



Bartusek Nikola

**Family Policies in the Czech Republic and
Austria: Responses to New Social Risks in
Concepts and Policy Measures**

Faculty of Social Sciences
Master's thesis
October 2020

Sworn declaration

I hereby declare under oath that the submitted Master's Thesis has been written solely by me without any third-party assistance, information other than provided sources or aids have not been used and those used have been fully documented in the references. Sources for literal, paraphrased and cited quotes have been accurately credited.

The submitted document here present is identical to the electronically submitted text document.

Linz, 21st October 2020

Bartusek Nikola

Acknowledgement

I would particularly like to thank my supervisor from Tampere University Noora Ellonen PhD for providing guidance and giving me feedback throughout the whole process of writing. Her thoughtful points helped me structure my thoughts in my thesis.

Furthermore I would like to thank my second supervisor from Johannes Kepler University Univ.-Prof. Margitta Mätzke, Ph.D for her conversations and feedback sessions, which were inspiring me and helped me to read between the lines.

My special thanks goes also to my family, for putting up with me during the past two years and for their biggest help with my little daughter Adina.

Abstract

Bartusek Nikola: Family policy in the Czech Republic and Austria: Responses to New Social Risks in Concepts and Policy Measures

Master's thesis

Tampere University

Masters Degree Programme Comparative Social Policy and Welfare

October 2020

As the structure of society changes, New Social Risks and new types of social problems emerge. The proposed Master thesis, entitled „Family policy in the Czech Republic and Austria: Responses to New Social Risks in Concepts and Policy Measures aims in its context on how do the family policies of the Czech Republic and Austria, construct New Social Risks of post-industrial societies. The partial objectives are, through document analysis of national concepts, on one hand, to clarify the possibilities of involving women with young children in the labor market and on the other hand to define the factors of how both countries approach with individual family policy instruments the risks of post-industrial societies. Methodologically the paper is exhibited (with the specification of the Czech Republic and Austria) on the document analysis of strategic documents of family policies of both countries. The analysis focuses on factors and instruments of formal and informal care, on factors influencing the activity of women with young children in the labor market and the activity of fathers in relation to childcare.

The results show that both countries are more or less maintaining the gender setting of the roles, mother the caregiver and father, the breadwinner. Both countries face gender inequalities in the labor market, which are mainly caused by horizontal gender segregation in the labor market, however many measures have been introduced in order to adapt the needs of families in changing structure of the society.

Keywords: Family policy, Family, New Social Risks, Post-industrial society, reconciling family and work, institutional care for children, maternity, parental leave, part-time employment

The originality of this thesis has been checked using the Turnitin OriginalityCheck service.

List of tables

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|
| Table 1: The most important pillars of Czech Family policy | 40 |
| Table 2: The most important pillars of Austrian Family policy | 57 |
| Table 3: Childcare allowance in Austria | 59 |
| Table 4: The amount of Childcare allowance..... | 61 |
| Table 5: National documents for Austria and the Czech Republic..... | 69 |
| Table 6: Identified categories and codes..... | 75 |
| Table 7: Identified categories in documents..... | 121 |

CONTENT

| | | |
|----------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|
| 1 | INTRODUCTION..... | 8 |
| 1.1 | AIM OF THE STUDY AND RESEARCH QUESTIONS..... | 10 |
| 1.2 | STRUCTURE OF THE THESIS..... | 11 |
| 2 | THEORETICAL BACKGROUND..... | 13 |
| 2.1 | SOCIAL POLICY AND ITS CHARACTERISTICS..... | 13 |
| 2.2.1 | <i>Typologies of social policy.....</i> | <i>14</i> |
| 2.3 | DEBATE ON THE TERM FAMILY..... | 15 |
| 2.3.1 | <i>Signs of post-industrial family.....</i> | <i>17</i> |
| 2.4 | FAMILY POLICIES AND ITS PRINCIPLES..... | 18 |
| 2.4.1 | <i>Typology of family policy (familization and de-familization).....</i> | <i>19</i> |
| 2.4.2 | <i>Types of familization and de-familization.....</i> | <i>20</i> |
| 2.4.3 | <i>Types of family models and gender inequality.....</i> | <i>22</i> |
| 3 | CONCEPT OF POST INDUSTRIALIZATION AND NEW SOCIAL RISKS..... | 25 |
| 3.1 | POST-INDUSTRIAL SOCIETY AND ITS FEATURES..... | 25 |
| 3.2 | THE PHENOMENON OF NEW SOCIAL RISKS..... | 26 |
| 3.2.1 | <i>The need to reconcile family life and work.....</i> | <i>29</i> |
| 3.2.2 | <i>Family structure and existence of single parent families.....</i> | <i>31</i> |
| 3.2.3 | <i>The need to care for sick or older family member.....</i> | <i>32</i> |
| 3.2.4 | <i>The role of education and work qualification.....</i> | <i>33</i> |
| 3.3 | NEW VS. OLD SOCIAL RISKS..... | 34 |
| 4 | METHODOLOGICAL FRAMEWORK..... | 37 |
| 4.1 | DEVELOPMENT AND OBJECTIVES OF FAMILY POLICY IN THE CZECH REPUBLIC..... | 37 |
| 4.1.1 | <i>Legislative measures.....</i> | <i>39</i> |
| 4.2 | FINANCIAL SUPPORT..... | 40 |
| 4.2.1 | <i>Maternity leave- Paternity leave.....</i> | <i>40</i> |
| 4.2.2 | <i>Parental leave.....</i> | <i>42</i> |
| 4.2.3 | <i>State social support benefits.....</i> | <i>44</i> |
| 4.3 | TAX RELIEF..... | 45 |
| 4.4 | NON FINANCIAL AND INSTITUTIONAL SUPPORT..... | 46 |
| 4.4.1 | <i>Providing childcare services in the Czech Republic.....</i> | <i>46</i> |
| 4.4.2 | <i>Nursery schools.....</i> | <i>47</i> |
| 4.4.3 | <i>Kindergarten and other pre-school facilities.....</i> | <i>49</i> |
| 4.5 | RECONCILING FAMILY AND WORK IN CZ..... | 50 |
| 4.5.1 | <i>Atypical forms of employment.....</i> | <i>51</i> |
| 4.6 | FAMILY POLICY IN AUSTRIA..... | 54 |
| 4.7 | HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT AND CURRENT SITUATION..... | 55 |
| 4.8 | CURRENT TOOLS AND FAMILY SUPPORT MEASURES..... | 57 |
| 4.9 | FINANCIAL SUPPORT DURING PREGNANCY AND MATERNITY..... | 58 |
| 4.9.1 | <i>Childcare allowance (Kinderbetreuungsgeld).....</i> | <i>59</i> |
| 4.9.2 | <i>Family allowance (Familienbeihilfe).....</i> | <i>60</i> |
| 4.9.3 | <i>Tax support.....</i> | <i>61</i> |
| 4.10 | WORK LIFE BALANCE IN AUSTRIA..... | 63 |
| 4.11 | FINAL COMPARISON..... | 65 |
| 5 | DOCUMENT ANALYSIS..... | 68 |
| 5.1 | SELECTION OF DATA AND PROPOSED TECHNIQUES FOR DATA COLLECTION..... | 68 |
| 5.1.1 | <i>Analytical procedure.....</i> | <i>69</i> |
| 5.2 | QUALITY OF THE RESEARCH AND ITS LIMITS..... | 72 |
| 6 | RESULTS OF THE RESEARCH..... | 75 |

| | | |
|----------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|
| 6.2 | NATIONAL FAMILY CONCEPT 2017 (CZ)..... | 76 |
| 6.2.1 | <i>Category of New Social Risks</i> | 77 |
| 6.2.2 | <i>Category Reconciling family life and work</i> | 79 |
| 6.2.3 | <i>Instruments of Family policies</i> | 84 |
| 6.3 | NATIONAL CONCEPT OF SUPPORTING FAMILIES WITH CHILDREN (2008)..... | 85 |
| 6.3.1 | <i>New Social Risks</i> | 86 |
| 6.3.2 | <i>Reconciling family and working life</i> | 89 |
| 6.3.3 | <i>Instruments of family policy</i> | 93 |
| 6.4 | FAMILYLAND AUSTRIA: THIS IS HOW WE MAKE AUSTRIA THE FAMILY FRIENDLIEST COUNTRY IN EUROPE!..... | 94 |
| 6.4.1 | <i>New Social Risks</i> | 95 |
| 6.4.2 | <i>Reconciling Family and work</i> | 98 |
| 6.4.3 | <i>Involving men in childcare</i> | 100 |
| 6.4.4 | <i>Flexible working hours</i> | 100 |
| 6.4.5 | <i>Institutional care</i> | 102 |
| 6.5 | AUSTRIAN FAMILY-REPORT – AUF EINEN BLICK..... | 103 |
| 6.5.1 | <i>New Social Risks</i> | 104 |
| 6.5.2 | <i>Childcare outside of the family</i> | 108 |
| 6.5.3 | <i>Instruments of family policy</i> | 110 |
| 6.6 | RESEARCH SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION | 113 |
| 7 | CONCLUSION | 123 |

Abbreviations

| | |
|------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| € | Euro (EU currency) |
| % | percent(s) |
| § | clause |
| AMS | Arbeitsmarktservice (Chamber of Labour) |
| BGBI | Bundesgesetzblatt (Federal Law Gazette) |
| BMFJ | Bundesministerium für Familie und Jugend |
| CZK | Czech Crowns (Czech currency) |
| CSÚ | Český statistický úřad (Czech statistical office) |
| ECB | European Central Bank |
| etc. | et cetera |
| EU | European Union |
| EUR | Euro (EU currency) |
| FLAF | Familienlastenausgleichsfond (Family Equalization fund) |
| FPÖ | Freiheitliche Partei Österreichs (Freedom Party of Austria) |
| GDP | Gross domestic product |
| MPSV | Ministerstvo práce a sociálních věcí (Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs) |
| MSMT | Ministerstvo školství, mládeže a tělovýchovy (Ministry of Education, Youths and Physical Education) |
| No. | Number |
| OECD | Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development |
| ÖVP | Österreichische Volkspartei (Austrian People´s Party) |
| P. | Page |
| SPÖ | Sozialdemokratische Partei Österreichs (Austrian Social Democratic Party) |

1 Introduction

Today's advanced European societies are undergoing a major transformation involving the normative and institutional organization and the distribution of the welfare state. The transformation of the labour market and changing family structure caused problems to many European countries (Keller 2012) and Austria and the Czech Republic was not left behind. However, according to Cerami (2008), due to the difficulties associated with the transition from a centrally planned to a market economy, this transformation was even harder in countries of Central and Eastern Europe. Institutional restructuring associated with political changes towards the democratic system and the transition to a post-industrial economy caused more difficult adaptation of political and economic social values (Cerami 2008).

De-industrialization and the development of a post-industrial society occurs in many countries and in many instances it can mean precarious situations resulting from changes in society which affected industry (Keller 2006). New technologies as well as modernization also require higher qualifications and education of workers (Keller 2012). According to Beck (2005), so-called New Social Risks are a natural part of development of various aspects in society, such as technological development, life expectancy and associated higher costs for health and long-term care, as well as lower birth rates. This results in having fewer people in productive age range (Beck 2005). Among these changes we can also include greater access to education, thanks to which women can be more integrated into the labour market, which leads to the issue of how to reconcile family life with one's career (Delanty 2006). Likewise, Esping Andersen (1990) comments on the revolution in demographic and family behaviour, as women move forward in career advancement. Marriage is taking on other dimensions and less stable household and family arrangements are emerging. As a consequence, less skilled jobseekers, who are no longer as desirable as before, can slip to low wages, job insecurity and even unemployment. Esping Andersen (1990) also emphasizes the impact of social heritage, when the post-war state was able to balance the living conditions of an individual, but on the other hand was not able to eliminate the effects of social origin and inherited disadvantages.

The question is if modern societies respond sufficiently to this changing structure and if the political measures implemented, adequately tackle the current situation. Bonoli (2007) argues that Nordic countries have adapted their social measures toward the New Social Risks, whereas most of the countries of continental and southern Europe are still behind. Sirovátka and Winkler (2010) argue that, unlike traditional risks, such as poverty or class inequality, which the welfare state has been able to cope with, the response of existing social institutions to the New Social Risks is inefficient in many areas because it is based on a traditional social system with solidarity in the family and in the helping professions.

One of the main targets of OECD countries is to invest and develop family-friendly policies that would encourage the reconciliation of employment and family duties (OECD 2007). Parts of these policies are affordable and accessible childcare, financial support, parental leave arrangements as well as flexible working conditions that would help to balance family life and the demands of the workplace (OECD 2007).

This thesis concentrates on a special issue of family policies of the Czech Republic and Austria. These two middle European countries are of a very similar size. At first sight it might seem that they had the same starting position, both were affected by reforms of Austrian rulers who increased education, improved living conditions and humanized companies. Both countries were also hit by industrialization, which brought fundamental social changes (Matejková 2005). Yet, due to significant political changes after the Second World War, both countries went through different developments in social policy.

The focus of this thesis will also be put at the steps both countries take in order to link family life and the participation of women with young children in the labour market. Balancing family duties and career is a challenge which many parents face while and after being on parental leave. Many young people face difficult decision whether to have children or pursue their career as they don't know how they could balance these two life sequences (Dudová 2009). Some parents would like to work more, but they don't find anyone to take care of their children or the opening hours of caring institutions do not fit with the working hours of the parent. Others would like to work less, but don't find a part time job or their employer doesn't enable them to work

flexible hours or to reduce their working hours. Having children does not always mean parents should sacrifice their career, but it is more important to develop family-friendly environments and conditions for parents, so that having children would not affect their career choices (OECD 2007).

This thesis will look at these facts from the point of family policies of the Czech Republic and Austria and will analyze the national family policy documents of both countries in terms of family policy instruments, measures reflected post-industrial changes as well as tools aiming at work-life balance.

1.1 Aim of the study and research questions

The aim of this thesis is to outline the family policy of the Czech Republic and Austria and to understand whether and how the existing measures encoered in family policies of both countries and presented in each document, support the participation of women with pre-school children in the labour market and thus reflect New Social Risks of a post-industrial society. The thesis will mainly deal with the analysis of texts, documents and guidelines. Throughout the paper, there will be a focus on what threatens families, what obstacles they have to face, what measures are being introduced and how these reflect on families. Therefore, the target throughout the paper will be put at policies aimed at families of the two countries, supported by the analysis of four national documents with their objectives and tools of family policies and their access to family friendly policies in the labour market. Therefore, the empirical part will first on behalf of secondary literature describe the main goals of family policies of both countries as well as the already existing tools and measures. Furthermore it will point out, on behalf of four examined and analyzed texts, how and to what extent the family policy instruments and measures of both countries reflect on New Social Risks and how they contribute to the reconciliation of family life and work.

In order to answer the two main research questions, a qualitative research and the document analysis method will be used. Qualitative research seems to be a suitable method, as I will not analyze the numerical ratio and frequency, but whether the national documents reflect on the issue of New Social Risks and in what way they support women with small children on the labour market. The research questions are focused on the national family policy documents of the Czech Republic and Austria.

The analysis will demonstrate the legacy of New Social Risks of family policies of both countries and will try to explain how the risks are reflected in all four selected documents. The thesis will deal with what, according to the selected documents, threatens family as an institution, what measures are chosen and how they reflect the New Social Risks. Furthermore, the analysis will focus at how both countries' policies take into account and support the entry of women with young children into the labour market. Therefore, the following research questions were chosen:

1. How do the family policy measures of Austria and the Czech Republic respond to New Social Risks that families with children in post-industrial society face?
2. How and through which measures is the participation of women with young children on the labour market in both countries encouraged?

The choice of these two, at first sight, different questions have its merits. Both are based on the importance of a flexible introduction of policy measures that reflect changes of modern societies. One of the important features of modern societies is a high participation of women in the labour market, however, their journey is often hampered by their family duties and insufficient non-legislative support. The second important connection between these two questions is employment, which has gone through many intense changes in post-industrial societies to which the state had to respond.

1.2 Structure of the thesis

The paper will be methodologically divided into two parts, the theoretical part and the empirical part. The theoretical part will present an overview of the issue as whole. The discussed topics will be the development and characteristics of social and family policy, features of post-industrial societies, family policy tools and measures of both countries, as well as an introduction of labour market participation of women with small children. Therefore, the first chapter will deal with definitions of social policy and its goals, the characteristics of the current family, but also the typology of familialism or defamilialism and models of family coexistence, which will, in all cases, be directed to the Czech Republic and Austria. The second part will then be based on the theory of

New Social Risks, which also builds the basis for the document analysis and the ways how selected documents reflect on these post-industrial obstacles of modern society.

Materials and data for the theoretical part will be drawn from sources that will be listed in the references at the end of the thesis. These will be in addition to the theoretically oriented publications and scientific literature, also internet sources of statistical offices, ministries, national banks and other portals dealing with the specific issue. Comparison of financial contributions will be made in such a way that the amount of benefits in the Czech Republic will be converted into Euro using the average rate for 2019 announced by the European Central Bank (ECB) and obtained from <https://www.ecb.europa.eu> in the amount of 25.80 CZK / €.

The first empirical part will include a description of family policies of the Czech Republic and Austria and it will give the reader the background information about the process development of family policy and its measures. The information will be taken from the secondary literature and it will make the basis for the analysis of national documents of both countries. The second empirical part will include an analysis of national documents published by the Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs in the Czech Republic, namely: *The National Concept of Supporting Family with Children* from 2008 and *The National Concept of Family Policy* from 2017 will be chosen. For Austria, I will select *The Family Report 1999-2009: The Family at Change to the 21st Century* published by the Federal Ministry for Family and Youth and the document: *This is How we Make Austria the Most Family Friendly Country in Europe* from 2017. The aim was to have two documents from both countries that were firstly published by ministries and therefore have high validity, secondly for better understanding it was important to have documents published at similar time sequences, and at last it was important that all four documents include descriptions of tools and measures of family policies as well as further planned implementation of measures in terms of family life. The access to all data is listed at the end of the references. Because the national documents are written in Czech and German, the important parts relevant for the analysis will, for better understanding of the reader, be translated into English in direct quotations as part of the interpretation.

2 Theoretical background

The aim of this part of the thesis will be to deal with terminology, which is an important part for a comprehensive view as part of social policy. Therefore the theoretical overview will describe social policy, its goals and models. Furthermore, the institute of the family and types of family will be discussed as forms of co-habitation as they have a great impact on changing needs of families in all modern societies.

2.1 Social policy and its characteristics

In the first place it is important to define the term social policy as it builds the basic building block to determine the type of state security focused on society. Walsh (2000) describes social policy as a key to collective well-being and acceptable conditions of all citizens, where the government distributes and redistributes financial as well as non financial resources and services to ensure the well-being of their citizens. Baldock (2007) gives two different perspectives on social policy. The first one describes the political use of Social Policy, whereas the second meaning describes the effort of the government and their steps in implementing social policies (Baldock 2007). Krebs (2010) similarly like Baldock (2007) sees social policy as activities of the state. In this sense Krebs (2010) states that the state has two main duties regarding social policy. The first is defining the legal framework of social policy and determining the rules for the state and for other social subjects and secondly, it is the implementation of social policy measures as for example providing specific benefits and support (Krebs 2010).

The aim of social policy is the protection of society, Baldock (2007) describes 3 groups of social protection, and these are Cash Benefits, Social Services and Tax Breaks. Under Cash Benefits we understand pensions, maternity, paternity leave, children allowance, or social assistance, Social Services on the other hand present different types of care as childcare, medical care, or care for disabled persons and the last group are any kind of tax deductions.

To a large extend the state takes over the social security of its citizens and ensures a considerable extent of their social needs (health, education, housing and ect.). It aims to

minimize social inequalities and reduces poverty and unemployment (Walsh 2000). Some of the most important issues of social policies are for example income maintenance, access to education, poverty, health care, employment and unemployment, housing and last, but not least family issues and family support (Walsh 2000). The formation of welfare state has also significantly influenced the economic, but also the social, cultural, and political developments throughout the post - World War II period (Baldock 2007). It has led many people of many countries to a higher standard of living. Whereas bad social protection can lead to social exclusion, which mainly happens when incomes are unequal, or when it comes to an expression of market failure (Baldock 2007).

2.2.1 Typologies of social policy

Not every country had the same development of social policy. The reason is that every country is unique in their decisions which are often influenced by political and historical developments of each country. Krebs (2010) explains that historical development of each country has a huge influence on the formation of social policy. The author describes the situation of the Czech Republic to be therefore different from the formation of social states in other Western countries (Krebs 2010). Also Esping Andersen (1990) describes social policies and the approaches of individual European states as very diverse. Krebs (2002), like Esping Andersen (1990), states that due to historical, economic, cultural and political developments of each country, family policy, which is also the target of this paper, is mostly in the competence of each state. Therefore, even within the EU, there are big differences in family policy tools and measures. Yet, it is perceived as a set of practical measures aimed at supporting the family within the framework of social policy (Krebs 2002). Nevertheless, the goal of social policies is always the way of how government redistributes resources among its citizens (Baldock 2007). Esping Andersen (1990) adds that differences in redistribution within different countries are also due to the type of social policy applied. According to Esping Andersens' s typology there are three basic types of a welfare state.

Liberal type: This type of a welfare state meets the needs of the population mainly through the labour market or family. State intervention is minimal and only in case the market or family fails (Esping Andersen 1990). This system is based on the assumptions

that every citizen is responsible for his/her decisions and the state guarantees support only to families with the lowest income, and for those who are on the poverty line (Krebs 2002).

