



Agency for International
Programs for Youth
Republic of Latvia



Co-funded by the
Erasmus+ Programme
of the European Union

(RE)SEARCHING FOR QUALITY OF LIFE OF YOUNG PEOPLE IN BALTICS
ERASMUS+ Strategic Partnership Project in Youth Field
(NR. 2017-2-LV02-KA205-001657)

WELL-BEING OF YOUNG PEOPLE IN BALTIC STATES: RESEARCH REPORT



Lastekaitse Liit
Estonian Union for Child Welfare



Riga – Tallinn – Vilnius, 2019

CONTENT

INTRODUCTION.....	4
About project	4
About study	4
About project partners.....	5
Working group of the study	6
STUDY METHODOLOGY.....	7
Concept of Well-Being	7
Project activities	8
ANALYTIC SUMMARY	11
Demographic challenges.....	11
Towards inclusive and equal society	11
Development of school curriculum and learning environment	12
Accessibility of non-formal and lifelong learning.....	13
Integration of young people in labour market.....	13
Accessibility of health care and the healthy living practices	14
Youth friendly living environment	15
Motivating young people for civic engagement.....	16
Youth policy and youth work	17
KEY YOUTH WELL-BEING INDICATORS.....	20
General Indicators	20
Education & Training.....	22
Family & Peers.....	24
Material & Social Well-being	26
Housing & Environment	28
Employment & Entrepreneurship	30
Participation	32
Health & Risk Behaviour	35

The project (RE)SEARCHING FOR QUALITY OF LIFE OF YOUNG PEOPLE IN BALTICS was financed with the support of European Commission's "Erasmus+: Youth in Action" administered in Latvia by the Agency for International Programs for Youth. This publication reflects only the author's views, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.

INTRODUCTION

About project

Erasmus+: Youth in Action Strategic Partnership project “(RE)SEARCHING FOR QUALITY OF LIFE OF YOUNG PEOPLE IN BALTICS” (No 2017-2-LV02-KA205-001657) was implemented from 1 September 2017 to 28 February 2019 in cooperation with the Latvian Children's Welfare Network and the Latvian company Excolo Latvia Ltd, NGO partners Ziburio Fondas (Lighthouse Foundation Lithuania), the Estonian Union for Child Welfare and the Estonian company “Web Multishop Company OÜ”.

Within the project (1) the Baltic Youth Researchers Platform has been established to strengthen cooperation and information exchange among youth researchers working in the Baltic States; (2) the indicator system of youth well-being has been established and piloted, allowing to conduct a regular, internationally comparable assessment of the well-being of young people in the Baltic States, as well as to conduct assessment of the Baltic States indicators at international scale; (3) the website, www.YouthPitStop.com, dedicated to youth field has been developed serving as a point of exchange of information, data and experience for those who are working in youth field (policy makers, youth researchers, youth affairs specialists, youth workers, etc.).

About study

Within the framework of the project, the indicator system of youth well-being has been established and piloted, allowing to conduct a regular, internationally comparable assessment of the well-being of young people in the Baltic States and on international scale. Methodology has been adopted from the other assessment studies on quality of life of young people in other countries, from international comparative studies, also it has been adopted from the methodology of children well-being measurements elaborated by the Latvian Children's Welfare Network (the Latvian Children's Welfare Network in cooperation with NGO partners Ziburio Fondas (Lighthouse Foundation Lithuania) from Lithuania, Lapse Huvikaitse Koda (Child Advocacy Chamber) from Estonia and Stiftelsen Fyrljuset from Sweden during 2016-2017 collaboratively implemented the project Well-being of Children in Baltic Countries with financial support from the Nordic Council of Ministers' Office in Latvia).

The aim of the research has been the development of youth well-being indicator model that would allow carrying out regular comparative measurements of the youth well-being in the Baltic States, including comparison on the international level. Such an outcome would facilitate the development of evidence-based policies on children, youth and family.

Measurements, indicators and monitoring on the youth and children well-being and welfare are common international practice for the evaluation of life quality. Most often such studies include

either statistics or self-reported assessment, rarely – the combination of both. Therefore, the authors of the study decided to develop and test such a system of indicators that would combine both – the objective (statistics) and the subjective (self-reported) indicators; to analyse their correlations in a broader context. Consequently, the research methodology included the following research methods: (1) the compilation of statistical data (Eurostat, Eurofound, the United Nations Organisation, OECD, etc.); (2) the quantitative survey of young people (age from 15 to 25) in Latvia (number of respondents – 1005), in Estonia (485) and in Lithuania (887); (3) focus group discussions with young people in Latvia, Estonia and Lithuania; (4) opinions and evaluation by experts on the indicators to be included in the monitoring; (5) the summary of international practices. The project activities included the deliverables describing each of the research methods (available in the website www.YouthPitStop.Com, section “Methodology”). This research report includes an analytical overview of the most significant conclusions and indicators included in the indicator system.

In total, there are 143 objective and subjective indicators included in the monitoring system. Eight thematic groups have been categorised for the sake of more convenient analysis and use of indicators: (1) general indicators; (2) education & training; (3) family & peers; (4) material and social well-being; (5) housing & environment; (6) employment & entrepreneurship; (7) participation; (8) health & risk behaviour. Each thematic group includes respective statistical data and subjective opinions on well-being expressed in quantitative surveys (taken both from the surveys carried out in the framework of this project and other international evaluation studies). Indicator model includes most recent data presenting situation on December 1, 2018. It is planned to renew data annually (if available) and to publish them in the project website www.YouthPitStop.Com, the section “Quality of Life”.

About project partners

Latvian Child Welfare Network is non-governmental organisation founded in Latvia in 2014 with aim to contribute to the development of public opinion and policy in order to improve situation of the welfare and rights of children in Latvia.



<http://www.bernulabklajiba.lv/>



<https://www.facebook.com/LatvijasBernuLabklajibasTikls/>

Excolo Latvia Ltd is a company founded in Latvia with specialisation in development and implementation of socio-economic and social studies and projects in such sectors as education, youth policy, culture, creative industries, economics, and regional development, working closely with national and local institutions.

Žiburio Fondas (Lighthouse Foundation Lithuania) is non-governmental organisation established in 2014 in Lithuania and whose major activities include direct support, services and assistance to children left without parental care and to their caregivers, adoptive parents and other family members as well as to persons considering foster care or adoption of the child.



<http://ziburio-fondas.lt/>



<https://www.facebook.com/ziburiofondas/>

Estonian Union for Child Welfare is established in 1988 and is the oldest and biggest non-profit advocacy organisation that contributes to ensuring children's rights and shaping a child-friendly society in Estonia.



<https://www.lastekaitseliit.ee>



<https://www.facebook.com/Lastekaitseliit/>

Web Multishop Company is Estonian IT company specializing on development of modern online platforms and websites.



<http://www.webmultishop.com/>



<https://www.facebook.com/Web-Multishop-Company-LLC-154521724727459/>

Working group of the study

Latvian Child Welfare Network	Daiga Eiduka; +371 29205717; info@bernulabklajiba.lv
Excolo Latvia Ltd.	Gints Klāsons; +371 22830200; gintsklasons@gmail.com
Ziburio Fondas	+370 69817852; info@ziburio-fondas.lt
Estonian Union for Child Welfare	Helen Saarnik; +372 6311128; helen.saarnik@lastekaitseliit.ee

STUDY METHODOLOGY

Concept of Well-Being

Well-being is a multidimensional concept that includes a person's physical and mental health, educational status, economic position, physical safety, access to freedoms, and ability to participate in civic life. It is, in a sense, the abundance or scarcity of opportunities available to an individual.

The definition of well-being and the indicators selected to create a picture of well-being draw upon the body of work measuring quality of life and economic and social progress, as well as the discipline of positive youth development, which is a framework that builds on young people's assets while still addressing their deficits.

Idea of young people's welfare is based on Amartya Sen's and Martha Nussbaum's *capability approach*, and the question is put forward whether young people have the skills and opportunities to cope in everyday life, to do things that they value and to have a good life. Capability approach – the idea is to see young people as active actors that learn and develop their skills in interaction with other members of the community where they grow up. Youth is a time for developing skills and talents, and it is important that young people have equal opportunities to grow up and develop themselves comprehensively.

In the monitoring system, the well-being refers to those aspects of life that most people consider as important for a person's happiness, quality of life and welfare. In this perspective, the well-being is understood as a complex of sound material base and available support (housing, health, education, meaningful work), participation in life and society (right to be heard, possibility to decide about own future, life choices), environment of safety and security, an atmosphere of community responsibility and a feeling of belonging (personal identity based on the relationship with community and society, dignity and positive functioning in everyday life). There is also a great focus on the life success of young people – it is believed that young person's well-being is dependent on the level of success of young person at school, on relationship with friends and partners, and on emotional life. In addition, general assumptions of society members about children and young people influence their well-being – children and young people must be perceived and treated as respected citizens like adults, they must be valued for who they are and have right for active participation in situations concerning their lives. Therefore, children's and young people's well-being is related to their status and profile in the society. For the well-being of children and youth, it is important to receive fair amount of protection, support, love and opportunities to reveal their full potential.

There is an increasing understanding that children and young people well-being has multi-dimensional character including dimensions of physical, emotional and social well-being; focusing on their current life, but also considering their future life; and incorporating subjective as well as objective measures. However, there is still a need to improve the general understanding and theoretical background of youth well-being since across the country the term is often used without proper explanation.

In general, the well-being is understood not only as the absence of illness, and it goes beyond life satisfaction. It is linked with an individual's physical health, health behaviours and resilience (the ability to cope with adverse circumstances). The Foresight Report (2008) defines well-being as "a dynamic state, in which the individual is able to develop their potential, work productively and creatively, build strong and positive relationships with others, and contribute to their community. It is enhanced when an individual is able to fulfil their personal and social goals and achieve a sense of purpose in society". Within the monitoring system, young people well-being includes both the circumstances of young people life and their own perspectives.

