

Factors Affecting Youth Unemployment: Empirical Assessment in the European Union Countries

This article aims to assess the influence of factors on youth unemployment in the European Union. The study evaluates several significant factors: GDP growth, education of young people, migration of young people, and average wages. Using multiple regression analysis, the study aims to investigate the relationship between these factors and youth unemployment. The results show that none of the chosen factors have a statistically significant impact on youth unemployment. This may be due to the fact that the chosen factors can have a lagged effect, which was not tested in this study. Additionally, the results revealed that, when solving the problem of autocorrelation, an included lagged youth unemployment variable has a statistically significant effect on youth unemployment.

Keywords: average wage, European Union, GDP growth, labour market, youth education, youth migration, youth unemployment.

Šio straipsnio tikslas – įvertinti veiksnių įtaką jaunimo nedarbui Europos Sąjungoje. Tyrime vertinami keli veiksniai: BVP augimas, jaunimo išsilavinimas, jaunimo migracija ir vidutinis darbo užmokestis. Naudojant daugialypę regresinę analizę, siekiama iširti šių veiksnių ir jaunimo nedarbo ryšį. Rezultatai rodo, kad nė vienas iš pasirinktų veiksnių neturi statistiškai reikšmingo poveikio jaunimo nedarbui. Tai gali būti dėl to, kad pasirinktų veiksnių poveikis gali vėluoti, todėl šiame tyrime nebuvo analizuojamas. Be to, rezultatai parodė, kad sprendžiant autokoreliacijos problemą įtrauktas vėluojantis jaunimo nedarbo kintamasis turi statistiškai reikšmingą poveikį jaunimo nedarbui.

Raktiniai žodžiai: vidutinis darbo užmokestis, Europos Sąjunga, BVP augimas, darbo rinka, jaunimo išsilavinimas, jaunimo migracija, jaunimo nedarbas.

Introduction

Despite their development, youth unemployment is an important political issue for most countries. The topic of youth

unemployment has been and is relevant for many years. However, this problem is constantly worsening with each subsequent year. For example, all population groups faced the issues of the labor

Anastasiia PUHA – Master student at Department of Political Science, Faculty of Political Science and Diplomacy, Vytautas Magnus University, Lithuania. Address: Putvinskio str. 23, LT-44243 Kaunas, Lithuania. Phone: +370 602 57441. Email: anastasiia.puha@vdu.lt

Tetiana KOROI – Master student at Department of Political Science, Faculty of Political Science and Diplomacy, Vytautas Magnus University, Lithuania. Address: Putvinskio str. 23, LT-44243 Kaunas, Lithuania. Phone: +370 624 53464. Email: tetiana.koroi@vdu.lt

Akvilė ALEKSANDRAVIČIENĖ – PhD, associate professor at Department of Economics, Faculty of Economics and Management, Vytautas Magnus University, Lithuania. Address: K. Donelaičio str. 52, LT-44248 Kaunas, Lithuania. Phone: +370 37 327856. Email: akvile.aleksandraviciene@vdu.lt

market during the COVID-19 crisis. Young people especially feel this, as they are deprived of their jobs as a priority and enterprises are closed. To this day, the situation with the unemployment of young people remains difficult, from finding a job after receiving an education to holding a job without losing it.

In 2015, the International Labour Organisation (ILO) estimated that 600 million jobs must be generated globally over the next ten years to accommodate the 200 million people who are currently unemployed and the 40 million people who enter the labour market each year. Youths now face worse economic circumstances than before. While nearly 309 million young people are employed, millions of them must work part-time or temporary jobs to make ends meet, as their households earn less than \$2 per day. These positions prevent them from advancing in their careers. Young people must battle difficult working conditions when they first enter the workforce. Yet, they may significantly boost local and global economies (ILO, 2015).

The scientific literature identifies the factors affecting youth unemployment. The study by E. Sever and A. Īgdeli (2018) shows that economic crises reduce youth employment, while an increase in per capita income reduces youth unemployment in the long term. However, adult labour force unemployment, the level of openness, and foreign direct investment negatively impact youth employment in the long term. G. Uslu and H. Tatlı (2024) found that young people who have completed secondary school, university, or postgraduate studies are less likely to be unemployed than those with only a basic education. The study also found

that a young person's family's per capita income positively affects the probability of unemployment. Additionally, literacy is one of the factors affecting youth unemployment (Koteli, 2024). It is worth noting, however, that there are very few studies on factors affecting youth unemployment. Thus, this paper addresses **the problem:** what effect do certain factors have on youth unemployment? **The object** of this paper is the effect of certain factors on youth unemployment. **The aim of this research** is to assess the effect of certain factors on youth unemployment. To reach this aim, the following **objectives** were set: (i) review literature on unemployment; (ii) develop a methodology to assess the effect of certain factors on youth unemployment; and (iii) assess the effect of certain factors on youth unemployment in the European Union (EU) using the developed methodology. To achieve the aim and objectives, this study employs the following **research methods:** synthesis, generalisation, and ordinary least squares. The article is structured as follows: First, a literature review is presented, based on which the factors for empirical research are chosen. Second, the research methodology is provided. Finally, the results of the research are presented, and the conclusions are drawn.