Conservative: This type preserves differences in society and its redistributive impact is negligible. In this type, the state replaces social security market. Social benefits provided depend on the length and amount of the insurance years paid by an individual. Typical countries are Germany, the Netherlands, Austria or France (Esping Andersen 1990). This system assumes that the social needs of the family should primarily be met on the basis of work performance and merit, and state support is provided by testing family directives, which must be at the level of the social subsistence minimum (Krebs 2002).

Social Democratic: The third type is sometimes also called Universalist, because it uses the principles of universalism and decomodification of social rights. The main objective is to eliminate high income differentiation among residents through a redistribution mechanism (Esping Andersen 1990). Typical countries are Scandinavian countries like Finland or Sweden (Mitchell 2011). This system is based on a considerable extent of redistribution with the dominant role of the state, where benefits are distributed to most or all families (Krebs 2002).

However Esping Andersen was being criticized by the feminists because he missed the family policy and other caring policies as a whole and because his de-commodification just poorly measures the welfare (Saxonberg 2012). Nevertheless sometimes it is very difficult to categorize countries in different types of welfare states, because there is no pure model and some countries have components of all three types (Baldock 2007). However the role of a state in social policy can be regardless the type of a welfare state considered as one of the most important signs of social policies.

2.3 Debate on the term family

The subject of family policy is family and since the term family policy connects the whole paper, it is very important to define family correctly. Many scientific texts as in for example Matousek (2008), Mozny (2008) or Giddens (1999), state that it is very difficult to find an appropriate and even definition on the term family. This is especially

due to social and political development of a society as well as due to varying value bases (Mozny 2008). The purpose of this section is to present and define family as an important social institution.

We can look at the definition of family from different disciplines. There is no one explanation what is family, because its functions are not unequivocally anchored in the literature and it is not specified whom can we define as family (Matousek 2008). The concept is based on the fact that family itself does not have one fixed, unchangeable form (Matousek 2008). Giddens (1999) defines family as *"a group of persons directly related to relationships, whose adult members are responsible for raising children"* (Giddens, 1999: 156). And because there is no a constant form, an institution of a family has undergone many changes. These changes are dependent on the development of the whole society throughout its history. Family can be considered as a social institution composed of parents and their children, therefore the condition is to have two generations (Mozny 2008).

Mozny (2008), states that family is mainly founded by the birth of the first child. And therefore, in the traditional concept family is a group of people linked by blood or true bonds such as marriage or adoption (Matousek 2008). The broader concept of family is typical for some modern societies and conceives family as a group of people who declare themselves as a family on the basis of mutual affection (Matousek 2008). From the sociological point of view, we view family as a social group, which is at the same time a primary, informal, small, own and member group (Giddens 1999). Krebs (2002) describes family as the oldest basic social unit and thus it fulfils important functions in society and receives special support in most countries through family policy measures. These are an integral part of national social policy and they are in form of legal, economic and social measures (Krebs 2002). In modern politics, family is considered to be a group of married people or spouses sharing one household, partners with one or more children, or one of the parents with one or more children (Krebs 2002). For the purpose of this thesis, I will also consider a family as partners or one parent living together with at least one child. The basic functions of family have changed together with changes in our society (Mozny 1999). However, the essence of these functions remains to this day, only the way of their fulfilment has changed. How does a family perform its duties is then reflected in its functioning. The basic functions which are

considered as typical signs of today's family are biological-reproductive function, economic functions and security, educational and socializing function as well as functions of health, relaxation and regeneration (Mozny 1999).

Although family seems to be losing their traditional roles in post-modern societies, we can still see it as a basic social unit (Mozny 1999). However according to Mozny (1999) we can say that the institute of family develops simultaneously with the development of society.

2.3.1 Signs of post-industrial family

Within the transition to post-industrial society, also the roles of men and women change. For women, education is nowadays as approachable and as important as for men, maternity does no longer mean a lifelong fulfilment, women don't see men as the sole breadwinner anymore, which changes the basic family structures (Havelková 2007). According to Trpišovská and Vacínová (2007) the features of the contemporary family are delay of marriage and postponing of family for later, existence of single parent families, increase in divorce rates, a decrease in people's interest in joining and having children after a divorce, reducing the number of children at home or having no children at all or an extended period of time for children to live with their parents. Also the national concept of family policy (2015) for the Czech Republic states that in today's post-industrial society, there is an increased focus on individuality, professional self-fulfilment, performance and flexibility and it odds with the traditional family roles.

Therefore, today's family is sometimes referred to as postmodern. The modern form of a family is often associated with the transformation of postmodern society. The modern society together with a family goes towards an individualization of values, lifestyles, and more freedom in their individual choices (Sirovatka 2005). However postmodern period often brings new values and risks. In postmodern society, women tend to be more educated and thus to increase their employment and interest in working careers and this builds new social risks in postmodern societies (Sirovátka 2003).

Establishing a family becomes a matter of individual choice, and marriage is no longer a necessary condition for establishing family life, thus creating new forms of partnership and thus new forms of family (Sirovátka 2003). Mozný (2006) summarizes the

characteristics of the modern family as follows: “*the head of a modern family is no longer only the father, but the authority of both parents is equally divided*”. The roles in a family remain complementary, but also segregated. The type of a contemporary modern family is based on an equal relationship between a woman and a man (Tucek 1998). Gradually, women are more emancipated. It is no longer an exception that women become the heads and the breadwinners in family. It especially happens in single parent families (Tucek 1998). However these signs of postmodern family bring new obstacles as well as great changes in the division of labour in a household, but also changes in caring duties.

2.4 Family policies and its principles

Due to the irreplaceable position of a family in society, in most developed countries, family receives special protection and support, collectively referred to as family policy (Krebs 2002). Family policy is a part of social policy and is therefore closely interrelated to other social policies. Already Lampert in 1985 has defined family policy as a set of measures and facilities with the aim to protect and support family as an institution that performs indispensable functions for society. The most significant support is usually provided to families with economically dependent children and there, where it comes to the biological, economic, educational or social functions of a family, because these are necessary for a stability of population (Krebs 2002).

According to Vančurová (2018), family policy can be understood as a wide range of different measures aimed at optimal family functioning. Family policy is usually divided into explicit and implicit policy. Explicit family policy has a legal form, its objectives are clearly defined and this kind of family policy is at the centre of political debates (Matějová, Paloncyova 2005). Vančurová (2018) adds that explicit policy takes into account family as a whole and its measures focus directly on the family. The implicit version, on the other hand, does not have a clear definition and the form is not intended directly for families, but focuses on a wider context such as women, children, men, poverty, or employment (Matějová, Paloncyova 2005, Vančurová 2018). Typical countries with explicit family policies are Germany, Belgium, France or Austria, thus countries which belong to the conservative system (Vancurova 2018). Countries with implicit family policies are the United Kingdom, Denmark or Italy.

In Central Europe, family policy is primarily characterized by the introduction of certain measures, partly inherited from the past and modified in some way, which are more or less successful (Vancurova 2018). In European countries in general, family policy has traditionally focused primarily on a narrow area of support programs for families with children, with particular emphasis on financial compensation for families in the early developmental stages of children (Možný 1999). Nevertheless, the country specific family policy can pursue multiple objectives in different countries that apply to individual groups of families who have specific needs, and are disadvantaged or suffer from particular burdens (Možný 1999). Costa Esping-Andersen (2002) argued that a welfare state should become “social investment state” in order to support families and children, as they are those, who form the welfare state in the future.

Nevertheless, Family Policy has always to work with a variety of specific forms of families that are affected by life cycle and certain modernization processes and trends due to changes in people's value orientations, which for family policy means choosing different approaches, schemes and specific measures (Vancurova 2018).

2.4.1 Typology of family policy (familization and de-familization)

The three types of welfare state liberal, democratic and conservative as mentioned according to Esping Andersen (1990) are classified on the basis of three principles; decomodification rates, levels of social stratification and levels of the market and the family in the social security system (Esping Andersen 1999). Later, the level of familialization joined these principles. This level was then to determine the family's dependence on the breadwinner. According to the traditional layout, the breadwinner of a family is mainly the man, and therefore in this context we speak of a small breadwinner model (Leitner 2003). The degree of familialization influences to a large extent the possibility of the division of roles in the household and the associated care for children (Esping Andersen 1999).

The way of defining the level of family support is described by different authors with different terms. Esping-Andersen (1999) describes familialism as the transfer of responsibilities, social obligations to the private sector, and thus to the competence

towards the family directly to individual family members. Therefore the family overtakes the responsibility (Leitner 2003). Thus, the welfare state in this case uses the model of subsidiarity and emphasizes the independent function of families known mainly in states promoting conservative-corporate models such as Austria, but also the Czech Republic. It provides direct and indirect transfers for care such as cash benefits or tax relieves. These forms of reward are intended to motivate persons to care more for their family members (Esping-Andersen 1999). The opposite of the system promoting the independence of families in society is the so-called defamilialist model, which occurs mainly in the Nordic countries of Europe. The de-familialist system, on the other hand, seeks to ease households and reduce the dependence of prosperity on relatives (Leitner 2003). The differences between the two systems therefore lie mainly depending on the family (Leitner 2003).

This model promotes the highest possible level of individual independence of a private sector in obtaining sources of support from the state, thereby reducing its dependence on the family and reciprocity of obligations to its members (Esping-Andersen 1999). De-familialism therefore seeks to relieve family through other forms of support, such as the provision of public childcare and other social services (Esping-Andersen 1999).

2.4.2 Types of familization and de-familization

Leitner (2003) divides familialism into four types, which she characterizes as follows: explicit, optional, implicit, and de-familialism. Types of familialism are distinguished on the basis of formal childcare and state childcare benefits. Tools and indicators after inclusion are maternity and parental leave, direct and indirect transfers to caregivers, other social rights related to caregivers, and childcare options outside the family. Leitner (2003) describes types of familization and de-familization as follows:

Explicit familialism promotes in family policies that a family should take care of children, the elderly and the disabled. A family is a key element in caring for children, the elderly and the disabled. And family policy offers no other alternative in this regard (Leitner 2003). According to Leitner (2003), the Czech Republic as well as Austria falls into an explicit form of familialism. In these countries, the state relies on supports from family members and state care is in the first year of children's life limited and parental leave is long (Leitner 2003).

Optional familialism: In this type of familialism is the caring family strengthened, but at the same time the family has the opportunity to be partially excluded from caring duties (Leitner 2003). Services such as supportive care are provided to the family. This type already offers some improvement in conditions for the family and certain social services are provided. This allows the family to transfer some of the responsibility for its members to the state (Leitner 2003).

Implicit familialism relies in the sense of childcare entirely on the family. This form of familialism does not offer families any support in care. All responsibilities and duties are left to the family (Leitner 2003).

De-familialism makes it easier to the family caregivers, but it does not reward them in any way. This type is characterized to a large extent by the provision of state or market care. It makes it easier for families in their responsibilities, but at the same time it does not reward them in any way if they decide to take care of family members themselves (Leitner 2003).

Leitner (2003) furthermore states that concepts of familialism and defamilialism serve primarily to identify a family policy approach that has an impact on an active involvement of women with young children in the labour market. When we speak about de-familization we refer to those policies where the state provides enough places in pre-school institution and takes the responsibility over (Leitner 2003). Defamilialized women are then those, who are no longer economically dependent on their partner and therefore could also survive as single parents. Therefore, decommodification is the degree in which one can survive without selling own labour force on the labour market (Saxonberg 2012). Saxonberg (2012) on the other hand prefers to base a typology on degree of degenderization and genderization, which focuses more on policies rather than outcomes. Saxonberg (2012) divides access to childcare into three categories, these are degenderizing childcare policies, implicitly genderizing policies and explicitly genderizing policies. Degenderizing policies refer to a public sector which provides relatively large number of childcare facilities for children younger and older three years. In case the public sector cannot provide enough free places, then it provides rich support to the private sector to make the childcare available (Saxonberg 2012). The second category is implicitly genderizing policies, this type provides poor support in providing

childcare facilities for preschool children (Saxonberg 2012). Even though this type does not visibly promote gender division, it supports though male bread winner model as women are more likely to stay at home and care for children (Saxonberg 2012). The third category refers to Bismarcian type into which we categorize Austria, but also the Czech Republic and this is the paternalistic Bimarcian model. The tradition of Bismarcian model comes from the idea to implement kindergartens in order to socialize and educate children, but they are not primarily institutions that overtake caring duties in order to enable women to participate on the labour market. Therefore the last model named explicitly genderrizing provides institutions for children over three years of age (Saxonberg 2012).

Furthermore, we consider the support of women in returning to work after maternity or better availability of part-time work during parenthood as a defamilializing element. In order to have a better start to work after parental leave, it is necessary to have an access to good quality formal child care and therefore higher defamilialization (Saxonberg 2012). Higher support of women in the labour market is characterized by a low pay gap difference between women and men. However, within individual welfare states, the profile of policies does not always have to be only familialist or only de-familialist, but in fact there can be a combination of familializing and de-familializing policies of different intensities.

2.4.3 Types of family models and gender inequality

The concept of family policies result from the mutual interaction of family models, which are formed by the structure of the family and the type of cohabitation, the division of roles in the household, and the care of dependent or older members of the household (Mozny 1999). All these elements are influenced by cultural factors that arose from the historical development of each country, but also by anchoring in the institutional norms set by the state. Different social systems also lead to different types of family policy (Mozny 1999). According to Sainsbury's (1996), two basic styles of family life have been created. These types differ in many measures and accesses of a given state social policy: the first type is the male breadwinner and the second type is the individual model (Sainsbury 1996). A typical feature of a male breadwinner model is the support of a classic marriage and the clearly separated work responsibilities of a

man and a woman (Sainsbury 1996). The man represents the position of the head of the household and his duty includes financial security of the family through work activity in the labour market. The role of a woman is then caring for their household and for their children (Sainbury 1996). The mother does not have her own financial income and is thus fully dependent on her partner or on contributions from the state (Fraser 1994). According to Fraser (1994), this model is the personification of gender differences. The boundaries between the public and private spheres of life are strictly observed. Work associated with caring for dependent family members and caring for a household in a private area is not significantly financially compensated (Sainsbury 1996).

The second model is individual. In this model, each adult is responsible for himself / herself, and spouses have the same rights and obligations to family responsibilities, financial security, and care for dependent members (Sainsbury 1996). A big difference also concerns the rights to the availability of the support provided. In such system, partners do not differentiate between work responsibilities related to employment or child care, but they look at individual needs of family members (Sainsbury 1996). An important part of family care responsibilities is taken over by the state, blurring the boundaries between public and private life for both partners and allowing them to partially perform both functions, the breadwinner and caregiver (Sainsbury's 1996).

The dimensions of the different variants of social policy show that support for family policies based on the breadwinner style do not allow fathers to be strongly involved in childcare, as they are predetermined in the role of a breadwinner (Sainsbury 1996). Similarly also the author Kreimer (1999) divides the model into male breadwinner and woman into caregiver. A man takes over the paid market work and thus also the financial provision of his family, and a woman takes over the unpaid family work and only appears as an additional earner on the market, often in connection with financial necessities (Kreimer 1999). Looking at the models and the structure of family policies of both examined countries it is evident that the Czech Republic and Austria belong with their conservative style and their ideology to the male bread winner model as described by Sainsbury (1996). However, it should be noted that policies of both countries show a great effort for greater equality between men and women and the division of domestic and caring responsibilities. Nevertheless, the established model of family policy of the Czech Republic caters mainly to families living in a traditional type

of cohabitation based on conservative norms. The Czech state thus wants to optimize benefits of social support intended directly for families (Haskova 2010). The typically conservative distribution of family roles in which the man played primarily the role of breadwinner has a long tradition in the Czech Republic (Haskova 2010). However, the traditional model of family coexistence, known mainly from the times of the industrial period, encounters a number of obstacles in today's modern times (Ingot 2008). Kreimer (1999) admits that even though Austria makes good steps forward in equalizing the role between a man and a woman it still belongs to the traditional division of a male breadwinner model (Kreimer 1999).

The traditional division of roles known from the male-bread winner model leads to gender inequalities. Closely related is the inequality in the labour market and the possibility of having the same opportunity to be financially independent and not to depend on state support. Authors Knijn and Kremer (1997) point out the importance of division of roles in the household and state that unpaid childcare work is not only a reduction in economic productivity, but it is an important activity with low social recognition, which leads to inequalities between men and women. As a solution to the conservative approach, Lewis (1992) gives the so-called dual earner model and dual carer, which supports the participation of the female labour force in the labour market and reduces dependence on household responsibilities. It also supports greater father involvement in child care, and, last but not least, it supports a value of unpaid work. Although this model looks like the ideal type in the fight against postmodern social risks, it has its critics. The first point includes activity in the labour market, as this model assumes that there will be ideal conditions and demand for participation in the labour market, which in reality is not mostly true (Lewis, Cambell, Huerta 2008). Furthermore, this model is based on the base that responsibilities are divided between two partners and it no longer takes into account single parent families in which both roles must be taken over by one of the parents (Lewis et al 2008).

3 Concept of post industrialization and New Social Risks

The structure of the family often changes and creates completely new models. The coexistence of several generations is also changing, which leads to increased demands in care. The change from a male bread winner model to single parents' families creates new social and economic risks for families. For this reason, the next chapter deals with the concept of New Social Risks that arose as a result of post-industrial society.

3.1 Post-industrial society and its features

When we speak about modern society, we mostly refer to a society that has undergone some essential changes towards modernization. Harrington (2006) states that: *“modernization is, by its very nature, the process of introducing modernity into society”*. These modern societies, sometimes also called post-industrial societies have no longer the traditional form of society with traditional division of roles, they are also characterized by different features and structures. These post-industrial societies or as a German sociologist Ulrich Beck (2004) uses the term, "risk society" or "reflexive modernity" are characterized by typical features as individualism, rationalization, generalization, but also uncertainty.

Beck (2004) uses the term forced individualization *“Individualism is what one has to do when he/she is free from the fabric of social support. However, he/she is not independent, but he/she has become totally dependent on the market mechanism in all dimensions of his/her life”* (Beck, 2004: 212). According to Harrington (2006) rationalization is a deliberate search for the most effective measures in order to achieve the goal. Beck (2004) writes that generalization is a process in which people's actions free themselves from local contexts and focus on more universal relationships, norms and values. Generalization breaks down the social foundations of society and of the family itself. An example of generalization is the market system, which has increased the productivity of the economy and has brought an economically highly efficient way of creating and distributing services (Keller 2011).

Another important feature of modern societies is uncertainty. One cannot be sure about his / her employment, divorce rates are increasing and the structure of family from the male bread winner to single parent family is changing and flexibility is becoming the centre of interests (Keller 2011). Therefore, another important feature of modernization is flexibility and the resulting uncertainty. Modernization is, for a growing number of people, a transition from a world with clear rules of play to a world of unstable, unpredictable, flexible rules and thus creates uncertainty (Keller 2011). It is not so much about adapting to another world, but rather accepting a life of uncertainty. This uncertainty overlaps in all important spheres of our lives, in employment, where employment contracts often do not guarantee long-term cooperation, higher divorce rates, adding more insecurity within the family relationships and marriage, but also insecurity in social support, where young people often ask themselves if they reach the old age pension (Keller 2011). And therefore, it is important to adapt our social system in order to more reflect the needs of modern societies.

In so-called modern states the main goal of family policy is to eliminate the rising costs for families while caring for the young generation by implementing the principles of social solidarity, social justice and social guarantee (Keller 2011). The tools used to achieve these objectives are primarily direct cash transactions, tax benefits, and the provision of public goods in form of indirect financial assistance, discounts and benefits (Krebs 2002). Other family policy objectives may pursue the compatibility of family duties and employment, where there is a scope for employment activities, which can be instruments of personal politics such as working time flexibility, support for parenthood or helping to efficiently reconcile parental missions and career (Keller 2011).

3.2 The phenomenon of New Social Risks

With the transition to post-industrial society, changes also the content of social risks. In addition, the structure of society is changing and with the new structure new social problems and new threats are emerging (Keller 2011). Bonoli (2007) explains that social risks of today's societies are different from those of western welfare states which were built after the World War II. Also Sirovátková (2010) states that developments and changes in the structure of developed societies have made labour markets, and social

and demographic realities different from social conditions in which post-war policy and social security systems of those countries were created. As long as the market economy of different states was based on a set of national economies, the social regime in the post-war period was based on three basic pillars: a relatively functional and stable nuclear family, a functioning labour market with full and long-term labour contracts and a welfare state (Keller 2011). These pillars change with modernization of societies. Beck (2004) points out certain risks in the context of modernization. According to him, the risks of modernization, whether ecological or social, are still escalating and taking on more dangerous proportions. Delanty (2006), on the other hand, states that the primary function of the state is to deal with social consequences of modernization and the New Social Risks.

With the transition to a post-industrial society, it comes from old social risks to so called New Social Risks. And although Elichová (2017) states that the post-industrial society brings its advantages, it also brings difficult life situations that are confusing. The main social events affecting the functions of our lives are, for example, illness, retirement age, unemployment, accident, pregnancy, or disability. So far the welfare state managed to cope relatively well with these so-called “old” risks through its institutions (Winkler, Sirovátka 2010). In addition to the so-called old social risks, New Social Risks appear across different types of welfare states (Plasová 2010), which according to Bonoli (2006) do not correspond with the traditional model of welfare states and their social policies, and therefore it is necessary that new policies are created.

The question that I am pointing out in the paper is whether the new political measures cope with the New Social Risks of post-industrial societies. New Social Risks according to Bonoli (2006) are earnings inequalities, labour market instability as well as barriers when linking private life with labour market participation. Likewise, Tomeš (2013) ranks changes in the labour market, changes in the family, aging of the population or unsustainability of constantly increasing social costs among the New Social Risks. The decline in family stability under the influence of globalization is indisputable. The divorce rate and the share of single parents increase (Možný 2006). In many western European countries, because of these New Social Risks, the social

coverage is often insufficient, however, due to historical and political development the social support is progressing at different level in different countries (Bonoli 2006).

