

Vira Derega
PhD in Political Science, Associate Professor
at the Public Policy and Management Department,
Petro Mohyla Black Sea State University

PUBLIC FAMILY POLICY: THE THEORY AND PROBLEMS OF REALIZATION

Public family policy is essential component of public policy of any state and is considered as a powerful instrument on the development of family institute.

State of family in Ukraine characterized by such tendencies: low and low-est-low fertility rates; postponement of childbearing to a later age; a rise in birth outside marriage and lone parents; decreasing of the number of marriages and increasing of the number of divorces; widening of cohabitation, non-marital relationships; the decline in average family; population ageing. These features points to depopulation process, demographic crisis and crisis of family institute. The elements of crisis are interconnected, because of objective laws of demographic processes passing. Indicated tendencies influence on all spheres of society, are threatening from socio-economic point of view and even for the very existence of Ukrainian nation. In this situation a state can and should impact on this sphere.

The aim, tasks and content of public family policy in whole are defined by its outlook bases - conception. Exactly from conceptual, ideological understanding family policy depends practical content its trends, tasks, principles and fullness of normative acts, program documents, character of public agency activities in an appropriate sphere.

In common understanding public family policy can be defined as actions of state and other political subjects aimed to statement or change family relations, family as social phenomenon and which determined by political ideology concerning family values. Accordingly to conceptual understanding actions aimed to regulation of family relations can differ a lot. In the given work public family policy understanding as such that aimed to strengthening family and family relations.

In scientific discussion concerning conceptual bases of public family policy thoughts are stipulated two paradigms, crisis and transform. Attitude to process of family institute development, its estimating determinates practical content of compliant public family policy: or supporting egalitarian relations, or providing priority of family as integrity, consolidation of family living, advance of role and meaning of traditional family values.

of conception bases of public family policy, this has determined choice of the given article theme.

Analysis of recent research

The essence, intension, trends and role public family policy examined in the works of Ukrainian researchers Vakulenko, G.Kryshstal, L.Culachok, L.Melnichuk, A.Mishin, S.Nychiporenko, Y.Pidlisnyi [1], I.Semenets-Orlova, L.Slyusar [10], I.Chehovska; Western researchers D.E.Bloom, C.Brian, D.Canning, A.J.Kahn, A.Kalwij, S.Kammerman [7], D.Popenoe, W.Lutz, P.McDonald, S.Scherbov, H.-W.Sinn; Russian researchers A.Antonov [8], I.Beloborodov, A.Bogaevska, V.Vishnevskiy, S.Darmodehin, S.Caunova, G.Climantova, V.Medcov, A.Pyanov [9].

Along with considerable attention to the given subject-matter, the questions of essence and intension of public family policy are needed in further studying. This stipulated choice of the given article theme.

Statement of research objectives

The aim of the work is defining of conceptual and the main practical foundations of public family policy.

Results

The aim, tasks and content of public family policy in whole are defined by its outlook bases - conception. Exactly from conceptual, ideological understanding family policy depends practical content its trends, tasks, principles and fullness of normative acts, program documents, and character of public agency activities in an appropriate sphere.

As stated Y.Pidlisnyi, family policy as well as another policy always based on defined outlook foundations. Even if they are not defined in preamble or another part of document, they always will look through contents of corresponding laws and normative acts, and in practical consequences. Therefore, at the time of family policy forming it is very important to clarify outlook foundation of this policy for its integrity and consistency [1, p.1].

For defining the essence of family policy, it is necessary to advert to encyclopedic and reference literature. Thus, the authors of Public Administration Encyclopedia defined family policy as purposeful activity directed to development of marriage and family relation, making conditions for full and successful realization family's main functions, satisfaction of family needs and interests [2, p.514]. Similar definition is in demographic notional dictionary: family policy is defined as aimed activity of state bodies and other social institutes in the sphere of family strengthening, optimization of fulfillment family functions and improvement of the living conditions; strategic trends of family policy are determined by its tasks, causes and results negative tendencies in family functioning. Concrete actions of family policy are defined in frameworks of strategic trends taking into account economic, organizational, and other possibilities of realiza-

tion [3, p.271]. Thus, here is underlined determination of family policy by its conceptual, ideological, outlook bases generally accepted in a state and society.