Literature review

It is a well-known fact that the labour force includes people who are either employed (working for profit) or unemployed but actively seeking work (WorldBank, n.d.a). Youth is defined as individuals between 15 and 24 years of

age (UN, n.d.). This study focuses on this age group. Unemployed youth have fewer opportunities to participate effectively in national development and exercise their civil rights. They spend less on consumption, save less, and often lack the “voice” to change their lives and society. In some cases, this can lead to social tension and the rejection of the existing socioeconomic system among young people. Widespread unemployment among young people prevents companies and countries from innovating and gaining a competitive advantage through investment in human capital, which can undermine their future prospects.

One reason for the high unemployment rate is the biased attitude in the labour market. For instance, employers often tend to lay off young workers first because it is generally believed to be cheaper for an enterprise to turn away young workers than older employees. In addition, employment protection legislation typically contains a requirement for a minimum length of service for employees to qualify for protection, and severance pay generally increases with length of service. Young workers have less experience than adults and are therefore easier and cheaper to fire (ILO, 2022). A second reason may be an underdeveloped labour market. Most jobs have been held by the same workers for many years, and only a small proportion of workers leave their jobs for comparable ones with better pay. Studies conducted in several countries have revealed significant differences in pay offered by different firms in the same local labour market for the same work. This slow labour market response is particularly noticeable among the more skilled labour force and among

those employed by firms with strong product market positions. In many cases, competition occurs primarily through the product market rather than the labour market, and employee remuneration is determined more by the employee than by the employer (Brown, n.d.).

The literature review identified the following factors that influence unemployment among the young population: gross domestic product (GDP) growth, migration, education, and wages. Okun's law is a key area of research examining the relationship between GDP growth and youth unemployment. Numerous studies have demonstrated that age affects Okun's coefficients. There is substantial evidence that the youth unemployment rate responds far more strongly to economic changes than older age groups do. According to the foundational Okun estimation in 1962, the unemployment rate decreases by 0.3 percentage points for every additional 1% increase in gross national product (GNP). This is known as Okun's coefficient, or the sensitivity of the unemployment rate to GDP growth (Butkus & Seputiene, 2019). While G. Marconi et al. (2016) confirmed Okun's law, their study found no evidence that young people are more vulnerable to business cycle fluctuations than older people. Their study proved that young people have less work experience compared to the older population but did not directly prove the dependence of unemployment on GDP growth (Butkus & Seputiene, 2019). D. Tumanoska (2020) found that a 1% increase in economic growth would reduce the youth unemployment rate by 2.5% in European Union countries and by 0.4% in Southeastern European countries.

Y. V. Fung and J. L. H. Nga (2024) studied Malaysia and found a positive relationship between youth unemployment and economic growth, though it was not statistically significant.

As A. Portes (1997) stated, Glick-Shiller believed that young migrants have economic resources and contacts or a plan of action for employment. The scientist's study focused on the Latin American population. Since these people were officially documented as being employed, it can be concluded that this movement has been present in the world since the 20th century. Additionally, as described by R. Baer et al. (2022), Bernandi and Gonzalez's research within the framework of this study confirmed that people from poor countries are forced to migrate in search of a better life due to their life circumstances in the 21st century. Furthermore, R. Cefalo and R. Scandurra (2021) highlighted the correlation between the migration of young people and youth unemployment, particularly in Europe, in their study. They demonstrated that regions with higher migration rates offer greater stability and opportunities for young people, whereas regions with low migration rates struggle with youth unemployment. K. Hermansson, R. Scandurra, and M. Graziano (2021) also addressed the issue of the impact of young people's migration on youth unemployment. They argued that regions that attract young migrants have higher youth unemployment rates, as there is a correlation between population size and employment opportunities in the market. Thus, all of these researchers concluded that young people leave for other countries in search of a higher standard of living.