Changes in the labour market cause higher unemployment and the rise in low-value employment contracts again cause uncertainty about the future (Keller 2010). More and more people feel insecure and worried. Bonoli (2007) also argues that post-industrial labour markets have higher income inequality and points out that in modern societies an occupation does not guarantee a person not to end up on or below the poverty line. According to Keller (2011), this uncertainty divides a post-industrial economy in two spheres. The first sphere is the area of the labour market, which produces uncertainty, for example by precarious work, thus concluding inefficient labour contracts, and the second sphere is the area of social security. Here, uncertainty is triggered by actions that reduce the functions of the welfare state and undermine citizens' social rights. Keller (2011) adds that new social risks are produced by a post-industrial society primarily in the areas of the labour market, insurance systems and family. He also adds that demographic development of most societies in Europe is not aimed at mitigating social risks (Keller 2011). The aging of the population tends to increase the proportion of the population inactive on the labour market and, in addition, more inhabitants dependent on pension insurance. Labour instability and low value contracts make more people dependent on material benefits once they find themselves on a poverty line (Keller 2010). Also poverty and social exclusion can occur quite unexpectedly in uncertain circumstances.

Sirovátka and Winkler (2010) describe New Social Risks as a side effect of modern society. In the context of social risks, for example, the problem of reconciling family and working life may appear as a side effect of normal modernization processes such as women's higher education and their participation in labour market (Beck 2004). Likewise, the risk of failure of the pension system can be seen as a side effect of life expectancy growth, middle-class quality of life growth, or improving technology in healthcare (Sirovátka, Winkler 2010). Therefore, these New Social Risks have also created new risk groups: these are mainly women, young people, single parents, and unskilled or low-skilled workers (Bonoli 2007).

Keller (2011) states that these New Social Risks, compared to the classical ones, affect a wider spectrum of society. Keller (2011) sees the fundamental difference between the old social risks of society and the new ones in the fact that old social risks have been linked to the position of individuals in their social stratification. New Social Risks, on the other hand, can affect almost anyone and represent a problem that is produced by systemic neoliberal policy, but its consequences are passed on to individuals who must deal with the New Social Risks themselves. Keller (2011) also points out that those new social risks exist due to the inability to adapt to market mechanisms by different parts of the population.

The following part describes the so-called New Social Risks and the precarious conditions they bring into modern societies. These 4 main social risks are the issue of reconciling work and family life, changing family structure and existence of single parent families, the need to care for sick or older member of household and the role of education and work qualification.

3.2.1 The need to reconcile family life and work

Employment, childcare as well as housework belong to the daily routine of everyday life. It should be noted here, a substantial part of the work is performed outside an occupation and that most of the unpaid domestic work is performed by women (Mozný 2008). One of the New Social Risks thus becomes, especially for women, the need to harmonize work and parental roles. Life in Europe has gradually throughout the years changed and modernized, and if we talk about activity in the labour market and caring for the family, it could be said that Europeans are currently leading a hectic life, employers have high demands for the work performed, in which people often spend a lot of time, which makes it difficult to reconcile with family responsibilities (Gillerová, Kebza, Rymeš 2011).

Sirovátka and Bartáková (2008) understand the harmonization of work and family as a choice, which includes certain decisions about the degree and form of participation in the labor market, how to provide childcare and the organization of the division of labor in the family. According to Sirovátka, Bartáková (2008), social policy should enable families to have a higher degree of free choice in providing care for children and at the same time to participate in the labour market. The need to reconcile family life and

career has recently come for three main reasons. The first reason is the change in demographic trends, a declining birth rate and thus a potential shortage of skilled labour force. Secondly, it is the development of technologies that affect the entire post-industrial world, including the Czech Republic and Austria (Mozny 2008). The pressure on the speed and quality of service provision creates the need for constant availability of manpower, which requires great flexibility. And the last reason is the progressive change in values, especially in the most developed parts of Europe (Mozný 2008) and in the Czech Republic and Austria not excluded.

As part of the reconciliation of work and family life, various measures, reflecting changes in society are being introduced. These are, for example, part time jobs, flexible working hours, paid parental leave, financial support for families with children, but also institutional care for pre-school children. As part of father's involvement in childcare it is the paternity leave.

As already mentioned above in traditional male breadwinner models, the man is responsible for providing the family with financial support, and woman does unpaid work in form of household duties and childcare (Mozny 2008). Because women have equal access to education as men, therefore, they are more educated than before, they are also much more involved in labour market participation and on behalf of this the whole structure of the division of household labour changes. Childcare, household duties and employment are primary vital functions of most families, however reconciling these two spheres can be very demanding (Gillerová et al 2011). Thus, one of the New Social Risks is the need to reconcile family and working life.

As another part of reconciliation of work and family life is the existence of flexible working hours such as part-time work, flexible working hours or job sharing are implemented in modern societies which enable women on one hand to return in the labour market when having small children, but it also enables them to work and care for their children at the same time (Sandbeak 2007). Berghammer, Riederer (2018) present two views on part time employment. One is the positive side leading to integration of persons with obstacles on the labour market. This group of people, mostly women cannot be working on full time basis, as they need to fulfill their family duties as well, but on the other hand want to contribute to economic background of their family. The

second view in part time employment is marginalizing, as part time employment does not provide the workers with certainty, it does not give its workers the chance in career advancement and on the long-term there is a higher risk of poverty and it reduces pension benefits and overall the social security (Berghammer, Riederer 2018).

Therefore, according to professional sources, reconciling work and family life is perceived as one of the main New Social Risks with the need to adapt the employment system according to changes in the society.

3.2.2 Family structure and existence of single parent families

The second identified new social risk is the change in family structure and the existence of single-parent families. The number of single-parent families is in post-industrial societies due to rising divorce rates increasing (Kucharová 2007). According to Cambridge dictionary a single parent family is defined as a family that includes a mother or a father, but not both of the parents and one or more children (www.dictionary.cambridge.org). These changes in family structure lead to the fact that the typical male-bread winner model is being pushed out by the existence of single-parent families and rising divorces (Bonoli 2007), also Giddens (2001) has pointed out that single parent's families are still increasing.

This new structure of family often raises a serious societal problem, as Bonoli (2006) states, reconciling work and family life is much more difficult for single parents than for two partners. Single parents are thus exposed to higher risk and they are more often threatened by unemployment, poor housing situation, poverty, social isolation or social exclusion (Kodymová, Koláčková 2005). Therefore, single parent families need more support, whether it is financial or institutional support, in fulfilling their parental responsibilities as well as they need more support when they are performing work. Mozný (2009) argues in this regard that economic problems may arise due to insufficient funding from one parent. If we consider the fact that single parents, usually women, are hit by risks coming from the structure of single parent families, then we join the statement of Kucharova (2007) that single mothers are one of the most vulnerable groups in the labour market and they often face gender inequality as well as family-related barriers like for example work life balance. Women who have ambitions to do their job while caring full time for their family, often have difficulties achieving this

goal. According to Krizova, Pavlica (2004), it is quite problematic to find a compromise between these two roles, which are in a constant conflict in today's society. And single mothers are constantly facing a choice between family and employment which makes reconciliation automatically difficult (Kodymová, Koláčková 2005).

For a brief comparison as this paper is directed at the Czech Republic and Austria, in the 1970s, 97% of single women and 95% of single men entered into marriage in the Czech Republic and most families had two children, which was perceived as a standard (Možný 1999). Changes in the family structure are evident in both countries where in 2001 there were 80 percent of two-parent families in the Czech Republic, where two parents and their children live, and the remaining 20 percent of single-parent families. Similarly to the Czech Republic, 73% of complete families in Austria and 10% of single parent families (OECD.org) lived in Austria in 2018. In Austria, according to statistics, the divorce rates increased from 26.5 percent in 1981 to almost 49 percent in 2007 (www.statistik.at). In 2018 there were 3 916 Million private households in Austria, of which 267 500 were single parent households, which corresponds to a share of 6,8 percent (Kaindl, Schipfer 2019).

When speaking about the New Social Risk of single parent families, where just one parent takes care of one or more dependent children, then we are mainly referring to women as it is usually them, who have to deal with the issues of reconciling family life and work. Also Dudová (2009) states that single parenthood, from the point of view of gender experience, mainly concerns women, who make up 90% of people who run a household in which only one parent is present.

3.2.3 The need to care for sick or older family member

Another risk is the provision of care for young children and / or other dependents (Plasová 2010). Regnault (2011) states that out of a number of family members, 80 percent of them provide care for less self-sufficient people, especially people who are over 65 years of age and are in need. This form of care is in a sense invisible, as it takes place in home environment and it is an unpaid job and unless people start talking about it themselves it remains as invisible obviousness. As with the two risks described above, it should be noted that in most cases women, wives, daughters-in-law or daughters of an

unable family member become carers (Jeřábek 2005). This New Social Risk has arisen and is deepening in the last 20 years, mainly due to the phenomenon of aging population, where there is an overall shift in the age structure associated with increasing costs of health and social care for elderly people (Jeřábek 2005).

The Czech Republic and Austria belong to the countries with a relatively high proportion of the population over 65 years (Čevela 2015). The aging of the population will continue to increase the demand for long-term care. From a statistical point of view, the total number of the population reaching senior age should increase to more than 50% by 2050 and the average age of the population should increase to 49 years (Jeřábek 2013). Caring for older parents or disabled person in the family used to be done as an unpaid job by mostly women, however with the increasing participation of women in the labour market it becomes difficult. Bonoli (2006) highlights that this expected duty needs to be solved in another way. Depending on these prognosis, there is a risk that there will be a high occupancy of nursing homes and other institutions aimed at long term care, therefore it is expectable that it will mainly be done through informal family care. In connection to that, Krebs (2010) adds that many EU member states will need to expand the availability of childcare facilities and support mechanism to help women caring for disabled or elderly family members.

3.2.4 The role of education and work qualification

Just as the structure of society, structure of families and their needs are changing, so is the approach to the labour market and its demands for qualifications changing. Demands for higher qualification are linked to the modernization of the society as described above. During the transition from industrial to post-industrial societies, there are increased requirements for higher qualification of workers. The basis of the economy in post-industrial society is primarily the service sector, not the industrial anymore, and thus there is a greater demand for skilled workers (Taylor-Gooby 2004).

Also Klimplová (2010) defines a New Social Risk as the loss of qualifications due to the development of information technologies and obsolescence of information and the threat to the possibility of acquiring a new qualification in an environment of much more flexible labour markets. The industry, in which the demand for lower-skilled labour has lagged behind and the economy is now underpinned by a service sector,

requires higher education (Taylor-Gooby 2004). People, who do not have adequate qualifications are often exposed to existential problems and worse working conditions, poorly paid work, and they often have to work part-time without a fixed employment contract, which then leads to uncertainty in the labour market (Sirovátka 2009). However, Keller (2010) draws attention to the fact that even higher education does not always protect us from the risk of unemployment; nevertheless earlier unemployment threatened especially people with the lowest education (Keller 2010). Keller and Tvrđý (2008) state that the risk lies in the fact that less prestigious positions require diplomas from applicants and thus it comes to over qualification of employees. This phenomenon is due to the fact that the level of required qualifications is not growing at the same rate as the level of education of young people.

However, according to Plasová and Válková (2009), educated population has better access to measures facilitating the reconciliation of work and family. This fact also proves statistics of unemployment for the Czech Republic where university students (with 1.8%) and high school graduates (with 1.9%) have the lowest unemployment rate (CSU 2018). According to the latest data from the Czech statistical office, the general unemployment rate in the third quarter of 2017 was 2.8%, so about 150,000 people were out of work. The unemployment rate has decreased in a large group of persons with secondary education without a GCSE, including apprentices (by 0.9 percentage point to 3.2%). Despite an evident decrease of unemployment, the unemployment rate in the group of people with elementary education remained high (11.3%) (CSU 2018). Austria has also a relatively low unemployment rate, reaching 7.4 percent in 2019 (AMS 2019). As in the Czech Republic and Austria, people with basic education are most often out of work and the lowest share of unemployment is at a high rate.

3.3 New vs. Old social risks

This part aims to place the concept of New Social Risks of modern society in the context of old social risks before the post-industrial period. Taylor-Gooby (2004, 2005) adds that aging population and privatization of social services are important processes that are not a risk themselves, but they can cause new risks. All these trends have changed the structure of social risks in Western countries (Bonoli 2007) and have led to

the emergence of new at-risk social groups that simply do not belong to the clientele of post-war welfare states (Bonoli 2006).

Huber, Stephens (2006), associate old social risks with loss of earning capacity due to old age, unemployment, illness or disability. Measures and social security mainly include cash benefits for the elderly and survivors (old-age and widows' pensions), cash benefits and services in the event of incapacity for work and unemployment benefits (Bonoli 2007). Social support for New Social Risks mainly includes expenditure on families (cash benefits and services), expenditure on active employment policies, services for the elderly and social assistance in the form of cash benefits and services (Bonoli 2007). These policies are generally targeted at fewer citizens and at a shorter time than old social risk policies, so they also involve lower social spending (Taylor-Gooby 2005). Policies of New Social Risks are more focused on services and socialization of care services in order to facilitate the harmonization of work and family life (Huber, Stephens 2006).

The first example relates to employment. A typical example of a New Social Risk is working poor, which means that although a person works, the income received does not allow them to get out of poverty (Keller 2012). On the other hand the old risk in this example was that the poor were almost exclusively people who were jobless, either because of unemployment, old age or illness. Another issue is education, whereas education used to be a guarantee for good occupation and unemployment threatened only persons with the lowest education, nowadays in context of New Social Risks, not even a university degree, is a guarantee for employment, which then results in uncertainty by the population (Keller 2012). Another example is a change in family structure, where within the framework of old social risks a man had the role of a breadwinner, whereas today due to increasing number of divorces a new family structure of single parent families is being developed and it is often the woman who becomes the main earner in the family. The old social risk was that a husband, as a male bread winner, could not feed a family from one salary. New social risk at this time means that households easily end up at risk of poverty, even though both spouses are employed (Keller 2011).

The aim of this part of the thesis was to define a post-industrial society and at present to identify what specific risks belong to the group of New Social Risks. Austria, as well as, the Czech Republic has undergone changes from industrial to post industrial society, where much of the industry has been replaced by the service sector, thus the New Social Risks apply equally to both countries.

4 Methodological framework

Based on the research questions, I have chosen qualitative research method and in particular the analysis of family policies of both countries and the document analysis of national strategic documents. Disman (2000) defines qualitative research as a non-numerical investigation and interpretation of social reality. The aim is to uncover the meaning underlying the information provided. The first part of the methodological framework will deal with the description of instruments and objectives of family policies of Czech Republic in Austria to build the basis for the document analysis and for the subsequent answering of my research questions.

4.1 Development and objectives of Family policy in the Czech Republic

In the Czech Republic, due to the different historical and political development, the social policy had a different speed than the development of family policy in Austria. The Czech Republic can be ranked among states with the so-called post-socialist model of family policy (Vlček, Kantorová 2003). This model is characterized by a two-income family model, which reflects high female employment and long parental leave (Vlček, Kantorová 2003). The former socialist Czechoslovakia had no social policy in the sense we understand it after the year 1989. Social policy was distorted primarily in the sense that it was mainly and only the activity of the state (Krebs 2002). The State monopolized, along with other activities, also certain activities in the social sphere. The role of other social entities was suppressed (citizen, family) or completely removed (for example the church or charity). The system was highly centralized and very undemocratic and it significantly reduced the scope for independent social behaviour of all non-state actors (Krebs 2002). We must consider that all these activities are usual in all democratically functioning systems, yet in the former Czechoslovakia, it was only the state that conceived, implemented, financed and controlled the whole area (Krebs 2002).

According to Konopásek (1991) in the Czech Republic the family policy was not explicitly applied during the communist time and the goal was not primarily aimed at helping families, but rather the application of a pro-population policy. Nešpor (2006) states that there was a strong focus on research in the demographic behaviour of the population, particularly the birth rate and the identification of factors that were influencing it. In doing so, it was implicitly based on the traditional model of a family with two parents and growing up dependent children (Nešpor 2006). On this basis, birth support measures were introduced, and social benefits were used to favour individuals who met criteria favourable to demographic development such as marriage or family formation (Nešpor 2006). Support was mainly given to people who had just entered marriage, which was considered as the only possible type of family life, or to people who had small children. Families in later stages of the development cycle were not given enough attention (Nešpor 2006).

In 1989, when the political regime revolutionized, the whole social system was transformed. However, after November 1989, family policy has never been explicitly defined as a separate area, much less attention has been paid to the elaboration of its concept (Munková 1996; Potucek 1997). The political reversal caused the need for a rapid transformation of the economy and politics, with family policy being one of the less important topics. This fact was caused, among other things, by the political situation at the time, when the right-wing government has identified with a liberal social regime and relied on the market (Nešpor 2006). It was therefore characterized by passive employment policy, low social support from the state and low family support. The support of a family consisted mostly of financial transfers and was directed mainly towards low-income families (Nešpor 2006). The Czech Republic has in family and social issues primarily focused to support people or groups in need, therefore in an unfavourable social situation as for example at risk of social exclusion (Nešpor 2006). This includes people with disabilities, seniors or people from weaker social class. Support of a healthy and functioning family, still regarded as the foundation of society, and it often remained in the background of social policy (www.rodinyvkrajich.mpsv.cz).

4.1.1 Legislative measures

Family policy is different from other policies, because it includes individuals and their private sphere. For this reason it aims to support natural functions of the family and it does not seek to assume or influence the social role in the family (www.rodinyvkrajich.mpsv.cz). The basic principles of family policy respect the constitutionally protected values and rights, as stated in particular in §10 and §32 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights and Freedoms, and the Czech Republic's international obligations arising in particular from the Convention on the rights of the Child, on Civil and Political Rights and the International Covenant on Economics, Social and Cultural Rights and the Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms and its Additional (Article §10 protection of private and family life, Article §12 – right to marry, Act. §14 – non-discrimination, Act §5 of its Additional Protocol No.7 – equality between spouses and the EU Charter of Fundamental Rights) (www.rodinyvkrajich.mpsv.cz).

In the Czech Republic, family policy falls under the Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs, they support families and effectively promote all family policy principles. Forms of family policy support focus primarily on creation of suitable conditions for the functioning of families (this includes financial security, reconciliation of work and family life, parental care for children, services for families), furthermore on family and parental competences, families with specific needs, institutions helping families (regions and municipalities) and on marriage and its social prestige (www.rodinyvkrajich.mpsv.cz). In the Czech Republic there is a special protective working conditions of employees caring for children, these are regulated by §238 to §242 of the Labour Code.

Family support is in the Czech Republic provided through family policy in three forms, which are more in detail described on table 1 below. It includes firstly Financial support (Social benefits like maternity, parental leave, paternity). Secondly it is Taxation, which is any discount on child tax, deduction for dependent wife, or joint taxation of spouses, deductible items of personal income tax and thirdly it includes Services of all kinds of an institutional care like kindergarten, nursery schools, children group and others).

TABLE 1: THE MOST IMPORTANT PILLARS OF CZECH FAMILY POLICY

| The most important pillars of Czech Family policy | | |
|----------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|-------------------------|
| Money transfers | Tax benefits | Benefits in kind |
| Family allowance | Tax relief for dependent wife or husband | Nursing schools |
| Child allowance (meantested) | Dependent child tax relief | Kindergarten |
| | Tax relief on child placed in pre-school facilities | |

(own processing)

The next part describes in more detail all forms of family support in the Czech Republic, whether in financial form, tax relief or non-financial institutional care. The following description on table 1 leads to a better understanding of implemented measures described in the national strategic documents of family policies in the Czech Republic.

4.2 Financial support

The material provision of families during pregnancy, maternity and childcare is an important prerequisite for reconciling family and professional life. The birth of a child brings both increased family costs for childcare and the need to reconcile family responsibilities with work. Material security helps parents during the first years after the child has been born. However most of the financial supports in the Czech Republic are mean tested benefits, they are therefore dependent on the income of the family. The next chapter presents the financial support for families with children in the concept of family policy in the Czech Republic. The financial support includes maternity and paternity leave, parental leave, tax reliefs and the state social support for families in need.

4.2.1 Maternity leave- Paternity leave

The purpose of maternity benefit is to provide financial security during pregnancy and maternity at the time when a woman cannot temporarily work. The insured person is entitled to maternity benefits in the period of advanced pregnancy and after childbirth in

connection with care of her newborn child (Kucharova 2009). It is not a universal benefit, but in order to qualify for maternity benefit, the insured person must have been insured, for at least 270 calendar days in the last two years. In the Czech Republic Maternity leave is provided for 28 weeks and for minimum 14 weeks and the basic criteria is previous employment (Kucharova 2009). The purpose is to replace the income that the insured one is due to motherhood losing. The financial support corresponds to 70% of the average gross monthly income for the last year. However, there is a reduction limit to average daily earnings, thus more you earn lower percentage of your daily salary you get. Therefore it is more advantageous for a parent with lower salary. Following numbers show the reduction calculated per day (Kucharova 2009).

- 100% is calculated from the amount up to CZK 901 per day,
- 60% is calculated from the amount over 901 to 1351 CZK per day,
- 30% is calculated from the amount of CZK 1351 to 2701 per day,
- amounts over CZK 2701 per day are no longer taken into account (CSSA, 2016).