Family policy intersects and has many common features with other public policies. In the first place this refers to social policy, which can be defined as system of actions of social and political institutes, oriented on ensuring optimum development of social sphere, welfare and satisfaction of needs of a society in general as well as single citizen. Social and political institutes are set of subjects which take part in realization of social policy.

Thus, social policy has more wide directivity on development all social sphere as compared with family policy. In this connection very often, family policy is considered as independent course of social policy.

Common sphere in family and demographic policy tied with process of reproduction of population and especially fertility which is regulated demographic policy, is one of the most important family function. However, reproductive function is not only the single, but also one of principal family functions, and there are other – educational, upbringing, communication etc.

Through one of the most important task – upbringing and child birth – family policy also closely connected with maternity and child welfare service, which is defined as system of actions of providing interests of a mother and a child through medical, material, and other kinds of state support [5, c.596].

Thus in Conception of public family policy accepted 17 September 1999 [6] one of the direction of family policy was defined assisting to families in child rearing and their all-round development by force of guaranteeing rights and liberties in all spheres; forming in outlook of children high humane beliefs about a family and its history, traditions, social directivity in the concrete historical conditions of state development; creation and support children's home of family type and foster homes for orphans and children without parental care etc.

One of the first research on family policy was "Family Policy: Government and Families in Fourteen Countries" of Sheila B.Kamerman and Alfred J. Kahn. In this work were separated states with "explicit" family policy and "implicit" family policy [7]. Explicit policy means that in state exists approved, legitimate, institutionalized conception; family is an object of political debates and tasks concerning family are established. Implicit policies haven't such features, although these states can have advanced policies aimed to a family. The difference is not always clear as conceptions change depending on political actors and with time.

All the same time public family policy is essential component of public policy of any state and is considered as a powerful instrument on the development of family institute.

In scientific discussion concerning conceptual bases of public family policy thoughts are stipulated two paradigms, crisis and transform.

The transform paradigm, which sometimes called “modernization of family” lie acceptance of priority individualistic interests on interests of a family and a society. Such effects as change attitude to marriage, family, childbirth, common devaluation of traditional family values etc. are estimated as positive and tied with transformation of family relations in frameworks of this concept.

The same phenomenon in crisis concept is estimated as negative. As stated A. Antonov, family policy is activity of a state, political parties, non-government organizations, interest groups etc, aimed to revival of family, family way of life, lost on a long historical familistic social culture, return to family social functions organically peculiar to it, aimed to strengthening family as a social institute ... family policy is a policy oriented to change of modern civilization design, which is hostile to a family indeed and unresponsive to its problems and diseases [8, p.246]. This approach based on rebuilding state and all social institutes for the sake of traditional complete family with children, strengthening and development of family mode of life, providing of family interests.

Attitude to process of family institute development, its estimating determinates practical content of compliant public family policy: or supporting egalitarian relations, or providing priority of family as integrity, consolidation of family living, advance of role and meaning of traditional family values.

As researcher A. Pyanov stated public family policy is independent direction of social policy, and is system of complex activity of state, aimed to family social institute with task of its consolidation and development, security of institutional rights and interests of family, providing its independence, relational autonomy and well-being; activation its subject role in social space, in which state and family are equal in rights subjects-partners [9, p.124-125]. Such understanding of family policy differentiates from other approaches such methodological features: orientation family policy on family as an integrated object, obligation of independence and relative autonomy from the direction of a state; the researcher attributes to the problematic of family policy not common social but only specific problems of a family. All of that logically leads to aiming of family policy on system solution of strengthening family and family values.

As stated scientist L. Slyusar, public family policy is one of directions socio-economic policy, aim of which is supporting family mode of life, strengthening of family institute, making favorable conditions for creation, functioning, development of family, first of all family with children [10, p.58].