Research has also been conducted on the effect of education on youth unemployment. As described by N. Mehmetai and N. Xhindi (2022), Moreau and Leathwood noticed a relationship between education and unemployment among young people. They concluded that as the number of graduate students increased, so did the number of unemployed youths in most European countries. However, I. Nunez and I. Livanos (2010) refuted the earlier study. Four years later, they confirmed the impact of higher education on unemployment in Europe in the short and long term. They concluded that higher education reduces unemployment and increases employment opportunities for young graduates in Europe. D. M. Bojadjeva et al. (2022) examined how education levels impact youth unemployment in Europe. They argue that young people with a completed secondary education and above have better employment opportunities than those with an incomplete secondary education (Bojadjeva et al., 2022). Another researcher, Y. D. Kang (2021), examined the impact of education on youth unemployment. He found that countries with higher levels of dual education tend to have lower youth unemployment rates in Europe. Despite the strong focus on education, as measured by the number of graduates or the level of educational attainment, the impact of the literacy rate on youth unemployment is evident as well. N. Hoosen, the CEO of the Federated Employers Mutual Assurance, mentioned that poor literacy is driving youth unemployment. He stated that the creation of artificial intelligence will reduce entry-level positions, so youth unemployment is expected to rise (Koteli, 2024).

In 1970, researcher Kaitz proved that higher wages lead to higher youth unemployment rates. He argued that when the minimum wage increases, workers' income rises and companies reduce their use of labour in favour of using more machines (substitution effect) (Gavett, 1970). In 1974, Welch presented another theory. The scientist concluded that as the minimum wage increases, employment decreases, and the unemployment rate rises. T. Sitompul (2022) stated that, according to Welch, raising wages will eventually lead to fewer workers due to increased business productivity. M. Dayioglu, M. Küçükbayrak, and S. Tumen (2022) argued that the minimum wage directly affects unemployment among young people. They claimed that an increase in the minimum wage will lead to a decrease in employment among young people because employers will be less inclined to hire young professionals at high wages. Conversely, E. van Bezooijen, W. van den Berge, and A. Salomons (2024) claimed that raising the minimum wage does not reduce employment among young people. They concluded that raising the minimum wage increases unemployment among young people in the short term but only increases youth employment in the long term by adjusting to the new wage structure (van Bezooijen et al., 2024).

Thus, the literature review highlighted two main reasons for the unemployment of young people. One reason is the unchanging environment, which is mostly occupied by experienced employees. Additionally, unlike older employees, employers tend to dismiss younger, less educated ones first. A review of literature identified several variables that affect

unemployment: GDP growth, migration, education, and wages.

Research methodology

This section presents a research methodology based on European Union data. Time series data was collected from 1995 to 2020, as no data is available on young people migrating to the EU after 2020. The data is updated approximately every 4-5 years, so data for 2021–2024 is unavailable. A time series is a set of observations on the values that a variable takes at different times. Such data can be collected at regular time intervals. In this case, the data is collected annually. The following variables are used for the analysis: Dependent variable: youth unemployment (*unempl*; *Q*); Independent variables: GDP growth (*gdp*; *G*), education among young people (*educ*; *E*), migration of young people (*migr*; *M*), and average wage (*wage*; *W*). In this study, education is measured by the literacy rate of 15-to-24-year-olds. According to the WorldBank (n.d.b), this rate reflects the latest educational progress and is intended to assess educational attainment. It is also worth noting that the average wage was chosen for the analysis of young people's wages, even though researchers in the analysed literature mainly focused on the minimum wage. This decision is based on the fact that studies on unemployment (not youth unemployment), such as those by A. Aleksandravičienė et al. (2023) and A. Damulienė (2012), include the average wage. Therefore, it is interesting to see the results of an analysis of youth unemployment, as it is logical that this should also have an effect.

This is primarily because young people often base their wage expectations on the average wages in the economy. If the average wage is high, young people may refuse low-paying jobs or seek better opportunities. The discrepancy between expected wages and employers' willingness to pay can lead to higher youth unemployment. Additionally, as average wages rise, so do employers' total labour costs. Employers may prefer to hire skilled or experienced workers to get better value for money, even if it means hiring fewer people. Young people, who are usually less productive and/or less experienced, can be replaced by more productive labour.

The variables of the study and their measurements are presented in Table 1. A multiple regression model is run based on the selected variables, and the assumptions of a linear regression model are tested.

A typical method for estimating the coefficients of linear regression equations, which explain the relationship between one or more independent quantitative variables and a dependent variable, is called ordinary least squares (OLS) regression. OLS minimises the sum of squared residuals and aims to

determine the coefficients of the regression model (Majka, 2024). This method has been used in previous research on youth unemployment, including studies by G. Uslu and H. Tatli (2024) and D. M. Bojadjeva et al. (2022). It is also used in this study. When running a regression model, it is important to check outliers. Outliers are unusual observations that significantly differ from the rest of the data. In regression analysis, an outlier is an observation with a residual larger than the residuals of the other observations. The standardized residuals method is used to identify outliers, with a critical value of $|3|$. It is also necessary to check the normality of the residuals. The method used to check for normality is the P-P plot.