The onset of maternity leave starts 6 weeks before birth and must not be terminated or interrupted earlier than 6 weeks after the birth. The length of time during which an employee takes maternity leave is often considered as an important personal obstacle at work in which an employee is excused for absenteeism and the work position is hold for her (Zákon č 262/2006 Sb.). The child's father may also receive a maternity leave if he fulfils the insurance conditions. This is most often the case when the mother is not entitled to it. From the seventh week after childbirth, is the father of the child or a spouse of the woman who gave birth entitled to receive maternity leave benefit (MPSV 2018).

A very important part in the involvement in care plays the historical background, the division of gender roles and the introduction of paternity leave. The typical conservative distribution of family roles in which a man plays the role of a breadwinner has a long tradition in the Czech Republic and therefore most of the introduced measures are targeted at traditional families (Kucharova 2009). Even in modern society, according to OECD (2016), the Czech Republic is among countries that prefer the traditional role of a family. According to the results of interviewed individuals, thus by women taking care of the household and men earning money is the preference by bread winner model.

Almost 65% of all respondents stated that parental leave should only be taken by a woman, and another 20% of respondents considered a woman to be a more appropriate caregiver who should stay on parental leave. Only less than 15% of respondents felt that care should be distributed equally between both parents, and less than a percentage of children were preferable to primary care by men (OECD 2016). However, the traditional model of family cohabitation is mainly known from the industrial era and in the post-industrial society it encounters many obstacles (Inglo 2008).

For a longer period of time, family policy of the Czech Republic has not set too strong goals to support the role of fathers in childcare, although the social perception of family roles has changed significantly over the last few years (Inglo 2008). It is evident that active attitude of fathers in childcare has a positive impact on the overall family climate, which is reflected in more stable relationships, increased life satisfaction and lower divorce rates (Haas, Hwang, 2008; Petts, Knoester, 2018). Stronger involvement of fathers in active childcare has in many countries been supported by the introduction of paternity leave, which rather serves to anchor the symbolic relationship between the child and the father and does not significantly strengthen the role of the father in the family (OECD, 2016b). In the Czech Republic, paternity was introduced in order to support more the involvement of men in childcare. Paternal afterbirth care is a sickness insurance that has been provided from 1 February 2018. The main purpose of the benefit is to involve the father in care of the newborn child and help the mother shortly after the birth. The legislation also promotes the reconciliation of family and professional life, responding to EU trends in this area and eliminating stereotypes (Štangová 2018).

The introduction of paternity leave is, from the point of view of state support, a helpful step towards promoting active fatherhood. The symbolism of this instrument helps to break down stereotypes and stigma related to the established patterns of child-rearing in deeply traditional societies with the overwhelming breadwinner model.

4.2.2 Parental leave

In the Czech Republic, the first form of parental leave was already introduced in 1964. It was originally a benefit meant only for mothers and fathers were not entitled to it (written in Act No. 58/1964 Coll., on increasing care for pregnant women and mothers).

Parental leave was allowed for 1 year per child and up to 2 years for two or more children (Matějková, Paloncyová 2005). Hašková (2010) states that later on, mothers were convinced that it was better for children if the mother stayed at home for at least 3 years and thus, the parental leave was extended up to four years. However, Vančurová (2008) argues that a very long parental leave can be seen as a problem when returning to the labour market.

Today, the state social support allowance, regulated in §196 of the labour code, allows one of the parents to take care of a child all day long. As the maternity leave, also the parental allowance is considered as an important personal obstacle at work in which an employee is excused for absenteeism (law Nr. 117 / 1995 Sb.). Thus, receiving parental allowance is directly linked to maternity leave, and if the parent is not entitled to maternity leave, the parental leave can be paid directly after the child is born. Thus unlike maternity leave, the parental leave is an untested state social support benefit and therefore the economic situation of the parent or previous participation in the labour market is not assessed. Currently, a parent may choose to draw a parental allowance in 3 different types: the basic, increased or reduced, however the total amount is always the same. Since January 2020 the total amount makes 300,000 CZK (until 2020 it was 220 000CZK) (www.MPSV.cz) this makes about 12,000 Euros (www.ecb.europa.eu) and this amount is divided into the length chosen by the parent. Entitlement to parental allowance is given to a parent who personally cares for a child all day and throughout the whole calendar month. However, if one parent receives parental benefit, then the other parent is not entitled to cash benefit during parental leave (MLSA 2015). At the same time, due to the impossibility of taking maternity and parental leave at the same time, contributions are made to those women who decide to have two children in a row. This often motivates women to wait for the second child at the end of the parental benefit they would otherwise lose. This also prolongs the return to the labour market. Even though men are allowed to take parental leave, their participation is still low in the Czech Republic. In 2017, the average monthly number of recipients of parental allowance was 278,6 thousand in total, out of which only 5,1 thousand were men. One of the main reasons for the low involvement of men in parental allowance are next to traditional division of roles persistent differences in income between sexes (MPSV 2018).

Nevertheless, there are some limitations in case of employment during parental leave. Parents receiving parental leave are allowed to work, however, there is a limited time their children can spend in an institutional care. In the past time it has come to an increase of hours that a child of a parent on parental leave can spend in a caring institution. A child younger than two years is since the beginning of 2020 allowed to visit nursery school for more than 92 hours a month (<https://www.mpsv.cz>). Before 01.01.2020 if the child attended kindergarten for more than 4 hours a day and the nursery institution for more than 5 days in a month, the parent usually a woman was no longer entitled to parental leave, on the contrary today when the child is placed in a caring facility for more than the 92 hours described, the parental leave is not cancelled, but stopped for a while (<https://www.mpsv.cz>). For that reason many women in the Czech Republic postponed their return to work. With this change the government hopes to support working mothers with small children (www.mpsv.cz). These strict constraints made it very complicated for caring mothers and fathers firstly to return back to work, and secondly to reconcile family and working life. Therefore facilitation in employment during parental leave is considered as a step forward in active participation of women with small children in the labour market.

4.2.3 State social support benefits

“One of the priority areas addressed in the design of the social safety net as a key social document in the first half of the 1990s was the issue of securing socially needy citizens and families with children” (Pruša, Višek, Jahoda, 2014: 28).

Other financial support within the family policy is aimed at supporting families with low income, therefore, for families in need. State social support benefits for families in need include child benefit, housing benefit or birth grant. The outcome is determined by the social situation of the family or the recipient of social benefits, which is measured by the multiple of the subsistence minimum. The range of state social support benefit is regulated by Act No. 117/1995 Coll., On State Social Support (Večeřa 2001) as amended.

Child benefit is a basic long-term benefit provided to families with children. Entitled are families with an income of up to 2.7 times the subsistence and the benefit ranges from 500 to 1000 crowns, which makes 20 to 40 Euros according to the child's age and in two

areas according to the type of income (<https://www.mpsv.cz/statni-socialni-podpora>). Housing benefit contributes to the cost of housing for low-income families and individuals. The owner or renter of an apartment with low income, who is registered for permanent residence in the apartment is entitled to housing allowance if 30% (in the capital 35%) of the family's income is not enough to cover housing costs (www.mpsv.cz). Child grand is a benefit intended for a low-income family and is one-off assistance for the costs related to the birth of a child. Child grand is a tested benefit and entitlement to maternity allowance is tied to a set income limit in the family. A family whose income was less than 2.7 times the family's subsistence level is entitled to maternity benefits. The amount of maternity pay is CZK 13,000 (503 EU) for the first live-born child, and the birth of the second live child it is CZK 10,000 (390 EU) (www.mpsv.cz).

4.3 Tax relief

The financial support for a family does not only have to be in direct form. There is also the possibility of tax support - which is referred to as indirect financial support. The basic principle of tax support is to ensure the financial self-sufficiency of each family in relation to dependency on social benefits (Vančurová 2008). Tax reliefs are usually linked to individuals and they are dependent on the performance of work activities and they are drawn on the basis of filling a tax return. The main aim is to motivate at least one family member to work and thus to use the tax benefits provided (Vančurová 2008). However, tax reliefs relate to the main earner of the household for which the state seeks to reduce the tax burden from employment. Nevertheless, the boundaries between public and private areas of life are strictly respected. The work related to the care of dependent family members and household care in the private area is not significantly compensated by financial means (Sainsbury 1996).

There are three main tax benefits to support families in the Czech Republic, they are the tax relief for dependent wife or husband, tax relief for dependent child and the tax relief on pre-school facilities (Holub 2010). Tax relief for dependent wife or husband is an indirect financial support for families with children and it is fulfilled through tax measures, mainly concerning a certain form of reduction of the tax burden reflecting the presence of the child in the family, the non-profit activity of the spouse or marriage as

such (Holub 2010). The taxpayer can claim a tax deduction for a wife/husband who does not have her/his own income higher than CZK 68,000 (which makes 2635€) for the tax period (calendar year) can apply a tax credit of CZK 24 840 (962, 80€) per year. The dependent child tax credit can be applied to a child living with the taxpayer in a household and is provided in form of a tax credit, a tax bonus, or a combination of both. To reach the tax bonus, the taxpayer must be economically active, that means only if he/she has taxable income at least six times the minimum wage in the taxation period or at least half the minimum wage when taxing the monthly wage. However, the child tax relief can only be received by only one parent (<https://www.financnisprava.cz>). And the tax relief on a child placed in pre-school facilities is dedicated to parents, who can reduce the tax on the costs they pay for child's stay in kindergarten or similar childcare facility. For 2020 it is possible to apply a maximum tuition fee of up to CZK 14,600 (565,90€) for each child (<https://www.financnisprava.cz>).

4.4 Non financial and institutional support

In this chapter we will look closer at de-familization measures of family policies. Affordable and locally available and good quality childcare services are one of the most important tools in maintaining contact with employment during maternity and parental leave and the entry of parents into the labour market. The institutional support includes childcare services as kindergarten, nursery schools and other facilities with childcare service, which enable the parents better and earlier re-entry on the labour market.

Different countries have different attitude toward childcare facilities which is mainly influenced by the historical development and the welfare model each country belongs to. The development of institutional care has a long tradition in the Czech Republic and it is, more or less, influenced by post-socialist model and the intertwining of conservative and liberal model (Krebs 2010).

4.4.1 Providing childcare services in the Czech Republic

In order to harmonize family and professional life, it is also necessary to provide affordable and good quality institutions of day care for pre-school children. If parents cannot place their children in day care institutions, returning to work after parental leave

and harmonizing it with family life, the participation in the labour market might be very difficult for them.

In the Czech Republic there are variable forms of providing pre-school childcare services. Care facilities with good quality education and good access can help to reduce inequalities in education and enable parents to balance family life and work (Kucharova 2009). In most European countries is the attendance of pre-school children between 3 and 6 very high on the contrary the participation of children less than 3 years is in some countries rather low. Countries with longer parental leaves usually stay with their children and don't send them to the pre-school facilities. For children older than 3 years, pre-school education is also very widespread and for 5-year-old children from the school year 2017/18 it is compulsory (<https://oecdeditoday.com>). However the attendance of children younger 3 years is very low in the Czech Republic. For instance in 2016 less than 5% of children under 3 years attended an early childhood educational institution, which ranks the Czech Republic very low in comparison with other OECD countries (<https://oecdeditoday.com>). As already mentioned above Czech Republic is a country with very long parental leaves and therefore it is usual to stay at home for at least 2 years, but more often for 3 years (Kucharova 2009).

The following part explains more in detail different types of an early childhood education in the Czech Republic as well as its historical development and current situation.

4.4.2 Nurseries schools

Since 1950 nursery schools have been under the Ministry of Health in the Czech Republic. Since 1960 nurseries schools were considered pre-school facilities, but after the fall of communism in 1989 they were excluded from the system of state support facilities and the number of nursery schools has decreased whereas care fees have increased (Hašková 2008). Nurseries schools were widespread before 1989 in the Czech Republic and they provided comprehensive and collective care for children aged six months up to three years.

In the post-revolution period, however, they were significantly liquidated and their number was declining for many years. The global closing down of these devices was

associated with a post-revolutionary return to conservative values supporting certainty. According to Havelkova (2007) it was the pretext of conservative governments which was to abolish all measures of the previous regime, which was described as totally bad. The main cause for cancellation of nurseries was based on the ideology of the ruling conservative right-wing politics, the municipalities tried to save the cost of running nurseries, and therefore it was worthwhile to cancel them and sell the buildings (Kucharova 2009). Even though nowadays the situation is improving there is still lack in nursery schools which are often situated in big cities rather than in small towns and the number of free places is very limited.

In recent years, there have been a gradual expansion of offered childcare services, for example the establishment of forest nurseries, company nurseries, children's groups, however, the offer still does not satisfy the demand. However, since 2016, micro crèches have been introduced as a measure to support the reconciliation of family and working life (MPSV 2018). Micro crèches is a public childcare service that offers regular professional childcare from six months to 4 years in a small group of children. Micro crèches are opened 5 days in a week for eight hours a day (Kucharova 2009). Nowadays there are 72 micro crèches for which more than 135 Million CZK (5232 558€) has been released from the European Social Fund (MPSV 2018). Not enough places in childcare facilities however possesses difficulties for parents when returning to work from maternity or parental leave, therefore they are forced to stay at home longer with their children. Another reason why parents do not put their children in nurseries is their relatively high price. The amount paid by parents is higher compared to the kindergarten - usually the tuition fees in nurseries range from CZK 3,000 (120 €) to 15,000 CZK (581,40€) in case of private institutions per month for all-day attendance. This is for a country with a minimum wage 14 600 CZK (565,90€) (MPSV 2020) rather high and many families cannot afford to pay for it. Until March 2012, nurseries fell under the Ministry of Health as a health care facility, therefore the hygiene rules were very strict. Even though it is now no longer a health institution, the establishment of nurseries is still obligated to strict hygiene rules and the need of employees with medical education (MPSV 2018). All this represents a great financial burden for the further establishment of nurseries.

4.4.3 Kindergarten and other pre-school facilities

Kindergarten is a pre-school facility, which builds on the upbringing of children in family and provides education (Pilík 2017). Kindergartens are according to the law Nr: 561/2004 Sb. set up by the state, regions, municipalities and voluntary unions in the field and they fall under the Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports, which also supports them financially. Because the number of kindergartens as well as the number of nurseries is still insufficient, the target is also put to motivate private sectors and companies to cooperate in terms of childcare. Children in the age from three to six years are usually accepted to kindergarten (Kučarová 2009). In particular they do not accept children younger than 3 years (MSMT 2015) even though since the beginning of 2020, pre-school education is organized for children aged between 2 and usually 6 years (MSMT 2017). However the places are often limited and therefore children younger 3 years often do not get a free place in kindergarten (Kučarová 2009). In response to this fact many new measures are being introduced in order to raise numbers in pre-school facilities. The following pre-school facilities, in particular the children's group institute and micro crèches have been provided in order to support institutional care in the Czech Republic.

In addition, since 2014 a new measure, the children's group institute, has been established in order to support more places in pre-school institutions. It is a relatively new form of day care for pre-school children, which enables employed parents to reconcile family and professional responsibilities and it also helps parents to return from parental leave to the labour market (MPSV 2015). The institute of a children's group represents an alternative to kindergartens and nurseries, whereas its easier legislation in comparison to kindergarten allows companies to establish a children's institute for their employees (Pilík 2017). The service provider may be an employer, a self-governing unit, a non-profit organization, institute, foundation, endowment fund, university, registered at association or legal entity or registered under the Churches and Religious Societies Act (MPSV 2015). With the approval of the Child Group Act in November 2014, the basic parameters of the childcare service were set on a non-commercial basis. This measure makes it possible to keep the parent in contact with her/his occupation while being on parental leave and gradually returning or entering the labour market. The measure also contributes in reducing the risk of poverty and income

shortage if the parent is out of work for a longer period (www.rodinyvkrajich.mpsv.cz). Although, the establishment of these groups is much easier than the establishment of kindergarten or nurseries, these groups might face a lack of qualified staff. The service consists of providing regular childcare for children from one year of age until the start of compulsory education. The attendance is allowed up to 6 hours a day (MPSV 2015).

4.5 Reconciling family and work in CZ

The topic of work reconciliation and private life includes family policies and employment and it is connected to the development of societies, changing of family structures as well as changing priorities of individuals.

As mentioned above, a protective working conditions of employees caring for children are regulated by §238 to §242 of the Labour Code. Parents who have an employment contract are legally protected during maternity and parental leave and therefore cannot be fired during this time and a pregnant woman cannot be dismissed from her employer. This protection period lasts for the entire period of her pregnancy and even during maternity and parenthood and she cannot be released for redundancy (MLSA 2015). In the case of maternity and parenthood, the employer is obliged to satisfy the parent (mother and father) caring until the child is three years old or until the employee returns to work. During this period, the employer must hold the job for the parent and if this position has been cancelled in the meantime, the employer must replace it with another place corresponding to employee's employment contract (MLSA 2015).

Working conditions are changing, its intensity and performance is increasing and new technologies make it possible to work from home or far distance. In particular, mothers of young children are often excluded from the labour market for a very long time, their qualifications are reduced, their family does not have a double income, which can also lead to poverty among families with young children (Kucharova 2009). In addition, high numbers of children in Kindergarten classes make individualized education and joint learning more difficult. Thus the quality of the preparation for primary school can be very diverse. In times of acute shortage of places in kindergartens and the lack of places in day nurseries and other alternatives to childcare in pre-school age, it is necessary to

consider how can employers work together in order to positively affect the situation (Kucharová 2009).

The majority of childcare in the Czech Republic is still carried out by women, while the financial stability of the family depends more often on men (Kucharova 2009), this corresponds with the male-bread winner model described above. The main reasons for this social imbalance are most often reported by the gender pay gap, the lack of legislative support for paternal childcare, the difficulty of placing children in kindergartens and spending their free time, or the modest offer of alternative jobs (www.rodinyvkrajich.mpsv.cz).

The Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs has together with other actors of public, private and civil spheres prepared concrete projects and measures in order to help reconciling family life with career. In order to be able to reconcile family and work you need not only a good institutional care, but also enough offers of high-quality atypical forms of employment. The following measures presented by the Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs have been introduced in order to help reconcile family and work.

4.5.1 Atypical forms of employment

Another part being linked to harmonization of family life and career is atypical form of employment. As atypical forms of employment we consider part time jobs, flexible working hours, teleworking, compressed work week or shared jobs (Formankova 2018). This lack of supply often leads to high and long-term unemployment among women with small children (Formankova 2018). Atypical forms of employment are one of the best functioning tools for reconciling family and working life and they are especially attractive for persons on maternity and parental leave (Frankova 2018).

The use of atypical forms of employment and the organization of working time are also more and more important in the context of the EU employment policy, which has begun to encourage the member states for greater flexibility in the labour market in its strategical plans (Strategy Europe 2020). In particular, the Strategy Europe 2020 a green book called „*Modernizing Labour Law to Meet the Challenges of 21st Century*“ (2006). The reasons of low offer of atypical forms of employment in the Czech Republic are negative aspects connected to this kind of employment (Formankova 2011). The low

offers of atypical forms of employment reflect the existing conservative thinking of employers, who employ their employees predominantly on a full-time basis or on a work agreement. Work agreement is a flexible form of employment, but it offers very low social protection for employees. The possible conservative thinking of employers may be due, among other things, to a lack of awareness of atypical employment opportunities, and benefits. Further education and discussion, tax credits or subsidies in form of projects could contribute to further development and motivation in offering atypical forms of employment by employers (Frankova 2018).

One of the new forms of employment are flexible working hours, however, it is difficult to define how flexible this employment is and how extend are the working hours. Working time is the period during which employees are obliged to work and in which they must be available for their employer. The working time however must not exceed 40 hours per week (www.genderstudies.cz).

Flexible working time is a shift regime in which the employee chooses to start or end working time within the time periods set by the employer (optional working time). Between two periods of optional working time is a period of time in which employees are required to be at workplace ("basic working hours"). Flexible working hours may be applied as flexible working day, flexible working week or flexible four-week working period, depending on the length of time for which the required working time must be worked. Shift length must not exceed 12 hours per day, so flexible working hours can only be used to this extent (Frankova 2018).

Another form of a so-called modern employment is a part-time job. As a part-time job we understand an employment which is less than full time, which makes 40 hours per week in the Czech Republic and can be negotiated between the employer and the employee (Frankova 2018). The employee is entitled to a wage or salary corresponding to the agreed shorter working hours (www.genderstudies.cz).

The use of part-time jobs in the Czech Republic is according to qualitative research of Lenka Formánková (2018) from the institute of Sociology of the Academy of sciences very low. In the Czech Republic, there is in comparison with other west European countries a low proportion of women working on part-time employment. For example, only 10% of women and 2,3% of men worked part-time in 2016, which ranks the Czech

Republic far below the European average for both genders which is 31,9% for women and 8,9% for men. For women, the share of part-time jobs is lower, for example in Bulgaria (2,2%), in Hungary (6,8%), Croatia (7,1%), Slovakia (7,9%) and Lithuania (8,8%). In the case of men, only Bulgaria has a lower share of 1,8% of men participating in part time jobs (*European Commission 2018*).

Also shared working time is sometimes used for employment lower than fulltime, however, it is important to mention that Job-sharing is not legally different from part-time employment. This modern way of working consists in working two or more employees in one job. These employees share the job description per employment, and, in proportion to their working hours, they are entitled to wages or salaries and entitlement to leave (Frankova 2018). Job sharing is not explicitly regulated by the Labour Code. How labour sharing will be realized depends on the agreement between the employer and the employee. Generally speaking, however, sharing is part of the possible working time arrangements that employers are obliged to provide to employees in specific life situations - parents of children under 15, pregnant women, etc. typically two) specific advantages. These include, in particular, that sharing people work as a team, share information, support each other, have the opportunity to be represented in absenteeism, work more flexibly with the timetable (www.genderstudies.cz).