The aim of public family policy can be defined as development of family relations, creation favorable conditions for achievement of family's functions.

It is necessary to say that in Ukraine accepted series of normative and program a document which straight or marginally refers to forming of family policy. But in this sphere terminological non-coordination exists. In particular the notion “public family policy” stays uncertain, and this is evidence of incomplete

elucidating of conceptual bases connected with understanding modern family, peculiarities of families' formation and appropriate public strategy.

Thus, top-priority state task is providing of national security and prosperity of a society. Preservation of traditional family values is a part and precondition of social development.

Family traditional values mean classical historical beliefs about a family. These are expressed in importance of official entering into a marriage, of integrity complete family with both parents – man and woman, traditional roles of a man and a woman, birth of children, faithfulness, the priority of marriage comparing divorce, and strong connection between generations.

Now, in situation of family institute crisis, a state can and should impact on this sphere. In the first place a state has real mechanisms and possibilities to decide challenges facing family. This is stipulated of the negative results of the family crisis in many countries.

At the present time the trends of demographic processes are the components of demographic crisis and depopulation as turn into the threat to the very existence of European nations.

One of the greatly social dangerous after-effects of low fertility rates, along with population reduction in whole, is decrease of children and youth quantity. This leads to extension of comparative part of aged persons, in other words, total ageing of population. This process is intensified by a decline in the number of birth or, in more positive terms, a general increase in overall life expectancy.

An “ageing” population structure determines whole series problems for societies, first of all social and economic. From economic point of view, increase the number of retirees lead to growth of pensioner payments, social service and health protection expenditures, necessity of enlargement gerontological institutions, care services network and other ageing-related expenditures.

All of that stipulates pressure on capable people from whose directly depend contribution to pension funds and at the expense of that, in fact, will supplied aged persons employment. The quantity of laboring reduces: each next generation less than previous. In contrary, the quantity of older people will increase considerably, since the post-war baby-boom generation reaches retirement.

Diminution on household size also makes deeper this problem. Part of aged persons who live with their own families, constantly lessens. This means that aged members of family as a rule do not live with their children or grandchildren, and young family members less and less ready to take upon theirselves care responsibilities of relatives. Thus, family as social institute parted by generations and doesn't able to providing care of own aged members.

All of that, along with rash increase of extramarital births, change in ratio marriages and divorces in favor of the last attest about crisis of family institute in whole.

As for causes of demographic crisis, today even in official documents noted that are value. Thus in Demography Report of European Commission noted: “changing value systems contributed to lower fertility rates and an increase in the number of childless couples” [12, p.73]; “changing social perceptions of the role of marriage and greater fragility of relationships have resulted in more extramarital births, including to lone parents, or in childlessness” [12, p.2]. These changes mean alteration in attitude of society towards to marriage, family, child bearing, general devaluation of family values. Family traditional values replaced by inverse values – individualism, emancipation of personality from family, idealization of comfort and consumerism, rejection of altruism.

This stipulate crisis of family which characterized separation of ages, nuclearization of family, the increasing childlessness, single life, monoparenting and other tendencies.

Value causes of crisis stipulate low effectiveness of socio-economic actions in this sphere, and also that which straight directed at fertility.

These actions are very diverse and include financial support for families through benefits, allowances, grants or benefit supplements, service provision, maternity and parental leaves, protection of mothers in the work place and others.

In spite of methodological variety there are doubts about their effectiveness, and this is confirmed by the results of many researches. Researches show that positive effect is achieved but only in minor degree so that very often can not achieve even the level of simple reproduction of population.

Demographic imbalance determines changes in attitudes to policy aimed to rising of fertility. In light of the dramatic decline of birth rates, more and more governments are reconsidering their position. As the United Nations system for monitoring government perceptions and policies on population have shown, between 1996 and 2003, the proportion of governments in Europe that perceive their fertility levels as too low has increased by on third, and those that perceive their rate of population growth as too low have almost doubled. The proportion of governments that have declared that they are putting in place policies to raise fertility levels and rates of population growth has increased respectively by twenty five, and by over fifty percent [13].