The other test is for multicollinearity, which occurs when two independent variables are highly correlated. This creates redundant information and distorts the results of a regression model. This issue must be addressed. Bivariate correlation is used to detect multicollinearity. If the coefficient of bivariate correlation, $|r_{ij}|$, is higher than 0.8, then the regression model exhibits multicollinearity between the X_i and X_j variables. If multicollinearity is present in the model, the solution is

Table 1. Variables and their measurements

Variable	Measurement	Data source
Youth unemployment	Million people	ILO (2023a)
GDP growth	%	WorldBank (2021)
Education among young people	Literacy rate (%)	Euro WHO (2023)
Migration of young people	Share of international migrants between 15 and 24 years (%)	Migration data portal (2021)
Average wage	US\$ per hour	Eurostat, (2022); ILO (2023b)

to divide the independent variables into different models.

One more regression assumption that must be checked is autocorrelation. Autocorrelation refers to the connection between each value of an error in an equation. Specifically, it refers to the degree of correlation between values of the same variable across different observations in the data. This concept is most often discussed in the context of time series data, where observations occur at different points in time. The most commonly used test for detecting serial autocorrelation is the Durbin-Watson (DW) d statistic. The d value always lies between 0 and 4. The closer the d value is to zero, the greater the evidence of positive autocorrelation. Conversely, the closer the d value is to 4, the greater the evidence of negative autocorrelation. Based on the sample size and the number of independent variables, the Durbin-Watson test establishes two critical values of the d statistic: d_L and d_U , called the lower and upper limits, respectively. If the computed d value lies below the lower limit, above the upper limit, or between the two limits, a decision about the presence of autocorrelation can be made. If there is autocorrelation in the model, the solution is to include a lagged dependent variable in the model as an independent variable and use the Durbin h statistic to check for the second-order autocorrelation.

The probability of obtaining an outcome that is comparable to or more extreme than what was observed under the null hypothesis is known as the p-value. If the p-value is higher than 0.05, then the null hypothesis (H_0) is accepted. To test the statistical significance of the model, a Fisher's test (F-test) is performed. If the

p-value for a parameter is less than 0.05, it is considered statistically significant and can be interpreted. To test the significance of a parameter, a Student's t-test is used. One more measure is the coefficient of determination (R^2). It measures how well a regression model predicts an outcome. In other words, it evaluates the model's fit. The better the model predicts, the closer its R^2 will be to 1. The multiple regression model was run:

$$\ln_unempl_t = b_0 + b_1gdp_t + b_2\ln_educ_t + b_3\ln_migr_t + b_4\ln_wage_t + u_t \quad (1)$$

where: *unempl* – youth unemployment, *gdp* – GDP growth, *educ* – education among young people, *migr* – migration of young people, *wage* – average wage; *t* indicates time series data, while *ln* shows natural logarithm (note: *gdp* is not transformed since it has negative values).

The following hypotheses were formulated regarding the influence of the analysed factors on youth unemployment:

Hypothesis 1: The higher the GDP growth, the lower the number of unemployed youths.

Hypothesis 2: The higher the youth migration, the higher the youth unemployment.

Hypothesis 3: The higher the education of young people, the less unemployed youth.

Hypothesis 4: The higher the average wage, the higher the youth unemployment.

All hypotheses are based on the research results provided in the literature review section.

In summary, this methodology allows us to build a multifaceted model to investigate the influence of certain factors on the unemployment of young people. The dependent variable is the unemployment

of young people, and the independent variables are: GDP growth, education among young people, migration of young people, and average wages in the European Union. The coefficients of the linear regression equation are estimated using the ordinary least squares method.

Results of the research

The descriptive statistics of the research variables are provided in Table 2. As shown in the table, the average value of the main variable, youth unemployment, is 5.7%, indicating the average level within the sample. The standard deviation of 4.8% indicates high variability around the mean. The minimum and maximum values are 2.7% and 19.9%, respectively, showing the range of the observed values.

The regression analysis began with an outlier detection. None were found. For multiple linear regression models, only normally distributed data can be used. In this case, the P-P test revealed that they are normally distributed. The next step is to check for multicollinearity using bivariate correlation. The value is higher than $|0.8|$ between two pairs of independent variables: education and

average wages (0.835) and migration and education (-0.918). This indicates that they are highly correlated. Based on these results, the solution to the problem of multicollinearity is to separate the highly correlated variables into different models (*see* Formulas 2 and 3):

$$\ln_unempl_t = b_0 + b_1gdp_t + b_2\ln_educ_t + u_t, \text{ and} \quad (2)$$

$$\ln_unempl_t = b_0 + b_1gdp_t + b_2\ln_migr_t + b_3\ln_wage_t + u_t. \quad (3)$$

