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Since 1991 Belarus has been implementing a youth policy. Scientific problem was formulated as follows: How effective is the model of youth policy in Belarus? The present paper aimed at investigating the extent how young people are informed about the directions of youth policy; how do they evaluate its implementation; what kind of support do they need; what should be changed in the youth policy in order to increase its effectiveness. Research methodology: neoinstitutional analysis of the youth policy model on the basis of legislation and government programs. Empirical research is based on an online survey of 387 respondents. It was revealed that young people are least informed about the mechanisms of support in the labor market and about the support of young families. The key moment in the development of the state youth policy in Belarus is that support should be provided to all youth, and not to certain categories of it.
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1. Introduction

Youth is a special socio-demographic group in society not only because its age characteristics, but also because of the role it plays in society. Youth is the future of society and of the country, it concentrates the human and social potential. And if the state and society forget about the young generation, they lose their future. Therefore all the developed countries develop and implement the state youth policy. For this reason in 2009 the European Commission approved “An EU Strategy for Youth – Investing and Empowering” in the sphere of youth policy for the period from 2010 to 2018. This Strategy is based on two conceptual positions: the youth is the most vulnerable part of society, especially in times of economic instability; young people are a resource to the EU’s future.

Studies of young people are interdisciplinary: young people are studied in sociology, social anthropology, management theory, social psychology, etc.
The focus of scientific analysis are: the place of youth in the social structure, the social mobility of young people, the problems of education, of labor market, of social mobility, youth subcultures, and state youth policy.

As a theoretical basis for the study of young people can consider the ideas of Pitirim Sorokin, who wrote about the breakdown of the traditional family and about the transfer of functions of youth socialization to the state. He pointed out that the socialization of young people is increasingly beginning to depend on the opportunities and limitations provided by society and the state in this historical period (Sorokin, 1916). The special interest of social sciences towards youth emerges in the 1960s. Margaret Mead wrote about the gap between the generations and about the evolution of relations between them (Mead, 1972). Interesting are the ideas of Karl Mannheim, who formulated the theory of generations as a factor of social change. He wrote that during the periods of major social upheavals new generations appeared, which differ significantly from the previous ones in their social experience. As a result, a qualitative leap in the development of society take place (Mannheim, 1970).

In the 1970s and 1980s, numerous studies of youth culture were developed. Longitudinal studies of that period under the direction of Mikk Titma are known, when the life paths of young people's self-determination in different national and territorial communities were studied. Particular attention was paid to studying the influence of the culture and economy of the regions on the professional and life self-determination of young people (Titma, 1984). In the team with M. Titma worked scientists from Lithuania (A.-V. A. Matulionis, R. Ališauskenė, E. Laumenskaitė), (Kokljagina, 1992).

In 1980s the study of the problems of the management of youth education (Brake, 2013), youth unemployment caused by the technological revolution, drug use, political extremism, the formation of political orientations of young people (Hurrelmann, 1989) become actual. Studies of changes in management approaches in the system of youth training were conducted (Bynner, 1991).

Since the 1990s, it has become actual to consider youth as part of the life cycle of a person, youth problems in the labor market, youth and migration processes, technology of mutual learning, evidence-based policy making, the role of the state and public organizations in supporting young people (Youth ..., 2016). Surveys of the current directions of the state youth policy are presented in EU Youth Report, which provides both a picture of young people and of youth policies at EU level and in Member States. It presents what EU countries and the European Commission have done to implement the EU Youth Cooperation framework over the past three years, and how this has helped to improve the lives of young people (EU Youth Report, 2016). Contemporary social scientists focus their attention on the development of new methods of empirical researches of the youth problems (Allaste, 2015), on the determining of young people’s access to the labour market, explaining the basic characteristics of youth unemployment (Fashoyin, 2014). Analysis of sharpened polarizations of chances and risks within and between generations in specific life circumstances meets up with the re-conceptualisation of childhood and youth as social constructions within the life-course (Giardina, 2014, Rice, 2015). Problems of systematic
gap in existing studies on human services and actual problems in the spheres of youth work are discussed by different work practitioners, managers of youth services, sociologists, psychologists, etc. (Daughtry, 2016).

