

# ALTERNATIVE REPORT

about the position and needs of the youth in Republic of Serbia

## 2020

SUMMARY



Krovna organizacija mladih Srbije



**ALTERNATIVE REPORT**  
**about the position and needs of the youth in Republic of Serbia**  
**2020**

**Beograd, 2020**  
**National Youth Council of Serbia**

## 2. METHODOLOGY

This research was conducted from May to July of 2020. Based on the methodology of the research and the way in which the data was collected, this research is both qualitative and quantitative. This means that both methods of research and data collecting were used. This research included several different techniques of data collection:

1. **Document analysis (desk analysis)** was used to analyze the institutional frame and all thematic fields which determine the position of the youth, if it had been possible to collect that data through desk research. Alongside the analysis of the institutional frame, the research included available data and reports of several different institutions, data which was gathered and published by the Statistical Office of the Republic of Serbia, and other institutions like the National Employment Service. It included unstructured data, but also the analysis of the available and published research about the youth which were important for several specific topics. It is emphasized where the indirect or secondary research was used. The basis of desk analysis is in previous alternative reports from 2017, 2018, and 2019. The most important data was shown one more time in some parts, but with the addition of some new data. Anybody who wants to know more about everything that was covered in the previous research can download **the Alternative report about the position and needs of the youth in Republic of Serbia – 2017, the Alternative report about the position and needs of the youth in Republic of Serbia – 2018, or the Alternative report about the position and needs of the youth in Republic of Serbia – 2019**. The desk research for this year included the addition of data in some parts for the other half of 2019 and the first half of 2020.
2. **Focus groups** with relevant subjects were used for qualitative research of specific topics, with participants which were chosen based on the criteria of relevance (organizations of the youth, organizations for the youth, prominent individuals, representatives of target organizations) for the given topic. There were four focus groups with the following topics: *1. Participation of the youth – realization of the rights of minorities; 2. Political participation of the youth – the youth voting for the first time; 3. Economic position of the employed youth; 4. The youth and education.*
3. **Online questionnaire for the youth** from the age of 15 to the age of 30 who live on the territory of the Republic of Serbia. The type of sample is targeted at the population of young people as a part of the general population in relation to age (from the age of 15 to the age of 30), and within that (basic) group the sample was stratified based on the variables of age, gender and place of permanent residence. The questionnaire consisted from nine groups of questions: *1. Basic information; 2. Political participation; 3. Values of the youth; 4. Media, social networks and applications; 5. Education, employment and mobility; 6. Social activism and participation of the youth; 7. Security and health of the youth; 8. Volunteer work; 9. Attitudes towards the pandemic of the Corona virus and the state of emergency in Serbia.* Both open-ended and close-ended type (multiple choice questions and scales) questions were used, and the questionnaire consisted from 133 questions. None of the questions were obligatory to fill. The questionnaire was filled out by 1219 participants from the territory of the Republic of Serbia. Differences in answers according

to gender, age and region of permanent residence were compared during the analysis of the gathered data. In certain segments of the research, further tests were conducted and that is emphasized in the text. In the analysis of the data, basic descriptive analyses were used: frequency and cross-tabulations, as well as tests (Independent Samples t Test, One-Way ANOVA, etc.) on the levels of significance  $p < 0,001$ ;  $p < 0,01$ ;  $p < 0,05$ .

**Table 1.**

<b>Research instrument:</b>	<b>Questionnaire</b>
<b>Research technique – data gathering technique:</b>	<b>Online survey</b>
<b>Target population:</b>	<b>Young people from the age of 15 to the age of 30</b>
<b>Sample type:</b>	<b>Stratified based on the variables of age, gender and place of residency</b>
<b>Sample size:</b>	<b>1219</b>
<b>Period of time within the research was conducted:</b>	<b>From 13<sup>th</sup> of May to 31<sup>st</sup> of May 2020</b>
<b>Margin of error with 95% of probability:</b>	<b>For incidence 5% is +/- 1.22; For incidence 10% is +/- 1.68; For incidence 50% is +/- 2.81.</b>
<b>Program used for data processing:</b>	<b>Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS)</b>

The margin of error represents deviation, or in other words a percentual range within which an answer is located which would be obtained if we were able to question the whole population, instead of just a sample of it. The margin of error at this sample is minimal.

Description of the sample:

According to age, i.e. ages of the participants, the questionnaire was filled out by young people of all ages. Those young people were divided into three groups according to their age for the sake of a more organized display of data:

**Table 2.**

<b>Groups</b>	<b>Age range</b>	<b>Percentage of participants (%)</b>
Group 1	The youth from the ages of 15 to the age of 19	32,9
Group 2	The youth from the ages of 20 to the age of 24	34,7
Group 3	The youth from the ages of 25 to the age of 30	32,4

The questionnaire was filled out by 52% of young women and 48% of young men.

**Graph 1. The sample in relation to the variable of gender of participants:  
Women 52% vs. Men 48%**

According to the type of settlement in which participants live, the sample is:

**Table 3.**

Type of settlement	Percentage of participants (%)
City (Belgrade, Novi Sad, Niš, Kragujevac)	39.5
Town	26.8
Municipality with more than 30 000 residents	9.4
Municipality with up to 30 000 residents	11.5
Settlement with less than 10 000 residents	12.8

With regard to the region in which the participants live, they come from:

**Table 4. The sample with regard to the variable of region in which participants live**

Region	Percentage of participants (%)
Region of Vojvodina	26.8
Region of Belgrade	25.5
West and Central Serbia	24.8
East and South Serbia	22.8

According to the level of acquired education, the participants were divided into following categories:

**Graph 2. The sample with regard to the variable the level of acquired education**

**Level of acquired education:**

**Primary school** 24.2

**Vocational high school** 19.7

**High school** 29.4

**College (primary studies)** 13.7

**Higher education institutions/University of applied studies** 5.5

**College (master studies)** 7.3

**PHD** 0.2

### 3. INSTITUTIONAL FRAME

Key institutions and subjects of youth politics are descriptively presented in this chapter of the Alternative report. Basic information about the Ministry responsible for youth politics, Youth sector, Provincial Secretariat for Sports and Youth, youth offices, organizations of the youth and organizations for the youth, unions of associations and Regional Youth Cooperation Office are presented in this chapter. The funding of local youth politics based on the sample of local self-government units are examined as well. This chapter represents an introduction to the institutional frames of youth politics for the readers.

#### 3.1. Ministry of Youth and Sport

Ministry of Youth and Sport is a government department in charge of youth and sport, which was established on 15<sup>th</sup> of May 2007, and the organization of this Ministry has not been changed since. The first Minister of Youth and Sport was Snežana Samardžić-Marković, Alisa Marić came to that position after her, and for the last seven years (from 3<sup>rd</sup> of September, 2013), Vanja Udovičić has been the Minister of Youth and Sport. At the moment of the finalization of this report, it is unknown whether Mr. Udovičić will remain at this position during the fourth Government. Darko Stanić has been the Secretary of State in charge of Youth sector since the end of 2017. **Since the termination of the previous assistant of the Minister Snežana Klačnja at the end of 2018,<sup>15</sup> the Ministry has not had another assistant in charge of the Youth sector ending with the month of May 2020.** It was stated in the previous Alternative report as well that several months of this spot's vacancy prove that systemic care does not exist, and the passage of another year without the selection of a new Minister's assistant can only additionally confirm this statement.

Affairs related to the youth are conducted within the Youth sector, which is within this Ministry.<sup>17</sup>

The Youth Sector:

The Youth sector deals with affairs related to: system, development and improvement of youth politics; implementation of national politics, and preparation and implementation of national strategy for the youth, as well as action plans and programs; encouragement of the youth to organize, unite and participate in social activities; protection of interests of the youth and providing help to the youth in order to accomplish those interests; giving advice to the youth and education of the youth about employment and volunteer work; encouragement of informal education of the youth, cooperation with youth organizations and associations which organize international manifestations and gatherings in Republic Serbia; providing help and cooperation with youth organizations and associations in their work and promotion of youth politics and youth politics

<sup>15</sup> Based on the delivered information according to the Law on Free Access to Information of Public Importance, MOS, Number: 96-00-00021/2019-02

<sup>16</sup> Work informant of Ministry of Youth and Sport, <https://www.mos.gov.rs/public/documents/upload/sport/inspekcija/%20-%20D0%BC%D0%B0%D1%98%20%202020-%D1%9B%D0%B8%D1%80%D0%B8%D0%BB%D0%B8%D1%86%D0%B0.pdf>

<sup>17</sup> Organizational scheme of Ministry of Youth and Sport (<http://www.mos.gov.rs/o-ministarstvu/organizaciona-sema?lang=lat>)

and youth organizations and associations; enabling youth organizations and associations from the Republic of Serbia to participate at gatherings and manifestations for the youth abroad; tracking and assessing the role and position of the youth in Serbia; creating conditions for establishment and work of youth offices; encouragement of the development of youth politics and youth offices at **community levels**; monitoring of implementation of youth politics on all levels of government; as well as other affairs within the scope of the Sector.