Project activities

Youth well-being indicators and monitoring is the widespread practice how to assess the developments in youth field in the country. Most of indicator systems use one of two approaches – either statistical indicators, or subjective opinions of young people or youth workers. Consequently, these approaches are largely one-sided. Therefore, the aim of the project and its innovative contribution was to develop the indicator system that would allow assessing the existing situation of young people from both objective and subjective point of view. The assumption of this project was that not always the objective indicators about well-being and prosperity correlate with the subjective well-being, namely, prosperous living environment, good health, and extensive education and leisure opportunities not necessarily imply that young people feel well, are psychologically comfortable with their life. For favourable youth development, the objective indicators on living environment, access to education, health, as well as subjective indicators on how young people feel in their family, at school, with friends, etc. are important.

The given project must be regarded as a pilot project, within which the youth well-being indicator model has been developed for all the Baltic States, and that could later be extended to other countries. The aim of the pilot project was (1) to identify which objective (statistics) and subjective (young people's and/or youth workers opinions) indicators can best reveal and characterize the well-being situation of young people in various aspects (family, school, leisure time, health, friends, housing, living environment, etc.); (2) to carry out selection of indicators; (3) to conduct a comparative analysis among the Baltic States and detailed analyses at national level.

The project adopted and developed further the methodology of the children well-being monitoring indicator system of the Baltic States elaborated within the project Children Well-Being in Baltic Countries (co-financed by The Nordic Council of Ministers' Office in Latvia) whose aim was to develop children well-being indicator system, which would enable to conduct a regular, internationally comparable child-centred analysis (monitoring) on children well-being in the Baltic States with particular attention on examining children well-being from children own perspective. Namely, the project adapted this methodology for youth well-being analyses. The project aimed also to emphasize the need to look at the development of young people as a sequential stage after the child development, thus ensuring sequential measurements of well-being from child to young people status.

Overall, there were four stages in elaboration of the youth well-being monitoring system of the Baltic States.

1. OVERVIEW OF INTERNATIONAL PRACTICES AND THE DEVELOPMENTS IN THE EUROPEAN UNION AND GLOBALLY

The authors have analysed developments on the European Union (EU) and global level (methodology provided in such documents as the Global Youth Well-being Index, the European Commission (EC) working Document on the EU Indicators in the Field of Youth, etc.), as well as international good practices on indicator systems and monitoring methodologies developed in other countries. As a result, the relevant methods for the Baltic States were identified. Besides, the authors interpreted the children well-being monitoring indicator system of the Baltic States elaborated within the project Children Well-Being in Baltic Countries (co-financed by The Nordic Council of Ministers' Office in Latvia) and identified adaptable methodology for monitoring youth well-being.

2. IDENTIFICATION OF INDICATORS AND THEIR APPLICABILITY

Identification of applicable indicators has been done based on several considerations – whether they are representing local situation of the Baltic States, whether they are available in existing databases or easily obtainable for small scope supplementary research activities, as well as whether their aggregation provides a comprehensive characteristics of particular spheres (they are not unilateral).

After identifying indicators, they have been discussed in focus groups of young people to find out which of these aspects young people mention when it comes to the well-being, adding to the initially identified set of indicators the opinions of young people. Besides, several experts were asked to provide their assessments on whether initially identified indicators are in line with the national situation, as well as to make recommendations for adjusting the indicators. After discussing the initially prepared set of indicators, it was piloted within the comparative research

of all the Baltic States. The set of indicators during its elaboration process have been discussed within the Baltic youth researchers' expert panel receiving their contribution for improving the quality of the elaborated youth well-being monitoring system.

3. PILOT STUDY OF YOUTH WELL-BEING

In order to pilot the developed youth well-being monitoring system, the comparative study has been carried out in all three Baltic States analysing the data obtained through the survey and identifying the deficiencies of the developed system. For elaboration of the pilot study in total 2377 young people were surveyed in Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania. The summary of the pilot survey of youth well-being is available in English. Whereas detailed report on analyses of each country is provided in national languages.

4. METHODOLOGICAL GUIDELINES FOR APPLYING YOUTH WELL-BEING MONITORING SYSTEM

After finalizing the youth well-being monitoring system of the Baltic States, the methodological guidelines as a practical guide has been developed about how to use the youth well-being monitoring system at national, regional and local level. It is aimed at facilitating the application of the youth well-being monitoring system not only at national level, but also at municipal level or for measuring well-being of specific target groups of young people. The methodological guidelines are available in national languages of the Baltic States and in English.

ANALYTIC SUMMARY

In the following chapter, the authors present contextual analysis of data providing the most significant conclusions or outlining additional questions regarding youth well-being in the Baltic States. Such an audit may serve as an overview about the situation in each of three countries and in international comparison; in addition, it may frame the activities needed for the youth policy implementation on national, regional and local level. Detailed overview about the indicators of the youth well-being (categorised in eight thematic groups) is available in the next chapter. They broadly and comprehensively illustrate life quality of young people both considering objective (statistical) and subjective (self-reported) viewpoint.

Demographic challenges

The most significant demographic tendencies are the population decrease and the concurrent aging of population. Average and median age of population is increasing in all three Baltic States; meanwhile the summary birth rate continuously is beneath 2.0 (rates 2.1-2.2 ensure the change of generation). Demographic projections predict the same development in the following years. Even though the proportion of young people in the total number of inhabitants will not change significantly (because the number of young people decreases less than the total number of population), the proportion of older persons in the population will enlarge, reaching almost 1/3. That brings along substantial social economic changes, as smaller number of taxpayers would be responsible for increasing number of inhabitants taking advantage from social insurance benefits. Subsequently it would lead to reforms and generate new challenges in education, employment structure, increase in productivity, public social insurance and health care systems.

Emigration of young people during the last 10 years has aggravated the demographic situation. Estonia has been less affected by this challenge, while Latvia and Lithuania have been considerably influenced by the emigration (about 1/3 of the young people aged 15-24 lives outside their country (in Estonia – about 1/10)). This raises questions about the place of youth diaspora in the national planning documents (retaining and strengthening contacts with the homeland, support for return migration etc.). Youth diaspora as a target group has not been scrutinized; information is scarcely available and deficient. However, the considerable number of this community allow and require a special attention in the youth policy and sustainable development policy on national level.

Towards inclusive and equal society

Many of collected data show that inclusive and equal society is a serious challenge for all three Baltic States. The Gini coefficient as a measure of income inequality in all three countries is above the average of the EU rate. Every fifth young person in Estonia and Latvia and every fourth in

Lithuania is at risk of poverty. Every fourth young person in Latvia and Lithuania and every tenth person in Estonia meet material or social deprivation – economic strain, insufficient resources to buy durables, housing deprivation. Approximately every tenth young person in the Baltic States declares the difficulty to make ends in the household.

The rates of social tensions are also rather high – about 90% of young people considers there is a tension between poor and rich people in the society, also between different racial and ethnic groups (in Lithuania this rate is lower, about 66%). 93% of Estonian, 88% Lithuanian and 73% Latvian young people indicate at the tension between people with different sexual orientations.

Furthermore, the data on confidence of young people about their future can be mentioned here too. Although an absolute majority of young people in all three countries have the optimistic view on their future (Estonia 95% (which is the highest rate in Europe), Latvia 90%, Lithuania 84%, EU average – 78%), at the same time still there is relatively high rate of young people who assess that they have little chance of success in life (Lithuania 33%, Latvia 24%, Estonia 20%) or they have little chance of financial success in life (Lithuania 47%, Latvia 41%, Estonia 28%).

Even though the situation and fewer opportunities of young people with special needs have not been scrutinized, sectoral reports and opinion studies indicate that socialisation and civic activities of these target groups are very restricted (considering environmental accessibility, attitude from society members, financial resources and personal self-perception).

All this leads to the need finding systemic and long-term solutions, as well as implementation of particular activities that would facilitate the development of equal and inclusive society.

Development of school curriculum and learning environment

Data of the international OECD Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) show that in relation to general education situation in each of three Baltic States differs. Estonia demonstrates better achievements in different segments (above the average OECD results), while Latvia and especially Lithuania are notably performing not as good as the average of the OECD countries. That refers to the successful performance in different subjects, collaborative problem-solving skills etc. Data also reveal that feeling a sense of belonging at school is lower in all the Baltic States than the average level of the OECD countries. Particularly worrying are the data indicating that Latvia among other OECD countries has the highest rate in regard to frequently bullied students (other students make fun of them, threaten, hit or push around, etc.), while in Lithuania this rate is slightly below, in Estonia – slightly above the average OECD rate. In addition, only small part of young people considers they have possibilities to influence decisions at their school or university – in Estonia 42% of young people, in Lithuania and Latvia – only 27%-29% of young people think they have such possibilities. As the quality of education

and learning environment leave a significant influence on future prospects of youth in their life, these data urge to improve significantly school curriculum and teachers' work, as well as learning environment, including more active involvement and participation of parents.

Accessibility of non-formal and lifelong learning

Every fourth young person in the EU (in average) has taken part in various courses, training and seminars (including online courses) for nonprofessional reasons. The Baltic States demonstrate even better results, as approximately every third young person (in Lithuania this rate is a bit lower) has taken part in such training. About one fifth of the young people in Lithuania and Estonia and every tenth young person in Latvia (the average in the EU) have followed online courses. Even though these achievements are better than on average in the EU, still the young people express rather critical views about accessibility of education.