It is evident, that to make the ongoing projects and programs effective it is necessary to carry out not only their conceptual rationale at the stage of their development / preparation, but also to monitor on the empirical level the effectiveness of their implementation. Sociological monitoring allows to reveal the extent to which the implemented programs correspond to the needs of young people, how young people evaluate the effectiveness of these programs, what the problems are. Monitoring data allows managers to improve the quality of different youth programs management, to correct them immediately.

According to the law of the Republic of Belarus from December 7/2009 No. 65-3 “On the Basis of the State Youth Policy”, state youth policy is a system of social, economic, political, organizational, legal and other measures, aimed at supporting young citizens, implemented by the state for social formation and development of young people, for the best realization of its potential in the interests of the whole society (Zakon …, 2017).

In conditions of economic instability youth is the most vulnerable social group of society, it faces problems in the labor market, has no opportunities to purchase their own habitation, the number of divorces in young families is increasing, etc. This gives a rise to a number of social problems and negative consequences. So in times of economic instability, state programs should provide efficient, effective support to young people. However, the realization of programs requires substantial financial resources, which the state often does not have, and this raises the dilemma of choosing: who should receive support? Youth in general or the most problematic and vulnerable groups of youth? What model of state youth policy it is better to choose?

The purpose of the research was to identify, which of the state support programs young people of Belarus know, how well they know them, how they evaluate the results of these programs, what the basic needs of young people are, what kind of help and support they need from the state.

In this article we consider the basic characteristics of the model of the state youth policy in Belarus, we describe the main features of realization of two of the most problematic areas of the state youth policy – support of youth in the labor market and support of young families.

Object: the main directions of the state youth policy in the Republic of Belarus.

Subject: level of awareness and evaluation of the effectiveness of realization of the state youth policy in Belarus by the student youth.

Research methodology. In the study, we analyzed the state youth policy as a social institution in the context of the methodology of neo-institutional analysis. We used the methodology of neo-institutional analysis to analyze the youth policy of Belarus as a social institution designed to develop a system of rules, norms and values that facilitate the socialization of young people and their entry into adulthood. The type of state youth policy, the nature of the main directions of its implementa-
tion, the mechanisms for providing support – they all organize the relationships between young people as a special social group and society (North, 1991), they are the product of public choice, they structure everyday life, reduce uncertainty, form a set of social alternatives (Buchanan, 2000). Complementing the methodology of neo-institutional analysis at the theoretical level by empirical methods, it is possible to study youth's assessments of the effectiveness of the functioning of the state youth policy as a social institution, it is possible to understand to what extent it meets the interests of young people.

Research methods: method of analysis of documents (laws and other normative legal documents in the sphere of youth policy in the Republic of Belarus), method of analysis of state statistics, online survey method, quantitative methods of data analysis in Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). We have studied the laws and normative acts regulating the state youth policy in Belarus; on their basis online questionnaire was developed; then we calculated sample and sent out invitations to take part in the survey to the students in their study groups (from 25 universities) in social networks.

2. Results

In world practice the two state youth policy models are realized: 1) neo-conservative model, oriented on the provision of state aid and support only to certain, the least socially protected and “disadvantaged” youth categories; in this case expenditures of funds and categories needing help are strictly regulated (this model of youth policy is implemented in such countries as the United States and Canada); 2) social democratic model, based on the recognition of the state’s responsibility for the successful entry into the social relations of all young people; basis of the model is the development of social programs, targeted specifically at young people and accessible for all young people (this model of youth policy is implemented in the majority of EU countries).