There are more narrow/specific inner units within the Youth Sector<sup>18</sup>:

### **Number of employees in the Youth Sector and their structure**

According to the Work Informant which was last updated in May 2020, **there are only nine employees in the Youth Sector in charge of the care for the youth. Eight of them are civil servants – perpetrators and there is one other employee, even though eleven job openings were systematized (one civil servant at the position of the assistant of the Minister is missing and one civil servant at the position of a perpetrator).** The situation remains unchanged in comparison to the last year. The number of employees in the Youth Sector is more than two times less than the number of employees in the Sport Sector (23), and it is 16% of the overall number of employees in the Ministry of Youth and Sport. Having in mind that there is a great number of civil servants in different organs of government, it is more than obvious that the Youth Sector has to expand and, in that way, show clear and unambiguous care for the youth, as well as to enhance the capacities for the realization of youth politics on a national level. According to the systematization in the Youth Sector, there is a position for one civil servant (assistant of the Minister of Youth), and this job opening has been vacant since 12<sup>th</sup> of December 2018.

The information about the salaries of the Ministry's employees are presented in the table which follows, and that information is: in the net amount without the past work, according to certain categories of the employees (vocation and pay grade) and according to the state in the month before the month for which the Work Informant of Ministry of Youth and Sport was updated.

The total budget of the Youth Sector for 2019 was 1,194,049,000 Serbian dinars, and 865,281,000 Serbian dinars from that amount was the fee for social protection from the budget within the Fund for the Young Talents. The rest of the budget of the Youth Sector was only 328,768,000 Serbian dinars. If we take a look at the entire budget of the Ministry of Youth and Sport, the percentage of it which is set aside for the youth is 22.06%, and when fees for social protection from budget within the Fond for the Young Talents, the percentage of budget which is used for the youth is 6.08%. If we take a look at the previous budget of Republic of Serbia, the percentage of the budget which is set aside for the youth through the Ministry of Youth and Sport is 0.09% of the annual republic budget, and if the fees for the social protection from the budget within the Fund for the Young Talents is excluded, the percentage of the budget which is set aside for the youth is 0.03%.<sup>24</sup>

<sup>18</sup> The rule book about systematization by the Ministry of Youth and Sport, <https://www.mos.gov.rs/public/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/Pravilnik-o-sistemizaciji.pdf>

<sup>24</sup> Work Informant of Ministry of Youth and Sport about the budget of the Republic of Serbia for 2019, „Sl. glasnik RS“, no. 95/2018

Ending with 30<sup>th</sup> of September 2019, when the information about the budget in the Work Informant was last updated, 626,992,673 Serbian dinars was realized, i.e. 72.46%. **The information about the budget and the realization of resources for 2020 is not available.**

## THE BUDGET OF MINISTRY OF YOUTH AND SPORT

**Graph 6. The budget of Ministry of Youth and Sport for the year of 2019.**

	The budget of Ministry of Youth and Sport	The budget of the Youth Sector	The budget of the Sport Sector	The budget of the Youth Sector (without the fees)
The budget of Ministry of Youth and Sport	100	22.06	77.94	6.08

**Graph 7. The budget for the youth within the budget of the Republic of Serbia for the 2019 (in percent)**

### BUDGET OF THE REPUBLIC OF SERBIA:

<b>Budget for the youth</b>	<b>vs.</b>	<b>Remaining budget</b>
<b>0.09%</b>		<b>99.91%</b>

Overall sources in the budget of the Autonomous Province of Vojvodina for the youth politics in 2020 are 27,000,000 Serbian dinars (1,194,049,000 Serbian dinars at the level of the Republic), **which is 6%** of the overall sources intended for the Provincial Secretariat for Sports and Youth (450,000,000 Serbian dinars).

**Graph 17. The budget for youth politics within the budget of the Provincial Secretariat for Sports and Youth**

**The budget of the Provincial Secretariat for Sports and Youth: 100%**

**The budget for the youth politics: 6%**

**The budget for the program: The development of the sport system: 64.7%**

**The budget for the program: The development of the sport infrastructure: 15.3%**

**The budget of the Provincial Secretariat for Sport and Sports Medicine: 13.9%**



## Graph 18. The budget for the youth politics within the budget of Autonomous Province of Vojvodina

### The budget of Autonomous Province of Vojvodina

<b>The budget for the Youth</b>	<b>vs.</b>	<b>The remaining budget</b>
0,0349%		99,9651%

Our sample of local government units was based on regional and district representation and within the sample every district is represented with the city or town which is the district center and one municipality from that district. Forty-seven **local government units** were a part of this research. Sixteen municipalities or cities out of those forty-seven local government units (which is around 34%) do not allocate sources aside for the realization of local youth politics (program of budget: 1301-05 The implementation of youth politics).

## Graph 19. Allocations from the budget of local government units for the youth politics

	local government units which do not allocate	local government units which allocate up to 0.1% of the budget	local government units which allocate from 0.1% to 0.2% of the budget	local government units which allocate from 0.2% to 0.5% of the budget	local government units which allocate more than 0.5% of the budget
Allocations from the budget	34.04	36.17	14.89	6.38	6.38

Besides sixteen local government units which do not allocate money for local youth politics, there are seventeen local government units (36,17%) which allocate less than 0.1% of the overall budget for the local youth politics, seven local government units (14,89%) which allocate from 0.1% to 0.2% of the budget for the local youth politics, three local government units (6.38%) which allocate from 0.2% to 0.5% from the overall budget for the local youth politics and three local government units (6.38%) which allocate more than 0.5% from the overall budget for the local youth politics.<sup>89</sup>

<sup>89</sup> Three local government units that allocate the highest percentage of their budget for the budget of the program of local youth politics are: the city of Kragujevac (0.65% of the budget), the city of Leskovac (0.52%) and the municipality of Bogatić (0.67%).

**Table 25. Local government units and the financing of the local youth politics (the budget program: 1301-05 The implementation of the youth politics)**

Local government units	The amount of means in RSD which is allocated for the Implementation of the Youth politics (1301-05)	Percentage of the budget of Local government units which is allocated for the Implementation of the Youth politics (1301-05)
<b>Bor</b>	2810000	0.09
<b>Majdanpek</b>	1900000	0.17
<b>Požarevac</b>	5500000	0.21
<b>Golubac</b>	193000	0.05
<b>Belgrade</b>	75000000	0.06
<b>Zaječar</b>	740000	0.03
<b>Knjaževac</b>	500000	0.04
<b>Sombor</b>	6000000	0.16
<b>Odžaci</b>	0	0
<b>Užice</b>	2400000	0.7
<b>Arilje</b>	0	0
<b>Leskovac</b>	24249000	0.52
<b>Lebane</b>	0	0
<b>Pančevo</b>	8050000	0.15
<b>Alibunar</b>	0	0
<b>Novi Sad</b>	26000000	0.12
<b>Bačka Palanka</b>	0	0
<b>Valjevo</b>	0	0
<b>Šabac</b>	4000000	0.01
<b>Bogatić</b>	5500000	0.67
<b>Čačak</b>	8800000	0.19
<b>Lučani</b>	0	0
<b>Niš</b>	20000000	0.18
<b>Aleksinac</b>	6440000	0.45
<b>Pirot</b>	0	0
<b>Dimitrovgrad</b>	0	0
<b>Smederevo</b>	500000	0.01
<b>Velika Plana</b>	0	0
<b>Paraćin</b>	0	0
<b>Vranje</b>	1400000	0.06
<b>Vladičin Han</b>	700000	0.08
<b>Kruševac</b>	11821000	0.29
<b>Čićevac</b>	0	0
<b>Kraljevo</b>	700000	0.02
<b>Raška</b>	222800	0.02
<b>Kikinda</b>	3785000	0.16
<b>Senta</b>	0	0

<b>Subotica</b>	1500000	0.02
<b>Bačka Topola</b>	50000	0.001
<b>Zrenjanin</b>	0	0
<b>Novi Bečej</b>	200000	0.02
<b>Sremska Mitrovica</b>	2190000	0.07
<b>Indija</b>	750750	0.01
<b>Prokuplje</b>	0	0
<b>Kuršumlija</b>	0	0
<b>Kragujevac</b>	6432000	0.65
<b>Batočina</b>	150000	0.03

Coordinating body for the tracking of occurrences from the field of economic migrations in the Republic of Serbia was established due to the decision of the Government of the Republic of Serbia on 31<sup>st</sup> of January 2019. According to the resolution, the coordinating body directs the work of the organs of the state's government in order to obtain an overview of the state in the field of economic migrations and to find the solution of the improvement of this field, with the goal of prevention of departure of citizens of the Republic of Serbia abroad and encouragement of the return of experts from abroad, as well as the creation of business and economic ambient for the arrival of foreign experts. Besides that, in the scope of Coordinating body's work is the proposal of new solutions in the sense of the improvement of the regulations from the field of economic migrations.