According to METR research, 2015, only 7% of companies and organizations used shared jobs in the Czech Republic, these are mostly parents of young children in administrative or expert positions. In Western Europe, the supply of shared jobs has developed rapidly over the past decade. In Germany for example 9% of companies used job sharing already in 2003 and in 2018 it was 20% (Frankova 2015).

Another form of flexible employment in the Czech Republic is a project called Coordination of Measures to Support Linking Family Life and Work. This project has been created to support women with small children on the labour market. The main objectives of this project are improving the supply of services for families in the regions concerned and improving their quality of life, more effective cooperation between the MPSV and regions on the measures being prepared that will better meet the needs of families (www.rodinyvkrajich.mpsv.cz). It also aims at eliminating differences in availability, offer and quality of family services and other family support activities in

the regions. Furthermore, it supports development of implementation of family measures at regional level and implementation of specific measures taking into account the specificities of the given region. And lastly, it leads, thanks to the counselling activity of regional advisors and educational and awareness-raising events of the project, to increased awareness of families about the possibilities of regional support and a change in their attitude to this issue (www.rodinyvkrajich.mpsv.cz).

4.6 Family policy in Austria

The next part of the paper concentrates on the description of family policy in Austria. Austria according to Esping-Anderson's typology of welfare states, described at the beginning of the thesis, belongs to the typical conservative type of a welfare state (Esping Andersen 1999). This system promotes a traditional division of roles in society between men and women in form of a man as the main breadwinner and woman as the main caregiver or as a half-breadwinner and a caregiver (Matejkova, Paloncyova 2005). Austrian state is ranked among the socially very generous Central European states with a relatively high standard of living (Esping Andersen 1999). The model for the establishment of a welfare state in Austria was the Bismarck welfare state, which was intended to maintain the old order, moral discipline, social settlement and building the nation (Matějková, Paloncyová 2005). Another characteristic of this welfare state is the promotion of the hierarchy of society, loyalty and the promotion of a minimum standard of living. Similarly like in the Czech Republic, also Austria sees family policy as the basic element of the social structure of traditional family with a single-caregiver, where one member of the family is the main source of income and the other overtakes the role of a caregiver (Matějková, Paloncyová, 2005).

Family policy in Austria falls under the Federal Ministry of Economy, Family and Youth. The main themes of family policy are women and their activity in the labour market, with the aim of eliminating the barriers and inequalities that affect their position in the labour market (BMFJ 2006). For a long time, the state supported rather familization measures, which are characterized by low support of public institutions. This system thus forces families to decide between family and career (BMFJ 2006). Recently, however, the pro – family environment and de-familization process has become the motto of Austrian family policy. In Austria, public spending on family

support ranks in the past years above the OECD average (Schratzstaller 2015). Already in 2001, almost 3% of GDP was earmarked for family benefits, the spending then decreased a bit and in 2015 the total spending for family benefits was about 2,65 from the GSP (OECD 2017). In comparison the total spending for family benefits was in the Czech Republic 1,7 in 2001 and it increased to 2,0 in 2015 (OECD 2017).

The Austrian social insurance system includes health, accident and pension insurance. Social expenditures also include family support, benefits for the socially needy and disabled, compensatory supplement and unemployment insurance (Vancurova 2018). Today family policy of Austria has one basic aim, which is creating a "family-friendly" environment. The most relevant family policy objectives and requirements are the consideration of the horizontal and vertical performance, the prevention and reduction of child poverty as well as the promotion of an employment of women and the observance of gender justice (Festl, Lutz 2009). Fest and Lutz (2009) describe three possible starting points for family-related instruments. These are securing the child's subsistence level, compensating loss of income during parental leave and compensating childcare expenses after parental leave.

4.7 Historical development and current situation

The development of social policy in Austria dates back to the 18th century. Hofmacher and Rack (2006) describe in their paper that the development of Austrian health system was associated with the establishment of a welfare state in the Austro Hungarian Monarchy in 1867. And therefore, already in 1887-1889 the first brick for today's social system of Austria was laid. In 1887, accident insurance was established and in 1889 it came to the establishment of health insurance. Accident insurance was introduced mainly due to ongoing industrialization, which caused more occupational accidents and occupational diseases (Hofmacher, Rack 2006). The primary aim was to avoid claims for damages for the employer, which in many cases could cause bankruptcy to the companies. Due to these circumstances, employers created a common fund that was funded through contributions from their taxes and this fund was responsible for all damages (Hofmacher, Rack 2006).

In Austria, the development of family policy in the form as we know it today started much earlier than in the Czech Republic. The establishment of family policy in Austria dates back to 1967 where the law (BGBl 376) was implemented. This law summarized and systematized family transfers. In Austria family allowance for parents with small children was already introduced in 1948 in form of nutritional allowance and from January 1950, there exists a child benefit in financial form as we know it today (BMFJ 2009). In the early years, the parental leave was for maximum 6 months and later it was extended to 1 year (Leitner 2013).

The period of rapid changes in Austrian family policy took place between the years 2002-2005. The vigorous changes in family policy followed when the People's Party of Austria (ÖVP) formed a black and blue coalition with free democrats (FPÖ) in the year 2000 (Vančurová 2008). A major change was the introduction of the childcare allowance in 2002, two tax reforms aimed at supporting families with children, but also a reform of the pension system, which also includes a family support instrument (Vančurová 2008). As part of the reform process of family policy was the support for families, at this time the parental leave has been shortened (10 months by one parent and 2 months by the other parent) with the aim to motivate more men in participating in parental leaves (BMFJ 2016). Nowadays, Austrian family policy can be summarized in four pillars - supporting women and the family, securing social relations, ensuring optimal conditions for family and work compatibility and supporting families in difficult situations (BMFJ 2016).

In the next part, the paper will introduce the tools and support measures included in the family policy of Austria. Family support in narrower sense includes direct and indirect monetary transfers as for example child-related tax relief or cash benefits (usually summarized as cash benefits without distinction), and real transfers (Festl, Lutz 2009).

In the next chapters, the subject of discussion will be a detailed description of the fundamental measures of the current family policy of Austria and an institutional furnace, which is an integral part of the interconnection of family and work.

4.8 Current tools and family support measures

The main source of family benefit funding is the Family Expensation Fund (Familienlastenausgleichsfonds, FLAF) (Vancurova 2009). The main expenditure items of FLAF are the parental allowance for childcare, family support, free public transport subsidies for children, artificial insemination and family research funding.

The Table 2 shows the main pillars of family policy in Austria. Austrian Family Policy is divided into three pillars system of money transfers, tax benefits and benefits in kind. The means of family financial support is financial assistance during pregnancy and maternity (insurance benefit), family allowances (FBH, universal benefit), childcare allowance (KBG, universal benefit), Tax deduction in form of child tax credit and a special tax credit for children for families with only one income (Festl, Lutz 2009).

There are two main models that dominate in parental allowance. The first one is an Income-dependent model and the second one is a flat rate benefit. The first model offers and actually mirrors an income replacement benefit thus reflects the economic performance of families. The second one is more of a basic security that is based on the recognition of domestic turn off care and basic social security for families. Both systems can have minimum amounts (lower limits) as well as regulations for low-income and multi-child families can be added (Festl, Lutz 2009).

TABLE 2:THE MOST IMPORTANT PILLARS OF AUSTRIAN FAMILY POLICY

| The most important pillars of Austrian Family policy | | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| Money transfers | Tax benefits | Benefits in kind |
| Family allowance | Family bonus | Parent counselling |
| Childcare allowance | Single earner | Parent education |
| | Single parent deduction | School buses |
| | | School books |
| | | Kindergarten or nurseries |

(own processing)

The single pillars of the table 2 are more in detailed described in the chapter below.

4.9 Financial support during pregnancy and maternity

Maternity protection is similarly like in the Czech Republic linked to the mother's previous professional activity and her sickness insurance, (Help.at 2016) therefore it is not universal. However, unemployed women, who have sickness insurance are also eligible for maternity support (Help.at 2016).

Next to financial support a woman also receives material benefits, as for example, assistance midwives during pregnancy and after the delivery, as well as medication and equipment package (Help.at, 2016). The duration of maternity leave does not differ very much within the member states of the EU, but there are big differences between the amount of financial compensation between the countries (Festl, Lutz 2009). In Austria, the financial support during pregnancy and maternity, in German language called *Wochengeld*, reaches 8 weeks before and further 8 weeks after delivery. According to a comparison of the European Parliament, Austria has the sixth shortest maternity leave among European Union countries (European Parliament 2015). The amount of financial assistance during pregnancy equals to 100% of the average net daily salary (www.arbeiterkammer.at) in the previous 13 weeks of the beneficiary's employment or in the last three months (Vancurova 2005). It is not a universal benefit and therefore the precondition for the provision of the benefit is the prior employment and sickness insurance, and in the case of unemployed persons the condition is receiving an unemployment benefit (Vancurova 2005). Women who have not been employed full-time before giving birth are also entitled to a maternity benefit of a flat-rate allowance of EUR 8.80 per day (Help.at 2016).

In Austria, as well as in the Czech Republic, the father has the possibility at least partially to share the care of the newborn child through paternity leave. The father may take two weeks of paid leave during maternity leave of the mother. However, the first 8 weeks before and 8 weeks after childbirth must the mother remain at home with her child, therefore in this case it is not possible for the father to receive the maternity allowance (Help.at 2016).

Maternity leave is then followed by parental leave which has different lengths and women without entitlement cannot receive maternity leave and therefore they receive a parental leave immediately after delivery (Vancurova 2005).

4.9.1 Childcare allowance (Kinderbetreuungsgeld)

The allowance is paid after filling in an application at the relevant hospital treasury called Krankenkasse. Since 2008, parents can choose between four options for receiving the allowance. Parental leave is extended by 6 months if the father spends this time with the child at home. Since March 2017, parents can choose from four options for receiving a flat rate allowance, which is a non-testable benefit, so it does not depend on their previous activity in the labour market or on their salary. In addition to the four flat-rate variations, there is one more option for parents, who are wishing to apply for a salary childcare allowance related on their previous income (www.help.gv.at).

On the next table 3, there is an overview of Austrian childcare allowance system where a flat rate childcare has 4 variations and in addition there is an income related childcare allowance system, which should help to motivate people with a higher income, in particular, men to stay on parental leave. The length of different variations is always written in two numbers, where the first number includes only one parent and the second number means when two parents share the parental leave. This is again to support the involvement of both parents in childcare.

TABLE 3: CHILDCARE ALLOWANCE IN AUSTRIA

| Childcare allowance in Austria | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|
| Flat rate childcare | | | | Income related |
| | Long | Middle | Short | Very short |
| Duration | 30+6 (when two parents) | 20+4 (when two parents) | 15+3(when two parents) | 12 +2 (when two parents) |
| Amount per day | 14,53€ | 20,80€ | 26,60€ | 80% of the paid maternity benefit, max. 2000 €. |

| | | | | |
|---------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Total amount | 13080€ | 12600 | 12000€ | According to the previous income |
| Emlyoment necessary | NO | NO | NO | YES |
| Extra income | Up to 16.200€ per year | Up to 16.200€ per year | Up to 16.200€ per year | Up to 460,66€ per month |

(Source Help.gv.at, own processing)

Flat rate childcare allowance

Parents receive the flat-rate childcare allowance regardless their employment before the birth of a child. The flat rate childcare allowance has four variations. With these various options, families get diverse and flexible range of offers that meet all of their wishes and ideas for their personal lifestyle. These four variations can be also shared with the partner. And in case parents share the parental leave they get extra months, when the second partner can stay with the child at home. This results in a significant motivation for the second parent, mainly the men, to be involved in care (bmfj.gv.at).

Income related childcare allowance

The income-related childcare allowance has the primary function of giving those parents an opportunity to retire from work for a short time and receive income replacement during this period. The prerequisites for the entitlement are to have the centre of life in Austria, a common main residence with the child, as well as they must be entitlet to family allowance (help.gv.at). During this time one can only earn a limited amount of extra income. Since January 2020 it is 460.66€ in a calendar month (arbeiterkammer.at). The height of the monthly payment is 80 percent of the salary in the last three months before delivery.

4.9.2 Family allowance (Familienbeihilfe)

These benefits have been universal since 2003 and they are therefore intended for all families with children regardless of their activity or income. The allowances are fully financed by FLAF and paid through the tax authorities. The amount of the dose depends

on the number and age of the child (Vancurova 2005). The following amounts on table 4 apply to those children who are entitled to family allowance in Austria.

TABLE 4: THE AMOUNT OF CHILDCARE ALLOWANCE

| Age of the child | Amount per month |
|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| 0 – 3 | 114€ |
| 3 – 10 | 121,90€ |
| 10 – 19 | 141,50€ |
| 19 – 24 | 165,10 |

(Source help.gv.at, Author's compilation)

Even though, family allowance is a universal benefit in Austria, one has to fulfil certain criteria. Parents are entitled to family benefits when their centre of life is in Austria and when their child lives with them in one household or with the one for whom they predominantly provide maintenance if no parent belongs to the household (www.help.gv.at).

4.9.3 Tax support

Austria has a wide range of tax supports and reliefs. In year 2005, the Austrian social system has undergone major changes and has significantly reformed its tax system during this decade. In the past, tax policy has disadvantaged people with higher incomes. Austrian policy offers a large selection of family tax reliefs today, as for example, marriage taxation, single parent tax relief, Maintenance deduction tax relief, child deduction tax relief (österreich.gv.at). Austrian individual taxation supports an egalitarian division of labour between sexes. The reduced financial performance of a single or main earner is taken into account by the single earner deduction amount, the reduced financial performance of single parents by the single parent deduction amount (Festl, Lutz 2009).

The second stage of the tax reform was in 2003-2004. This reform is considered to be the largest tax reform of the Second Republic of Austria. During this time, the following measures that positively favour families have been introduced (Österreich.gv.at). The usual system of bands and marginal tariffs was abolished and only 4 bands were created.

With the introduction of this reform, employees are exempt from payroll tax up to 15,77 thousand. €, for pensioners it is 13.5 thousand. € and for self-employed it is 11 thousand € a year. The last part included a retroactive increase in tax relief for single-parent or single-earner families since 2004 and an increase in the ceiling for income that can be obtained without losing that relief (österreich.gv.at).

For the support of work at home and the reconciliation of work and family is a positive measure allowing domestic workers to apply an additional 10% lump-sum deduction. Austria also provides tax support for so-called extraordinary expenses (Vancurova 2005). These expenditures can be claimed against the tax base of employees, however, they are limited to 6-12% of employees' gross income according to their income, and this percentage is reduced to one-earner households according to the number of children (Vancurova 2005). Eligible extraordinary expenses include, for example a dental aids for both the gainful and non-profit family members, health care costs for both the gainful and non-profit family members birth costs, the cost of travel to a doctor, dietary expenses (flat-rate ceilings), the cost of accommodation in the nursing home, treatment and transport costs minus savings household operation, the cost of staying in nursing homes, costs of carers for the elderly, funeral and grave costs (up to € 3,000 for each item or prove necessity higher costs), costs of nurseries, day nurseries, day care centres, day centres for children, nurses and assistance in babysitting at home (Vancurova 2005).

Within family policy, Austria also offers various possibilities for tax deductions as for example child tax deduction. This means that any taxpayer receiving family allowance is entitled to the child tax relief (österreich.gv.at). The child tax credit is 58.40 Euros per child per month. The deduction amount is paid together with the family allowance and there is no need to apply for it separately. The payment is made even with little or no tax payment (österreich.gv.at) therefore, no matter if the parent is currently in employment or not. The second one is called a maintenance deduction amount. Entitled for the monthly maintenance deduction tax allowance is anyone who regularly pays legal maintenance for a child and who does not live in the same household. The following amount is calculated per month:

- For the first child: 29.20€,
- For the second child: 43.80€

- For the third and further children: 58.40€

(österreich.gv.at)

The last part of the reform is a tax deduction for single earners. The single wage tax deduction is meant for parents, who do not live in a common household with their partner for more than six months in the calendar year and for parents who receive the child tax credit for their child or children for more than six months in the calendar year (österreich.gv.at). The single wage tax deduction is primarily claimed by men and the single parent tax credit mainly by women (Festl, Lutz 2009).

4.10 Work life balance in Austria

Generally speaking, the scope of non-legislative family support measures is enormous in Austria and it is linked to the traditionally strong emphasis on supporting families with children. This trend has intensified since the advent of a coalition of ÖVP, which place a strong emphasis on traditional division of roles and conservative values such as family or homeland (Gornick, Meyers 2003).

In the next part, we will look at de-familization measures which lead to reconciling of family life and career, the main emphasis will be put at institutional care of pre-school children like kindergarten, nursering schools, or daycare mothers. However, non financial family support is divided into two parts direct family support and indirect support. The direct family support includes free transportation of children by public transport (Familienlastenausgleichsgesetz 1967) and Schoolbook campaign (Equipping the necessary school books and financial relief for the parents. The funding takes place via the family blast compensation fund (FLAF) (FFJ.bka.gv.at). The indirect family support is promoting the employment of women and family reunification conditions and working careers.

According to Leitner (2003) De-familization measures (publicly provided facilities for the care of children) contribute to releasing the family from the obligation of care, while on the other hand, familization measures (parental leave, tax relief, care benefits) support the caring role within family. Childcare facilities belong to a field that all parents right after the birth of their child think about, as it contributes to work life balance. Not only financial, but also the local availability of pre-school facilities

significantly affects the participation rate of women in the labour market. The lack of services or its financial cost is often negatively reflected in women's employment or in the possibility to be employed (Gornick, Meyers, 2003).

Austria offers a range of institutions, they are nurseries for children under 3 years, Kindergarten for pre-school children older than 3, day care mothers and day care fathers, Childcare groups, childcare at universities, Babysitters, whole day schools, and grandmothers and grandfathers to borrow (Österreich.gv.at). However the offered places of childcare facilities are still not satisfactory. In 2009 only a third of childcare places for pre-school children offered a working-friendly environment, which had a negative effect on the opportunities for women to start work after parental leave (Festl, Lutz 2009). The number of children in childcare facilities in Austria is slightly increasing year to year. In 2009, 15 percent of children were in day care and 88 percent were in kindergartens; in 2018, already 26.5 percent were in nurseries and 93 percent were in childcare (www.de.statista.com). Since 2010, there is a legal obligation to attend kindergarten in Austria, and every five-year-old child must attend the last pre-school year, which is free of charge (Österreichisches Institut für Familienforschung, 2011).

Another important part of work life balance is to step out of the traditional division of roles and involve more fathers in care in order to reach higher gender equality which then helps women to return to work, despite having children. Austrian family policy takes the involvement of men in childcare very seriously. Next to paternity leave, which makes 2 weeks during maternity of the women, the system offers an award if both parents share the time spent on parental leave. If the parents have shared childcare allowance, regardless the variation, in approximately equal parts (50:50 to 60:40) and at least 124 days each, each parent is entitled to a partnership bonus of EUR 500 after the end of the total reference period. Therefore a total of 1000 Euros for both parents is paid as a single payment for partners who decided to share parental leave (bmfj.gv.at). This measure should motivate more partners to share parental leave, so that women could enter the labour market earlier than they get a free place in childcare facility.

Furthermore, the government, in collaboration with the private sector, has also found ways to support part-time work for women who care for pre-school children. The right

to a part-time employment under the age of seven is useful and beneficial to many women. This measure is an important tool for reconciling work and family, and the government, in cooperation with the private sector, has also found ways to promote part-time work for women who care and school children. The right to a part-time employment under the age of seven is useful and beneficial to many women. This measure is an important tool for reconciling work and family. In addition the government also emphasizes reducing the unequal involvement of men in housework time devoted to childcare and unpaid work daily, in households with parents and child (Gornick, Meyers 2003).

4.11 Final Comparison

This section will summarize indicators within family policy that lead to the answering of my research questions. First, I would like to focus on the financial and non-financial form of support, then I would like to compare the approach to institutional care and the division of gender roles in both countries.

First we get to the comparison of financial support during maternity. The first important factor is maternity leave. By evaluating the maternity allowance, we came to the conclusion that the Czech Republic has better conditions, mainly in the length of maternity leave. The length of maternity benefit is in the Czech Republic more than twice as long, exactly 16 weeks longer than in Austria. For this reason, a Czech citizens receive more out of this benefit than Austrian citizens. The disadvantage in the Czech Republic is the complexity of the calculation and the subsequent reduction of the amount according to salary. There is also a progressive calculation, which means that the more people earn, the lower the percentage of their income they receive. In Austria, on the other hand, the citizen receives an amount equal to his/her previous salary, which better compensates for the loss of income during maternity leave. The Czech state makes more significant differences between the non-working and working mother when drawing the meternity leave. The setting of drawing the maternity allowance in the Czech Republic significantly disadvantages non-working women, the entitlement arises only from the fact whether the woman has been participating in sickness and social insurance for at least 270 days. Disadvantaged are mainly female students or recent

graduates, as well as unemployed women and those who, for example, cannot work or cannot find a job due to an obstacle. Women thus lack certainty in family planning.

After maternity leave, a parental allowance is paid in both countries. Both, in the Czech Republic and in Austria, it is possible to draw the dose according to the chosen length. If we look at the total amount of funds paid out per child, a total of 300,000 CZK (EUR 11,600) is paid out in the Czech Republic. Austria, on the other hand, offers more drawing opportunities, which also responds more flexibly to the New Social Risks and offers better conditions for mothers with young children to integrate back into the labor market. A total of EUR 12 366 is paid when receiving a parental benefit in Austria. When drawing the income based parental leave, the maximum annual amount of the contribution is EUR 24,090. In the Czech Republic, the length of the drawdown is a year longer than in Austria, however, this does not play any role in the amount of financial contributions that are paid to one child. In Austria, entitlement to maternity allowance also arises from participation in sickness insurance, as in the Czech Republic, but in addition, unemployed women and women preparing for employment - students - can also receive support. Thus, working women do not have to deal with the loss of funds when entering motherhood. If a woman did not work before maternity, she receives a lump sum of EUR 8.8 per day. This also makes Austrian family policy more appreciative of women who have demonstrated previous activity in the labor market. However, they all end up financially in the same or similar way as they were before entering the maternity leave.