Absolute majority in Estonia (86%) suggests having all possibilities to acquire the education they want, but in Latvia only 70% and in Lithuania 63% of young people have similar opinion. Young people are even more critical about the possibilities for improvement, attending various courses, training, seminars – 66%-68% in Estonia and Latvia and only 52% in Lithuania express positive views. In this respect, we can highlight the potential of the Internet and its purposeful use – only small part of young people use the Internet for education or meaningful leisure time activities. In general, data show that at least every third young person has encountered insufficient possibilities in non-formal or lifelong education. It brings to the fore the question about equal accessibility of non-formal and lifelong learning for all young people. Even though this study did not analyse the questions of accessibility in more detail, the other studies provide information that accessibility most often is influenced by the place of residence (there are limited possibilities outside the cities, or they are too far); financial capacities of young people and their families; limited offer complying with interests; lack of free time (heavy workloads at school or university); often also restricted physical access for youth with disabilities.

Integration of young people in labour market

Youth unemployment has been one of the most topical problems in the EU for a longer time. Even though youth unemployment rate in the Baltic States is lower than in the EU in average, still every tenth young person in Estonia and Lithuania and every fifth young person in Latvia are unemployed (including 3% long-term unemployed). The proportion of the so-called NEET youth – young people neither in employment, nor in education – is very similar. It may seem that unemployment concerns only small part of youth. However, also those young people who are employed reported that they are not always satisfied with possibilities in their professional life. Majority of the young people is positive about possibilities to choose a profession/ occupation they like (62% of Lithuanian, 67% of Latvian, 73% of Estonian young people). However, more

critically young people estimate possibilities to find a job that they like (64% of Lithuanians think they have no such possibility, 52% in Latvia and 40% in Estonia). Even worse prospects relate to possibility do business – only 20% of Lithuanian, 35% of Latvian and 46% of Estonian young people consider this option. Despite the fact that there are numerous activities facilitating youth employment and entrepreneurship on the EU and national level, the data suggest that such endeavours are insufficient. However, it is important that efforts are targeted not only at improvement of employment or entrepreneurship skills, but also at youth competences necessary for changing labour environment. In this context the role and quality of general and vocational education is of great importance (including accessibility and usefulness of internships, career guidance, accessibility of information about labour market), as well as accessibility of lifelong learning for different age groups.

Accessibility of health care and the healthy living practices

Even though most of the Baltic youth has self-reported that their health is good (in Estonia 85%, in Latvia 86%, in Lithuania 87%), still this is lower rate than the average in the EU (93%). In addition, every third young person in Estonia and Latvia, and every fourth in Lithuania consider they have long-standing illness or health problems. Data also show that in Estonia and Latvia there is a larger than in the EU in average proportion of young people who regularly feel downhearted and depressed (respectively 7% and 11%, while in the EU 5%, in Lithuania 3%). In this respect we can spotlight the need for psychological and emotional support and accessibility (see the following sub-chapter), and about accessibility of health care services. 1% of the young people in the EU in average has reported that they did not receive needed health care; in Latvia this rate is 6%, in Estonia – even 11% (in Lithuania 1%). Moreover, in Latvia there is a large proportion of young people who have delayed visit to doctor to save money for other basic needs (26%, in Estonia 8%, in Lithuania 0%, in the EU in average 11%). In Lithuania 17% and in Estonia 19% of young people have self-reported that they have no possibilities to receive health care services; in Latvia this rate is 28%.

Different data sets indicate that healthy living practices among young people are unsettled. Body mass index suggests that 22% of young people in Estonia has overweight or obese, in Latvia 19%, in Lithuania 15% (the average rate in the EU is 20%; Lithuania has the lowest rate in the EU). Every fourth young person in Latvia and Lithuania and every fifth in Estonia are smoking. Alcohol use is less regular than in the EU in average, but still the rate is rather high – 48% of the young people in the EU, in Latvia – 44%, in Estonia – 38% and in Lithuania 34% of the young people drink alcohol. The rate of young people who have used cannabis at least once per their lifetime is higher in the Baltic countries than in the EU (average in the EU is 16%, in Latvia 17%, in Lithuania 18%, in Estonia 25%). In particular large proportion of young people in Latvia and

Estonia have used inhalants – respectively 13% and 18%, while the average in the EU is 7% (in Lithuania 8%).

Youth suicide rates are particularly alarming – for the Baltic countries, these rates are among the highest in Europe. In the age group of 15-19 years old, the suicide rate of Estonia is 14 suicides out of 100 000 young people of this age group, and Lithuania – 13 (which is the second and third highest rate), while Latvia – 11. Higher suicide rates are in the age group of 20-24-year-olds – Lithuania has the highest rate in Europe (24), but it is also high for Latvia (16) and Estonia (15). These figures largely correspond to the data on the emotional well-being of young people. Approximately every fifth young person in Latvia and Estonia and every fourth in Lithuania assess that it is difficult to deal with important problems that come up in their life. Roughly, the same number of young people considers that it takes a long time to get back to normal after things go wrong in their life. 24% of young people in Estonia, 36%-37% in Latvia and Lithuania declare they do not have adequate possibilities to get help in difficult, problematic situations. About every fifth young person suggests she/ he has no possibilities to spend time with their family and friends; moreover, 33% Estonians, 25% Latvians and 46% Lithuanians acknowledge they have no possibilities find peers. Data also show that in Estonia and Latvia there is a larger than in the EU in average proportion of young people who regularly feel downhearted and depressed (respectively 7% and 11%, while in the EU 5%, in Lithuania 3%).

In general, these data show that at least every fourth young person meet insufficient psychological and emotional support in their daily life. The methodology of this study does not allow concluding whether this is a specific youth target group and what the particular causes for insufficient support are, still certainly this is comparatively obvious indication that requires particular attention and support.

Youth friendly living environment

There is a large proportion of those young people in all three Baltic States who consider that their municipality is not youth friendly – in Estonia 38%, in Latvia 28%, in Lithuania even 49%. Besides, although the young people in all three countries are satisfied with their local area as a place for living (and these rates are higher than the average in the EU), larger than in the EU is the proportion of young people who do not feel safe after dark (in Estonia 35%, in Latvia 46%, in Lithuania 41%; EU average 28%). Reasonable, but still higher than on average in the EU is the proportion of young people in Estonia and Lithuania (19% and 17%, in Latvia 7%; EU average 14%) who confirms difficulties (due to restricted physical accessibility, distance, working time or other reasons) to access recreational or green areas. This indicates that urban and municipal planners do not always respect interests and needs of youth; involvement of the young people should more regular and meaningful.

In addition, large part of young people in Latvia lives in poor amenities (overcrowded, leaking roof, no bath/shower and no indoor toilet, or a dwelling considered too dark) – in the EU in average there are 7%, in Latvia – 24% (in Estonia 6% and in Lithuania 13%). This corresponds to the opinions on the dwelling expressed by young people themselves – in Latvia this rate is notably lower (7.1 of 10-point scale) than the average in the EU (7.7), or Estonia (7.4) and Lithuania (7.5). 32% of young people in Latvia has indicated there is a shortage of space in his/ her accommodation (the EU in average 23%, in Estonia 28%, in Lithuania 24%). In Latvia, also adults meet the same obstacles, however, concerning children and youth it is important to mention that they often have no private space where to study, to rest or to be alone.

Motivating young people for civic engagement

Different studies have already identified the youth as a society target group that seldom takes part in elections or political activities. Data show that young people are not much active also in other participation activities. For example, young people rarely take part in the neighbourhood activities (urban planning, signing a petition, etc.) – in Lithuania 14%, in Estonia 12% and in Latvia only 5% of young people (average in the EU 10%). Only 9% of young people in Latvia, 14% in Lithuania and 15% in Estonia (average in the EU 16%) post their opinion on civic or political issues in social networks or elsewhere in the Internet. Not more than 5% of youth in the Baltic countries has been involved in political parties. Indeed, political activity may have a low priority in youth life and usually a limited amount of young people get involved in it. However, youth participation in civic, non-governmental activities is a meaningful indicator. About 30% of young people in Estonia and Lithuania, and only 17% in Latvia engage in the activities of non-governmental organizations. Participation in youth organisations is slightly more active – 38% in Estonia, 35% in Lithuania and only 22% in Latvia. 41% of young persons in Estonia, 34% in Lithuania and only 24% in Latvia have been engaged in youth projects. 33% of Estonian, 22% of Lithuanian and 19% of Latvian youth have participated in the activities of youth centres and clubs. The proportion of young people actively participating in other activities is not significant. Exception is culture and entertainment events, activities at school or university and traveling.

Even though the numbers of young people that get involved in different activities are not substantial, there is no reason to conclude that they have no possibilities for participation. Self-reported views of young people suggest that possibilities to participate have been assessed higher as the frequency of their personal involvement. For example, 37% of Latvian youth assesses positively their possibilities to take part in the activities organised by non-governmental organisations, meanwhile only 17% of them participates; 49% assesses that they have possibilities to take part in youth organisations, but only 22% participates; 57% assesses that they have possibilities to take part in youth projects and activities, but only 24% participates; 68% of young people does have possibilities to volunteer, but only 34% has volunteered. On the one

hand, we can conclude that possibilities are not used by all the young people who have access to them. In this target group, the strategy could be aimed at motivation of youth participation (also reaching inactive young people), instead of diversification of possibilities. On the other hand, data suggest that at least 1/3 of young people meets limitations to get involved (due to limited possibilities, financial reasons etc.). Data also reveal that majority of young people participates in cultural and entertainment activities, but less regularly in social and civic activities. Indirectly it may indicate at limited offer of civic activities properly addressing the diversity of interests of young people (especially this regards to non-governmental and youth organisations). In this respect, we also need to consider equal access for all youth groups to civic activities despite different places of residence, financial resources or belonging to certain social group. Youth work activities need to be more focused at identification of particular target groups and development of relevant and diversified activities, and/ or at increasing motivation of young people to participate.