### **Annual report about the progress in the realization of the Action plan**

Annual report about the progress in the realization of the Action plan for the implementation of the National strategy for the youth in 2018 is the most recent report which the Ministry of Youth and Sport has made, in December of 2019.<sup>118</sup> At the same time, this is the first report which refers to the Action plan for the period 2018-2019.

The report followed the implementation of the following strategic goals from the Action plan:

- Strategic goal 1: Improved employability and employment of young women and men
- Strategic goal 2: Improved quality and possibility for acquirement of qualifications and the development of competence and innovation of the youth
- Strategic goal 3: Improved active participation of young women and men in the society
- Strategic goal 4: Improved health and well-being of young women and men
- Strategic goal 5: Improved conditions for the development of security culture of the youth
- Strategic goal 6: Improved support for the social involvement of the youth from the categories in risk of social exclusion
- Strategic goal 7: Improved mobility, extent of international cooperation of the youth and support to young immigrants

<sup>118</sup> Based on the submitted information in accordance with the Law on Free Access to Information of Public Importance, Ministry of Youth and Sport, Number: 96-00-00017/2020-02/1

- Strategic goal 8: Improved system of informing the youth and knowledge about the youth
- Strategic goal 9: Improved use and participation of the youth in the creation of cultural content

For every of these specific goals in the National strategy for the youth, activities, expected results of realization of proposed activities and indicators (quantitative and qualitative) have been determined, based on which the implementation will be tracked, and achieved results will be measured. Based on the Annual report, the following table can be presented:

**Table 27. Results of the fulfillment of the Action plan for 2018 (first part)**

Strategic goals	Number of realized results	Number of expected results	Percentage of realization of results	Number of realized activities
<b>SG1</b>	10	15	66.67%	20
<b>SG2</b>	9	9	100%	19
<b>SG3</b>	13	13	100%	31
<b>SG4</b>	11	12	91.7%	18
<b>SG5</b>	7	9	77.8%	14
<b>SG6</b>	8	8	100%	11
<b>SG7</b>	10	10	100%	14
<b>SG8</b>	8	9	88.9%	13
<b>SG9</b>	5	5	100%	11

**Table 27a. Results of the fulfillment of the Action plan for 2018 (second part)**

Strategic goals	Number of prescribed activities from AP	Percentage of realization of results	Percentage of realization of results	Percentage of realization of indicators
<b>SG1</b>	36	15	55.5%	23.8%
<b>SG2</b>	24	9	79.2%	30.7%
<b>SG3</b>	50	13	62%	40%
<b>SG4</b>	27	12	66.7%	45%
<b>SG5</b>	24	9	58.3%	61%
<b>SG6</b>	14	8	78.6%	24.8%
<b>SG7</b>	18	10	77.8%	38.6%
<b>SG8</b>	28	9	46.4%	36%
<b>SG9</b>	12	5	91.66%	13.1%

## 5. Political participation and relation of political subjects toward the youth

This chapter depicts the picture of the participation of the youth in the political life in Serbia, the political participation of the youth, but also the relation of political subjects and political institutions towards the youth.

### 5.1. The youth in political institutions

According to the last population estimate from the end of 2019 which was published on 1<sup>st</sup> of July of 2019,<sup>119</sup> there are 1,141,016 young people (from the age of 15 to the age of 30) which is 16.47% of the population in Serbia, which is almost exactly one sixth of the population. In the current convocation of the National Assembly of Republic of Serbia which was constituted after the elections on 21<sup>st</sup> of June, twenty-eight Ministers are under the age of thirty, which means that the representation of the youth in this representative body is 11.2% of the overall number of representatives. Electoral lists which have young representatives are: Aleksandar Vučić – „Za našu decu“ – twenty-four young Ministers, Ivica Dačić - „Socijalistička partija Srbije (SPS) – Jedinstvena Srbija (JS) – Dragan Marković Palma“ – two young Ministers, Savez Vojvođanskih Mađara – Ištvan Pastor i SDA Sandžaka – dr Sulejman Ugljanin, which both have one young Ministers.

There were 580 young out of 3,419 candidates on twenty-one different electoral lists on elections which were held this year, which is 16.96% out of the overall number of candidates for Ministers (which is, approximately, the percentage of the youth in the general population). Young people were prominently present as other halves of various electoral lists, but an electoral lists of the youth, i.e. the electoral list of Grupa građana: 1 od 5 miliona, which had seventy-seven young out of ninety-eight candidates on their electoral list, which is 78.57%. When it comes to the number of young people in the National Assembly of Republic of Serbia, the number of 28 young Ministers is the biggest since 2008 and it can be interpreted positively, due to the fact that number was becoming lower and lower from convocation to convocation.

<sup>119</sup>Estimated number of population at the end of 2019, Statistical Office of the Republic of Serbia, <https://www.stat.gov.rs/sr-cyrl/oblasti/stanovnistvo/procene-stanovnistva/>

**Table 28. The number of young people the National Assembly of Republic of Serbia**

Convocation of the National Assembly of Republic of Serbia	The number of young Ministers	Percentage of young people in the National Assembly of Republic of Serbia
2008	22	8.8%
2012	8	3.2%
2014	5	2%
2016	3	1.2%
2019	4	1.6%
2020	28	11.2%

**Source: The National Assembly of Republic of Serbia and Republic Electoral Commission<sup>120</sup>**

In the previous Government of Republic of Serbia, none of the Ministers nor the member of the Government belonged to the category of young people. The report was written and closed before the formation of the new Government of Republic of Serbia which will be formed according to the results of the 2020 elections. When it comes to young people in the Government of Republic of Serbia in the last fifteen years, only two Ministers were younger than the age of thirty. The first one is Nikola Selaković who became the Minister of Justice and Public administration in the first Government of Ivica Dačić which was formed in 2012. The second one is Lazar Krstić, who became the Minister of finances in the second Government of Ivica Dačić which was formed in 2013.<sup>121</sup>

Our research has shown that young people are more interested in politics and political occurrences than they were last year. When asked “How much are you interested in political occurrences?” on a scale from one to five (1 – not interested at all, 5 – very interested), the average answer of the participants of the research was 3.46. People who responded with fours and fives make 52.5% of participants, while on the other hand less than 10% (9.1%) are not interested in politics at all (answered with one).

**Graph 20. Interest of the youth in political occurrences (in percentage)**

Not interested at all	2017	2018	2019	2020
1	9.8	10.4	18.6	9.1
2	14.2	13.5	13.6	13.9
3	15.2	24.2	22.2	24.5
4	29.4	20	21.3	27.3
5	31.4	27.9	24.2	25.2
Very interested				

<sup>120</sup> The National Assembly of Republic of Serbia, <http://www.parlament.gov.rs/narodna-skupstina-.871.html>

<sup>121</sup> Source of data for the composition of government of the Republic of Serbia: [https://whogoverns.eu/cabinets/?view=epoca\\_pais&id=7&codigo=rs](https://whogoverns.eu/cabinets/?view=epoca_pais&id=7&codigo=rs)

Even though there are no statistically significant differences in the responses, it has to be emphasized that there are differences between average values of the answers (mark). Young men are more interested in political occurrences than young women (the average mark of 3.6 versus 3.32). When it comes to the region from which the young people come, the Belgrade youth (3.59) and the youth from Vojvodina (3.53) are more interested than the youth from other parts of Serbia (3.3)

In comparison to the previous year, the number of young people who chose the answer “not interested at all” has decreased by almost 10%.

Young people mostly get informed through the Internet and web portals (76.5%) and social networks (73.6), while television (51.5%) is present in slightly more than half of the cases. 44.3% of young people get informed through their families and friends, while 15% of young people get informed by reading daily newspapers.