Another appreciation of financial contributions is Child allowance. The fundamental difference between the two countries in the provision of this benefit is the right to receive them. In the Czech Republic, the total income of the family is decisive, which must not be higher than 2.7 times the subsistence level, while in Austria this benefit is universal, so, income does not play any role. This type of financial contribution plays an important role in the care of children, where the financial contribution is not paid only in the first years, but all the time before the child reaches the age of maturity, which gives families greater financial stability. Child allowance is not very satisfactory in the Czech Republic and the conditions for granting it are so difficult that only a small percentage of families reach them.

Both family policies are more or less maintaining the gender setting of the roles mother - caregiver, man - breadwinner. Looking at the family policy scheme regarding the care arrangements it seems to be easier for women to stay at home and fulfil the duties of a mother for the first three years, this corresponds with Saxonberg (2006) who states that women are to be expected to leave the labour market for 3 years with every child. However, this is literally an obstacle in their professional career choices where they have to decide whether and when to have children, knowing they will drop out from the labour market for longer time.

Good institutional care could enable better integration of women with young children into the labor market. In Austria, for example, the number of public kindergartens is growing year by year, thus actively responding to the current trend of families. Austria also offers more options for caring for young children in the event that a family does not receive a placement in a state institution, such as a daily mother. This form does not exist in the Czech Republic and in case the family does not get a place in a caring institution, they must choose private institutions, which are often financially unavailable, or provide family care. This gives the Czech Republic more responsibility to the private sector.

5 Document analysis

Document analysis is a wide range of partial methods and approaches, it can be both qualitative and quantitative. Nevertheless, the aim is always to describe and explain the content and the structure of the text (Gulová 2013). This method can be used to analyze any text document that aims to clarify its meaning, identify its stylistic and syntactic peculiarities, or determine its structure. Content analysis is a process of text analysis, not a theory; it is therefore, a procedure how to systematically and reliably analyze documents (Disman 2000). For my type of research with regard to the type of research questions, the qualitative method seems to be a more suitable research method than the quantitative method. Through this analysis, various elements and phenomena of selected documents will be identified and formulated. As Reichel (2006) states, the content analysis may focus on the intentions of the document, the consequences of its existence, or its linguistic or non-verbal aspect.

5.1 Selection of data and proposed techniques for data collection

Disman (2003:124) describes the document analysis as follows *“it is an analysis of any document that were not created for the purpose of our research. Recording can be just as well written documents as any material traces of human behaviour”*.

In my research it will be mainly an analysis of legislative measures in the area of family policy, presented in documents of individual ministries. The study of documents differs from interactive qualitative methods through the fact that during interviews, it is necessary to negotiate the ethical aspect of the relationship between investigator and respondent (Hendl 2005). Since, I use publicly available resources in my research, it is not necessary to address ethical issues such as anonymity, informed consent or other things that are important in research based on interaction with interview partners (Hendl

2005). Selection of documents will be the most important part of my research. These 4 documents were chosen on purpose. The main criterion was that they are published by the Ministry of Labor and Social Affairs within the Czech Republic and the Ministry of Family and Youth within Austria. As the expert committee has been involved in the creation of all 4 documents, they show in my opinion a high degree of validity.

The Czech Republic has a total of 3 core concepts of family policy and the newest version is planned for the year 2020. Since the paper focuses mainly on the post-reform period, *the National Concept from 2017* was chosen for the Czech Republic and we also focus on pro-family measures, which are directly in *the National Concept for Family Support from 2008*, which is the second main concept that was selected the for content analysis for the Czech Republic. The intention was to select concepts from both enormous reforms for both countries. Within Austria the document *Family Concept Auf einen Blick 1999-2009* and *the Familyland Austria* were selected. Selected documents for Austria as well as the national concept of the Czech Republic include family policy instruments, measures to support the pro-family environment at work and the approach to social and cultural change. All examined documents are accessible on the internet and thus there was no problem with anonymity and it was very easy to collect data. The following table summarizes the researched documents.

TABLE 5: NATIONAL DOCUMENTS FOR AUSTRIA AND THE CZECH REPUBLIC

| CZECH REPUBLIC | AUSTRIA |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Family Policy Concept (2017)</i> | <i>Familyland Austria (2017)</i> |
| <i>National Concept of Supporting Families and Children (2008)</i> | <i>5.Austrian Family Concept – Auf einen Blick (2009)</i> |

5.1.1 Analytical procedure

The following steps will be used to work with the four above mentioned documents. In the beginning, I will choose all measures that support families with children with all their goals and means. I consider these measures to be primarily related to the state and family (financial support, tax relief, and informal or institutional care). From the

analysis I will exclude for example, the support of socially excluded children and support of children with disabilities, which though relate to important political measures, however the topic of social exclusivity and support of children with disability would be too extensive for this paper. The next step will be to specify and select measures that primarily contribute to the employment of women with young children (part-time, flexible working hours, company nurseries). The next part will closer discuss the analytical procedure. According to Reichel (2006) there are four steps of documentary analysis through qualitative content analysis. The following four steps will also be taken for my research process.

1. Document selection (selective method)

The documents for my analysis were carefully selected, using the selective method. The main criterion for the selection was the time period, it was important that the documents include measures implemented after big reforms, and the second criterion was that the documents were primary sources published by appropriate ministries. The third and last criterion was the content itself, it was important that chosen documents perceive directly or indirectly post-industrial changes, introduce tools and measures of family policy in a given country and that these documents capture attention to family and work reconciliation. Therefore for the analysis of the chosen documents of family policies of the Czech Republic, *the National Concept of Supporting Families with Children* presented by the Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs presented in 2008 and *the National Concept of Family Policy from 2017* was selected. For Austria, *the Family Policy Report: Auf Einen Blick 1999-2009* published by Federal Ministry for Family and Youth (also referred to as BMFJ) and conceptualization: *This is How we Make Austria the Most Family Friendly Country in Europe* published by BMFJ. The access to all data is listed at the end of the references. The reason why I have chosen these four documents is their high credibility, their comprehensive approach to family policy tools as well as their temporal and content similarity.

2. Decomposition of content

After getting acquainted with the text and reading it first, without attempting to analyze it, I proceeded to the decomposition of the content. The second step was the transformation into factual data selection. Hanzl (2014) states that content analysis is a

process where the researcher is looking for the occurrence of relevant material in the text, therefore, after careful examination I selected important information relevant to the thesis purpose. The author Hanzl (2014) describes this relevant material as features that the researcher lists during careful reading. While reading, the researcher pays close attention to what other features are connected to his/her issue (Hanzl 2014). At this part sections that relate directly and indirectly to our research questions will be selected and the researcher will try to reduce the risk of excluding texts that may be relevant to the analysis. The criteria for decomposition will indicate the objective of the research, hence the content including New Social Risks as described in the theoretical part and the employment of women with young children.

3. Factual organization of the document

In the next phase, I focused on sorting the material according to research focus. The aim was to identify the various categories that are the subject of my research interest, as for example New Social Risks and women's participation with young children in the labor market.

Categories were created in a way that firstly all information including instruments of family policies, employment and participation of women in the labour market, as well as modernization and problems emerging from the post-industrial era were highlighted and listed. These categories then led to data analysis and to research objectives. Therefore, the focus here was put on tools and policies that lead to work life balance as well as financial and non-financial support programs for families. The following categories were created: Identified new social risks including demographic changes, instruments of family policies, and Reconciliation process. After the categorization scheme was created, it was necessary to read the documents again and decode the individual segments according to which category they belong to. As a coding method, the so-called pencil and paper method was used and as described by the author Svaricek, Sedova (2007), we colour-coded individual passages in the text where each category was marked with a different colour and subsequently marked passages in the text were assigned to individual categories. So there were first 9 categories, but after precise look at them some categories were due to their interconnection connected, so that the end result are 3 main categories with codes. Depending on the nature of the data, it is

possible to search for the same and different characters of individual categories and then connect them or split them (Svaricek, Sedova 2007). The system of categories and codes has changed throughout the whole process as new codes were appearing and on the other hand some categories disappeared as it was found out that they do not include information relevant to the research questions. After categories and codes were created the data was ready for a closer analysis.

4. Interpretation of results and comparison

We came to the last stage when all the categories that appear in the documents had been identified and interpreted. Therefore the last part includes an interpretation and an analysis of gained results, which include content elements and their connection with our research questions. However, it is important with the help of analyzed categories to clearly present the conclusion. As described by Hendl (2008) interpretation is a meaningful interpretation of the results obtained.

Emphasis was placed primarily on the interpretation of data to be directly related to the aim of the research, therefore to find out how the examined documents reflect New Social Risks and how the given measures affect the participation of women with young children in the labour market. The obtained data, as recommended by the author, were presented in summary, when the results were related to the objectives of the work and were included in the interpretation of research questions. Finally, the results were summarized and compared. The analysis has taken into account how the described policies responded to the development of societies in particular to the New Social Risks and how do identified categories lead to better employment of women with small children.

5.2 Quality of the research and its limits

In this chapter I focus on possible limits associated with my research, to maintain good quality of the research. The research method as mentioned above is a qualitative strategy and text analysis. The subjectivity of the researcher plays an important role in the selection of documents, but not in the content itself. Another benefit is that this research can open up new topics for us. As Mayring (1990) states, the diversity of documents,

represents an advantage of this type of research strategy and emphasizes that this type of research opens up access to information that would otherwise be difficult to obtain.

Lincoln and Guba (1985) argue that any research in the social sciences will cope with 4 main problems. The first one is named Truth Value and it raises the question: How can the trust of the research sample be achieved? Secondly, it is applicability where the researcher needs to ask: Are the facts found applicable in another environment or in another group of the research sample? The third problem is Consistency. This includes the question: How reliable can it be claimed that the results are repeatable if the examination is carried out again in similar contexts? And the last problem is Neutrality, which concentrates on the issue how can one find out that the results of a particular study are truly determined by the situation and context, and not by the overlap, interest or perspective of the researcher (Lincoln, Guba 1985).

The next part should help to eliminate above described problems. The evaluation of validity and reliability in this case is more difficult due to the characteristics of the data and the way they are obtained. Similarly, like Lincoln and Guba (1985), also Hendl (2005) lists important criteria for good quality research, which include credibility, therefore, finding that the subject of investigation is accurately described as well as identified. I have fulfilled this criterion in advance by setting criteria for the selection of a research sample and at the same time, I constantly questioned and critically considered the course of my research. Another criterion is portability, in other words the criterion of generalizability (Hendl 2005). Considering the characteristics of my research, gained results cannot be generalized for all family policies. Within family policy, we meet different types of families who have different needs, therefore, the results cannot be generalized to all families within the countries surveyed. The paper does not sufficiently take into account the area of care for elderly and people with disabilities either, because it would be too extensive for this paper. Another criterion is credibility, which is a review of research that is being done throughout the whole research (Hendl 2005). It is therefore necessary to constantly verify the examined data and their credibility. One of the main pitfalls of this paper may be poor information or possible misunderstanding (Hendl 2005). The last criterion described by Hendl (2005) is the acceptability which is assuming the objectivity of the research itself.

The validity of the research can also be fulfilled when the researcher is being aware of the potential dangers and limits of the research (Hendl 2005). I tried to eliminate the limits of research from the very beginning. The greatest risk of this type of research is the reliability of documents, therefore it was very important to carefully select materials for text analysis. On behalf of this, all four analyzed documents come from proven sources. For the Czech Republic, it is material issued by the Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs and for Austria a material issued by the Federal Ministry for Family and Youth. I see the limits of this research mainly in the above mentioned subjectivity therefore, the possibility of a biased or erroneous judgment of the researcher himself/herself. On the other hand, with reference to Mayring (1990), the data obtained are not exposed to sources of error or distortion that arise from data collection through interviews, observation, measurement and testing.

Because the four texts for my analysis are in Czech and German language and in order to ensure the credibility in data analysis, I proved my results by translated citations of individual documents into English language. A limitation is seen in the translation, which does not have to be that accurate and can lead to misunderstandings of the reader. Another limitation that I can see is that it is not possible to include all texts and concepts concerning family policy in the Czech Republic and Austria in the research, the limit here is that some family support measures, whether formal or informal, may also appear in other concepts such as housing and pension policy or unemployment policy. I assume, however, that four documents used for my text analysis were the starting point for both countries' family policies.

6 Results of the research

Through repeated reading of the national strategy papers of both countries and subsequent analysis, I have identified individual categories that, based on the data, are closely linked to my above-mentioned research questions. Every category is then characterized by three codes as seen on the table 6.

TABLE 6: IDENTIFIED CATEGORIES AND CODES

| New Social Risks | Instruments of Family policies | Reconciliation process |
|----------------------------|---------------------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Decrease in birth rates | Institutional childcare | Mothers in the labour market |
| Change in Family structure | Financial support before and after delivery | Flexible forms of employment |
| Socioeconomic conditions | Tax subsidies | Involvement of fathers in care |

For the presentation of the results, an interpretation of the data will be presented with the interpretation of individual texts including a brief identification of the main features and categories. In the results, I will try to critically evaluate individual categories and the form of their solution. Each text will be elaborated into 3 main parts. The first one will be Access to protection of New Social Risks, Linking Family and work and the last part will be an overall tools and instrument of family policies in the Czech Republic and Austria. The following part includes four interpretations and results of each document.

6.2 National Family Concept 2017 (CZ)

The Family Policy Concept of 2017 (later referred to as the “Concept”) was prepared by the Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs in cooperation with the expert committee for family policy of the Czech Republic. I very much appreciate that the list of people from the expert committee is registered at the end of the concept, thus gaining on the credibility of a scientific text.

The purpose of the document was to ensure a long-term and systemic solution of family policy in the Czech Republic. The aim of the formation was a strategic document in the area of support for families with a medium-term prospect, established for the next five years. The concept in the area of family policy is based on the Government's Program Declaration and the Coalition Agreement, the Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs (later referred to as “MPSV”) conceptual documents, as well as some other strategic documents adopted at the level of the Czech government. The concept also incorporates recommendations proceeding from EU and international documents, such as the EU Council Recommendation, the Partnership Agreement for the 2014-2020 or recommendations based on OECD publications, therefore, it can be said with certainty that the document is fully credible. The concept responds to the demographic trend of an aging society and low birth rates, thus areas which the previous national concepts have not mentioned before or mentioned only inadequately. The concept describes various factors of family policy related to current social changes. The aim of the analysis will be to critically consider whether the proposed measures adequately reflect the factors of current social changes. Text analysis will be performed on the basis of open coding, where the selected parts will directly or indirectly relate to my research questions.

The concept defines family as fundamental and the most important unit of our society. The purpose of the analyzed document is to eliminate risks, which appear on page 3-4 *"A key principle of family policy is to create an environment in which families can freely fulfil their decisions and beliefs about family values, their ways of caring and the goals of family and personal life."* (3-4). As it is not directly mentioned in the text through which tools the family policy wants to fulfil the decision and beliefs of families, we expect that the following tools and measures described in the concept are the key to the principle of family policy.

6.2.1 Category of New Social Risks

The first category being characterized in the document is the New Social Risks. As well as the theoretical part of this paper, also the concept of Family Policy from 2017, already at the beginning points out the changing society and the phenomenon of modernization *"The result of modernization is a process characterized by increased individualism and materialism "(p. 5).* Connected to that, the concept mentions the importance of adapting working conditions due to changing life styles *"to take into account that preferences evolve according to life stages, for example when families have small children, it is necessary to reflect the wishes of parents who want to look after their children, while combining care and employment through flexible work arrangements" (p.10).*

At the beginning, the concept presents six basic trends that show how much Czech society has changed, either demographically or in structure. These changes are due to modernization ,as described in the theoretical part, are named New Social Risks. Also Winkler (2011), states that Czech society and public policy are strongly confronted with New Social Risks. It can be said that the mentioned trends correspond to the described risks in the theoretical part of this thesis, so it can be stated that they are in accordance with the scientific literature. In this case, however, it should be noted that New Social Risks remain on a descriptive level and the concept does not offer a concrete solution to many of the above mentioned risks, although on page 10 the concept emphasizes that increasing female education needs to be taken into account when planning family policy measures (p.10).

Furthermore, the concept discusses the decrease in birth rates. The document mentions for example a decline in birth rates as the first trend (p. 11)" *In the Czech Republic a significant problem in the area of birth rates is especially the low number of second and other children"* (p.45). With this statement the document points out the risk of aging population and the need to motivate families for higher fertility. This statement corresponds with the opinion of Potucek (1995), who states that goals of family policy are closely linked to the goals of population policy, which seeks to influence the reproduction of the population. However, the concept does not relate its social policy measures to higher fertility, but to the financial and institutional support of families,

therefore, the statement cannot be fully accepted in today's society. We can assume that the proposed measure is the mentioned birth for a wider range of children, which is to be found on page 46. The measure proposes a birth grant for families, whose income reaches a maximum of 3.5 times the subsistence minimum of 15,000 Czech crowns, which makes 595€. However, this measure is not further developed and is not directly linked to a decline in birth rates.

The reason for not giving birth to a second and other children are described in the concept in connection with New Social Risks of postponing family for later age, namely: " *postponing founding of a family to a later age, insufficient provision of services for families with children, difficult reconciliation of work and care, as well as the fear of parents whether they will be able to ensure a sufficient standard of living for another child* " (p. 45 – 46). The document highlights that the reason for low fertility rate could be the financial background of the family.

Next risk mentioned in the document is aging of the population. The concept describes the demographic development of Czech society, where, as in other European countries, it involves the risk of providing care for people of unproductive age: "*With increasing process of demographic aging and the growth in the number of older people, increases the importance of good quality life, thus in what health condition and under what social conditions people live their increasing age*" (p.13). However, the concept no longer mentions the necessary measures or solutions, we can assume that even if the concept sees aging as a New Social Risk it does not place it at the core of a family policy.

As next, the concept mentions the changing family structure, namely the risk of single-parent families: "*Families with specific needs should receive special attention - especially single-parent families, families with a disabled member, families with three or more children, and other families most at risk of relative and absolute poverty*" (p.15). The concept also mentions an increase in the proportion of children born out of wedlock: "*The overall structure of Czech families is changing. The share of single-member households (singles), childless couples and unmarried cohabitation is on the rise.*" (p.16). Therefore, it can be said that new structure of families as well as increasing number of one parent families build New Social Risks.

Similarly like in the theoretical framework, also here is higher education of women placed as one of the New Social Risks. The fourth out of the 6 trends describes the threat in reconciling family and working life. Women are more skilled and therefore more integrated into the labour market. Another risk plays an important role in returning after parental leave, where *"Reducing professional development in the long-term career break due to parenthood is often manifested by women's dissatisfaction with their careers"* (p.16). Thus, motherhood has a big influence on women's career *"Reducing professional development in long-term career breaks, due to parenting, shows often women dissatisfaction with their life path"* (p.16).

Another important aspect stated in the document is an employment by the age of child. An interesting finding is that the concept points to the diversity of women's employment according to the age of their children as a sign of motherhood. *"The employment of women in the Czech Republic is strongly influenced by motherhood. While the employment rate of women with children over 11 years of age in the Czech Republic is the highest ever in the EU ..."*(p.17). Nevertheless the concept similarly like Kucharova (2009) points out a very high unemployment of women with small children *"employment of women with small children is at European minimum"* (p.17). As a reason, the concept mentions the lack of quality flexible workloads as well as shared jobs and the lack of flexible working hours. It is true that the Czech Republic belongs to countries with lowest employment rate of women working part time (Kucharova 2009).

6.2.2 Category Reconciling family life and work

Another important group identified in the concept is reconciling family and working life. The concept identifies the risk of compromising work-life balance as follows: *"Appropriate socio-economic conditions are intended to support the well functioning of families and bringing up of children. They should focus on the financial security of the family, the compatibility of work and family, and care services for children and the elderly or other dependents, thus enabling families to have enough free time to improve family relationships"* (p.4). At this point the concept coincides with Thavelon (2012) who describes how children and their upbringing are costly and how expensive their lifestyle can be. Thavelon (2012) adds that institutional support might motivate parents to have children as it gives parents the opportunity to combine work and family life and

thus helps to reduce the costs linked to child rising. Similarly like the theoretical part of this paper, also the concept introduces atypical forms of employment, the importance of involving men in care, or the institutional childcare as reconciliation measures. The institutional support plays an important role in reconciling family with work duties.

Another inseparable part of the harmonization of work and family is Institutional support. In the concept it is noticeable that it links New Social Risks and employment primarily to women, this can be seen from the description "*The unemployment rate of women with young children is more than double compared to childless women, more than 60 percent of unemployed women after parental leave stay without an employment*" (p.17). According to the concept, employment policy plays an important role in reconciling family and working life "*The main causes of unemployment include a combination of various disadvantages, in particular lack of professional mobility (qualifications, health constraints), employer prejudice and the need to combine work and care for family, especially for the elderly*" (p.18). Looking at the analysis of the collected data from the concept, I find that within the New Social Risks, the concept focuses primarily on formal, institutional care, which is seen as a tool to facilitate returning to work after parental leave. However, the concept addresses the provision of services to preschool children as critical and insufficient "*the biggest problem in the Czech Republic in the area of childcare and education services for children in pre-school and school age is insufficient supply of quality, affordable and locally available services that would correspond to the wishes of parents*" (p. 30). Although the concept perceives the importance of free choice, whether to stay at home with the child or return earlier to the labour market, it does not link that fact with concrete measures or with the importance creating them. Similarly, like the description of Czech Family policy, also the concept points out at incomplete legal regulation in the Czech legislation as a reason for insufficiency, but I do not find any proposals for a change in the concept. Kindergartens are governed by legislation of the Ministry of Health, which causes very high hygiene requirements, demands on staff, or financing of services (Zákon č. 258/2000 Sb.) and as the theoretical part describes the establishment of kindergartens is very complicated and for private institutions it means impracticability.