The next step is to check for autocorrelation. Based on the results of the Durbin-Watson (DW) d test in the first model (*see* Formula 2), $d = 0.596$, $d_L = 1.224$, and $d_U = 1.553$. Since $d < d_L$, there is likely evidence of positive autocorrelation, meaning the errors of the model are correlated. Therefore, a lagged dependent variable was included in a regression model (autoregression), and the Durbin h statistic was calculated. The result showed that the problem of autocorrelation was resolved. Based on the results of the first model, this model can be interpreted. It is statistically significant ($p < 0.001$), but the significance of the individual parameters differs: GDP growth and education are statistically

Table 2. Descriptive statistics of the variables

Variable	Minimum value	Maximum value	Mean	St. deviation
Youth unemployment	2.7	19.9	5.781	4.834
GDP growth	-5.7	3.9	1.500	2.188
Education among young people	97.4	98.9	98.173	0.480
Migration of young people	8.9	12.8	11.181	1.336
Average wage	2.9	32.4	18.046	9.247

insignificant ($p = 0.473$ and $p = 0.131$, respectively), while lagged youth unemployment is statistically significant ($p < 0.001$) (see Table 3). Therefore, the overall model can be interpreted as a whole and only the lagged dependent variable separately. The results of the autocorrelation test for the second model (see Formula 3) are as follows: $d = 1.072$, $d_L = 1.143$, and $d_U = 1.652$. Since $d < d_L$, there is probably evidence of positive autocorrelation, meaning the errors of the model are correlated. Therefore, a lagged dependent variable was included in the next step to eliminate autocorrelation. The Durbin h statistic showed that there is no autocorrelation. Based on the above analysis, it can be concluded that this model is statistically significant ($p < 0.001$). However, the significance of the individual parameters differs. All of the parameters are statistically insignificant, but the lagged dependent variable is statistically significant ($p = 0.002$) (see Table 3). Thus, the overall model can be

interpreted as a whole, but the lagged dependent variable can only be interpreted separately.

In summary, none of the factors had a statistically significant impact on youth unemployment in the European Union. After testing the models, it can be concluded that none of the hypotheses were confirmed. This is because all selected variables for the study were not statistically significant in the regression model.

Conclusions

Unemployment among young people is a global problem. Based on a review of the literature, several reasons for this phenomenon can be deduced. First, there is a biased attitude in the labour market. Employers prefer to hire people with work experience, but young people who have just completed higher education often lack this experience. Second,

Table 3. Results of the regression models

Variable	Coefficient	t-statistic	p-value (p)
<i>Model 1:</i>			
Constant	114.505	1.578	0.130
GDP growth	-0.019	-0.731	0.473
Education among young people	-24.836	-1.573	0.131
Youth unemployment (lagged)	0.608	4.172	<0.001
<i>Model 2:</i>			
Constant	-1.580	-0.853	0.404
GDP growth	-0.026	-0.922	0.368
Migration of young people	0.740	1.176	0.253
Average wage	0.066	0.379	0.709
Youth unemployment (lagged)	0.740	3.486	0.002

the labour market is underdeveloped. Most worker positions have been filled by the same workers for many years, and only a small proportion of workers leave their jobs for comparable jobs with better pay. Consequently, young people face extreme difficulty finding employment under these conditions, and legislation often fails to address this adequately (IMF, 2014). Previous studies have identified several factors affecting the level of youth unemployment, including GDP growth, migration of young people, education, and wages.

For this study, a methodology was developed for analysis and model validation. A multiple regression model was built to analyse the effect of certain factors on youth unemployment. The standardised residuals method was chosen to detect outliers, the P-P test to analyze normality, the bivariate correlation test to analyse multicollinearity, and the Durbin-Watson (DW) d statistic to analyze autocorrelation. The results of the

model show that none of the four hypotheses were confirmed, as none of the chosen factors were statistically significant. Although the hypotheses were not confirmed, the results of this research are consistent with those of other studies regarding two hypotheses. M. Butkus and J. Seputiene (2019) found no direct impact of GDP growth on youth unemployment. A. Aleksandravičienė et al. (2023) also found no statistically significant effect of the average wage on unemployment. It is worth mentioning that the included lagged youth unemployment variable have a statistically significant effect on youth unemployment. This is due to strong inertia, meaning that this year's youth unemployment is heavily affected by last year's youth unemployment. Thus, much of the variation in current youth unemployment is explained by its past values. Future research could include more variables, analyse different periods, use other econometric method(s), etc.