**Table 30. The way in which young people get informed about political occurrences in percentage (%)**

<b>The way of getting informed</b>	<b>2018</b>	<b>2019</b>	<b>2020</b>
Television	49.1	47.6	51.1
Daily newspapers	26.4	17.7	15
Social networks	69.8	62.2	73.6
Internet (web portals)	71.3	62.6	76.5
Applications of informative portals	19.8	15.9	21
Friends and family	39.3	35.7	44.3

When asked “How much does the political system in Serbia allows young people to influence political processes and decisions?” on a scale from one to five (1 – does not allow at all, 5 – allows completely), the average answer of the participants of the research was 1.64. Only 0.7% of young participants consider that the political system completely allows the influence of the youth onto political processes. Even though there are no statistically significant differences in relation to age, gender or the region in which the participants live, there are differences among average marks in relation to the age of the participant. So, the youngest participants (from the age of 15 to the age of 19) had the average answer of 1.71, while the oldest young people (from the age of 25 to the age of 30) had the average answer of 1.59.

## Graph 22. The influence of the young people on the political processes and decisions (%)

### The influence of the young people on the political processes and decisions in 2020

Does not allow at all	1	2	3	4	5	Completely allows
	53.5%	33.4%	10%	2.4%	0.7%	

When asked “Do you vote?”, 40% of young people who have the right to vote said that they vote on a regular basis, while 27.6% of young people answered that they vote occasionally. 32.4% of young people never votes.

## Graph 23. Do you vote (in percentage, the young people who have the right to vote)?

### Do you vote?

2018	2019	2020	2018	2019	2020	2018	2019	2020
<b>I vote on a regular basis</b>			<b>I vote occasionally</b>			<b>I never vote</b>		
32.4	40	54.5	31	27.6	22.9	36.6	32.4	22.6

In comparison with the previous year, a larger number of young people answered that they vote on a regular basis, and the number of young people who said that they never vote dropped significantly. There is a statistically significant difference<sup>125</sup> between the answers of young people from Belgrade and other regions (especially between Central and West Serbia and East and South Serbia), and young people from Belgrade vote on a more regular basis. There are also statistically significant differences concerning the gender of participants since young women vote on a more regular basis than young men.

We asked whether young people think that elections in Serbia are fair and independent, and only around 5% of participants consider that they are.

<sup>125</sup>The places where the tests showed statistically significant differences are state throughout the text.



### Graph 30. Are elections in Serbia fair and independent?

**5% - YES.; 18% - I CANNOT ASSESS.; 77% - NO.**

The high majority (more than three quarters) of young people in Serbia does not trust any politician. We asked “Is there a politician who you trust?”, and the answers were following:

### Graph 30. Is there a politician who you trust?

	YES	NO
<b>2017</b>	24	76
<b>2018</b>	17	83
<b>2019</b>	19	81
<b>2020</b>	23.5	76.5

In comparison with the previous year, the number of young people (4.5%) who answered that there is a politician who they trust was increased. There are a statistically significant differences in answers between young men and women, since a larger number of men claimed to trust a politician than young women did.

In the research, we questioned the trust that young people have in certain institutions. We asked young people to evaluate their level of trust in certain institutions on a scale from 1 to 5 (1 – no trust at all, 5 – complete trust) and the average answers were:

**Table 36. The trust of young people in certain institutions**

Institution	2017	2018	2019	2020
Army	2.9	2.8	2.9	2.88
Police	* <sup>126</sup>	2.3	2.4	2.11
Media	*			
Youth offices	2.6	2.55	2.5	2.37
Ministry of Youth and Sport	2.3	2.1	2.2	2.12
Ministry of Education, Science and Technological Development	*	1.9	1.95	1.90
Ministry of Health	*	*	*	2.00
Church	2.2	2.1	2.4	2.6
Mayor	1.9	1.65	1.7	1.67
the National Assembly of Republic of Serbia	1.7	1.5	1.6	1.52
Government of Republic of Serbia	1.7	1.5	1.6	1.59
President of the Government of Republic of Serbia	1.7	1.5	1.6	1.51
The president	1.6	1.5	1.6	1.56
Political parties	1.5	1.3	1.4	1.35

First conclusion that can be drawn is that **young people do not have trust in any of the institutions which were in question in this research (<3.00)**. None of the institution has the average mark over 3, which implies that young people are completely distrustful and that they feel neglected. Political parties, media and political institutions (the President of the Republic, President of the Government of Republic of Serbia, the Government, the National Assembly, and mayors of cities and municipalities from which the participants come from) stand out by the lowest marks. On the other hand, **institutions for young people (Ministry of Youth and Sport, and Youth offices) have slightly higher marks than average** (institutions which were established for the sake of the youth and which are supposed to work on the improvement of the position of the youth) **marks of most of the other institutions**.

In comparison to last year, trust levels decreased in almost all of the institutions (with the exception of Church).

We also researched **the trust that young people have in individuals which are in charge of some of key institutions**. The average marks are shown in the graph below.

<sup>126</sup> It was not included in the research.

**Table 3. Trust of young people in individuals**

Individual	2018	2019	2020
<b>Patriarch Irinej</b>	2,1	2,2	2,40
<b>Aleksandar Vulin</b>	1,2	1,3	1,28
<b>Nebojša Stefanović</b>	1,3	1,4	1,37
<b>Maja Gojković</b>	1,3	1,3	1,32
<b>Ana Brnabić</b>	1,6	1,6	1,57
<b>Aleksandar Vučić</b>	1,7	1,6	1,56
<b>Vanja Udovičić</b>	2	2	1,92
<b>Mladen Šarčević</b>	*	*	1,42
<b>Zlatibor Lončar</b>	*	*	1,45

If we compare the average marks of institutions and individuals which are in charge of those institutions, it is evident that the differences between them are very small in almost all cases, except in relation to institutions of army and police and Ministers who are in charge of those institutions (army – 2.88, Minister of defense Aleksandar Vulin – 1.28; police – 2.11, Minister of internal relations Nebojša Stefanović – 1.37). Minor differences are in relation to Church – 2.60 and Patriarch Irinej – 2.40; as well as the National Assembly – 1.52 and its president Maja Gojković – 1.32; as well as the Ministry of Youth and sport – 2.12 and its Minister Vanja Udovičić – 1.92; Ministry of Education, Science and Technological Development – 1.90 and its Minister Mladen Šarčević – 1.42; and Ministry of Health – 2.00 and its Minister Zlatibor Lončar – 1.45.

## 6. VALUES OF THE YOUTH

In this chapter, attitudes and values of young people in Serbia were researched. The goal of this chapter is to present how young people perceive democracy, leadership, some basic ideological positions, as well as attitudes towards the problem of Kosovo, NATO, foreign policy and how they perceive European Union and the process of European integrations in Serbia. We asked young people whether democracy is the best form of political governance and the following results were obtained:

### **Graph 32. The attitude of the youth towards democracy.**

**Is democracy the best form of political governance?**

**45% - YES; 29% - NO; 26% - I DO NOT KNOW**

If we compare these results with the ones obtained last year, the level of trust in democracy as a form of political governance has increased. However, the growth of the level is significantly smaller than the growth between the previous year in relation to the years before the last.

### Graph 33. Comparison of results concerning the relation towards democracy

Is democracy best form of political governance?

	YES	NO	I DO NOT KNOW
<b>2017</b>	33	32	35
<b>2018</b>	30	35	35
<b>2019</b>	43.3	30.5	26.2
<b>2020</b>	45.5	28.6	25.9

We asked young people whether they think that Serbia needs a strong leader whom the people will follow, and we obtained the following results:

### Graph 34. Relationship of young people with leadership and leaders

Do you consider that Serbia needs a strong leader whom the people will follow?

**56% - YES; 31% - NO; 13% - I DO NOT KNOW**

This information does not coincide with the previously mentioned increment of trust in democracy as the best form of governance even though the percentage of young people who support a strong leader decreased by about 3% in comparison to last year.

### GRAPH 35. Comparison of results concerning the relationship towards leadership and guidance

Do you consider that Serbia needs a strong leader whom the people will follow?

	YES	NO	I DO NOT KNOW
<b>2017</b>	39	46	15
<b>2018</b>	48.6	39.4	12
<b>2019</b>	58.8	30.6	10.6
<b>2020</b>	55.6	31.5	12.9

We wanted to investigate the relationship towards gender equality among young people through attitude statements from: 1 – I completely disagree, to 5 – I completely agree.