Next part of institutional care is nursering school. Even though, the concept, as well as the theoretical framework of this paper, includes measures addressing the need to

provide care for young children up to the age of three, namely measure 6 "Micro crèches", which is aimed at qualified non-family childcare from six months, it does not provide enough solutions to improve the situation in the Czech Republic. However, I positively evaluate the introduction of micro crèches, which could be taken as an implemented measure in order to enable women to link their family life with career. However, the concept does not mention the extent to which the micro crèches will be introduced, therefore it is impossible to evaluate if introduction of this measure is sufficient. The aim of this measure is to anchor the care in micro-crèches with a maximum of four children per carer (p. p.35). Related to this is the measure 8 in the concept, namely *"to ensure long-term funding of children's groups and micro crèches from national sources after the European Social Fund has ended: Provision of financial resources for the creation of a sustainable system of pre-school care and education in the Czech Republic. The preparation of measures will discuss the provision of a system of financing from the state budget"* (p.35). Nevertheless, rather than creating plans for sufficient institutional care, the concept gives description of problematic reconciliation of family and work.

The concept furthermore discusses the financial support of institutional care and states that spending on services for families with children in the Czech Republic is very low and that only 0.55% of GDP (about CZK 20 billion in 2011) goes to support services (pre-school care, after-school care, extracurricular activities), while the average in OECD countries is 0.95% of GDP (p.27).

Not only institutional care leads to better work life balance, but also the involvement of fathers in childcare. As a solution to the consequences of New Social Risks, the concept suggests primarily the involvement of fathers in childcare and states that *"Due to childcare, caregivers often give up their profession as well as their own financial income and leisure time. However, if one freely chooses to take care of his/her time and family, he/she must not be punished for it by the system, but rather appreciated. The problem of valuation of care does not only concern care for the elderly and the long-term ill, but also care for young children and the involvement of men in care is fundamental prerequisite"*(p. 47). It should be noted that the state responds to this through measures of so-called paternity leave, which was established on 01/01/2018 as a

social insurance benefit. Men can take one week of paternity leave, which is 70% of gross salary after the child was born.

Involving fathers in care, eliminating the risk of reconciling work and family life and the need for care, can according to the concept not only help to connect work and private life but also, to increase birth rates and so respond to low fertility rate as a New Social Risk. The analyzed document identifies and proposes: *“Involvement of both parents in care is not only of great importance for the functioning of family relationships, but also for the development of a child and the well being of a whole family. Nowadays, women often fear that all family and household care will remain, even if they have a paid job “ (p.41).* The concept also points out the double burden of work and household duties that women must often face. Furthermore the concept shows examples of countries with other welfare states typologies as a motivation for changes namely: *“Greater involvement of fathers in childcare can be expected to have an impact on the increase in birth rates, as these concerns will be dispelled with a more even distribution of childcare. Experiences from Sweden show that parents who share care for their first child together tend to have a second child faster. It also appears that daughters of employed mothers are more often employed and their sons are more involved in household care. It is the involvement of men in the care of children and the household that will also enable the transformation of social stereotypes, which manifests themselves in access to the labour market, for example real wishes and aspirations“ (p.42).* Measures for the involvement of fathers in child care are sought by the Government of the Czech Republic through Act No. 187/2006 Coll., On sickness insurance. However it is important to point out that it still does not give women the certainty that family duties will be shared between both partners.

Furthermore, the concept de facto reflects on the negative impact of long parental leave and acknowledges that after parental leave women have significant problems in reconciling work and career *“After parental leave, women often start to build careers from the very beginning, and in addition to the problems by reconciling family and working life “(p.16).* Even though the concept acknowledges the negative effect of long parental leaves it does not give neither a solution, nor a plan for shorter variations of parental leaves that motivate women to return earlier on the labour market or that would

motivate men to take part in taking parental leave. The number of men participation on parental leave remain rather low (p.16).

As the theoretical part of this paper, also the concept sees importance in adapting the working conditions for parents with children. As an important part in reconciling family and working life, the concept proposes so-called flexible forms of work such as flexible working hours, the possibility of working from home, a compressed working week or shared jobs, which according to Berghammer, Riederer (2018) bring positive effects *”Flexible forms of work mean more time for family, work, self-realization and relaxation. They bring benefits to employers, employees as well as to the state. Employers increase labour productivity and reduce both financial and personal costs. Furthermore, they have a positive impact on the corporate culture, as they increase employee satisfaction and loyalty. They represent a way to preserve and develop the knowledge and skills of highly qualified and talented employees who want or need to work differently. They are also an instrument of active aging policy by enabling older people and the elderly to remain in the workforce, while pursuing other activities, helping with childcare, etc. They also help to harmonize work as well as private and family life, thereby improving caregiver, including parents with young children, the involvement to the labour market”* (p. 38).

At the same time, however, the concept also draws attention to the negative sides of flexible working arrangements. The concept directly states that, *“ at the same time, it is important to point out that part-time or flexible workers often have fewer opportunities to work, less benefit, less job security and less participation in corporate training programs. Moreover, for part-time work, the disadvantage is reduced income and the impact on social insurance, which is particularly reflected in low pensions”* (p. 38). However, the concept does not give any solution to the above mentioned negative effects as fewer opportunities, lower insurance payment ect. As a measure, the concept proposes a reduction through insurance form for employers, who allow flexible forms of work, which should serve as an incentive to establish more part-time and other forms of flexible work *” Reduction in insurance for employers providing flexible forms of work '- Reduction of social security contributions for employers who provide part-time or shared employment to carers for children under six years of age (inclusive, up to the last day months after the child reaches seventh birthday) or to parents caring for a child*

with a disability under the age of 18 while maintaining the above-mentioned flexible forms of work (...)” (p.39). Nevertheless, one of the most important measure that leads to work life balance represented in this document is Measure 18, which is a measure expressly constructing new social risks, namely *“raising the limit of 46 hours per month in a pre-school facility for children under two years of age. Increase the possible time of placement of a child under two years in preschool facility when drawing on the parental allowance from the current 46 hours so that it is possible to reconcile family and working life, but at the same time there is a preference for individual family care for such small children ”*(p. 41). However, it is of importance to point out that the offer of part time jobs is in the Czech Republic insufficient and due to its negative aspects is not much popular in the country.

As a positive part, I consider the effort to motivate employers to introduce flexible working hours and part-time employment through reductions. However, again, it is only a descriptive suggestion, as there is nowhere a planned date of implementation throughout the concept, as well as lacking a more detailed description of how to achieve it.

6.2.3 Instruments of Family policies

Even though, financial security is one of the main pillars of Czech Family policy (Kucharova 2009), the document does not pay much of an attention to direct financial support in the document. In CZ, there are two basic financial benefits in maternity, maternity leave and parental allowance. The proposals also emphasize the financial security of families, where it is planned to increase parental allowance and maternity leave. Maternity leave is based on the previous working activity, and the parental allowance is an untested benefit. The length of the parental allowance is seen as very long in European comparisons. Although the system suggests a shorter variant, most parents choose a longer variant of parental allowance. As a reason, the concept of uncertainty says *“Parents choose the longest option to benefit from parental allowance, because many do not have certainty in public preschool facilities ”*(p.41). The concept does not provide a precise proposal to support a shortened parental leave option, and to increase the number of places in institutional care, but suggests increasing the hours one can spend in a facility without losing parental benefit. It should be noted that today, the

time is increased to 92 hours a week (MPSV.cz). However, this measure does not give parents the ability to place children in pre-school facilities, but merely allows them to give their parents certainty in the placement of institutional care, leaving it to the private sector.

The document presents many proposals and measures to reflect New Social Risks and changes in the structure of society, but these proposals remain largely on a theoretical basis, where specific measures are lacking. Moreover, the individual measures are not provided with specific dates of implementation, therefore the proposed measures seem to be rather on descriptive level in order to get attention. With reference to Sirovatka, Wildmannova, Bubnová (2000), it can be said that governments often secretly or openly pursue pro-population goals by providing family benefits, although the effects of family benefits have never been proved as being significant in this respect. The document deals relatively little with the causes of the phenomena, such as increasing instability, postponing parenthood, and decreasing fertility and birth rates. The concept rather describes the negative phenomena, but does not present enough measures to eliminate those, therefore the proposed measures of this concept are not sufficiently focused on eliminating the causes against the negative influences of modern society. Furthermore, the concept does not reflect the real needs of society and the resulting family expectations.

6.3 National concept of supporting families with children (2008)

The second document for the analysis is the *National Concept for the Support of Families with Children*, which was drafted in the same way as the previous concept by the Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs and is an updated version of the National Concept of Family Policy from 2005. The target group of the updated concept is families with dependent children. As according to the concept their creation and functioning requires the greatest support from the state. In the analysis of the concept I have identified specific categories, presented earlier, which will be described below and at the end of the chapter obtained data will be analyzed.

In the next chapter, I will in detail elaborate the above described categories that appear in all 4 concepts. As already mentioned, it will be the identified category of New Social Risks, which includes socio-economic conditions, family structure, and the demographic data, the second main category Reconciling family and working life will include flexible working hours, involvement of fathers in care, institutional care measures, and the last category includes tools of family policies as for example financial childcare support. It should be noted that individual categories are interrelated in the context and can therefore be intertwined in interpretations. To obtain the results, I will again present a brief identification of the main features and subsequent analysis.

The national concept of 2008 was drawn up during the economic crisis and during the right-wing government of Mirek Topolánek, which was characterized by its rather liberal approach. Therefore there is obviously a strong political influence in comparison with the national concept of 2017, which was created under the left-wing government of Bohuslav Sobotka. Baldock (2007) also states that the generosity of social protection depends on political forces and on the influence of left political side. Due to the post-crisis period, the 2008 concept shows that the government has focused more on saving measures, which is particularly evident in the private sector of institutional facilities. However, despite the difficult economic period, the concept is on the side of people and together with them the government wants to fight against the New Social Risks of today's society. We can say that this strategic document commits to their fulfilment of certain measures, especially in those where the deadlines of established measures are stated. The concept directly states *“The measures largely concern financial support, which, according to the concept, plays a key role. The level of dependence on the financial support of the state is still high in Czech society and the expectation remains that, especially in the period of care for small children, the state is obliged to financially take care of the family“* (p.31).

6.3.1 New Social Risks

The approach to New Social Risks is mentioned right at the beginning of the concept when it discusses the unfavourable demographic development of the Czech Republic. *“The priority character of family policy for the Czech Republic is, as in other European countries, accentuated also due to unfavourable demographic development, which is*

accompanied by a particularly aging population in the Czech Republic associated with many negative socio-economic consequences” (p.3).

The concept also introduces the solution to demographic development in the Czech Presidency of the EU Council. *“The topic of family support in connection with unfavourable demographic development is therefore also a priority of the Czech Presidency of the EU Council in the first half of 2009” (p.3).* However, I don't find any measures which would namely be connected to the unfavourable demographic development. The Concept (2008), for example, declares that the state should support families with three or more children (p.7). This de facto says that it is necessary to promote higher birth rates and thus contribute to better demographic development.

The document also points out at changing family structure and loss of traditional division. On page 9, the concept mentions that while the Czech family is based on traditional division, the family structure is gradually changing, namely: *“The Czech family still builds on traditional values and tends mostly to traditional organization, on the other side, there has been an increasing tendency to loosen partnerships in the past decades” (p.9).* The concept, however, does not specify the term family, and therefore it is not clear to the reader, who can fall into this group. Taking in consideration the description in the theoretical part of this paper it is parents or one parent and at least one child (Krebs 2002). Prevention of the risk of single-parent families is indirectly included in the promotion of the institute of marriage *“The Institute of marriage deserves support from the state, given its higher degree of stability in comparison with other forms of cohabitation, the lower incidence of socio-pathological phenomena, the mutual securing of spouses and, last but not least, as an environment particularly conducive to the family life and upbringing of children” (p.17).* Such an effort is certainly appropriate. However, there is a contradiction in the second statement on page 7, where the concept states that *“The varying differentiated interests and needs of different families will be respected” (p.7).* Again, it is noticeable that many of the proposals address New Social Risks, however they are on a general level, for example in context of single-parent families: *“Particular attention must be paid in single-parent families, to a stable environment for the universal well-being of children in accordance with the best interests of the child” (p.23).* However, it is important to say that the best interest of the child is relatively vague and unclear and it is not explained in detail in the concept.

Also in other generalized proposals, I find emphasis to have a better state support: *"In addition to creating favourable external conditions for the birth and functioning of families, state support must also be directed towards a qualitative dimension of parenthood and family life, given the high demands placed on parenthood and child rearing"* (p.21). Precisely at this point, it is evident that New Social Risks are perceived and taken into account, but the proposals are in general terms that are often not linked to specific measures, which are sometimes at the end of the concept and we can only guess which social risks these measures reflect on.

Furthermore, regarding the New Social Risks, the concept identifies support for creating appropriate socio-economic conditions for family functioning. These measures focus mainly on work-family compatibility, childcare services as well as family financial support (p.16). *"Support for families with three or more children should be seen not only as a source of emotional satisfaction for parents and investment in human capital, but also as an investment in future social and economic development. Therefore, the state should pay increased attention to the support of multiple families and give greater appreciation to the childcare provided in these families. In particular, support should be directed towards financial compensation for increased costs."* (p.23). The intent of this support is again related to the financial support. Nevertheless, I lack a specific procedure and source of funding, for example from which sources will the government draw on this form of support. On the other hand, the concept states that the increasing number of children has a negative impact on the economic situation of households. *"However, the increasing number of children has a negative impact on household income per capita. The worst situation for low-income families is either for single-parent families as a whole or for families with more children"* (p.22). It should be noted that there are not many other supports mentioned in the conception than financial, although, it is very important to support other than financial measures such as better working conditions for the sweetening of family life and career, or institutional care. Nevertheless the concept is very positive about financial support and it's primarily focus is on financial assistance and states: *"Very important is also support in form of financially and locally available services that prevents social exclusion, supports families in childcare and upbringing, or helps to reconcile work and family"* (p.26).

Throughout, the whole concept, we are "witnesses" of transferring responsibility to other actors of public life than only to the state alone. The concept indirectly describes that municipalities and regions should get more involved: *"Despite the fact that immediate knowledge of family needs and local conditions makes municipalities and regions one of the most important actors of family policy ..."* (p.9). The government is also trying to delegate responsibilities in other areas, such as institutional care for preschool children, or, as the concept states: *"The involvement of all actors of family policy at various levels of the functioning of public administration and actors from the private sector, which is crucial for the implementation of the implemented measures, is low in the Czech Republic"* (p. 10).

6.3.2 Reconciling family and working life

Another important part in family policy is to enable parents, who care for dependent children to have good conditions that would enable them to combine family life with careers, for example to foster, in particular, institutional childcare, the involvement of fathers in childcare, as well as to tackle flexible working arrangements. This part will attempt to identify and evaluate those measures which are introduced in the concept and through which they encourage the participation of women with young children in the labour market.

Another important part connected to changing society is linking family with employment. The compatibility of work and family is related to financial support instruments, in other words, family financial security is, by the concept, an instrument to address above mentioned social risks *"Financial support not only serves as a tool to offset the costs of families due to the presence of children in the family, to redistribute funds from high-income to low-income families and from childless or persons to families with children, but is also an important tool in the field of work compatibility and families"*(16). This part draws on the solidarity principle discussed in the theoretical part. As in the previous concept, financial support is also being discussed here. In connection with the financial support of a family, many issues have been discussed at European level, as in the Czech Republic, in particular its effects on fertility support recently (p.16-17).

It should be noted that the government calls for co-responsibility in the reconciliation of family and working life and states in the text: *“Other actors - in particular the social partners, regional and local government and the media and the government - have a role to play in improving work-family compatibility. The partnership of all actors who can influence conditions of work-life compatibility must be encouraged”* (p. 19). The role of other actors is also emphasized elsewhere: *“Other actors in social life also play an important role in supporting the fulfilment of the needs of Czech families and ensuring access to all necessary material, social and psychological resources to master parenthood”* (p.16). This shows a gradual enforcement of the subsidiary principle. *“From the position of the government, the intention is to expand the range of individual childcare services in particular and to remove legislative obstacles that currently prevent the use and development of childcare on a commercial basis”* (p. 20).

However, the government also calls for some co-responsibility: *“At the same time, the government will support the emergence of alternative and innovative types of these services and strive for their development while guaranteeing a high quality of their provision. Their development needs to take greater account of the needs of families and the interests of children”*(p.20). To this end, their founders and providers should be encouraged to introduce more flexible services, such as adapting the period of service provision or allowing the admission of children in summer. These services should also involve employers and other actors that the government will motivate by creating conditions that will allow their involvement”(p. 20). The government declares that in the way of providing care for children (or older household members in need) it intends to involve the private sector: *“The basic principle of government activity in this area will be respect for freedom of a family to decide on how to provide childcare. The government will therefore not prefer state institutional support for care services, as it would mean making decisions on what form of care will be spent on taxpayers' money instead of families. The state cannot substitute this decision. However, it is necessary to remove legislative and other obstacles to the development of the availability of individual forms of childcare services”* (p. 20-21). It is clear from such category that the government is targeting its efforts to involve the private sector in preventing or addressing New Social Risks, thereby defacto transferring responsibility to the families themselves. Similarly, Sirovátka (2008) describes that, in general, institutional intervention in family life is a source of inconsistencies in the competences and

responsibilities of individual actors. I would like to point out is that the concept pays little attention to families with children with disabilities. The concept merely states that it is important to support families with children with disabilities “*desirable, in addition to material compensation and the involvement of the disabled themselves in the labour market, to focus on the compatibility of caring for disabled family members with their careers and their involvement social activities*” (p. 23) however, I don’t find anywhere any measure directed to support women with young children with disabilities on the labour market. Besides financial support it is nowhere stated which possible institutional care families with children with disabilities have access to.

In order to facilitate the reconciliation of work and family responsibilities for parents two sides play an important role, on one hand it is the measures of the state and families themselves, and on the other hand also employers play an important role. Their conditions either allow or block parents of young children to develop appropriate strategies for participation in the labour market, while managing family responsibilities (Plasova 2008). As in the concept (2017), flexible forms of work are mentioned as a tool for reconciling work and family life also in this document: “*In order to maintain the professional qualifications of parents caring for young children and to make it easier for them to return to the labour market after maternity or parental leave, the government's efforts will be aimed at removing obstacles to the expansion of flexible forms of work and part-time work.*” (p.19). Furthermore, the document points out the necessity to involve employers in the development of family friendly environments “*On the side of employers, it is also necessary to support the development of education in terms of their motivation to take into account the interest of employees - parents and the creation of a family friendly environment in the workplace. The role of employers in making work and family compatible is also important in their involvement in providing childcare services.*” (19). These measures are certainly appropriate, however, the concept does not seem to take into account negative aspects of flexible workloads, such as lower social security contributions and hence, lower pensions, reduced ability to advance, but often high uncertainty. Although, the concept suggests introducing a discount on insurance for employers for having part-time employees, nevertheless, there is no detailed plan in the concept to achieve more flexible jobs and to persuade private companies to offer more of such positions. In this way, flexible work arrangements seem to be inadequately elaborated and thus, remain within the theoretical framework.

This type of employment is thus primarily regulated by the Labour Code, but partly also by the Employment Act. The concept does not even count with a greater administrative burden for employers at the moment when they have more part-time employees, thus leaving employers motivated to use this form of employment. Plasová (2008) also states that the demand for a flexible form of work can entail high costs for the employer, especially in the area of work organization. Another fact, which is not mentioned in the concept, is to what extent are the employers informed about the proposal of discount on insurance premiums or how does the state intend to inform about this measure. This fact gives us again the feeling that this planned measure is more descriptive without a more detailed plan for its realization.

Within the category of involvement of men in family care and upbringing of children, there are no significant changes in the previously analyzed Concept of Family Policy (2017) and in the concept of 2008 as these efforts have already been declared here, namely: *"In order to make work and family compatible, it is necessary to promote the possibility of more active involvement of men in family care and child rearing. It does not only contribute to alleviating the double burden on women, or it enables mothers to participate in the labour market, thereby promoting work-life compatibility, but it also improves and strengthens paternal relationships with children, parental partnerships, anchors male-fathers status family stability and functionality. Greater involvement of men in care of children and family and greater cooperation between fathers and mothers in this area is a relatively new phenomenon in family life, the extension of which is a question of future social development "*(p.19). In its measures, the concept proposes to legislate the paternity benefit enshrined in the amendment 187/2006 S.b on sickness insurance, where father can take a week of paternity leave after the birth of his child and thus build a relationship between him and the child and help the woman with care. It should be noted that this measure came into force on 1.1.2018 therefore 10 years after it was first mentioned in the concept of 2008. Another positive measure, which came into force on January 1, 2009, is to legislate the possibility of parents to take turns once in the care of a sick family member (in this case a child). With this option, the risk of an employee (mostly a woman) with small children, who is often taken precisely because of the frequent birth of small children as risky workers, is reduced.