Willingness to engage is also greatly influenced by the perceptions and experiences of the effectiveness of public and civic activities. Only 21% of young people in Estonia, 12% in Latvia and 9% in Lithuania think they have chance to influence decisions on municipal level. 42% of young people in Estonia, 29% in Latvia and 27% in Lithuania consider they have possibilities to influence decisions at school or university. While decisions in their family can influence 74% of Estonian and Latvian and 70% of Lithuanian young people. Meanwhile, 75% of young people in Estonia, 71% in Latvia and only 58% of youth in Lithuania admit they have possibilities to freely express their opinions, judgments, beliefs. Above all, these data indicate that youth is not always involved in related decision-making. Even though young people can influence decisions in their families, they are more sceptical about their impact on municipal level or on education institutions (though rates in Estonia are substantially higher). This leads to the need to enhance involvement of young people in discussing decisions and explaining decisions that are made – both on institutional level, and through particular projects or activities, avoiding formal participatory activities.

Youth policy and youth work

Being a young person is a special stage in a person's life – he/ or she is no longer a child, but has not grown up yet, is not fully mature and materially independent. A young person is willing and able to act independently, to build relationships, to make his/ her own decisions and implement them – sometimes successfully, sometimes less successfully. The challenge for adults is to give young people the opportunity to develop, to inspire them with own example, to support and help them to make decisive decisions. Such role also has the institutionalised youth work and, more broadly, the youth policy. In this respect, a number of relevant issues can be identified. Are there the comprehensive data on the quality of life of young people in different aspects

collected and regularly updated? Are measures aimed at improving the quality of young people's lives developed and implemented based on the data? Do the undertaken measures correspond to the different life situations, needs and interests of young people? Is there sufficient and effective cooperation and exchange of information between the institutions of different sectors (and also the non-governmental sector) in relation to young people as a target group? Is funding at national and local level sufficient for effective youth work?

Given the versatility of the topic of the quality of life of young people (which is defined by the eight thematic areas within this study), it is also important to consider the extent to which the current youth policy and the youth work are evidence-based and contextual – whether activities undertaken are based on the real needs of young people and on their diversity? Not only the youth work of the Baltic States, but also almost of any other EU country "suffers" from "chronic" financial and human resource shortages. Under limited resources, it is crucial to define precisely the definition of policy interventions and target groups of everyday practical youth work and to define potentially the most effective activities. This requires, firstly, an adequate data and information base for decision-making and, secondly, an objective assessment of the effectiveness of already undertaken and planned measures and activities. In the youth field, these two tasks are very complex, as youth as the target group includes actually a large variety of specific groups (based on gender, age, residence, family and health, material and social security situation, etc.). Only measures and activities that consider these diverse individual factors can be fully effective. It is, however, likely that this system and approach of youth work would be too cost-intensive for countries with relatively low budgets at the national and local levels. This, in turn, leads to the search for activities the implementation of which would have a greater or lesser positive impact on the widest possible range of specific target groups, while abandoning measures that are very narrow or unsustainable. In this context, it can be asked whether the current youth work is really based on the needs of young people, or rather in various other factors – for what and where project funding is available, which activities support national and EU policies, what activities are understood and supported by the management of the municipality, what activities require fewer resources, what activities easier attract young people, etc..

A widely debated topic is also the specificity of youth work – whether it should focus only on a particular aspect of quality of life (e.g. non-formal learning) or it should include a whole spectrum of essential aspects (from leisure activities to health care). There is no unambiguous answer. Nor is there any approach and institutional model, which would be considered as the best and which – not effective. Each country's situation is different and specific. However, in the case of limited resources, this topic is also becoming essential – whether with available resources to carry out small interventions across the whole spectrum or to develop more targeted and broader activities in just some respects. The choice is likely to be different at national, regional and local level, in each level finding potentially the most effective approach. This issue is also problematic in a

different context – although youth work has a multi-dimensional nature (education, culture, health, employment, etc.), the youth policy and the youth work have a low impact on those policy areas that are under the responsibility of other Institutions (in the case of Latvia: health – the Ministry of Health, child and family policy – the Ministry of Welfare, employment – the Ministry of Welfare and the Ministry of Economics, etc.). Therefore, there is an unclear relationship between various involved institutions regarding the definition and implementation of the youth policy (allocation of responsibilities, possibility of coordination of youth policy). Moreover, the need to develop the youth policy and the youth work is often perceived as a recommendation, rather than a necessity (especially at municipal level).

The methodology of this research project was partly adapted from the project Well-Being of Children in the Baltic States implemented by the Latvian Child Welfare Network in 2016 – 2017, (funded by the Nordic Council of Ministers' Office in Latvia), thus highlighting the continuity between children's policy and youth policy as an important topic, simultaneously observing them in the context of family policy, as well. In this respect, different national approaches and experiences vary widely. If in Latvia under the Youth Act a target group is defined the youth of age group 13-25 years, in other countries age definitions vary significantly or there is no such age definition at all (for example, in Estonia a young person is defined in the age group 7-26, Finland – 0-29, in Iceland – 6-25, Luxembourg – 12-30, Slovenia – 15-29¹). It also has a major impact on the scope of youth policy and youth work, both in terms of availability of data (for example, in Latvia the Central Statistical Bureau does not constitute separate categories of data for age group 13-25 years) and in the planning of support measures and activities (needs in different age periods can vary considerably). However, in any case there is remaining a question of whether there is ensured a mutually coordinated policy for children, youth and family, whether they are mutually complementary and continuous.

* * *

¹ Youth Stocktaking Report. Engaging and empowering youth in OECD countries – How to bridge the "governance gap". OECD. 2017. Available: <http://www.oecd.org/gov/youth-stocktaking-report.pdf>

KEY YOUTH WELL-BEING INDICATORS

This chapter provides a descriptive overview about youth well-being indicators aggregated within the framework of this project, divided in eight thematic groups. According to the indicators, data on the Baltic States are interpreted and compared with the average in the EU. Indicator table in each subchapter includes also the highest and the lowest value of the indicator on international scale (if available).

General Indicators

- According to the Human Development Index of the United Nations Organisation (includes such indicators as life expectancy at birth, level of education, real gross domestic product (GDP) per capita) all three Baltic States correspond to the group of the countries with high human development. Estonia is ranked a little bit higher, Latvia – lower. Among 189 countries Estonia is ranked as 30th, Latvia – as 43rd and Lithuania – as 36th country.
- Also the Youth Progress Index developed by the European Youth Forum (includes 12 thematic sections with 60 indicators in total) ranks Estonia higher than other Baltic States – being the 22nd country of 102. Lithuania is ranked lower (35th).
- Looking at demography, population structure of all three Baltic States is similar – proportion of 15 to 24 year old population is between 10% to 12%, while population aged 60 or more is 25%-26%. Median age of population is 42-43 years. Respective indicators of all three Baltic States are similar to the average rates in the EU countries.
- At the same time Latvia and Lithuania has slightly higher summary birth indicator (1.7, Estonia – 1.6). The rate of all three Baltic States corresponds to the average EU rate.
- However, the life expectancy in Estonia is higher – 78 years – than in Latvia and Lithuania where it is 75 years. In this respect, all three countries have lower rates than the EU in average (81 year).
- Among the population aged 15-24 there is a high emigration rate in all three countries as in this age group per 1000 population 14 persons leave Estonia, 17 – Latvia and 30 young people leave Lithuania.
- Subjective satisfaction with life rates are high in all three countries. Lithuanian young people comparatively more positively evaluate their own life, while Estonian young people are more positive about their future (and this is the highest rate among the EU countries). Level of satisfaction with current life in all the Baltic States is similar to the average EU level, while Baltic young people think more positively about the future than young people in the EU in average do.

Indicator	The lowest rate: Country	The lowest rate	EE	LV	LT	EU (28)	The highest rate	The highest rate: Country	Year	Data source
Human Development Index: Index (among 189 countries) ¹	Niger	0,354	0,871	0,847	0,858	-	0,953	Norway	2017	UNDP
Human Development Index: Rank (among 189 countries) ¹	Niger	189	30	43	36	-	1	Norway	2017	UNDP
Youth Progress Index: Index (among 102 countries) ²	Mozambique	33,53	80,55	76,43	73,76	-	88,94	Norway	2017	European Youth Forum, Youth Progress Index
Youth Progress Index: Rank (among 102 countries) ²	Mozambique	102	22	26	35	-	1	Norway	2017	European Youth Forum, Youth Progress Index
Proportion of population aged 0-14 years	Italy	14	16	16	15	16	25	Kosovo	2017	EUROSTAT
Proportion of population aged 15-24 years	Bulgaria	9	10	10	12	11	18	Kosovo	2017	EUROSTAT
Proportion of population aged 60 years and more	Azerbaijan	10	26	26	25	26	28	Italy	2017	EUROSTAT
Median age of population ³	Kosovo	29	42	43	43	43	46	Italy	2017	EUROSTAT
Fertility rate ⁴	Spain	1,3	1,6	1,7	1,7	1,6	2,2	Georgia	2016	EUROSTAT
Life expectancy	Georgia	73	78	75	75	81	84	Switzerland	2016	EUROSTAT
Emigration (aged 15-24; per 1 000)	-	-	14	17	30	-	-	-	2016	EUROSTAT
How satisfied are you with your current life in general? (Satisfied, 6-10 on 10-point-scale; aged 15-25)	-	-	78	82	69	-	-	-	2018	Young people in Baltics: Survey, 2018
How satisfied are you with your life these days? (Mean 1-10; aged 18-24)	Bulgaria	6,4	7,6	7,5	7,7	7,6	8,3	Finland	2016	Eurofound, European Quality of Life Survey 2016
I am optimistic about my future (agree or strongly agree; aged 18-24)	Greece	69	95	90	84	78	95	Estonia	2016	Eurofound, European Quality of Life Survey 2016

¹The Human Development Index (HDI) is a summary measure of average achievement in key dimensions of human development: a long and healthy life, being knowledgeable and have a decent standard of living. The HDI is the geometric mean of normalized indices for each of the three dimensions.

²The Youth Progress Index measures the extent to which countries provide for the social and environmental needs of young people.