**Table 49. Agreement with the claims about gender equality**

CLAIMS	The average mark of the answer	Women	Men	Differences between answers <sup>146</sup>
Women in Serbia earn less than men when it comes to same jobs.	3.14	3.81	2.41	(1) (3) <sup>147</sup>
It is still a woman's job to take care of the children and the house.	3.85	4.22	3.45	(1)
People from Serbia are less likely to accept a woman in a position of power than a man.	3.92	4.45	3.35	(1) (3)
Present Government of Serbia is doing enough when it comes to the protection of women's rights.	2.43	2.21	2.57	(1) (2) <sup>148</sup>
Quotes for women, for example in parliament, will help the improvement of their position.	2.77	3.11	2.39	(1) (2)
There are men's and women's occupations.	2.82	2.35	3.34	(1)
A husband and a wife should divide the house chores.	4.43	4.72	4.12	(1)
Women who put their careers in front of their family lives are selfish.	2.27	1.71	2.89	(1) (3)
In today's society, women are equally free as men are.	3.17	2.61	3.79	
In the cases of rape, it is possible that the woman is also guilty.	2.09	1.62	2.60	(1) (2) (3)

<sup>146</sup> (1) There is a statistically significant difference between the answers of young men and women.  
 (2) There is a statistically significant difference between the answers of different age groups.  
 (3) There is a statistically significant difference between the answers of participants from different.

<sup>147</sup> Young people from West and Central Serbia are significantly less in agreeance with the claims that women earn less in comparison to the youth from Belgrade and Vojvodina. Also, young people from West and Central Serbia are significantly less in agreeance with the claims that women are less likely to be accepted as an authority figure in comparison to young people from Belgrade. Young people from West and Central Serbia are more in agreeance that women who put their careers in front of starting a family are selfish than the youth from Belgrade and Vojvodina. The youth from the South and East Serbia are significantly more in agreeance with the claim that it is possible that the woman has a part of the guilt in the cases of rape, which is different from the youth of Belgrade.

<sup>148</sup> Young people from the youngest age group (from the age of 15 to the age of 19) differentiate in answers in comparison to other to groups, and they gave higher marks when it came to the question whether the Government of Serbia is doing enough to protect women's rights, as well as that quotes improve the position of women. Also, they consider, significantly more, that the woman can have a part of the guilt in cases of rape.

These results show that young women and young men have significantly different perceptions about the position of women in Serbia and about gender equality. Young women consider significantly more that the position of genders is not equal and that women are discriminated. There are differences between the ages of the participants since the young participants grade the politics of the Government more positively, but the fact that they consider that it is possible that the woman can be guilty in some cases of rape is concerning. Young people from West and Central Serbia are less in accordance with young people from Belgrade and Vojvodina in some claims – by which they show that they are less capable of recognizing problems which women face (income, authority, starting of a family). This year, we also wanted to question young people and their attitudes towards LGBTQ people and their rights. We presented them with attitude statements in order to investigate their relationship towards certain situations and they were supposed to answer how would they feel in those situations from marks from 1 to 5 (1- I would not mind at all; 5 – I would mind it very much).

**Table 50. Agreement with claims about LGBTQ population**

<b>CLAIM</b>	<b>Average mark of the answer</b>	<b>Differences among answers <sup>149</sup></b>
<b>Is a member of LGBTQ population your superior at work?</b>	2.18	(1) <sup>150</sup> (3) <sup>151</sup>
<b>Is a member of LGBTQ population your child's teacher?</b>	2.48	(1)(3)
<b>Is a member of LGBTQ population your neighbor?</b>	1.82	(1)(3)
<b>Are members of LGBTQ population more present in media?</b>	2.64	(1)(3)
<b>Is there a gay parade in your city/town?</b>	3.05	(3)
<b>How would you feel if same sex marriages became legal?</b>	2.74	(1)
<b>How would you feel if same sex couples were allowed to adopt children?</b>	2.98	(3)

<sup>149</sup>1) There is a statistically significant difference between the answers of young men and women.  
 (2) There is a statistically significant difference between the answers of different age groups.  
 (3) There is a statistically significant difference between the answers of participants from different.

<sup>150</sup>Statistically significant differences in answers between men and women exist in 5 out of 7 claims. The average value of women's answers is not higher than 2.52 (the question about gay parade has the highest value); on the other hand, the lowest value of men's answers is 3.12 (about a LGBTQ member being a teacher).

<sup>151</sup>There are statistically significant differences between young people from West, Central, South and East Serbia in comparison to the youth from Belgrade and Vojvodina for all of the claims. Young people from Vojvodina have the lowest average marks for almost all of the claims. Differences between Belgrade and the other two regions are slightly lower for certain questions.

The answers of the young people to these claims showed us that there is a great division among young people when it comes to LGBTQ population. Marks of the first four claims are significantly below the average mark of 3, but the average marks are close or above three when it comes to the holding of gay parades, legalization of the same sex marriages and adoption of children. Particularly significant are the differences between answers of young women and men, and between the regions of Vojvodina and Belgrade in comparison with West, Central, South and East Serbia. The answers of young women and the youth from Vojvodina and Belgrade have significantly lower values.

We asked young people whether the introduction of quotas for the youth in institution is necessary in order to secure their participation in the decision making. More than three fifths of young people consider it necessary.

We asked young people what is **their first reaction to the term of European Union**, and the answers show that there **neutral and negative responses are more frequent**, and that there is only 18% of young people respond positively to it.

### **Graph 39. Attitudes of the youth toward European Union**

**When you hear European Union – is your first reaction to the term:**

**Negative 41%; Neutral 41%; Positive 18%**

If we compare these results with the ones from the previous years, it is evident that in the meantime the number of young people who perceives European Union as something positive has lowered from 26% to 18%. Also, the number of young people who have negative reaction increased from 28% to 41%.

### **Graph 40. Comparison of results from previous years in relation to the perception towards European Union**

	<b>POSITIVE</b>	<b>NEGATIVE</b>	<b>NEUTRAL</b>
<b>2017</b>	26	28	46
<b>2018</b>	26.6	33.5	39.8
<b>2019</b>	22.9	34.8	42.3
<b>2020</b>	18	40.9	41.1

When the participants were asked whether they will support the entrance of Serbia into the European Union, 33% of the young people is supportive, 46% is against it, and 21% stated that they do not know.

### **Graph 41. Attitudes of the youth towards the road of Serbia towards the EU**

**Do you support the entrance of Serbia into the EU?**

**46% - NO, 33% - YES, 21% - I DO NOT KNOW**

If we compare these results with the ones from previous years, it becomes evident that in the meantime **the number of young people who support the entrance into the EU has decreased by almost 10%**, and that the number of the ones which do not support the entrance into the EU has increased by 14%.

**Table 51. Attitudes towards membership in the EU in relation to the region**

**Do you support the entrance into the EU?**

REGION	YES	NO	I DO NOT KNOW
The region of Belgrade	38.0%	42.7%	19.3%
The region of Vojvodina	32.2%	43.8%	24.0%
The region of East and South Serbia	32.3%	45.4%	22.3%
The region of West and Central Serbia	28.2%	52.4%	19.4%
Total:	32.7%	46.0%	21.3%

**Graph 42. Comparison of results from previous years in relation to the entrance of Serbia into the EU**

	YES	NO	I DO NOT KNOW
2017	42	32	26
2018	42.5	37.8	19.7
2019	37.9	39.8	22.3
2020	32.7	46	21.3

We also asked young people to tell us why do they think Serbia still has not became a member of the European Union, and the two most common answers were because Serbia does not want to recognize Kosovo as a sovereign state (58.4%), and because Serbia has not implemented all the necessary reforms for the membership (52.6%).

**Graph 45. Why has not Serbia become a member of the European Union**

**19.8% - Because the EU does not want to accept new members.**

**58.4% - Because Serbia does not want to recognize Kosovo as a sovereign state**

**43% - Because Serbia does not want to give up on the good relations with Russia.**

**52.6% - Because Serbia has not implemented all the necessary reforms that the EU requires.**

**49.7% - Because Serbia does not meet the criteria of democracy and the rule of law.**

**10.2% - I do not know.**



We asked young people for their opinion about on who should Serbia mostly rely when it comes to the creation of its foreign policy, and these are the answers:

#### **Graph 46. Attitudes of young people towards foreign policy of Serbia:**

**In your opinion, Serbia should create its foreign policy by relying on:**

**USA: 2%; China: 13%; Other: 14%; I do not know: 20%; Russia: 30%; EU: 21%**

If we compare these results with the ones from the previous year, we can notice that the results concerning the EU remained almost the same. We can also notice that the percentage of people who consider that Serbia should rely on Russia dropped even though most young people in Serbia think that Serbia should chiefly rely on Russia (29.9%). There is also a noticeable growth when it comes to answers concerning the influence of China (13%).