References

1. Aleksandravičienė, A., Dulinskaitė, R., Muzikevičius, E. (2023). Assessment of the Impact of Macroeconomic Factors on Unemployment: Lithuanian Case // *Scientific Papers Series Management, Economic Engineering in Agriculture and Rural Development*. Vol. 23, No. 1, pp. 29–38. Internet access: https://managementjournal.usamv.ro/pdf/vol.23_1/Art3.pdf
2. Baer, R., Browne, K. E., Gomberg-Muñoz, R., Liu, S. H., Lyon, S. M., Mazzeo, J., Ullan De La Rosa, F. (2022). Human Organization // *Journal of the Society for Applied Anthropology*. Pp. 171–179.
3. Bojadjeva, D. M., Cvetanoska, M., Kozheski, K., Mujčinović, A., Gašparović, S. (2022). The Impact of Education on Youth Employability: The Case of Selected Southeastern European Countries // *Youth & Society*. Vol. 54, No. (2_suppl), pp. 29S–51S. doi: 10.1177/0044118X211069403
4. Brown, E. (n. d.). Labour Economics. Internet access: <https://www.britannica.com/topic/labour-economics> [accessed March 25, 2025].
5. Butkus, M., Seputiene, J. (2019). The Output Gap and Youth Unemployment: An Analysis Based on Okun's Law // *Economies*. Vol. 7, No. 4, pp. 108. doi: 10.3390/economies7040108
6. Cefalo, R., Scandurra, R. (2021). Territorial Disparities in Youth Labour Market Chances in Europe // *Regional Studies, Regional Science*. Vol. 8, No. 1, pp. 228–238. doi: 10.1080/21681376.2021.1925580
7. Damulienė, A. (2012). Ekonomikos svyravimų poveikis Lietuvos nedarbo lygiui 1998–2011 metais // *Societal Innovations for Global Growth*. Vol. 1, No. 1, pp. 927–938. Internet access:

- <https://etalpykla.lituanistika.lt/fedora/objects/LT-LDB-0001:J.04~2012~1367189109914/datastreams/DS.002.0.01.ARTIC/content>
8. Dayioglu, M., Küçükbayrak, M., Tumen, S. (2022). The Impact of Age-specific Minimum Wages on Youth Employment and Education: A Regression Discontinuity Analysis // *International Journal of Manpower*. Vol. 43, No. 6, pp. 1352-1377. doi: 10.1108/IJM-02-2021-0079
 9. Eurostat (2022). Annual Increase in Labour Costs at 1.9% in Euro Area. Internet access: <<https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/documents/2995521/14358248/3-18032022-BP-EN.pdf/bbef1f4e-52c4-4a65-8887-4ebe8220ac26>> [accessed March 13, 2025].
 10. Euro WHO. (2023). Literacy Rate (%) in Population Aged 15+ Years. Internet access: <https://gateway.euro.who.int/en/indicators/hfa_36-0400-literacy-rate-in-population-aged-15plus-years/visualizations/#id=18843> [accessed March 13, 2025].
 11. Fung, Y. V., Nga, J. L. H. (2024). Economic Growth and Youth Unemployment in Malaysia // *Academic Research in Economics and Management Sciences*. Vol. 12, No. 2, pp. 497-513. doi: 10.6007/IJAREMS/v12-i2/17494
 12. Gavett, T. W. (1970). Youth Unemployment and Minimum Wages // *Monthly Labor Review*. Vol. 93, No. 3, pp. 3-12. Internet access: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/41837921>
 13. Hermannsson, K., Scandurra, R., Graziano, M. (2021). The Effect of Higher Education on Youth Unemployment in European Regions during a Period of Economic Instability // *Journal of Education Finance*. Vol. 46, No. 4, pp. 477-495. Internet access: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/48643768>
 14. ILO. (2015). *Brief Profile on Youth Unemployment*. - Geneva: ILO.
 15. ILO. (2022). *Global Employment Trends for Youth 2022: Investing in Transforming Futures for Young People*. Internet access: <https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---dgreports/---dcomm/---publ/documents/publication/wcms_853321.pdf> [accessed March 13, 2025].
 16. ILO. (2023a). *Unemployment by Sex and Age*. Internet access: <https://www.ilo.org/shinyapps/bulkexplorer11/?lang=en&segment=indicator&id=UNE_2EAP_SEX_AGE_RT_A> [accessed March 13, 2025].
 17. ILO. (2023b). *Mean Nominal Hourly Labour Cost per Employee*. Internet access: <www.ilo.org/shinyapps/bulkexplorer7/?lang=en&id=LAC_4HRL_ECO_CUR_NB_A> [accessed March 13, 2025].
 18. IMF. (2014). *Key Country Examples of Labor Market Issues*. Internet access: <<https://www.imf.org/external/np/res/jobs/pdfs/labormarket.pdf>> [accessed March 13, 2025].
 19. Kang, Y. D. (2021). Determinants of Youth Unemployment: Empirical Analysis of OECD and EU Member Countries in 2000-2017 // *Journal of Economic Development*. Vol. 46, No. 3, pp. 109-131. doi: 10.35866/caujed.2021.44.3.006
 20. Koteli, T. C. (2024). Poor Literacy Contributes to Sa's Youth Unemployment. Internet access: <<https://www.bee.co.za/post/poor-literacy-contributes-to-sa-s-youth-unemployment-says-expert>> [accessed July 7, 2025].
 21. Majka, M. (2024). Ordinary Least Squares. Internet access: <<https://www.researchgate.net/publication/384403324>> [accessed July 7, 2025].
 22. Marconi, G., Beblavý, M., Maselli, I. (2016). Age Effects in Okun's Law with Different Indicators of Unemployment // *Applied Economics Letters*. Vol. 23, pp. 580-583. doi: 10.1080/13504851.2015.1090540
 23. Mehmetai, N., Xhindi, N. (2022). Public Expenses in Education and Youth Unemployment Rates - a Vector Error Correction Model Approach // *Economies*. Vol. 10, No. 12, 293. doi: 10.3390/economies10120293
 24. Migration data portal. (2021). Share of International Migrants between 15 and 24 years Residing in the Country/region at Mid-year 2020. Internet access: <https://www.migrationdataportal.org/international-data?m=1&rm49=150&i=stock_young_perc&t=2020> [accessed March 13, 2025].
 25. Nunez, I., Livanos, I. (2010). Higher Education and Unemployment in Europe: An Analysis of the Academic Subject and National Effects // *Higher Education*. Vol. 49, pp. 475-487. doi: 10.1007/s10734-009-9260-7
 26. Portes, A. (1997). Immigration Theory for a New Century: Some Problems and Opportunities // *The International Migration Review*. Vol. 31, No. 4, pp. 799-825. doi: <https://doi.org/10.2307/2547415>
 27. Sever, E., İğdeli, A. (2018). The Determining Factors of Youth Unemployment in Developing Countries: The Case of Turkey // *International*