It is structured around 12 components and 60 distinct indicators in the areas of basic human needs, foundations of well-being, and opportunity to progress show the relative performance of nations."

³The age that divides a population into two numerically equal groups, meaning half the people are younger than median age and half are older.

⁴It is defined as the mean number of children who would be born to a woman during her lifetime, if she were to spend her childbearing years conforming to the age-specific fertility rates, that have been measured in a given year.

Education & Training

- At least 85% of young people aged 20-24 in the Baltic States have at least upper secondary educational attainment level. In Lithuania, this rate is the highest, as 91% of this age group has either secondary or higher education. Comparatively Estonia has lower rate (85%). All three countries demonstrate higher rate than the average rate in the EU (83%).
- Better achievements than in the EU in average the Baltic States demonstrate in relation to the index of early leavers aged 18-24 from education and training. Average EU rate is 11%, in Lithuania – 5%, in Latvia – 9%, in Estonia – 11%.
- Each Baltic country demonstrate different achievements of students, Estonia being a leader. In Estonia, there are only 5% of 15 year old students that has low results in mathematics, reading and sciences (and this is the best result among all the countries included in the study), meanwhile 20% of students are top performers in at least one of these subjects. Achievements of Latvia and Lithuania are not as good – low achievers in all subjects – 11% in Latvia and 15% in Lithuania, top performers in at least one of these subjects – 8% in Latvia, 10% in Lithuania.
- However, Baltic young people are rather satisfied with their education in their own view. Views that are slightly more critical are expressed only among Latvian young people (still this stays at the average level of the EU).
- At the same time, three Baltic States have higher rate than in the EU countries concerning frequently bullied students (15 y.o.). Average rate in the EU is 9%, in Estonia and Lithuania – 10%, in Latvia – it reaches 18% (this is the highest rate among all the countries included in the study).
- Even though the general level of subjective satisfaction with education is high, young people have expressed more critical views on possibilities to acquire the education they want – in Estonia 86% of young people are satisfied with possibilities, but in Latvia this indicator is 70% and in Lithuania – only 63%. Similar opinions are expressed in regard to possibilities for improvement, attending various courses, training, and seminars – in Estonia positive response is received from 66%, in Latvia – 68% and in Lithuania – only 25% of young people.

Indicator	The lowest rate: Country	The lowest rate	EE	LV	LT	EU (28)	The highest rate	The highest rate: Country	Year	Data source
Young people aged 20-24 with at least upper secondary educational attainment level ¹	Turkey	57	85	87	91	83	96	Croatia	2017	EUROSTAT
Early leavers aged 18-24 from education and training ²	Croatia	3	11	9	5	11	33	Turkey	2017	EUROSTAT
Low achievers in all subjects (science, reading and mathematics) (15 y.o.)	Estonia	5	5	11	15	12	60	Kosovo	2015	OECD, PISA 2015
Top performers in at least one subject (science, reading and mathematics) (15 y.o.)	Turkey	2	20	8	10	-	22	Switzerland	2015	OECD, PISA 2015
Frequently bullied students (15 y.o.) ³	Netherlands	3	10	18	10	9	18	Latvia	2015	OECD, PISA 2015
How satisfied are you with your education? (Mean 1-10; aged 18-24)	Croatia	6,9	8,0	7,6	7,9	7,6	8,7	Portugal	2016	Eurofound, European Quality of Life Survey 2016
Training or courses for nonprofessional reasons over the last 12 months, including online courses (aged 18-24)	Czech Republic	5	35	33	29	24	43	Austria	2016	Eurofound, European Quality of Life Survey 2016
Internet use: doing an online course (of any subject) (aged 16-24)	Turkey	3	23	10	22	10	41	Finland	2017	EUROSTAT
There are great or all possibilities for me to acquire the education I want (age 15-25)	-	-	86	70	63	-	-	-	2018	Young people in Baltics: Survey, 2018
There are great or all possibilities for me for improvement, attending various courses, training, seminars (age 15-25)	-	-	66	68	52	-	-	-	2018	Young people in Baltics: Survey, 2018

¹Upper secondary, post-secondary non-tertiary and tertiary education (levels 3-8).

²Early leavers from education and training denotes the percentage of the population aged 18 to 24 having attained at most lower secondary education and not being involved in further education or training. The numerator of the indicator refers to persons aged 18 to 24 who meet the following two conditions: (a) the highest level of education or training they have completed is ISCED 2011 level 0, 1 or 2 (ISCED 1997: 0, 1, 2 or 3C short) and (b) they have not received any education or training (i.e. neither formal nor non-formal) in the four weeks preceding the survey. The denominator in the total population consists of the same age group, excluding the respondents who have not answered the questions 'highest level of education or training successfully completed' and 'participation in education and training'.

³A student is frequently bullied if he or she is in the top 10% of the index of exposure to bullying among all countries/economies.

Family & Peers

- In average 85% of the young people aged 16-24 in the EU live together with their parents, while in the Baltic States this rate is lower – in Latvia 83%, in Lithuania 81%, in Estonia 78%. Estimated average age of young people leaving the parental household in Latvia is 27, in Lithuania – 26, in Estonia – 23 years.
- Mean age at first marriage is comparatively higher in Estonia: 32 years for male, 30 years for female. In Lithuania, this rate is the lowest among the Baltic States – 30 years for male, 28 years for female.
- All three Baltic States demonstrate high level of divorce rate. Divorces per 100 marriages in Estonia is 51, in Latvia 47, in Lithuania 42.
- The proportion of live births outside marriage varies in different Baltic countries. In average 43% of children are born outside marriage in the EU, while in Estonia – 56%, in Latvia – 41%, but in Lithuania – 27%.
- At the same time subjective self-reported satisfaction with his/ her family life in the Baltic States is explicitly higher than the average in the EU (most often positive evaluation is presented in Lithuania).
- Still, not all young people are satisfied with possibilities to spend time with their family: 79% of Estonian, 78% of Lithuanian and 75% of Latvian young people provided positive answers.
- Less positive prospects concern the possibility to meet like-minded people. In this respect positive responses are provided by 67% of young people in Estonia, 75% – in Latvia and only 54% in Lithuania.
- In average 19% of young people in the EU estimates that it is difficult to deal with important problems that come up in their life. Estonia and Latvia demonstrate similar rate to the EU average (17% and 18%); while in Lithuania this rate is remarkably higher (23%).
- In the meantime, young people have divergent opinions of how long time it takes to get back to normal after things go wrong in their life. In Estonia, only 9% of young people agree that it takes a long time, in Latvia – 17% and Lithuania – 20%. The EU average is 18%, so in this respect Estonian rate is more positive, but Lithuanian rate – more negative than the average.
- 63% of Lithuanian, 64% of Latvian and 76% of Estonian young people have positive opinion of possibilities to receive help in difficult, problematic situations.

Indicator	The lowest rate: Country	The lowest rate	EE	LV	LT	EU (28)	The highest rate	The highest rate: Country	Year	Data source
Share of young people aged 16-24 living with their parents	Denmark	53	78	83	81	85	96	Croatia	2017	EUROSTAT
Estimated average age of young people leaving the parental household	Sweden	21	23	27	26	26	33	Montenegro	2017	EUROSTAT
Mean age at first marriage: Male	Belarus	28	32	31	30	-	37	Sweden	2016	EUROSTAT
Mean age at first marriage: Female	Turkey	25	30	29	28	-	34	Sweden	2016	EUROSTAT
Proportion of live births outside marriage	Turkey	3	56	41	27	43	70	Iceland	2016	EUROSTAT
Divorces per 100 marriages	Kosovo	7	51	47	42	-	69	Portugal	2016	EUROSTAT
How satisfied are you with your family life? (Mean 1-10; aged 18-24)	Belgium	7,4	8,5	8,4	8,7	8,2	9,1	Luxembourg	2016	Eurofound, European Quality of Life Survey 2016
How satisfied are you with your friends? (Satisfied, 6-10 on 10-point-scale; aged 15-24)	-	-	85	90	69	-	-	-	2018	Young people in Baltics: Survey, 2018
I find it difficult to deal with important problems that come up in my life (agree or strongly agree; aged 18-24)	Austria	9	17	18	23	19	42	Sweden	2016	Eurofound, European Quality of Life Survey 2016
When things go wrong in my life, it generally takes me a long time to get back to normal (agree or strongly agree; aged 18-24)	Slovakia	7	9	17	20	18	30	Sweden	2016	Eurofound, European Quality of Life Survey 2016
There are great or all possibilities for me to spend time with my family (age 15-25)	-	-	79	75	78	-	-	-	2018	Young people in Baltics: Survey, 2018
There are great or all possibilities for me to influence decisions in my family (age 15-25)	-	-	74	74	70	-	-	-	2018	Young people in Baltics: Survey, 2018
There are great or all possibilities for me to get help in difficult, problematic situations (age 15-25)	-	-	76	64	63	-	-	-	2018	Young people in Baltics: Survey, 2018
There are great or all possibilities for me to get to know like-minded people (in my city/ municipality, on the Internet) (age 15-25)	-	-	67	75	54	-	-	-	2018	Young people in Baltics: Survey, 2018
There are great or all possibilities for me to spend time with friends (age 15-25)	-	-	80	77	77	-	-	-	2018	Young people in Baltics: Survey, 2018