This year we wanted to examine the attitudes of the youth about Kosovo, as well as about NATO. We asked them “In your opinion, what should Serbia do about Kosovo?” and we got the following answers:

#### **Graph 48. Attitudes towards Kosovo**

**2.5% - Maintain the current state**

**36.3% - To continue on working on revoking recognitions of other states of Kosovo as a sovereign state**

**5.6% - To recognize Kosovo as a sovereign state**

**15.6% - To recognize Kosovo as a sovereign state, but with different borders so that majority of Serbian population who live in Kosovo ends up in Serbia**

**9.8% - Not to recognize Kosovo as a sovereign state, but to make a compromise about certain things, like about the membership of Kosovo in international organizations**

**20.6% - To work on making peace between Serbian and Albanian people, and to set aside the matter of Kosovo’s independence for now**

**9.5% - Other**

The majority of young people consider that Serbia should keep on working on revoking recognitions of other states of Kosovo as a sovereign state (36.3%). 20.6% percent of young people consider that Serbia should work on making peace between Serbian and Albanian people and to set aside the question of independence for now, while 15.6% of young people consider that Serbia should recognize Kosovo as a sovereign state, but with some changes when it comes to borders so that majority of Serbian population who live in Kosovo ends up in Serbia.

We also asked young people whether Serbia should join NATO and the results are:

### Graph 49. Attitudes of the youth towards Serbia joining NATO

**59% - No, Serbia should not have any kind of relations with NATO.**

**22% - No, but I do support Serbia's cooperation with NATO.**

**13% - I do not know.**

**6% - Yes.**

Almost two thirds of young people consider that Serbia should not have any relations with NATO, while only 6% support Serbia joining NATO. Concerning differences between answers to the previous three questions, there is a statistically significant difference among answers of young women concerning the matter of Kosovo, and among different age groups in relation to Kosovo (from the age of 20 to the age of 24 and from the age of 25 to the age of 30) and NATO (differences between the age group from the age of 15 to the age of 19 and other two age groups). Also, there are differences concerning the region in which the participants live when it comes to Kosovo matter (differences between the regions of West and Central Serbia as opposed to Belgrade and Vojvodina).

We asked young people which devices do they use to inform themselves on various matters. As we can observe from their answers, the majority of the youth uses their mobile phones as an informing device (97.9%). Then, 60.2% of them uses laptops and 51.9% watches television.

### Graph 50. Which devices do you use to inform yourselves? (in percentage)

	Mobile phone	Television	Desktop computer	Laptop	Newspapers	Tablet	Radio
<b>2018</b>	93.5	45.9	33.1	65.5	24.9	11.6	
<b>2019</b>	96.5	44.3	29.8	51.6	15.9	9.6	
<b>2020</b>	97.9	51.9	30.9	60.2	14.5	9.4	24

We asked young people on which social networks do they have profiles. Most of them have Instagram (93.9%) and Facebook (92.1%) profiles.

### Graph 58. On which social networks do you have a profile? (in percentage)

	Facebook	Instagram	Twitter	TikTok	YouTube	LinkedIn
<b>2018</b>	90.1	73.2	32.9		66.7	31.3
<b>2019</b>	89.9	91.3	31.3		70.3	20.6
<b>2020</b>	92.1	93.9	34.4	23.3	72.1	22.7

We asked young people which communication applications do they use, and the majority of them uses Direct Messages on Instagram (85.6%), then Viber messages (83.4%), Facebook messenger (78.4%) and WhatsApp (75.4%)

**Graph 59. What applications do you use to communicate? (in percentage)**

	WhatsApp	Viber	Telegram	Signal	Wire	Skype	Zoom	Snapchat	Facebook Messenger	Instagram DM
<b>2018</b>	62.9	79	6.6	2.2		31.7		9		
<b>2019</b>	72.1	74.4	4.6	2.4		17.3		19.7	78.2	82.6
<b>2020</b>	75.4	83.4	9.5	3	0.3	19.7	21.1	26	78.4	85.6

## 8. THE YOUTH AND JOB MARKET

This chapter deals with the examination of the position of the youth at the job market. **One of the biggest problem of the youth is unemployment.** According to the official data by the National employment service<sup>169</sup>, **the number of unemployed young people in May of 2020 is 104,702 which is 20.02% of the overall number of unemployed people in Serbia.** That means that practically one fifth of unemployed people in the Republic of Serbia are young people from the age of 15 to the age of 30.

**Table 60. Number of unemployed young people organized by their age groups since 2014**

Year	Number of unemployed young people	From the age of 15 to the age of 19	From the age of 20 to the age of 24	From the age of 25 to the age of 30
<b>2014</b>	196,260	20,666	77,484	98,110
<b>2015</b>	183,602	19,242	72,973	91,387
<b>2016</b>	171,245	17,765	66,919	86,561
<b>2017</b>	146,843	14,472	56,569	75,802
<b>2018</b>	123,686	12,934	46,654	64,098
<b>2019</b>	114,679	10,979	43,690	60,010
<b>2020</b>	104,702	10,711	38,902	55,702

Source: National employment service

These data show that the number of unemployed young people dropped about around 10,000 in comparison to last year, which is around 9%.

<sup>169</sup> National employment service, Monthly statistical newsletter – May, 2020, No. 213.  
[http://www.nsz.gov.rs/live/digitalAssets/15/15172\\_bilten\\_nsz\\_-\\_maj\\_2020.pdf](http://www.nsz.gov.rs/live/digitalAssets/15/15172_bilten_nsz_-_maj_2020.pdf)

**Table 61. Number of unemployed young people in May 2020 organized by their gender and age groups**

Overall number of unemployed young people in May 2020 – 104,702	From the age of 15 to the age of 19		From the age of 20 to the age of 24		From the age of 25 to the age of 30	
	M	F	M	F	M	F
	5,792	4,919	18,452	20,450	27,512	27,572

Source: National employment service

These data show that there is slightly more young women (from the age of 20 to the age of 24) who are unemployed than unemployed young men, as well as that there is almost the same number of unemployed young men and women (from the age of 25 to the age of 29) which was not the case in previous years because there was a significantly bigger number of unemployed women in that age category.

**Table 62. Number of unemployed young people in organized by the region they live in and the percentual share of unemployed youth in total unemployment**

Region	Number of unemployed youth (from the age of 15 to the age of 30)	Percentage of unemployed youth in overall unemployment
The region of Belgrade	11,095	15.99%
The region of Vojvodina	19,570	18.53%
The region of Central and West Serbia	36,871	20.33%
The region of East and South Serbia	30,765	21.31%
The region of Kosovo and Metohija	6,401	29.56%

Source: National employment service

This information shows that there are no significant differences when it comes to the and the percentual share of unemployed youth in total unemployment, except in the region of Kosovo and Metohija, as it was the case in previous years.

**Table 62. Percentual share of unemployed youth organized by the region they live in in relation to the overall number of unemployed youth**

Region	Number of unemployed youth (from the age of 15 to the age of 30)	Percentual share of unemployed youth in relation to the overall number of unemployed youth
The region of Belgrade	11,095	10.60%
The region of Vojvodina	19,570	18.69%
The region of Central and West Serbia	36,871	35.22%
The region of East and South Serbia	30,765	29.38%
The region of Kosovo and Metohija	6,401	6.11%
<b>Total</b>	<b>104,702</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Source: National employment service**

This data shows that **more than a third of unemployed youth lives in the region of Central and West Serbia**, as it was the case in previous years. A slightly less percentage of unemployed youth is from the region of South and East Serbia, and significantly less percentage from Vojvodina. The lowest percentage of unemployed young people are from Belgrade and Kosovo and Metohija.

Due to the fact that salary is the most important factor, which is not surprising, it is important to investigate what salary is considered enough for a somewhat decent life in Serbia. **A very low number of young people would settle with a salary lower than 65,000 Serbian dinars, and the majority of them consider everything between 65,000 and 100,000 Serbian dinars enough to have a decent life in Serbia. However, the average salary in Serbia in April was 58,932 Serbian dinars.**<sup>171</sup> The differences between the expectations of the youth and reality are an important explanatory factor for their dissatisfaction with the standard of living in Serbia.