It is worth noting that in some countries for the implementation of youth policy young people are treated as an entire socio-demographic group, while in other countries political management for the implementation of youth policy divides young people into several groups, since needs and interests of different age groups are different. At the very least, within the youth two groups of “actual youth” (age 14–18 years) and “young adults” (18 to 30 years or up to 34 years) are defined. The following age groups are distinguished in the state statistics of Belarus: 5–9 years, 10–14 years, 15–19 years, 20–24 years, 25–29 years, 30–34 years. Thus, in Belarus the age boundaries of statistical groups do not coincide with the age boundaries of “young people” category, enshrined in the legal system. In Belarus a group of the population aged 15–29 years at the end of 2016 amounted 1813559 people, or 19,09% of the Belarusian population (Demograficheskij ..., 2016, p. 52). In Germany, for example, the Federal Statistical Office Statistisches Bundesamt (Destatis) identifies the following age groups: 6–15, 15–18, 18–21, 21–25, 25–40 (Statistisches ..., 2016). Some researches propose to distinguish at least three groups among youth: 1) teenagers (from
14 to 17 years) are dependent on their parents, majority of them receive general education, they do not have all civil rights (the right to vote and to be elected, the right to freely enter into marriage); 2) youth (from 18 to 24 years) – obtaining all civil rights, receiving specialized professional education, separation from the family of parents, acquisition of social and economic independence, formation of their own social status, marriage, birth of the first child; 3) young adults (from 25 to 29 years) – professional, socio-economic development, the presence of many of the characteristics of a mature member of the society.

In recent years in EU countries upper age boundary of social group “young adults” has shifted to 40 years due to the fact, that educational, marital and other youth strategies are changing. The same processes are observed in Belarus, even though the formal age boundaries of “young people” category are still not expanded. Taken together these factors underscore the need for the differentiation of the main directions and programs of the state youth policy.

In Belarus category “young citizens” includes “citizens of the Republic of Belarus, foreign citizens and stateless persons, permanently residing in the Republic of Belarus, aged from 14 to 31 years” (Zakon …, 2017, article 1). Belarusian model is based on a three-level cascade structure of the implementation of youth policy. Legislative base and general directions are developed on the level of government and ministries – the first level. The government and ministries delegate the possibilities of its implementation to the regional administrations (regional executive committees) – the second level. Youth public associations – the third level. The multilevel structure is designed to ensure cooperation during the implementation of the main directions of youth policy and to promote the mainstreaming of regional specificity. The important role of the youth public associations is recognized, because they work in close contact with youth. 280 children’s and youth public associations are registered in Belarus (as on the 1st of January, 2016; according to the information of the Ministry of Justice of the Republic of Belarus) (Ministry of Justice …, 2017). However, the Belarusian youth insufficiently actively uses youth associations as an instrument of participation in the state youth policy, often performing only a formal membership in these organizations. Many youth public associations in Belarus are focused only on cooperation with donor organizations and on the implementation of projects, they interact little with each other and with young people as their target audience (Egorov, 2016).

The main directions of the state youth policy in Belarus are: “… state support for young people in getting education; state support for talented and gifted youth; facilitating the implementation of the youth right on association; promotion to the formation of a healthy way of life of young people; facilitation to the realization of young people’s right to work; promotion to the development and realization of socially significant youth initiatives; international youth cooperation; state support of young families; civil-patriotic education of youth” (Zakon …, 2017, article 3). These directions of youth policy are conventional in international practice.

According to the legislation and state programs in Belarus social democratic model of youth policy is realized. And it is declared that this model is oriented on the
support of all categories of young people. However, our analysis of mechanisms of realization and getting state support allows us to conclude that in fact strategies of neo-conservative model dominate in Belarusian state youth policy, because there is an evident orientation on support for the least socially protected and disadvantaged categories of young people. Let us illustrate this with the example of state support for young families.