Material & Social Well-being

- All three Baltic States demonstrate higher income inequality index than average in the EU. Lithuania has the highest, while Estonia – the lowest among the Baltic States.
- Every fourth young person in Estonia and Latvia is at risk of poverty or social exclusion; every fifth – at risk of poverty. In Lithuania, these rates are even higher – every third young person is at risk of poverty or social exclusion; every fourth – at risk of poverty.
- In average 13% of young people in the EU declares the difficulty to make ends in the household; while in Baltic States this rate is lower – in Latvia and Lithuania 8%, in Estonia 6%.
- In Latvia, 13% of young people aged 18-24 has been in arrears for utility bills and 12% – in arrears for payments related to informal loans from friends or relatives. These are the highest rates among the Baltic States and explicitly higher than in average in the EU.
- Approximately every tenth young person in Latvia and Estonia cannot afford buying new clothes (that corresponds to the average in the EU), but in Lithuania – every fourth young person.
- Satisfaction rate with the present standard of living is slightly lower in the Baltic States than in the EU in average. Still, young people express very divergent views on satisfaction with their income – 67% of Estonian young people are satisfied, while in Latvia this rate is 52% and in Lithuania – only 27%. These rates correlate with the opinion of young people on their possibilities to achieve financial success in life: in Estonia 72% of young people has positive view on this, in Latvia – 59%, while in Lithuania – only 53%.
- Appraisal is more positive concerning the possibilities to achieve success in life in general – in Estonia 80% expresses positive opinion, in Latvia – 76%, in Lithuania – 67%.
- It is interesting that these indicators have no obvious correlation with worries of young people about their income in old age – in Lithuania young people are comparatively less concerned about that (although they are the most critical about their present situation and future prospects). Latvian young people are concerned more about that (Latvia is also the only Baltic States demonstrating higher rate than average in the EU).
- All three Baltic States have explicitly high proportion of those young people who consider there is a tension between different groups in society. Lithuanian young people are more concerned about the tension between poor and rich people, Estonian young people are concerned about the tension among different ethnic groups and about the tension between people with different sexual orientations. Besides, these rates are higher than the average in the EU. In the meantime, Lithuanian young people have less than in average EU young people expressed concern about the tension among ethnic groups, and in Latvia – about the tension between people with different sexual orientations.

Indicator	The lowest rate: Country	The lowest rate	EE	LV	LT	EU (28)	The highest rate	The highest rate: Country	Year	Data source
Gini coefficient of equivalised disposable income (0-100) ¹	Slovakia	23	32	35	38	30	40	Bulgaria	2017	EUROSTAT
Young people at risk of poverty or social exclusion (aged 15-24)	Czechia	14	25	27	34	29	45	Greece	2017	EUROSTAT
Young people at risk of poverty (aged 15-24) ²	Czechia	12	22	19	27	23	34	Romania	2017	EUROSTAT
Material and social deprivation rate (aged 15-24) ³	Luxembourg	4	8	23	24	14	47	Romania	2017	EUROSTAT
Severe material deprivation rate (aged 15-24) ⁴	Luxembourg	1	4	12	14	8	37	Bulgaria	2017	EUROSTAT
How satisfied are you with your income (stipend/ salary/ allowances)? (Satisfied, 6-10 on 10-point-scale; aged 15-25)	-	-	67	52	27	-	-	-	2018	Young people in Baltics: Survey, 2018
How satisfied are you with your present standard of living? (Mean 1-10; aged 18-24)	Bulgaria	5,9	7,4	7,4	7,3	7,5	8,5	Austria	2016	Eurofound, European Quality of Life Survey 2016
Difficulty to make ends meet in your household (aged 18-24)	United Kingdom	1	6	8	8	13	54	Spain	2016	Eurofound, European Quality of Life Survey 2016
Cannot afford paying for a week's annual holiday away from home (aged 18-24)	Netherlands	10	42	29	39	30	66	Romania	2016	Eurofound, European Quality of Life Survey 2016
Cannot afford buying new, rather than second-hand, clothes (aged 18-24)	Netherlands	2	11	10	25	11	36	Greece	2016	Eurofound, European Quality of Life Survey 2016
Cannot afford a meal with meat, chicken, fish every second day if you wanted it (aged 18-24)	Ireland	0	3	3	10	7	25	Bulgaria	2016	Eurofound, European Quality of Life Survey 2016
Household been in arrears for utility bills in the last 12 month (aged 18-24)	Slovakia	1	4	13	9	9	51	Greece	2016	Eurofound, European Quality of Life Survey 2016
Household been in arrears for payments related to informal loans from friends or relatives in the last 12 month (aged 18-24)	Poland	0	3	12	7	5	28	Greece	2016	Eurofound, European Quality of Life Survey 2016
How worried are you that your income in old age will not be sufficient? (Mean 1-10; aged 18-24)	Ireland	3,1	5,1	6,0	4,4	5,5	7,5	Greece	2016	Eurofound, European Quality of Life Survey 2016
Perceived tension between poor and rich people (some or a lot of tension; aged 18-24)	Bulgaria	69	88	83	91	85	95	Belgium	2016	Eurofound, European Quality of Life Survey 2016
Perceived tension between different racial and ethnic groups (some or a lot of tension; aged 18-24)	Lithuania	66	91	88	66	88	99	Netherlands	2016	Eurofound, European Quality of Life Survey 2016
Perceived tension between people with different sexual orientations (some or a lot of tension; aged 18-24)	Denmark	51	93	73	88	75	93	Estonia	2016	Eurofound, European Quality of Life Survey 2016
There are great or all possibilities for me to achieve success in life (age 15-25)	-	-	80	76	67	-	-	-	2018	Young people in Baltics: Survey, 2018
There are great or all possibilities for me to achieve material, financial success in life (age 15-25)	-	-	72	59	53	-	-	-	2018	Young people in Baltics: Survey, 2018

¹The Gini coefficient measures the extent to which the distribution of income within a country deviates from a perfectly equal distribution. A coefficient of 0 expresses perfect equality where everyone has the same income, while a coefficient of 100 expresses full inequality where only one person has all the income.

²Cut-off point: 60% of median equivalised income after social transfers.

³The collection "Material deprivation" covers indicators relating to economic strain, durables, housing deprivation and environment of the dwelling.

⁴Definition: percentage of the population that cannot afford at least four of the following nine items: 1) to pay their rent, mortgage or utility bills; 2) to keep their home adequately warm; 3) to face unexpected expenses; 4) to eat meat or proteins regularly; 5) to go on holiday; or cannot afford to buy a: 6) TV 7) Refrigerator, 8) Car, 9) Telephone.

Housing & Environment

- 7% of young people in the EU in average live in poor amenities (overcrowded, leaking roof, no bath/ shower and no indoor toilet, or a dwelling considered too dark). In Latvia this rate is one of the highest in the EU – every fourth young person stays in such a dwelling. In Lithuania this rate is 13%, in Estonia – 6%.
- This corresponds to the opinions on the dwelling expressed by young people themselves – in Latvia the evaluation rate is the lowest among the Baltic States, in Estonia and Lithuania – it is lower than average EU rate.
- Every third young person in Latvia, every fourth in Lithuania and 28% in Estonia indicate there is a shortage of space in his/ her accommodation.
- Young people from all three countries, especially those from Lithuania are satisfied with their local area as a place to live. Besides, the rates of all three countries are higher than the average in the EU.
- In the meantime, comparatively large proportion of young people does not consider their city/ municipality as a friendly place for young people. In Latvia 72% of young people appraises their municipality as friendly for young people, in Estonia – 62%, but in Lithuania – only 51%.
- Comparatively negative opinions are expressed in relation to personal safety in the locality after darkness. In average in the EU 72% of young people feels safe after dark, in Estonia – 65%, in Lithuania – 59%, in Latvia – only 54%.
- Both in Estonia and Latvia about 81-82% of young people are satisfied with their personal safety on the Internet, while in Lithuania this rate is explicitly lower (58%).
- At the same time, 12% of Latvian young people suggests they have experienced online harassment. In Lithuania this rate is only 3%, in Estonia – 0%.

Indicator	The lowest rate: Country	The lowest rate	EE	LV	LT	EU (28)	The highest rate	The highest rate: Country	Year	Data source
Severe housing deprivation rate (aged 15-24) ¹	Finland	1	6	24	13	7	27	Romania	2017	EUROSTAT
How satisfied are you with your accommodation? (Mean 1-10; aged 18-24)	Bulgaria	7,0	7,4	7,1	7,5	7,7	8,8	Luxembourg	2016	Eurofound, European Quality of Life Survey 2016
Problems with your accommodation: Shortage of space (aged 18-24)	Slovakia	7	28	32	24	23	32	Germany	2016	Eurofound, European Quality of Life Survey 2016
How satisfied are you with your local area as a place to live? (Mean 1-10; aged 18-24)	France	7,1	7,6	7,5	8,2	7,5	8,9	Slovakia	2016	Eurofound, European Quality of Life Survey 2016
How friendly is your city/municipality for young people? (Satisfied, 6-10 on 10-point-scale; aged 15-25)	-	-	62	72	51	-	-	-	2018	Young people in Baltics: Survey, 2018
Difficulty to access recreational or green areas (rather or very difficult; aged 18-24)	Denmark	4	19	7	17	14	24	Bulgaria	2016	Eurofound, European Quality of Life Survey 2016
I feel safe when I walk alone after dark (agree or strongly agree; aged 18-24)	Czech Republic	40	65	54	59	72	83	Portugal	2016	Eurofound, European Quality of Life Survey 2016
How satisfied are you with your personal safety on the Internet, social networks? (Satisfied, 6-10 on 10-point-scale; aged 15-25)	-	-	81	82	58	-	-	-	2018	Young people in Baltics: Survey, 2018
Experienced online harassment over the last 12 month (aged 18-24)	Estonia	0	0	12	3	6	26	Austria	2016	Eurofound, European Quality of Life Survey 2016

¹Severe housing deprivation rate is defined as the percentage of population living in the dwelling which is considered as overcrowded, while also exhibiting at least one of the housing deprivation measures. Housing deprivation is a measure of poor amenities and is calculated by referring to those households with a leaking roof, no bath/shower and no indoor toilet, or a dwelling considered too dark.