The consciousness of family value occurs and this is reflected in documents. A recently adopted Resolution by the Council of Europe “Investing in family cohesion as a development factor in times of crisis” states that, “The Parliamentary Assembly recognises the force that the family represents in meeting life’s challenges and considers that the family unit is a fundamental element to aid in the economic recovery, especially during times of adversity and change” [14].

A Parliamentary Assembly Recommendation calls for member States to “support regional and local policies to strengthen public services in order to bring about a truly family-friendly society and to develop intergenerational re-

relationships within families,” [14] thus recognizing the fundamental value of the family unit.

However, in forming of family policy definite conceptual contradiction exists. On the one hand, under threat of demographic collapse more and more recognized necessity of pronatal actions aimed to rise of birth rates. On the other hand, such strategy as well as support of traditional family values is incompatible with gender policy. Thus, Adviser of United Nations Population Fund Nikolai Botev pointed out that: «there are objections that prenatal measures can stand against achievements in the field of gender equality, as increased fertility could interfere with the educational opportunities and career aspirations of women and might confine them to the traditional family roles [13, p.6-7].

In other words, gender policy gains such as active part of women in socio-political, equality rights of men and women etc. conflict with setting aim of fertility rising, which include back to traditional norms, rejection of listed trends and principal revaluation of social priorities.

Ukraine is one of the most demographically unsuccessful states. At the present time the trends of demographic processes are the components of demographic crisis and depopulation as turn into the threat to the very existence of Ukrainian nation.

Depopulation is a steady tendency of Ukrainian demographic situation. Total fertility rate (TFR) in 2001 year fell to the record low level - 1,085 [15]. This is still considered as a “lowest-low” fertility country, with a TFR under 1,3 [16, p.1148]. The largest quantity of population 52,2 million persons was fixed in 1993 after what begin process of its unceasing cutting down. According to Ukrainian Statistics State Service on 1 February 2013 in Ukraine live 45539,1 thousand persons [15]. This means that population size decreased by more than 6,6 million persons.

The fertility structure is unfavorable. As the results of Ukrainian households survey, in 2012 76.0 % of families, which have children were families only with one child and only every fourth (21.2 %) have two children. Families with three and more children are rare, their unit weight doesn't exceed 3 % [15, p.10].

Separation of households by children number differs in urban and rural region. In a city 80.1 % of households bring up one child, in rural locality such households 65.9 %; two children – 27.9% in rural region against 18,6% in city, three and more children – 1.3 % in city against 5.3 % in rural region [15, p.10]

Negative trends in birth rate results to a lot of consequences for state and a society, such as lack of manpower resources, shortening of population, its ageing and deformation of structure, absence of generation replacement, threat to territorial wholeness and so on.

One of the greatly social dangerous after-effects of low fertility rates, along with population reduction in whole, is decrease of children and youth quantity.

This leads to extension of comparative part of aged persons, in other words, total ageing of population.

Consciousness of negative trends in birth rates as a threat to national safety and as a problem that needs to be solved is impetus for undertaking adequate measures of family policy. Forming the most favorable conditions for creation a family, child-bearing and upbringing, is one of the most important goals of family policy and basic instrument of overcoming negative trends.

On the practical level the impact of demographic factors on family policy forming and realization appears in the raise of expenses on social sphere in a whole, and particularly in enlargement service for families with children, different kinds of payments, and guarantees of employment to parents etc. However, the results of series of researches show that effectiveness of such methods stay insufficient. This means that only socio-economic actions can't decide all problems in this sphere.

Conclusions

In common understanding public family policy can be defined as actions of state and other political subjects aimed to statement or change family relations, family as social phenomenon and which determined by political ideology concerning family values. Accordingly to conceptual understanding actions aimed to regulation of family relations can differ a lot. In the given work public family policy understanding as such that aimed to strengthening family and family relations.