**Graph 62. What is considered a good salary in order to live comfortably?**

**35 – 50,000 RSD – 1.3%**

**50 – 65,000 RSD – 9.7%**

**65 – 80,000 RSD – 34%**

**80 – 100,000 RSD – 33.4%**

**100 – 150,000 RSD – 17%**

**More than 150,000 RSD – 4.6%**

<sup>171</sup> Statistical Office of the Republic of Serbia, <https://www.stat.gov.rs/sr-latn/vesti/20200625-prosecne-zarade-po-zaposlenom-april-2020/?s=2403>

Also, we asked young people to rate their impressions about the importance of the following factors when it comes to getting a job in Serbia on a scale from 1 to 5 (1 – Not important at all, 5 – Very important). It is devastating that **young people believe that the most important factors when it comes to getting a job are personal and family acquaintances and connections, as well as membership and activism in a political party. An adequate formal or informal education come after those factors.**

**Table 67. How important is it when getting a job?**

<b>How important is it?</b>	<b>2017</b>	<b>2018</b>	<b>2019</b>	<b>2020</b>
<b>Formal education – a degree of an educational institution</b>	3.7	3.2	3.1	3.19
<b>Personal and family acquaintances and connections</b>	3.9	4.4	4.3	4.38
<b>Membership and activism in a political party</b>	3.4	4.3	4.1	4.23
<b>Informal education</b>	*	3.2	3.1	3.17
<b>Membership in a nongovernment organization</b>	*	*	*	3.03
<b>Previous volunteering</b>	*	*	*	2.89

However, this year there is **a noticeable decrease in the number of young people who would move out of the country.** Last year, that percentage was 64%, and now that number is lower by 10% which is a significant difference. However, it is questionable whether young people changed their attitudes towards the standard of living in Serbia in the meantime. When they were asked about their reasons for staying, only 12% of them said their reason for staying is that it is possible to lead a decent life even in Serbia. The question what influenced the youth to change their attitudes arises, and that information could be of significance for the creators of politics for keeping the Serbian youth in Serbia.

**Graph 63. Are you planning to move out of Serbia?**

**53% - YES; 47% - NO**

**Graph 64. Why would you move out of the country?**

<b>A more dignified life</b>	36%
<b>Better public services</b>	5%
<b>Higher standard of living</b>	25%
<b>More freedom</b>	5%
<b>Better surrounding to start a family</b>	6%
<b>Bigger chances for employment</b>	10%
<b>Other</b>	13%

### Graph 64. Why would not you move out of the country?

<b>I do not want to live anywhere else</b>	35%
<b>Because of my family and friends</b>	33%
<b>Because of a language barrier</b>	5%
<b>I can live completely decent in Serbia</b>	12%
<b>Other</b>	15%

When they were asked in which country would they move to, highest on the list were the countries of West Europe with 58% of overall answers, followed by the USA with 16%, Russia with 8%, and lastly other regional countries.

### Graph 64. Where would you move to?

<b>West Europe</b>	58%
<b>To the countries of the region</b>	5%
<b>Russia</b>	8%
<b>The USA</b>	16%
<b>Other</b>	13%

Almost all of the young people have travelled at least once out of Serbia, and two thirds of them (66%) can afford to travel at least once a year.

We asked the youth whether they are willing to do other jobs until they manage to find a job in their professional domain. A vast majority of the youth, **93% of them is willing to do other jobs until they find an adequate one**, reasoning it by saying that they would work because they have to – 30%, and 15% of them would not work on a job like that for a period of time longer than six months. Only 4% would not work at all, and 3% said that they do not now, which leads to the conclusion that the youth in Serbia is not picky when it comes to jobs and that they would work wherever they got a chance, just like it was concluded in the previous report.

### Graph 79. Are you willing to do other jobs?

<b>Yes</b>	48%
<b>I do not know</b>	3%
<b>No</b>	4%
<b>Yes, but not for longer than six months</b>	15%
<b>Yes, because I have to</b>	30%

We asked young people whether they are willing to get overqualified if there is not any need on the job market for their educational profile, and almost two thirds of the youth is willing to do it. The impression that young people will do everything in their power to get a job and that **they are willing to adapt to market conditions, from getting a job outside their field of expertise to the willingness to get overqualified, as well as to wait for a job, etc.**, remains unchanged.

### Graph 80. Would you be willing to get overqualified if there is no demand for your educational profile on the job market?

63% - Yes; 17% - No; 20% - I do not know.

## 10. THE YOUTH AND ACTIVISM

We asked young people what are **the biggest problems of the society** in which they live. In 2020, young people made the following list of problems: 1. Unemployment, 2. Value system; 3. Educational system.

If we compare the results from previous years, it becomes evident that unemployment was considered the biggest problem once again, while the percentage of the small impact on decision making had a significant growth.

**Table 74. The biggest problems of the youth presented in percentage**

<b>Problem</b>	<b>2017</b>	<b>2018</b>	<b>2019</b>	<b>2020</b>
<b>Unemployment</b>	89.1	83.1	74.7	80.3
<b>Educational system</b>	77.9	69.0	70.2	69.1
<b>Value system</b>	76.4	79.6	76	75.5
<b>Corruption</b>	50.4	55.9	54.7	51.7
<b>Small impact on decision making</b>	47.5	48.5	39.7	55.1
<b>Hopelessness</b>	41.8	48.3	43.1	43.7
<b>Lack of cultural manifestations/events</b>	35.1	34.2	44.3	43.8
<b>Safety</b>	18.4	26.7	31.2	26.8
<b>Lack of solidarity</b>	*	*	*	47.9
<b>Lack of tolerance in the society</b>	*	*	*	56.2
<b>Lack of freedom of expression in society</b>	*	*	*	48.7

We asked young people whether they were members of any association of citizens and 23.9% of them participate in society through associations.

We also asked young people whether they have participated in any of the following activities in the last year:

**Table 75. Activism of the youth**

<b>Activity</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
<b>Protest organized by political parties</b>	14.2
<b>Protest organized by associations</b>	28.5
<b>Signing of a petition</b>	69.7
<b>Participation in tribunes</b>	36.1



We asked young people whether they are aware of the existence of the Youth Law and the results show that 33.8% of the youth know about it, which is significantly more than the last year's 19%.

### **Graph 85. Have you heard about the Youth Law?**

**34% - Yes; 66% - No.**

Just a little more than a fifth of young people has heard about KOMS.

## **12. SAFETY AND HEALTH OF THE YOUTH**

In this chapter, findings about the various perspectives of the youth on safety problems, their causes and reactions on various safety situations are presented. Via a questionnaire, we asked young people whether they are or whether they were exposed to any form of violence, and the results show that **more than a third of young people have experienced digital violence (cyber bullying)**.

### **Graph 95. Exposure to digital violence (cyber bullying)**

**Were you exposed to digital violence? 38% - yes; 62% - no.**

### **Graph 96. Exposure to physical or verbal violence**

	<b>NO</b>	<b>YES</b>
<b>2017</b>	53	47
<b>2018</b>	41.1	58.9
<b>2019</b>	33	67
<b>2020</b>	35.5	64.5

We asked young people how do they perceive causes of violence and what of the following influences the growth of violence among the youth in their opinion. They were asked to rate them on a scale from 1 to 5 (1 – Does not affect it at all, 5 – Greatly affects it). The youth recognized the following as causes of violence in Serbia: 1. Family relations; 2. Absence and decline of social values in Serbia; 3. Social relations which promote violence and the general state of society.

**Table 79. Average answers of participants concerning the causes of violence**

The cause	2017	2018	2019	2020	Differences between answers <sup>187</sup>
Promotion of violent people in media	4.3	4.0	4.0	3.99	(1) <sup>188</sup> (2) <sup>189</sup>
Family relations	4.4	4.4	4.4	4.39	(1)(3) <sup>190</sup>
Poverty	3.9	3.9	3.8	3.95	(2)
Nationalism and national intolerance	4.2	4.0	4.1	40.6	(1)
Discrimination of vulnerable groups (LGBTQ, Gipsy people, etc.)	4.1	3.9	3.9	3.98	(1)(2)
Alcohol and drug consumption	3.9	3.8	3.9	3.87	(1)(2)
Video games	2.8	2.6	2.7	2.57	
Weapon	3.7	3.3	3.4	3.47	(1)(3)
Social relations which promote violence	4.2	4.2	4.3	4.27	(1)(2)
General state of society	4.3	4.3	4.2	4.27	(1)(2)
Bad penal policy toward violent people	4.6	4.3	4.2	4.29	(1)(2)
Repression of police authorities	3.8	3.7	3.8	3.93	(1)(2)
Absence and decline of social values in Serbia	4.5	4.3	4.3	4.37	(1)
Fan groups of sport clubs and sport fanatics	*	3.7	3.8	3.79	(2)(3)

<sup>187</sup> (1) There is a statistically significant difference between the answers of young men and women.

(2) There is a statistically significant difference between the answers of different age groups.