Employment & Entrepreneurship

- The proportion of youth (aged 15-24) employment in Estonia is higher (41%) than the average in the EU (35%), but in Latvia and Lithuania – lower (respectively 33% and 30%).
- At the same time youth unemployment rate is explicitly lower in Estonia and Lithuania than in the EU in average (12%-13% and 17%), while in Latvia – the same as the average in the EU (17%).
- The numbers of young people neither in employment nor in education (NEET rates) are similar in all three countries and they are slightly lower than in the EU in average – in Lithuania and Estonia 9%, in Latvia 10%, in the EU 11%.
- Estonian and Latvian young people are satisfied with their present job; meanwhile opinions of Lithuanian young people are less positive than in average in the EU.
- Young people in each of the Baltic States evaluate differently their possibilities to find a job or to do business. Estonian young people are more positive about their prospects, while Lithuanian young people – are more negative. They have expressed particularly negative opinions concerning the possibilities to do business – 46% of young people in Estonia, 35% in Latvia and only 20% in Lithuania declare they have such possibilities. Young people estimate critically also possibilities to find a job that they like – optimistic opinions are expressed by 60% of young people in Estonia, 48% in Latvia and only 36% in Lithuania.
- They are more positive about possibilities to choose a profession/ occupation they like – positive opinions are expressed by 73% of Estonian, 67% of Latvian and 62% of Lithuanian young people.

Indicator	The lowest rate: Country	The lowest rate	EE	LV	LT	EU (28)	The highest rate	The highest rate: Country	Year	Data source
Youth employment (aged 15-24)	Greece	14	41	33	30	35	76	Iceland	2017	EUROSTAT
Youth unemployment (aged 15-24)	Germany	7	12	17	13	17	47	Macedonia	2017	EUROSTAT
Youth (aged 15-24) long-term unemployment rate (12 months or longer)	Denmark	1	3	3	nd	5	33	Macedonia	2017	EUROSTAT
Young people aged 15-24 neither in employment nor in education and training (NEET rates) ¹	Iceland	4	9	10	9	11	25	Macedonia	2017	EUROSTAT
How satisfied are you with your present job? (Mean 1-10; aged 18-24) ²	Croatia	5,2	7,7	7,7	7,3	7,5	8,7	Finland	2016	Eurofound, European Quality of Life Survey 2016
There are great or all possibilities for me to choose a profession/ occupation I like myself (age 15-25)	-	-	73	67	62	-	-	-	2018	Young people in Baltics: Survey, 2018
There are great or all possibilities for me to find a job that I like (age 15-25)	-	-	60	48	36	-	-	-	2018	Young people in Baltics: Survey, 2018
There are great or all possibilities for me to do business (age 15-25)	-	-	46	35	20	-	-	-	2018	Young people in Baltics: Survey, 2018

¹The indicator on young people neither in employment nor in education and training (NEET) corresponds to the percentage of the population of a given age group and sex who is not employed and not involved in further education or training. The numerator of the indicator refers to persons who meet the following two conditions: (a) they are not employed (i.e. unemployed or inactive according to the International Labour Organisation definition) and (b) they have not received any education or training (i.e. neither formal nor non-formal) in the four weeks preceding the survey. The denominator in the total population consists of the same age group and sex, excluding the respondents who have not answered the question 'participation in regular (formal) education and training'. Due to no answers to the variable 'participation in education and training' or 'educational attainment level', certain breakdowns of NEET rates may not exactly sum up to the overall NEET rate for a given age group and sex.

²From those employed.

Participation

- Young people in Estonia are more positive, while young people in Lithuania – more critical about their possibilities to take part in different public and leisure time activities. Young people in all three countries have comparatively positive views about possibilities to attend cultural and entertainment events, to spend free time the way they want, to do hobby that they are interested in, and to be engaged in volunteering work.
- They assess more critically possibilities to be engaged in the activities of political organizations and parties, to influence decisions of the municipality and to influence decisions at their school or university.
- Moreover, Estonian young people have more positive views on possibilities to get engaged in amateur art activities, in volunteering, to express freely their opinions, judgments, beliefs.
- Young people in all three countries have been active participants in cultural and entertainment events, in hobby groups and interest clubs, have often taken part in school or university events, travelled across their country or abroad and taken part in courses, seminars and training.
- Less regularly young people have been engaged in the activities of political organizations and parties, youth centres and clubs, youth councils and project calls.
- Even though data suggest that young people are actively engaged in different activities, at the same time part of them acknowledges that they seldom have time to do the things they really enjoy – 17% of young people in Estonia has expressed such opinion; 38%-39% young people in Latvia and Lithuania have declared the same, which is higher rate than in the EU in average (32%).
- Data also reveal that a large proportion of young people in Estonia and Lithuania (35% and 45%) has difficulty to access cinema, theatre or cultural centre due to limited physical access, financial resources or other reasons. Latvia has comparatively lower rate, though still rather high (27%).
- Data also suggest that Estonian and Lithuanian young people more often than Latvian young people post opinions on civic or political issues via websites and take part in on-line consultations or vote to define civic or political issues. Meanwhile Estonian and Latvian young people more often have used the Internet for interacting with public authorities; Lithuanian young people have done this considerably more seldom. Still these rates are higher than the average EU rates.

Indicator	The lowest rate: Country	The lowest rate	EE	LV	LT	EU (28)	The highest rate	The highest rate: Country	Year	Data source
Minimum age that an individual can be a candidate for elected office	-	-	21	21	21	-	-	-	2018	National legislation
Minimum age that an individual can vote in national elections	-	-	18	18	18	-	-	-	2018	National legislation
Minimum age that an individual can vote in municipal elections	-	-	16	18	18	-	-	-	2018	National legislation
Persons who cannot afford to regularly participate in a leisure activity (aged 16-24)	Finland	3	3	11	21	14	51	Romania	2015	EUROSTAT
Internet use: taking part in on-line consultations or voting to define civic or political issues (e.g. urban planning, signing a petition) (aged 16-24)	Czechia	2	12	5	14	10	38	Malta	2017	EUROSTAT
Internet use: posting opinions on civic or political issues via websites (e.g. blogs, social networks, etc.) (aged 16-24)	Austria	5	15	9	14	16	27	Iceland	2017	EUROSTAT
Individuals using the Internet for interacting with public authorities (aged 16-24)	Romania	6	87	80	57	46	91	Finland	2017	EUROSTAT
Have you participated in the following activities in the last year? (aged 15-25)										
Cultural and entertainment events	-	-	83	85	84	-	-	-	2018	Young people in Baltics: Survey, 2018
Environmental clean-up activities	-	-	41	38	49	-	-	-	2018	Young people in Baltics: Survey, 2018
Hobby groups, interest clubs	-	-	71	48	44	-	-	-	2018	Young people in Baltics: Survey, 2018
Non-governmental organisations	-	-	27	17	29	-	-	-	2018	Young people in Baltics: Survey, 2018
Political parties	-	-	5	4	3	-	-	-	2018	Young people in Baltics: Survey, 2018
Youth organisations	-	-	38	22	35	-	-	-	2018	Young people in Baltics: Survey, 2018
School/ University events	-	-	87	62	80	-	-	-	2018	Young people in Baltics: Survey, 2018
Volunteering	-	-	63	34	47	-	-	-	2018	Young people in Baltics: Survey, 2018
Youth projects	-	-	41	24	34	-	-	-	2018	Young people in Baltics: Survey, 2018
Youth centre/ club	-	-	33	19	22	-	-	-	2018	Young people in Baltics: Survey, 2018
Pupil/ students' parliament/ self-government	-	-	25	14	23	-	-	-	2018	Young people in Baltics: Survey, 2018
Youth council	-	-	12	6	9	-	-	-	2018	Young people in Baltics: Survey, 2018
Project calls (business, social projects, etc.)	-	-	14	21	19	-	-	-	2018	Young people in Baltics: Survey, 2018
Artistic activity, amateur art (choir, dance groups, music groups, etc.)	-	-	58	41	45	-	-	-	2018	Young people in Baltics: Survey, 2018

Indicator	The lowest rate: Country	The lowest rate	EE	LV	LT	EU (28)	The highest rate	The highest rate: Country	Year	Data source
Traveling across our country	-	-	87	77	64	-	-	-	2018	Young people in Baltics: Survey, 2018
Travelling abroad	-	-	68	55	50	-	-	-	2018	Young people in Baltics: Survey, 2018
Courses, seminars, training, continuing education (including in the Internet)	-	-	63	46	42	-	-	-	2018	Young people in Baltics: Survey, 2018
I seldom have time to do the things I really enjoy (agree or strongly agree; aged 18-24)	Estonia	17	17	38	39	32	50	Croatia	2016	Eurofound, European Quality of Life Survey 2016
Satisfaction with the way democracy works in your country (Mean 1-10; aged 18-24)	Bulgaria	4,0	5,6	5,5	6,0	5,5	7,2	Luxembourg	2016	Eurofound, European Quality of Life Survey 2016
Signed a petition, including an e-mail or on-line petition over the last 12 months (aged 18-24)	Greece	5	14	8	19	25	48	Sweden	2016	Eurofound, European Quality of Life Survey 2016
There are great or all possibilities for me to do hobby that I am interested in (age 15-25)	-	-	70	69	57	-	-	-	2018	Young people in Baltics: Survey, 2018
There are great or all possibilities for me to spend free time the way I want it (age 15-25)	-	-	74	67	55	-	-	-	2018	Young people in Baltics: Survey, 2018
There are great or all possibilities for me to attend cultural and entertainment events (age 15-25)	-	-	73	70	60	-	-	-	2018	Young people in Baltics: Survey, 2018
There are great or all possibilities for me to travel, explore other cultures, countries (age 15-25)	-	-	47	43	32	-	-	-	2018	Young people in Baltics: Survey, 2018
There are great or all possibilities for me for participation in amateur art, artistic activities (age 15-25)	-	-	71	53	46	-	-	-	2018	Young people in Baltics: Survey, 2018
There are great or all possibilities for me to engage in the activities of non-governmental organizations (age 15-25)	-	-	37	37	35	-	-	-	2018	Young people in Baltics: Survey, 2018
There are great or all possibilities for me to engage in the activities of political organizations and parties (age 15-25)	-	-	24	22	17	-	-	-	2018	Young people in Baltics: Survey, 2018
There are great or all possibilities for me to engage in the activities of youth organisations (age 15-25)	-	-	55	49	46	-	-	-	2018	Young people in Baltics: Survey, 2018
There are great or all possibilities for me to participate in projects and activities organized for youth (age 15-25)	-	-	60	57	53	-	-	-	2018	Young people in Baltics: Survey, 2018
There are great or all possibilities for me for volunteering (age 15-25)	-	-	68	68	62	-	-	-	2018	Young people in Baltics: Survey, 2018
There are great or all possibilities for me to influence decisions of the municipality (age 15-25)	-	-	21	12	9	-	-	-	2018	Young people in Baltics: Survey, 2018
There are great or all possibilities for me to influence decisions at my school/ university (age 15-25)	-	-	42	29	27	-	-	-	2018	Young people in Baltics: Survey, 2018
There are great or all possibilities for me to receive reliable, objective information about events in the country and world (age 15-25)	-	-	70	66	66	-	-	-	2018	Young people in Baltics: Survey, 2018
There are great or all possibilities for me to freely express my opinions, judgments, beliefs (age 15-25)	-	-	75	71	58	-	-	-	2018	Young people in Baltics: Survey, 2018
Difficulty to access cinema, theatre or cultural centre (rather or very difficult; aged 18-24)	Finland	13	35	27	45	33	57	Romania	2016	Eurofound, European Quality of Life Survey 2016