- Journal of Social and Economic Sciences. Vol. 8, No. 1, pp. 75–83. Internet access: <https://www.ijses.org/index.php/ijses/article/view/296>
28. Sitompul, T. (2022). The Impact of Minimum Wage on Youth Employment // *Journal of Accounting and Management Innovation*. Vol. 6, No. 1, pp. 15–28. Internet access: <https://ejournal-medan.uph.edu/jam/article/view/522>
 29. Tumanoska, D. (2020). The Relationship between Economic Growth and Unemployment Rates: Validation of Okun's Law in Panel Context // *Research in Applied Economics*. Vol. 12, No. 1, pp. 33–55. doi: 10.5296/rae.v12i1.16665
 30. UN (n. d.). Youth: Who Are the Youth? Internet access: <https://www.un.org/en/global-issues/youth> [accessed July 7, 2025].
 31. Uslu, G., Tatli, H. (2024). Factors Affecting Regional Youth Unemployment: Micro-evidence on Individuals // *International Journal of Management Economics and Business*. Vol. 20, No. 1, pp. 16–42. doi: 10.17130/ijmeb.1374411
 32. van Bezooijen, E., van den Berge, W., Salomons, A. (2024). The Young Bunch: Youth Minimum Wages and Labor Market Outcomes // *ILR Review*. Vol. 77, No. 3, pp. 428–460. doi: 10.1177/00197939241239317
 33. WorldBank. (2021). GDP Growth (annual %) – European Union. Internet access: <https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/NY.GDP.MKTP.KD.ZG?end=2021&locations=EU&start=2000> [accessed March 13, 2025].
 34. WorldBank. (n. d. a). Metadata Glossary: Labor Force. Internet access: <https://databank.worldbank.org/metadataglossary/world-development-indicators/series/SL.TLF.TOTL.IN> [accessed July 7, 2025].
 35. WorldBank (n. d. b). Metadata Glossary: Literacy Rate. Internet access: <https://databank.worldbank.org/metadataglossary/millennium-development-goals/series/SE.ADT.LITR.ZS> [accessed July 7, 2025].