Public family policy has own specific subject of influence – family and family relations, which is concrete and different from the other public policy directions. Accordingly it has own tasks and aim which can be formulated as development, strengthening of family institute, creation of favorable conditions for performance family functions from a state.

Important methodological significance has distinguishing of notions, specificity and object of influence family, social, demographic policy, and on the other hand interrelation of different spheres of public policy.

Perspectives of further researches connected with studying of trends, tasks, principles and functions of public family policy, methodological problems of its estimating.

References

1. Pidlisniy Y. Svitoglyadni osnovy simeynoi polityky ta ii perspektivvy (World outlook foundations of family policy and its perspectives): <http://www.family-institute.org.ua/downloads/file/dopovidi%20konferencii%202007/Pidlisnyj.pdf>

2. Entsyklopedia derzhavnogo upravlinnya (Encyclopedia of Public Administration): u 8 t. / NADU, 2011. T. 4 : Galuzeve upravlinnya. – 648 p.

3. Demograficheskiy ponyatiynyi slovar (Demographic conceptual dictionary) / Pod red. prof. L.L.Rybakovskogo. – M.: TSP, 2003. – 352 p.
4. Tyndik A.O. Obzor sovremennih mer semeynoy politiki v stranah s nizkoy rozhdzaamostyu (Survey of the modern family policy measures in countries with low fertility) in Spero. – 2010. – № 12. – PP. 157-176.
5. Velykiy entsiklopedychniy yurydychniy slovnyk (Big encyclopaedic juridical dictionary) / za red. Akad. NAN Ukrainy YU.C. Shemshuchenka. – K., 2007. – 992 p.
6. Pro Kontseptsiyu derzhavnoi simeynoi polityky: Postanova Verkhovnoi Rady vid 17.09.1999. № 1063-XIV (About the Conception of public family policy: Decree of Ukraine's Verkhovna Rada): Vidomosti VRU. – 1999, № 46-47. – Ст.404.
7. Kamerman Sheila B., Kahn Alfred J. Family Policy: Government and Families in Fourteen Countries. New York: Columbia University Press, 1978. – 252 p.
8. Antonov A.I. Sotsiologiya semi (Sociology of a family) / in A. Antonov, V.M. A.I. Antonov, V.M. Medkov Sotsiologiya semi. M.: 2001. – 304 p.
9. Pyanov A.I. K voprosu o sodержanii predmetnoy oblasti gosudarstvennoy semeynoy politiki (To the question of the content of subject sphere of public family policy) in Vestnik Stavropolskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta. Sotsiologicheskie nauki. – 2008. - № 58. – PP.121-127.
10. Slyusar L.I. Semya i gosudarstvo: institutsionalnie osnovy gosudarstvennoy semeynoy politiki (Family and a state: institutional foundations of public family policy) in Naukovi pratsi DONNTU. Seriya: ekonomichna. Vol. 38-1. – PP 56-60.
11. Kontseptualni zasadi derzhavnoi simeynoi politiki v Ukraini (Conceptual foundations of public family policy in Ukraine) :www.dipsm.org.ua/files/2010/05/vistup.doc
12. Demography report 2010: Older, more numerous and diverse Europeans : European Comission, Eurostat, Comission staff working document, Luxembourg, 2011.
13. Botev N. Is Europe trapped in/by low fertility? // Entre Nous. The European Magazine for Sexual and Reproductive Health - № 63. – 2006. – P.4-8.
14. Investing in Family Cohesion as a Development Factor in Times of Crisis: Report, 19 Jan.2010. Doc.12103. Parliamentary Assembly. Council of Europe
15. Naselennya Ukrainy. Narodzhuvanist i vidtvorennya naselennya (Ukraine's population. Fertility and reproduction of population?) Derzhavna sluzhba statystyky: http://database.ukrcensus.gov.ua/MULT/Dialog/statfile_c.asp
16. Perelli-Harris B. Ukraine: On the border between old and new in uncertain times. Demographic research. V.19, 01 July 2008. P.1145-1178.