(3) There is a statistically significant difference between the answers of participants from different regions.

<sup>188</sup> Young women have more average answers for all of the listed causes.

<sup>189</sup> The older the participants are, the higher the percentage of answers for all of the listed causes is and there are significant differences between the answers of the participants.

<sup>190</sup> Concerning the regions from which the young people come, there are significant differences between the answers of the youth from Vojvodina and West and Central Serbia concerning family relations (young people from Vojvodina see it as a greater cause of violence in Serbia), there are differences between West and Central Serbia and South and East Serbia concerning the significance of weapon (young people from South and East Serbia see weapon as a greater cause of violence in Serbia) and there are differences between young people from Belgrade and West and Central Serbia concerning sports fan groups and sport fanatics (the youth of Belgrade perceive them as a greater cause of violence in Serbia)

We asked young people whether violence can be justified. **30% of them consider that violence can be justified**, which is also a concerning information about a environment which justifies violence.

### Graph 103. Can violence be justified?

	NO	YES
<b>2018</b>	19.2	80.8
<b>2019</b>	27	73
<b>2020</b>	30	70

This year we had some questions concerning the health of the youth and the habits that they have when it comes to the consummation of cigarettes, alcohol and other opiates. So, we asked young people whether they smoke, and somewhat more than a third of young people are active smokers.<sup>191</sup>

### Graph 107. Are you a smoker?

**Ex-smokers - 5%;**

**I smoke sometimes - 14%;**

**No – 45%;**

**Yes – 36%**

We asked young people whether they drink more than once a week and more than 60% of young people do not drink more than once a week.

### Graph 108. Do you drink more than once a week?<sup>192</sup>

**Yes – 12%;**

**I never drink - 13%;**

**Sometimes I drink more than once a week – 25%;**

**No – 50%**

<sup>191</sup> There are significant statistical differences between answers of young men and women.

<sup>192</sup> There are significant statistical differences between answers of young men and women.

We asked young people to mark substances that they tried at least once:

<b>Coffee</b>	94.8%
<b>Marijuana – Cannabis</b>	52.2%
<b>Cigarettes</b>	73.3%
<b>Ecstasy</b>	13.7%
<b>Alcohol</b>	94.6%
<b>Cocaine</b>	12.5%
<b>Sedative</b>	15.6%
<b>LSD</b>	4.7%
<b>Amphetamines</b>	9.6%

### 13. THE YOUTH AND COVID-19

This chapter deals with the youth and pandemic of COVID-19 virus. Our goal was to see how the pandemic influenced the youth, their behavior, how they felt, how they evaluate the reaction of the authorities, how much trust they had in doctors and statesmen, as well as whether they volunteered during the pandemic. It is important to mention that the questionnaire was distributed in May, immediately after the state of emergency was lifted. According to the results of the questionnaire, the majority of young people (44.2%) was not affected by the isolation during the state of emergency in any way, nor positive nor negative. However, the total percentage of those who were influenced by it in a negative or a very negative way (29.6%) is higher than those who were influenced by isolation in a positive or a very positive way (26.2%).

#### Graph 110. In what way did the isolation influence you?

<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Very negative</b>	<b>Negative</b>	<b>So-so</b>	<b>Positive</b>	<b>Very Positive</b>
10.1	19.5	44.2	16.5	9.7

The average mark of the answer to this question is 2.96.

We asked young people which emotions prevailed during the pandemic. The majority of them said that they were mostly worried for their family and friends (64.2%). The feeling of uncertainty was also present (51.2%), as well as concern for the future (45.3%).

**Table 80. Emotions of the youth during the pandemic**

<b>Emotion</b>	<b>Percentage (%)</b>
Fear	20.3
Despair	19.7
Anger	32
Hopelessness	36.3
Uncertainty	51.2
Concern for the health	31.6
Concern for the future	45.3
Concern for friends and family	64.2

**Graph 111. Rate the reaction of the state to the pandemic of coronavirus.**

<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Very bad</b>				<b>Great</b>
18.6	21	29.4	20.4	10.6

The average mark of the answer to this question is 2.84. There is a statistically significant difference between the answers of young men and women, as well as between young people from different age groups.<sup>193</sup>

Approximately equal number of young people consider that movement and gatherings restriction measures were too strict (39%) and that the restriction measures were as strict as they were supposed to be (41%). Only 8% of them consider that the measures were not strict enough.

**Graph 112. How would you rate the movement and gatherings restriction measures?**

**As strict as they were supposed to be – 41%**

**Too strict – 39%**

**I cannot assess – 12%**

**Not strict enough – 8%**

<sup>193</sup> Young women rate the reaction of the state to the pandemic in a more positive way than young men, as well as young people from the age group from 15 to 19 in comparison to the other two age groups.

During the state of emergency, the youth of Serbia had the highest level of trust in doctors who fought against the virus COVID-19 in health institutions, and had the lowest level of trust in the institution of the President of the Republic.

**Table 81. Levels of trust of young people in institutions during the state of emergency, on a scale from 1 to 5**

Institution	Average mark	Differences in answers <sup>194</sup>
Doctors from Crisis headquarters	2.94	(1) <sup>195</sup> (2) <sup>196</sup>
Government of Republic of Serbia	2.02	(2)
President of the Republic of Serbia	1.91	(2)(3) <sup>197</sup>
Doctors (in general)	3.5 <sup>198</sup>	(1)(2)
Local authorities	2.21	(2)(3)
Media	1.95	

The youth only trusted the doctors (Serbian doctors in general). Doctors from the Crisis headquarters had more trust from the youth than the carriers of the highest state's functions, despite the fact that the youth did not trust in them either (average mark <3.00).

<sup>194</sup> (1) There is a statistically significant difference between the answers of young men and women.  
(2) There is a statistically significant difference between the answers of different age groups.  
(3) There is a statistically significant difference between the answers of participants from different regions.

<sup>195</sup> Women had more trust in all of the marked institutions.

<sup>196</sup> Young people from the age group from 15 to 19 had more trust in all of the marked institutions in comparison to the other two groups.

<sup>197</sup> Young people from the region of East and South Serbia had more trust in the president of the Republic than young people from the region of Belgrade. Young people from the region of East and South Serbia, and from West and Central Serbia had more trust in local authorities than young people from Belgrade.

<sup>198</sup> During the pandemic, the youth had more trust in doctors in general. Young people from the age of 15 to the age of 19 had trust in doctors from the Crisis headquarters (3.28); young women had trust in doctors from the Crisis headquarters (3.03) and dr. Darija Kisić Tepavčević (3.03) and young people from Belgrade had trust in doctors from the Crisis headquarters (3.01).

**Table 82. Levels of trust of young people in individuals during the state of emergency, on a scale from 1 to 5**

Individual	Average mark	Differences in answers <sup>199</sup>
Dr. Predrag Kon	2.72	
Dr. Darija Kisić Tepavčević	2.79	(1) <sup>200</sup> (2) <sup>201</sup>
Dr. Goran Stevanović	2.66	
Dr. Branimir Nestorović	2.12	(2)
Dr. Branislav Todorović	2.45	
Aleksandar Vučić	1.78	(2)(3) <sup>202</sup>
Ana Brnabić	1.75	(1)(2)
Zlatibor Lončar	1.66	(1)(2)
Siniša Mali	1.44	(1)(2)

<sup>199</sup> (1) There is a statistically significant difference between the answers of young men and women.

(2) There is a statistically significant difference between the answers of different age groups.

(3) There is a statistically significant difference between the answers of participants from different regions.

<sup>200</sup> Women had higher levels of trust in all of the selected individuals.

<sup>201</sup> Young people from the age of 15 to the age of 19 had higher levels of trust in all of the selected individuals in comparison to the other two groups.

<sup>202</sup> Young people from the regions of East and South Serbia had higher levels of trust than young people from Belgrade.



CIVIL SOCIETY  
FOR EUROPEAN  
INTEGRATION



Sweden  
Sverige



The work of the National Youth Council of Serbia is supported by Sweden under the Programme Civil Society as a Force for Change in Serbia's EU Accession Process" (CS4EU), implemented by Belgrade Open School.



[www.koms.rs](http://www.koms.rs)



[/company/komsmladi](https://www.linkedin.com/company/komsmladi)



[@komsmladi](https://www.instagram.com/komsmladi)



[@komsmladi](https://www.tiktok.com/@komsmladi)



[/komsmladi](https://www.facebook.com/komsmladi)



[KOMSmladi](https://www.youtube.com/KOMSmladi)



[@komsmladi](https://twitter.com/komsmladi)