The paper submitted: May 30, 2025

Prepared for publication: October 30, 2025

Anastasiia PUHA, Tetiana KOROI, Akvilė ALEKSANDRAVIČIENĖ

JAUNIMO NEDARBA VEIKIANTYS VEIKSNIAI: EMPIRINIS EUROPOS SĄJUNGOS ŠALIŲ VERTINIMAS

S a n t r a u k a

Jaunimo nedarbas yra pasaulinė problema, siejama su nesąžininga darbo rinka ir jos negebėjimu gana greitai plėstis. Jauni žmonės dažnai neturi reikiamų darbo įgūdžių, todėl jiems sunku įsidarbinti. Nedarbantys jauni asmenys turi mažiau galimybių veiksmingai dalyvauti nacionaliniame vystymesi ir pasinaudoti savo pilietinėmis teisėmis. Jie mažiau išleidžia vartojimui, mažiau taupo ir dažnai neturi „balso“, kad pakeistų savo gyvenimą ir visuomenę. Kai kuriais atvejais tai sukelia socialinę įtampą bei esamos socialinės ir ekonominės sistemos atmetimą tarp jaunų žmonių. Jaunimo nedarbas trukdo įmonėms ir šalims diegti inovacijas ir įgyti konkurencinį pranašumą investuojant į žmogiškąjį kapitalą, o tai gali pakenkti jų ateities perspektyvoms. Paminėtina, kad bendrąja prasme jaunimas apibrėžiamas kaip 15–24 metų amžiaus asmenys, todėl šio straipsnio tyrime laikomasi šios nuostatos.

Remiantis empirinių tyrimų analize, aukštą jaunimo nedarbo lygį galima paaiškinti tuo, kad jauni asmenys dažniau atleidžiami iš įmonių nei labiau patyrę darbuotojai. Be to, silpnos darbo rinkos

dažnai lėtai reaguoja į konkurenciją, atlyginimą dažniau diktuoja darbuotojas, o ne darbdavys. Literatūros apžvalga leido identifikuoti pagrindinius veiksnius, darančius įtaką jaunimo nedarbui: BVP augimas, jaunimo migracija, jaunimo išsilavinimo lygis ir vidutinis darbo užmokestis. Analizuotuose tyrimuose teigiama, kad, skirtingai nei vyresnio amžiaus žmonių, jaunimo nedarbas yra jautrus BVP pokyčiams. Tyrimais nustatyta, kad, ekonomikos augimui padidėjus 1 %, jaunimo nedarbo lygis sumažėtų 2,5 % Europos Sąjungos šalyse ir 0,4 % Pietryčių Europos šalyse. Taip pat yra tyrimų, kuriais nenustatyta statistiškai reikšmingo ryšio tarp jaunimo nedarbo ir ekonomikos augimo. Migracija – dar vienas veiksnys, darančis įtaką jaunimo nedarbui. Daugelis jaunų žmonių migruoja, kuomet susiduria su didele konkurencija. Išsilavinimo lygis taip pat daro didelę įtaką užimtumui; tyrimai parodė, kad kuo aukštesnis išsilavinimas, tuo mažesnis jaunimo nedarbo lygis. Kalbant apie vidutinį darbo užmokestį, jo daromas poveikis jaunimo nedarbui yra teigiamas (mažina jaunimo nedarbą).

Šio straipsnio tyrimo tikslas – įvertinti tam tikrų veiksnių įtaką jaunimo nedarbui Europos Sąjungoje. Tyrime vertinami keli veiksniai, tokie kaip BVP augimas, jaunimo išsilavinimas, jaunimo migracija ir vidutinis darbo užmokestis, kurie, kaip parodė literatūros analizė, veikia jaunimo nedarbą. Straipsnyje vertinama minėtų veiksnių įtaka jaunimo nedarbui Europos Sąjungos šalyse. Remiantis 1995–2020 m. duomenimis, sudarytas daugialypės regresijos modelis, kuris įvertintas naudojant įprastą mažiausių kvadratų (OLS) metodą. Siekiant gauti regresijos modelio parametrų įverčius, atsižvelgta į išskirtis, paklaidų normalumą, multikolinearumą ir autokoreliaciją. Tyrime iškeltos šios hipotezės: (1) H1: Kuo didesnis BVP augimas, tuo mažesnis jaunų nedarbingų asmenų skaičius; (2) H2: Kuo didesnė jaunimo migracija, tuo didesnis jaunimo nedarbas;

(3) H3: Kuo aukštesnis jaunų asmenų išsilavinimas, tuo mažiau bedarbių jaunų žmonių; (4) H4: Kuo didesnis vidutinis darbo užmokestis, tuo didesnis jaunimo nedarbas. Visos hipotezės pagrįstos ankstesnių empirinių tyrimų rezultatais.

Atlikto tyrimo išvados rodo, kad visi pasirinkti veiksniai neturi statistiškai reikšmingo poveikio jaunimo nedarbui (visos hipotezės nepatvirtintos). Tačiau paminėtina, kad, sprendžiant autokoreliacijos problemą, iš modelio ištrauktas vėluojantis jaunimo nedarbo veiksnys yra statistiškai reikšmingas. Jaunimo nedarbas pasižymi didele inercija, reiškinčia, kad šių metų jaunimo nedarbui didelę įtaką daro praėjusių metų jaunimo nedarbas. Taigi, didelę dalį dabartinio jaunimo nedarbo kitimo paaiškina jo praeities reikšmės.