In Belarus there is an urgent problem of young families’ support in the sphere of private home building. However, in this sphere the conditions for granting such support are formulated rigidly: only those families in which at least one of the spouses is under the age of 31 will refer to the category of young families in this situation; for both spouses it should be the first marriage; if the age condition is fulfilled, but the marriage is not the first at least for one spouse, young family cannot expect such support. Furthermore, a young family should not be the owner of habitation and no one of the spouses should be a lessor of habitation; at the place of residence of the young spouses on each of them must be less than 15 square meters of living space. State support provides a variety of concessional loans to young families, but in fact they can be received only by those who belong to the category of low-income young families. Thus, young families, implementing proactive strategies of economic behavior are actually left without state support, they can only rely on benefits paid due to the childbirth; the largest amount of state support for young families is received by families relating to the low-income category. This situation can stimulate the reproduction of less-active strategies of economic behavior among young people and can lead to the development of paternalistic orientations in their behavior.

In general, the whole list of state youth policy programs realized in Belarus is oriented to young people from 18 years. In this connection we conducted a sociological survey to examine the awareness of Belarusian students about the main directions of the state youth policy and to identify students’ evaluation of the effectiveness of their realization. At the beginning of 2015 in Belarus the number of students in higher educational establishments amounted to 362,900 persons (Obrazovanie …, 2015). Based on the amount of the target population (N) with α=0.05, Δ=0.05, D(x)=0.2500, the estimated amount of the sample is 387 respondents.

There are 54 higher educational establishments in Belarus (including 34 universities and 7 academies). Higher educational establishments are unevenly distributed across the regions: more than half of them are concentrated in Minsk – 30 higher educational establishments (55.6 %), in the Brest oblast – 4 (7.4 %), in the Vitebsk oblast – 3 (5.5 %), in the Gomel oblast – 7 (12.9 %), in the Mogilev oblast 5 (9.3 %), in the Grodno oblast – 3 (5.5%) (Obrazovanie …, 2016).

At the first stage stratified sample was used, when in each region typical higher educational establishments were selected for conducting a survey among students. At the second stage quota sample was used, when for each region (oblast) quotas of numbers of students were calculated in accordance with the proportion of students in each region (oblast). Within the quotas the number of students was evenly distributed between higher educational establishments selected for the survey. The study was conducted using the method of online survey using service SurveyGizmo; invitations
to the survey were sent in social networks to the students’ groups of selected universities. The actual sample coincided with the calculated sample and included 387 respondents. This allows us to consider the obtained data as representational and to extrapolate them on target population of students of higher educational establishments of Belarus. On the basis of the obtained sociological research data we can draw certain conclusions.

To the greatest extent the student youth of Belarus knows: 1. about the politics in the sphere of formation of healthy lifestyle of youth (91.6 %, the sum of answers “know well” and “heard something”); 2. about the support system for talented and gifted youth (86.2 %); 3. about support system for young families (85.4 %). Next, according to the level of awareness there can be distinguished such directions of the state youth policy as: support system for youth in the sphere of education (79.9 %), civil and patriotic education of youth (79.3 %) and support of youth associations (68.8 %). Worst of all respondents are informed about the state support of young people in the labor market (56.2 %). If we analyze not the overall level of awareness, but a good knowledge of the characteristics, requirements and mechanisms of implementation of the main directions of youth policy (option “know well”), it turns out that in awareness rating two answers are shifted to the lower positions: knowledge about the state support of young families (23.4 %) and knowledge about the state support of young people in the labor market (13.4 %) (Table 1).

Table 1. The level of awareness about the basic directions of realization of the state youth policy in Belarus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>Know well, %</th>
<th>Heard something, %</th>
<th>Don’t know, %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Formation of healthy lifestyle of youth</td>
<td>49.2</td>
<td>42.4</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil and patriotic education of youth</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>47.8</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support system for talented and gifted youth</td>
<td>46.3</td>
<td>39.9</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support system for youth in the sphere of education</td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td>49.2</td>
<td>20.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support of youth associations</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>39.8</td>
<td>31.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support system for young families</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>62.0</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State support of young people in the labor market</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>42.8</td>
<td>43.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Obtained results can be explained by the wide coverage in the media of healthy lifestyle values, of projects of the Special Fund of the President of the Republic of Belarus for the social support of gifted pupils and students, of projects of the Special Fund of the President of the Republic of Belarus for the support of talented youth. Extensive involvement in these projects of Belarusian youth at all levels of education – from pre-school to high educational establishments – also plays an important role.

