőség az oktatásban, a munkavállalásban és a szabadidőben Európában*. Szeged, Belvedere Meridionale.
- GERE I. (2001): Ifjúsági munkanélküliség. A probléma jellemzése, eddigi intézkedések hatása, további teendők. In Frey Mária (szerk.): *EU-konform foglalkoztatáspolitikai. A hazai foglalkoztatáspolitikai átalakítása a közösségi gyakorlatnak megfelelően*. Budapest, 2001. 45–66.
- HOUSE OF COMMONS. CHILDREN, SCHOOLS AND FAMILIES COMMITTEE (2010): *Young people not in education, employment or training*. Eighth Report of Session 2009–10. London, House of Commons. The Stationery Office Limited.
- INSTITUTE OF HEALTH EQUITY (2010): *Fair Society, Healthy Lives*. The Marmot Review. <http://www.instituteofhealthequity.org/fair-society-healthy-lives> Download: 2014. 11. 03.
- JANCSÁK Cs. (szerk.) (2011a): *Az európai fiatalok világa a 21. század elején*. Szeged, Belvedere Meridionale.
- JANCSÁK Cs. (2011b): Az ifjúságkutatás nemzetközi tendenciái. In Bauer, B., Szabó, A. (szerk.): *Arctalan (?) nemzedék*. Budapest, Nemzeti Család- és Szociálpolitikai Intézet. 315–328.
- KRÉMER, B. (2014): *Mennyire lett kifosztva a társadalom? A társadalmi többség elbizonytalanítása és „lecsúsztatása”*. Beszélő online. <http://www.beszelo.c3.hu/onlinecikk/mennyire-lett-kifosztva-a-tarsadalom> Download: 2016. 01. 04
- Magyarország 2013. Évi Nemzeti Reform Programja*. http://www.ec.europa.eu/europe2020/pdf/nd/nrp2013_hungary_hu.pdf Download: 2014. 11. 14.
- MINISTRY OF BUSINESS, INNOVATION & EMPLOYMENT (2013): *Not in employment, education or training: the long-term NEET spells of young people in New Zealand*. <https://www.dol.govt.nz/publications/research/long-term-neet-young-people/long-term-neet-young-people.pdf> Download: 2015. 05. 08.
- MOLNÁR GY. – BAKÓ T. – CSERES-GERGELY ZS. – KÁLMÁN J. – SZABÓ T. (2014): *A munkaerőpiac peremén lévők és a költségvetés*. Budapest, Magyar Tudományos Akadémia. Közgazdaság- és Regionális Kutatóközpont. Közgazdaságtudományi Intézet.
- NATIONAL AUDIT OFFICE AND DEPARTMENT FOR EDUCATION (2014): *16- to 18-year old participation in education and training. Report by the Comptroller and Auditor General*. <https://www.nao.org.uk/.../16-to-18-year-old-participation-in-education-and-training> Download: 2015. 03. 22.]
- OECD (2013) *The OECD Action Plan for Youth*. <http://www.oecd.org/newsroom/Action-plan-youth.pdf> Download: 2014. 11. 06.
- OECD (2014): *Society at Glance 2014: OECD Social Indicators. OECD Publishing*. <http://www.oecd.org/social/societataglance.htm> Download: 2014. 11. 06.
- OECD (2015): *Youth not in employment, education or training (NEET)*. <https://data.oecd.org/youthinac/youth-not-in-employment-education-or-training-neet.htm> Download: 2015. 04. 09.
- RAHMAN, KH. M. (2007): *NEETs' Challenge to Japan: Causes and Remedies*. http://www.dijtokyo.org/doc/JS18_rahman.pdf Download: 2015. 05. 15.
- SISSONS, P., JONES, K. (2012): *Lost in transition? The changing labour market and young people not in employment, education or training*. The Work Foundation. Part of Lancaster University. London.
- SISSONS, P. (2011): *The Hourglass and the Escalator. Labour market change and mobility*. The Work Foundation. Part of Lancaster University. London.
- SLOMAN, M. (2014): *A Black Paper on NEETs and Apprenticeship*. <http://www.trainingjournal.com> Download: 2014. 11. 06.
- SMITH, E. R – MACKIE, D. M. (2000): *Social Psychology*. New York, Worth Publishers.
- SOCIAL EXCLUSION UNIT (1999): *Bridging the Gap: New Opportunities for 16-18 Year Olds Not in Education, Employment or Training*. <http://webcitation.org/61D9Jlx7d> Download: 2014. 11. 10.
- SPIELHOFER, TH. – BENTON, T. – EVANS, K. – FEATHERSTONE, G. – GOLDEN, S. – NELSON, J. – SMITH, P. (2009): *Increasing Participation: Understanding Young People who do not Participate in Education or Training at 16 and 17*. Nottingham, Department for Children, Schools and Families. National Foundation for Educational Research. DCSF Publications. <http://www.dera.ioe.ac.uk/11328/1/DCSF-RR072.pdf> Download: 2015. 05. 30.
- SZEGEDI E. (főszerk.) (2014): *Végzettséget mindenkinek! Kutatási eredmények, esetleírások, helyi kezdeményezések a korai iskolaelhagyás témájában*. Budapest, Tempus Közalapítvány.