Health & Risk Behaviour

- The highest rates of live births (mother's aged 15-24) are in Latvia; per 10 000 females there are 199 births. The lowest rate is in Estonia – 142 births.
- Estonia is the leader for legally induced abortions – per 10 000 females aged 15-24 there have been 222 abortions, in Latvia – 105, in Lithuania – 59.
- 20% of young people in the EU has overweight or obese; each of the Baltic States has different rate – Estonia 22%, Latvia 19%, Lithuania 15% which is the lowest rate in the EU.
- Among young people in the Baltic States extremely high are crude death rates by suicide. Among 100 000 persons aged 15-19 in Estonia crude death rate by suicide is 14, in Lithuania 13, but Latvia 11. The higher these rates are in age group 20-24 – in Estonia rate is 15, in Latvia 16, but Lithuania 24 (and it's highest rate in Europe).
- Proportion of smoking young people in all three Baltic States is slightly larger than in the EU in average, meanwhile alcohol use is less regular than in the EU in average.
- Illicit drug use differs in each of three Baltic countries. 17%-18% of young people in Latvia and Lithuania and 25% in Estonia have used cannabis at least once in their lifetime. 8% of Lithuanian, 13% of Estonian and 18% of Latvian young people have used inhalants at least once in lifetime.
- 12% of young people in Estonia and Lithuania have been engaged in money gambling, while in Latvia this rate is higher – 16%, this is also higher rate than average in the EU (14%).
- Self-perceived health assessment suggests that 30% of young people in the EU consider they have long-standing illness or health problems. In Estonia this rate is higher (35%), in Latvia 31%, in Lithuania 23%.
- The proportion of young people who have delayed visit to doctor to save money is larger in Latvia (26%) than in Estonia (8%) or in Lithuania (0%). This correlates with young people views on possibilities to receive health care services – in Estonia 83% of young people confirm they have such possibilities, in Lithuania – 83% in Latvia – only 72%.
- According to the self-reported assessment, 5% of young people in the EU in average has felt downhearted and depressed. In Lithuania this rate is slightly lower (3%), but in Estonia and Latvia – higher (7% and 11%).
- 86% of young people in Estonia, 70% in Latvia and Lithuania consider they have possibilities to engage in physical activities.
- Estonian young people are more positive (85%) about possibilities for daily consumption of healthy food than Latvian and Lithuanian young people (77% and 61%).

Indicator	The lowest rate: Country	The lowest rate	EE	LV	LT	EU (28)	The highest rate	The highest rate: Country	Year	Data source
Mean age of women at birth of first child	Azerbaijan	24	28	27	27	29	31	Italy	2016	EUROSTAT
Live births (mother's aged 15-19; per 10 000)	-	-	45	80	62	-	-	-	2016	EUROSTAT
Live births (mother's aged 15-24; per 10 000)	-	-	142	199	160	-	-	-	2016	EUROSTAT
Legally induced abortions (mother's aged 15-24; per 10 000)	-	-	222	105	59	-	-	-	2016	EUROSTAT
Body mass index (aged 15-24): Underweight ¹	Czechia	5	8	6	9	10	14	France	2014	EUROSTAT
Body mass index (aged 15-24): Overweight or obese ¹	Lithuania	15	22	19	15	20	33	Malta	2014	EUROSTAT
Crude death rate (per 100 000) by suicide: 15-19 ²	Greece	1	14	11	13	-	22	Iceland	2016	World Health Organization
Crude death rate (per 100 000) by suicide: 20-24 ²	Greece	4	15	16	24	-	24	Lithuania	2016	World Health Organization
Cigarette use past 30 days (15-16)	Iceland	6	21	24	24	21	37	Italy	2015	ESPAD
Alcohol use past 30 days (15-16)	Iceland	9	38	44	34	48	73	Denmark	2015	ESPAD
Lifetime use of cannabis (15-16)	Moldova	4	25	17	18	16	37	Czech Republic	2015	ESPAD
Lifetime use of illicit drugs other than cannabis (15-16)	Finland	2	5	7	5	5	11	Bulgaria	2015	ESPAD
Lifetime use of inhalants (15-16)	Moldova	1	13	18	8	7	25	Croatia	2015	ESPAD
Money gambling during the last 12 months (15-16)	Moldova	5	12	16	12	14	30	Greece	2015	ESPAD
Internet use: seeking health information (16-24)	Italy	31	71	39	59	51	78	Malta	2017	EUROSTAT
Self-perceived health (From 16 to 24 years): Very good or good ³	Portugal	84	85	86	87	93	98	Greece	2017	EUROSTAT
Self-perceived health (From 16 to 24 years): Bad or very bad ³	Malta	0,2	2	2	1	1	3	Luxembourg	2017	EUROSTAT
Self-perceived long-standing limitations in usual activities due to health problem (From 16 to 24 years): Some or severe ⁴	Malta	2	13	12	7	7	19	Finland	2017	EUROSTAT
People having a long-standing illness or health problem (From 16 to 24 years) ⁵	Italy	7	35	31	23	30	39	Finland	2017	EUROSTAT
Self-reported unmet needs for medical examination (aged 16-24) ⁶	Spain	0,1	11	6	1	1	11	Estonia	2017	EUROSTAT
Delayed visit to doctor to save money (delayed or didn't go at all; aged 18-24)	Lithuania	0	8	26	0	11	36	Romania	2016	Eurofound, European Quality of Life Survey 2016
I have felt downhearted and depressed (most or all of the time; aged 18-24)	Bulgaria	0	7	11	3	5	11	Latvia	2016	Eurofound, European Quality of Life Survey 2016
Taking part in sports or physical exercise at least once a week (aged 18-24)	Bulgaria	18	69	77	62	65	87	Netherlands	2016	Eurofound, European Quality of Life Survey 2016
There are great or all possibilities for me to receive health care services (age 15-25)	-	-	83	72	81	-	-	-	2018	Young people in Baltics: Survey, 2018
There are great or all possibilities for me to engage in physical activities, sports (outside school/university) (age 15-25)	-	-	86	82	70	-	-	-	2018	Young people in Baltics: Survey, 2018

Indicator	The lowest rate: Country	The lowest rate	EE	LV	LT	EU (28)	The highest rate	The highest rate: Country	Year	Data source
There are great or all possibilities for me for daily consumption of healthy food (age 15-25)	-	-	85	77	61	-	-	-	2018	Young people in Baltics: Survey, 2018

¹Body mass index (BMI): Distribution of the population according to their body mass index (BMI). BMI is defined as the weight in kilos divided by the square of the height in meters. Underweight: BMI less than 18.5. Normal weight: BMI between 18.5 and less than 25. Obese or overweight: BMI equal or greater than 25.

²The crude death rate describes mortality in relation to the total population. Expressed in deaths per 100,000 inhabitants, it is calculated as the number of deaths recorded in the population for a given period divided by population in the same period and then multiplied by 100,000.

³Self-perceived health: the concept is operationalized by a question on how a person perceives his/her health in general using one of the answer categories very good/ good/ fair/ bad/ very bad.

⁴Activity limitation: the concept is operationalized by using the Global Activity Limitation Indicator (GALI) for observing limitation in activities people usually do because of one or more health problems. The limitation should have lasted for at least the past six months. Three answer categories are possible: 'severely limited', 'limited but not severely' or 'not limited at all'.

⁵Chronic morbidity: the concept is operationalized by a question asking if the respondent suffers from any longstanding (of a duration of at least six months) illness or health problem.

⁶Self-reported unmet needs: Person's own assessment of whether he or she needed examination or treatment for a specific type of health care, but didn't have it or didn't seek for it. EU-SILC collects data on two types of health care services: medical care and dental care. Medical care: refers to individual health care services (medical examination or treatment excluding dental care) provided by or under direct supervision of medical doctors or equivalent professions according to national health care systems.



Agency for International
Programs for Youth
Republic of Latvia



Co-funded by the
Erasmus+ Programme
of the European Union

(RE)SEARCHING FOR QUALITY OF LIFE OF YOUNG PEOPLE IN BALTICS
ERASMUS+ Strategic Partnership Project in Youth Field
(NR. 2017-2-LV02-KA205-001657)

 Latvian Child
Welfare Network

 excolo
LATVIA

 ZIBURIO FONDAS



Lastekaitse Liit
Estonian Union for Child Welfare

 Web
Multishop
Company