The legal and economic mechanisms of realization of the state support for young people in the labor market and of the state support system for young families are more complex and are conditioned by a number of regulatory and legal documents. An ordinary user often cannot understand them without consulting a lawyer,
therefore the level of young people’s awareness about these public policy directions are lower.

Efficiency of state support for young people in getting education on average was assessed by respondents in 5.36 points according to the 10-point scale. State support of talented and gifted youth was assessed by students in 5.61 points. Average ratings for the support of young specialists in the labor market (4.95 points) and for the support of young families (4.96) are lower. Average ratings in the range of 5–6 points and the low proportion of high scores (9–10 points) show that nowadays student youth low enough evaluates realized directions of state youth policy (see Table 2).

Table 2. Assessment of student youth of the realization efficiency of the main directions of the state youth policy in Belarus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment</th>
<th>Efficiency of the state support of young specialists in the labor market, %</th>
<th>Efficiency of the state support of young families, %</th>
<th>Efficiency of the state support of youth in getting education, %</th>
<th>Efficiency of the state support of talented and gifted youth, %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 point</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 points</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 points</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 points</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 points</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 points</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 points</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 points</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 points</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 points</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average rating</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>4.96</td>
<td>5.36</td>
<td>5.61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To understand what caused the low average scores and to identify priority directions of increasing the management effectiveness of realized programs it is necessary to examine the needs of youth in these spheres. Let us consider them on the example of promoting the realization of the right of youth to work.

In Belarus statistical data are recorded only by the level of registered unemployment, the unemployment rating using the methodology of the International Labour Organization is not calculated. According to the data of the Ministry of Labor and Social Protection of the Republic of Belarus at the end of 2016 the registered unemployment rate amounted to 0.8% of the economically active population. Despite the undertaken measures percentage of young people aged between 16 and 29 years as part of the group of registered unemployed at the end of 2015 amounted to 24.5%, and at the end of 2016 – 21.8%. Average duration of youth unemployment in 2016 was 3 months (Situacija …, 2017). These data show the relevance of the programs’ realization in the sphere of support of young people in the labor market.

In promoting the implementation of the rights of youth to work, the program of the state support for young specialists in the labor market is carried out. In Belarus the status of young specialist can be obtained only by those graduates who completed education at the institutions of higher and secondary special education at the expense
of the republican budget and who were directed to work (i.e. were directed according to the mechanism of distribution to the first place of work). Graduates, who received education at their own expense, may also undergo the procedure of distribution, taking on themselves certain obligations and obtaining certain guarantees and state support (Kodeks ..., 2011).

It is worth noting that in addition to the basic package of guarantees and benefits that are provided to all young specialists, there are guarantees and benefits that are provided differentially on the level of regions or certain economic spheres according to the need for certain specialists. The basic package of guarantees and benefits provided to young specialists includes:

- guarantee of employment in accordance to the received specialty and qualification;
- ban on the dismissal of young specialists and on their transfer to another job, that is not connected with the received specialty (profession) and qualification before the expiry of the work according to the distribution (as an exception in this situation there are several cases: transition to an elected position, redistribution of young specialist, enrollment to the institution of education for studying on a higher level of full-time education);
- violation of labor legislation, collective or employment contract by the employer;
- dismissal by the employer in some limited situations;
- provision of vacation with duration one calendar month (for those, who received secondary special or higher education in pedagogical specialties – 45 calendar days);
- absence of probationary period (test period) when signing an employment contract with young specialist;
- guarantee of payment in connection with the relocation to work in another locality; in particular travel-costs should be compensated (under the same conditions as in the case with employees on business-trips (including per diem).

The differentiated package of guarantees provided to young specialists includes:

- surcharges to the basic salary;
- provision of financial assistance;
- provision of an extended package of social benefits (for example, in areas with radioactive contamination, in rural areas, etc.).

In general, 78.1% of students are informed that in Belarus all graduates, who got their education at the expense of the republican budget and were directed to work according to the mechanism of distribution will get the status of a young specialist (and corresponding privileges and guarantees). Only 32.2% of students are aware of the fact that the graduates, who received their education on a paid basis, can be distributed to the place of their work and can get the status of a young specialist. The system of support is only for graduates who have undergone the distribution when entering the labor market is considered to be “fair” only by 43.0% of respondents.
Natalia Sechko, Svetlana Romanova. Effectiveness of youth policy model in Belarus at the contemporary stage of development

(“completely fair” – 15.2%, “rather fair” – 27.8%); 35.8% of respondents consider this system “unfair” (“rather unfair” – 22.2% and “completely unfair” – 13.6%); 21.0% of respondents found it difficult to assess. According to the survey 75% of students believe that the status of a young specialist and the corresponding measures of state support should be available to all young people who get a job for the first time. Among the respondents 50.0% would like to be distributed to the first place of work (59.0% of these students are getting their education at their own expense, and according to the laws they are not obliged to undergo the procedure of distribution).

When assessing guarantees provided by the state in terms of their usefulness and necessity for the young specialist (using a scale from 1 point (minimum) to 5 points (maximum)) the highest evaluation was given to such guarantees as:
- providing young specialists with a job according to their specialty (average rating 4.06 points);
- providing young specialists with housing or financial compensation of hiring of habitation (average rating 4.35 points);
- ban on the dismissal of young specialists before the end of the obligatory period of work according to the distribution (except for the cases of dismissals for violations of labor discipline) (average rating 3.77 points);
- ban on the establishment of a probationary period when concluding the employment contract with the young specialist (average rating 3.22 points).

The obtained data indicate the difficulties of young people during their entrance into the labor market and the high level of interest of young people in obtaining support when they are trying to find their first place of work; young people want to be protected by the legal system in their first place of work, which will allow them to receive necessary work experience.

The second most important area of the state support for young people is the sphere of support for young families. According to the survey, 99.2% of respondents believe that young families face specific problems inherent exactly to them. Among the most urgent problems – housing problems (71.2% of the respondents pointed to them) and problems of the material type (low living standards – 63.7%; financial problems experienced by families during birth and upbringing of children – 42.5%) (Table 3).

Table 3. Rating of the most urgent problems faced by young families in Belarus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing problems</td>
<td>71.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material problems in general due to the low standard of living</td>
<td>63.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase in the number of divorces</td>
<td>63.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase in the number of single-parent families</td>
<td>54.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial problems because of the birth of children and existence in the status of being on maternity leave</td>
<td>42.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payments for additional educational services for children</td>
<td>33.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To resolve the problems of young families respondents primarily rely on themselves (80.4%) and on the state system (71.5%). These results reflect evidence that young people are ready to be independent and proactive, but to improve the level and quality of life of young families at this stage in Belarus it is necessary for the state to implement a number of institutional changes (for example, to reduce credit interest rates on construction of housing, to develop a mortgage on housing, etc.). An unexpected result was that only 12.1% of respondents rely on the help of parents and other relatives, since traditionally the parents provide the largest support to young families. This can be explained by the fact that the majority of respondents’ parents at this stage cannot help them. The fact that 20.4% of respondents rely on the help of public organizations in solving the problems of young families, is a recognition of the usefulness of the youth projects of non-governmental organizations, oriented at improving the financial literacy of young families, consulting on relationships of spouses, parents and children, etc. The proportion of respondents who expect the aid of organizations is not high (7.5%), since the bulk of the Belarusian enterprises, organizations and companies (except organizations of IT-sector) have reduced social packages of benefits for their employees over the past several years (Table 4).

Table 4. Answers to the question “What do you think, who should solve the problems of young families?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answers</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Young spouses on their own</td>
<td>80.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents and relatives of the young spouses</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>71.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious organizations</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public organizations</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enterprises, organizations and companies</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

56.6% of respondents assessed negatively the fact that the state provides the basic package of benefits for young families only after the birth of children and suggested that there is the lack of real support at the stage of creating a young family which will keep from childbearing; 15.4% of respondents were undecided; 28.0% of respondents believe that this support mechanism (if it is stable) will encourage young families to have children.

In Belarus for the period from 01 01 2015 till 31 12 2019 a program of family capital was introduced to the families in which during this period the third and subsequent children are born (non-cash sum of 10000 USD). As our survey data show, 40.8% of students did not know about this program, although they are the target group for this program. The goal of the program of providing family capital is to motivate families to give birth to the third and subsequent children. However, only 4.9% of respondents said, that the granting of family capital motivates them to give birth to the third child; 10.5% – that “rather motivates”; 23.1% of respondents were undecided; 37.8% said that it is unlikely, that the program will be able to motivate them to have the third child; 23.8% are absolutely convinced, that the program definitely will
not motivate them to have the third child. Thus, the prolonged providing of material support to the families (it becomes available when the child reaches the age of 18) does not encourage the young families, who have housing and financial problems, to give birth to three or more children.

In Belarus a mother (a father, or another relative), who is on maternity leave to care for a child up to 3 years old, receives (for the first child) monthly allowance equal to 35.0% of the average wage in the country (about 140 USD) (Razmery..., 2017). Among the respondents 78.3% evaluated the allowance of such a size as low, they believe that this amount of allowance for the mother and her child is not enough to provide all the necessary consumer needs; only 21.7% of respondents defined size of allowance as sufficient for living of mother and her child during a month. Allowance on the second and subsequent children in Belarus is 40% of the average wage (about 160 USD) (Razmery ..., 2017). This amount of the allowance 75.0% of respondents found low, 20.3% – as sufficient for a mother and her child, 4.7% evaluated it as high.

As priority directions that should be realized by the state and by its ministries the youth pointed to:
- programs of providing young families with preferential loans and disposable subsidies for building and acquisition of residential premises;
- programs aimed at increasing the size of allowances for families with underage children;
- programs aimed at increasing the size of the support for families with many children;
- programs of support of families, which are in post-crisis situations.

3. Conclusions

1. De jure in Belarus social democratic model of youth policy, focused on the support of all categories of youth, is implemented. De facto, this model is a neo-conservative, oriented on supporting the less socially protected and disadvantaged categories of youth. This is dangerous because it can encourage young people to reproduce passive strategies of economic behavior and lead to the development of paternalistic orientations.

2. Belarusian students face a number of difficulties when entering the labor market; students are interested in state aid in getting their first job and they want to have legal protection at their first place of work. In the opinion of students the status of a young specialist and the measures of state support should be available to all young people who get a job for the first time.

3. At the initial stage of their existence young families are faced with the problems associated with the absence of their own housing and with the lack of material resources for meeting the basic needs, especially during childbirth (when one of the spouses is on maternity leave with a child). Delayed (prolonged) provision of material support to the families (family capital programs) does not encourage young families to give birth to three or more children. In Belarus the state should introduce a
number of institutional changes: reducing credit interest rates for housing construction, development of the mortgage system for housing, increasing allowances for childcare.

4. In general, at the moment, young people not highly assess the effectiveness of the state youth policy in Belarus as a social institution; young people are not fully satisfied by the implemented directions. To improve the state youth policy, dialogue and interaction between the main actors should be established, youth associations and youth should become not just a recipients of state support, but also an active actors involved in the formation of youth policy.
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Santrauka

Straipsnyje nagrinėjamas Baltarusijos jaunimo politikos modelis. Tyrimo tikslas – nustatyti jaunimo informatyvumą apie jaunimo politikos kryptis lygį, siekiant nustatyti šios politikos dides-
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