6.3.3 Instruments of family policy

As already mentioned, family policy in the Czech Republic is closely linked to financial support, therefore parental leave plays an important role. The concept (2008) states that: *“New arrangements for receiving parental allowances will enable parents to choose pace that best suit their needs and family situation. The social security system in which families are financially supported shows poor efficiency in terms of its addressability (p.11)* “.However it is important to note that not always are long parental leaves effective in work life balance. Although this measure appears to be positive, in the sense that parents have a choice over the length of the parental allowance, this choice is also linked to negative impact found in the case of the above mentioned inadequate institutional care. If a woman wants to return to work after two years, then it is necessary that institutional care is be provided for her, as the concept states that they will not put pressure on the emergence of new institutions, we assume that the state is leaving this concern to women themselves. The Czech Republic has 3 relatively long models of parental leave where the shortest is for 2 years and the longest for 4 years, this model does not correspond with labour market participation after parental leave. The trend of long parental leave in the Czech Republic has historical justification. Sirovátka, Bartáková (2008) state that in the Czech Republic the model of women's interrupted careers has stabilized already in the times of socialism, characterized by high participation rate of women in the labour market in general employment at a time when they raise children up to the age of three. The concept suggests free choice of parental leave, where it is a woman herself, who can choose what type of parental leave she chooses, however, it is not generous as it looks at first sight. On one hand, the concept does not prevent women from choosing a two-year parental option and then returning to the labour market on the other hand it does not offer them enough institutional support for children between 2-3 years. Women, therefore, have the opportunity to return to the labour market at the age of two, but they have to find a childcare solution themselves, which puts them in a very precarious situation and prefers to choose the option for three year olds. In fact, thus it has not been mentioned that this "free" decision is only accessible to a certain group of parents. We can assume that the main motive for the introduction of this model was mainly the reduction of state expenditures to support families. Regarding the implementation of the described measures, I would like to say

that there is no indication in the concept where resources could be drawn for the fulfilment of individual goals. This fact leads us to the idea, whether, described measures are feasible and whether they are not just mere descriptions. It can be stated that the Czech Republic in its mixed model of family policy from the point of view of the social democratic model lags behind in terms of public services for families with children, which not only deepens gender inequality, but also significantly prevents women with children under three years of age from actively participating in the labour market. This fact is seen in the document in the description of long parental leaves and institutional care.

It is necessary to say that the concept of 2008 supports the complementarity of male and female roles. The concept also supports home care for children up to the age of three, openly prefers this model, stating that it will not put pressure on the emergence of new institutions, thereby it is transferring again the responsibility to the family and therefore to the private sector. It is in this statement that the government's austerity measures are strongly noticeable. Although the concept mentions some measures, there is no direct specification of individual measures in the concept. It is therefore necessary to formulate and elaborate these measures further and more precisely.

6.4 Familyland Austria: This is How we Make Austria the Family Friendliest Country in Europe!

Family policy in Austria falls under the Federal Ministry of Economy, Family and Youth (later referred to as BMFJ). Another document chosen for the analysis, in the field of family policy in Austria, is a concept presented by the Ministry for Family and Youth in 2016. The document, *Familienland Österreich* (later referred to as document) offers an overview of the existing measures and future orientations of modern family policy.

The concept, at the beginning, introduces modern society as a structure that needs new future measures. From the concept, it is obvious that family as such plays a very important role in the family policy of Austria and probably also in the development of its measures. Within the document, *Familienland Österreich* (BMFJ, 2015), is the current situation of Austrian families described and statistically substantiated. There are

five basic principles defined for achieving the given goals. According to the Austrian Ministry of BMFJ, adherence to these set principles, should lead to the fulfilment of the set goal that Austria will, by 2025, become the most family friendly country in Europe.

Already the title includes the set aim as it is called familyland Austria and shows a strong priority in implementing measures supporting families. The concept is written in a way to connect with its readers and through its form substantially differs from the other two above described concepts published by the ministry of Labour and Social Affairs in the Czech Republic. In order, to meet the mentioned goal, the ministry wants to expand cooperation and support of political actors, such as municipalities, regions and others, but also calls for active involvement of the private sector and all parts of society. This involvement shows a clear division between the state, municipalities and the private sector. On one hand, the state relinquishes their responsibility and shifts it to other actors, on the other hand it promotes an individual approach and takes into account the needs and wishes of individuals. According to author Blum (2010), new actors and ideas in policy making process is an important part in doing reforms.

Since, the document initially provides an overview of already existing as well as future measures as one of its objectives, there is a lack of detailed description of these measures, giving the reader the impression that these measures aren't in comparison with descriptive facts perceived as a priority.

6.4.1 New Social Risks

In the concept the approach to New Social Risks is already mentioned at the very beginning, when it points out the change in family development, and when it deals with marriage and divorce scales. Nevertheless, the approach to New Social Risks is rather on descriptive level and the importance and continuity of the data is not specified in any way, however, according to the information given in the theoretical part, it is clear that description of New Social Risks is demographic structure, family structure as well as employment of women. The concept also implies that an opinion of majority is an important part and often describes trends of modern society in conjunction with public opinion namely: *“In a management survey, 94% of those surveyed stated that family-friendliness is very important or rather important for employers and for companies”* (p.6).

The main goal of the concept, is to improve the family policy measures by division of roles. The first principle is that a family-friendly society needs to create conditions that do not favour any type of family, thus the concept draws attention to New Social Risks, where a change in the structure of families leads to negative conditions for single parent families. The second principle calls for a balance between family and professional life; extended childcare must become a matter of course for politics. The second principle, also draws attention to New Social Risks, namely, involving more men in childcare and thus, achieving an equal division of roles. The concept however does not specify which measures are implemented in Austria and therefore, the reader needs to know the previous background. These measures, are as described in the theoretical part of the thesis, the possibility to divide parental leave between both parents, this decision is not only allowed, but also financially rewarded. The third principle calls for family friendliness to become a factor in measuring the economic situation of businesses in Austria. The third principle also includes the fight against the risks caused by post-industrialization and points out the family-friendly environment in companies. Furthermore, the (fourth principle) of family policy must be based on the principle of partnership. Although, the fourth principle encourages equality in a relationship, it can also be perceived as supporting the relationship of two individuals and thus neglects families where there is one adult and at least one person. The last, fifth principle emphasizes the strength of parental competencies, in the sense that the child-parent relationship is perceived as very important, so, the state is required to focus measures on educating parents and their competencies in relation to the child (BMFJ, 2015).

Another important social risk, mentioned in the document, is changing family structure. The document states that from 2005 to 2015, Austria recorded a slight increase in the number of families, it rose from 2.29 Million to 2.39 Million. Thus, in 2016 there were 68.2% of married couples and 14.2% of single parents, while 17.6% were spouses living in the same household. The concept with this description de facto states that a change in family structure plays an important role in addressing family policy and in introducing new measures. This statement corresponds to the description of New Social Risks in the theoretical part of the paper. Between 2005 and 2015, the increase of children under the age of 15 dropped from 982 to 877 for couples sharing the same household. From this description, the document gives us clear indication of, who is in the term family included and, therefore, at whom are the following measures targeted. This is a very

good point as we know from the theoretical part, the description of family can be very diverse.

On page 7, the concept acknowledges that Austria is still one of the traditionally oriented countries with typical male breadwinner model, but then it points out that younger generation is abandoning these traditional roles. *“young people are increasingly deviating from traditional role”* (p.7) and adds that it is therefore, necessary to implement family measures *“For this realization, the best possible family-friendly framework conditions are required”* (p.7) it is noticeable that the document emphasizes the need to flexibly reflect the gradually changing structure of society. By this statement the document clearly points out at new structure of society and the need to adapt new measures toward New Social Risks, which corresponds to Bonoli’s description of New Social Risks as described in the theoretical part (Bonoli 2007).

The concept also points out the risk of aging population and states that the ideal birth rate for Austria would be 2 children per woman, however, now the birth rate is lower approximately 1.49 per woman *“For the majority of Austrians, the ideal number of children is 2 per woman. However, the birth rate is 1.49 children per woman ”*(p.6) thus, the concept points to the issue of low birth rates. Nevertheless, it should be noted that in the concept the birth rate issue is anywhere directly linked to any measure or to any other political intervention to improve the situation, nor does it propose any other measures to increase the birth rate. The concept also states that there is a shortage of professional labour due to the current development of the population with a low birth rate *“..aging society has fewer younger workers, therefore a low birth rate increases the shortage of skilled workers”* (6). At this point the concept de facto links family policy with employment policy. The document also deals with the issue of aging population, placing it as a risk of post industrial societies.

Another important aspect is that the document perceives Gender role and presents a connection between gender-gap and family policy *“The best possible family-friendly framework conditions are required for its implementation”*(p.22). However, the document no longer mentions what framework conditions should it be and how to achieve more positive outcomes of the above mentioned inequality between men and women. Previously, the division of gender roles used to be rather traditional, thus the document shows that these traditional roles have been abandoned. The document,

Familyland Austria also theoretically describes the situation of flexible job offers in Austria, which implies that Austria has a greater supply of flexible jobs than the analysis of strategic documents of the Czech Republic show. However, the document shows that flexible forms of work remain over-determined for women and it does not offer any measures to change that, thus it does not sufficiently take into account equality between men and women. It is not explicitly mentioned in the document what are the new social risks that women with children currently face, however described measures correspond with the New Social Risks described in the theoretical part of this paper. On behalf of this we assume that the concept reflect on all parts of New Social Risks as described in the theoretical part.

The document presents adequate number of measures that reflect New Social Risks, however, they are rather on descriptive bases indirectly linked to the New Social Risks as described in the theoretical part of this paper.

6.4.2 Reconciling Family and work

Since, the document already at the beginning mentions that it's purpose is that by 2025 Austria is the most family-oriented country in Europe it is to be expected that its strength will be oriented to reconciling family life with career. In this chapter, I will therefore, look at the fact how this document supports linking family and career and which measures is the document offering in order to support reconciling family life and career. On page 7, the concept identifies the following key areas as possible measures against New Social Risks *“The expansion of childcare facilities, family-friendly working conditions and employers, the promotion of women, but also the sharing of family work in partnership are key factors for a family-friendly society”* (p.7). The document also places family at the top of family policy, stating that it is necessary to involve the family itself in the emergence of family measures. This fact shows that Austria puts a great emphasis and places family policy on equal level with other policies.

The document also highlights the importance of family-oriented companies, with 63% of companies stating that family friendly environment is very important, 31% of them find these measures quite important, and less than 1% finds measures to make a more friendly environment in businesses less or not important. The document thus

demonstrates that it is not only important for the state to introduce family measures, but also to point out what the demand for such measures is. Therefore the document better reflects the needs of the private sector, which responds more flexibly to the individual needs of families, but also companies.

As well as the previous concept of family policy from the Czech Republic from 2017 and 2008, this concept understands financial support as being a very important family policy measure. Austria offers a family allowance for all children up to 24 years of age regardless the family income and the amount varies according to the age of the child where the older the child is the higher allowance he / she gets . Moreover, the document also takes into account families with three or more children, whereas this financial support is already limited regarding the income of both parents *“In addition, there is the so-called multi-child surcharge for families with three and more children where their income does not exceed 55,000 Euros per year “* (p.10). This financial support could, on the one hand, be seen as a measure that could promote greater birth rates, on other hand, it is not available to all families with three or more children and therefore it only applies to families in need and responds more to fight against child poverty. The document also mentions a series of percentage increase in Family allowance and therefore by doing so, it gives this measure an important role. *“ There was a threefold increase in the family allowance, which was in 2014, 2016, 2018“* (p.10).

Another described financial support in the field of family policy of Austria is the parental leave. Like the Czech Republic also Austria offers 4 variations, however the shortest version is 12 + 2 months where 12 months is one parent and 2 months the other. This option very well builds on the support of involving fathers more in care and thus spreads the child care between both parents. This also refers to the statement from author Blum (2010) who says that Austria has implemented modernizing reforms of the family policy in 2008 and in 2010 with the aim to support shared parenthood and enable women a rash re-entry on the labour market. However the modernization included supplementary choices while all the old schemes stayed unchanged, but they were rather implemented to require complementary schemes of the EU directives. And this is most probably the reason which makes Austrian family policy schemes rich on individual's freedom choice (Blum 2010). Furthermore, this option seems to be an ideal model for parents who want to return to work soon, which certainly requires good institutional

care. Institutional care is in the concept not directly connected to this support, but it is to be expected that one of the previously described forms is available for parents who choose the shortest option. The longest option is then 30 + 6 (page 11), but since the concept primarily focuses on the shortest option, it can be inferred that it considers this type of parental leave as the most appropriate in the direction of linking family and labour market.

6.4.3 Involving men in childcare

As already mentioned above, one of the things to encourage men to participate in childcare and to participate in parental leave is the shortest option of parental leave. The document also mentions other measures to support involvement of men in care. One of them is the so-called Family bonus *“It is for employed fathers who devote themselves intensively and exclusively right after the birth of their child and who interrupt their employment (in agreement with the employer)”* (p.12) the document, also emphasizes that during this period fathers are entitled to sickness and pension insurance. As it is emphasized here in agreement with an employer. However a clear measure or a legal framework that would allow fathers to do so or at least a step to motivate employers to fulfill it is lacking throughout the whole document. The last mentioned measure in the document is Partnership bonus, which is offered to couples who divide parental leave 50:50 or at least 60:40, this bonus is worth 500 Euro for each parent. This measure motivates and encourages parents to take turns in parental leave and return to the labor market earlier. This is followed by the fact that too long parental leave often prevents women from returning to the labour market.

6.4.4 Flexible working hours

Although, the concept does not directly express promotion of women with children in the labour market, the announced creation of part-time work or sufficient financial support in the concept are measures created to support women in the labour market and therefore we can assume that the concept responds to higher employment of women.

Nevertheless, it should be noted that the concept deals relatively little with the issue of flexible working hours, but it is possibly for the reason that Austria already offers large

number of part-time jobs, which is evident from the statistics described above, therefore it is no longer an acute issue. It is important to note that in 2014 the part-time employment of women was among the three highest in Europe (Berghammer, Riederer 2018). According to the authors, part time employment helps women to enter the labour market despite having small children (Berghammer, Riederer 2018). However, it is important to say that the concept leaves out negative effects of this form of employment, nor does it provide other solutions, such as maintaining sufficient social security and pension contributions. In this sense, Berghammer, Riederer (2018) point out that women usually choose a job, which enables them to reconcile family and work even though it requires lower education and offers lower wage, rather than work with career advancement.

Nevertheless, it is visible from the document that part time jobs play in Austrian family policy an important role, also the author Blum (2010) states that part-time job can be a big help when reconciling family life and work. The document proofs this statement by giving high numbers of women working in part time employment. In particular that the number of women with children under 15 who are actively working is increasing and now reaches 65.7% out of which the proportion of women working part-time is 76%. Whereas a total number of actively working men with children under 15 is 91.4% and only 7% are part-time workers (p.19). On the other hand, this fact highlights the large employment gap between women and men in flexible working hours as it is usually a woman who works in part time employment. Taking into consideration that part time employment means lower salary, and then we can assume that it leads to a financial dependency of women on men. However, it is important to highlight that the document refers to the fact that part time employment has certain disadvantages that workers often do not know “the effects on careers and pensions are often not known“ however, the document does not inform about the possible negative sides of this form of workload. According to the data submitted, it is noticeable that Austria offers enough part-time jobs, but the document no longer specifies what is in the term part-time work included, whether it is 20, 25 or 30 hours a week. Furthermore, I miss the description of the negative effects that women who work part-time have to face to a greater extent (p.19-20).

6.4.5 Institutional care

Furthermore, the document also puts great emphasis on institutional care of preschool children:” *Between 2008 und 2017 the federal government provided the federal states with a total of 390 million Euros for the accelerated expansion of childcare services and facilities*”(p.22). The document also states that Austria has relatively high attendance in institutional childcare facilities. The document presents following numbers, 25.5 percent of children under the age of three and 93.3 percent of children between the age of 3 and 6 attend any institutional facility. The document also puts great emphasis on statistics and describes in detail that 217,925 children attend kindergarten, 56,897 children are in “Hort” which is an afternoon facility for schoolchildren, and 33,500 nursery and Day parents have 11,866 children (p.15). Nevertheless as already mentioned in the beginning institutions for children older 6 years will not be analyzed.

The concept, also critically evaluates the existing demand of childcare facilities and at the same moment shares future goals of increasing kindergartens or nursery schools which on one side assures the reader of enduring initiative in implementing more institutional care and on the other side it shows lasting insufficient supply. The period between 2002 and 2010 is so called modernizing period, in that time important reforms were implemented. It is visible that gender equality plays a very important role an essential example is the introduction of income related parental leave, which wasn’t a replacement for other variations, but it was meant to by as additional measure, this fact proofs that the main intention was to motivate women with higher income and men to take parental leave. Also author Bloom (2010) states that Austrian leave policies are marked by path-dependencies and they show both elements progressive as well as conservative. It is precisely in the area of institutional care for children under the age of 3 that the two countries differ most. Also the family policy of Austria puts special emphasis on a care of younger children, trying to achieve the so-called Barcelona Goal through new measures, thus achieving a 33% participation of children under 3 in institutional facilities and describes ”*In Austria, the childcare rate of under 3 year olds has more than doubled since 2008*“(p.22) this strengthens us in the belief that the situation with institutional care is improving and that great emphasis is placed on it.

However, the document points out that the functioning of these measures is not only needed from the initiative of the government, but also cooperation with other political and social actors: *“In addition, important supports in the program are also, improvements in the quality of childcare, the extension of opening hours and more day care flexible, community as well as cross-generation care solutions”* (p.23) in doing so, the document aims to transmit the childcare initiative more into the private sector, supported by solidarity between generations and drags back to the traditional division of roles. As the document does not explain in detail the form of education for the so-called “Tagesmutter”, it raises the uncertainty whether this education is sufficiently pedagogically qualified. However, the so-called day mothers appear to be very positive as support for the integration of women with young children into the labour market.

6.5 Austrian Family-report – Auf einen Blick

The 5th Family Report 1999 - 2009 survey was presented in the framework of "The Family on the Way to the 21st Century" on June 14, 2010. The document based on the years 1999 - 2009 summarizes a balance sheet over the development of family policy measures and offers individual contributions to the institution Family. This well-founded scientific decision with the Family Complex is essential, and can be realistic in terms of social policy levels. The main topics are introduced in the beginning of the document and it is to be said that these are the aim of the document. The main topics are more partnership, common responsibility, responsibility for family services, better security, further development of financial services or support and advice. Because of very extensive document, the analysis left out some chapters, that were not directly linked to our research questions as well as information from the time period before big family reform in Austria as described in the theoretical part. The passages which have been left out are for example family and violence, demographical changes from the perspective of immigration to Austria, family and school, but also institutional care for school children as the analysis concentrates on measures for pre-school children and their parents.

Already in the introduction, family is presented as the future of Austria (p.3). This view shows that Austria puts a great value on the family institute. Already at the beginning the report introduces Austrian family policy as one of the most generous in Europe

where it states *“Expenditure on family policy measures set in Austria after the amendments to the old and health issues of the third issue category”* (p.3). The confidence of the Austrian system is evident in another passage *“In the European comparison, Austria has its most important monetary family and the most important services in the area of the Spitzenfeld”*(p.3). The definition of Family and its debate is written on page 21. As well as the theoretical part of this thesis, also the document talks about different definitions of family which are very important for legal, material or private announcements of private forms. The three definitions of family described in the document are I. Traditional which states that family is there where a married couple with or without children is, II. The second position states that family is there where children are, III. And the third definition states that family can also be there where no children are (21). In our analysis we lean towards the second definition that family is there where children are.

It is important to mention that through the tax reform of 2009, family policy in Austria confirmed a strong sense of adapting flexibly to the situation of modern society and to the changing values as a result of the economic crisis. *“As a reaction to the worsening global economic crisis and the price increases in recent years, it was decided in November 2008 to bring forward the tax reform originally planned for 2010 as a measure to stimulate the economy”* (p. 183). Family policy reforms between the years 1999 and 2009 brought many changes support programs for families and a strong support of social services. Through the described measures and the will to involve many charities and private institutions as well as the development of social non financial support the family policy of Austria according to the analyzed document reflects on changing society and through the multiple child allowance reflects the New Social Risks. However it is to point out that institutional support even though being greatly widespread over the past decade still faces shortages that lead to the difficulty to link family life and career.

6.5.1 New Social Risks

The document is very self confident when speaking about the Austrian Family policy stating that it is one of the most generous family policies in Europe. The first half of the report deals with the issue of New Social Risks resulting from the developing changes

of modern societies. The document is generally based on expectations and tries to meet them through implementing various measures. The report describes aging population and low fertility rate as a problem of post industrial society and presents migration as a solution to the New Social Risks of social aging.

The document also highlights the need to adapt new measures to the new signs of modern societies. It is important to point out that the document uses a relatively large number of surveys which show that it is important for Austrian family policy to include people's opinions. Almost the entire document emphasizes the development of social changes and the resulting risks to which it is necessary to respond to with the right measures. At the very beginning, the document points out at family and the population development. The document as well as the other 3 analyzed documents sees the demographic development of modern society as a risk of aging population. As a reason for the change in demographic development the document gives the decline in fertility and the gain in lifetime. On page 28, the document describes further problems caused by aging population *"The rapid increase in older people and the longer training periods of the younger generation mean that the generation contract and thus the social security system are at risk of becoming fragile, as the reform debate in recent years suggests"* (p.28). In connection with demographic aging the document refers to second social risk as described in the theoretical part of this paper, namely care for old or sick family member *"Compatibility of family and work with regard not only to child care, but also with regard to care and support older people"* (p.28). Furthermore, the report emerges from the description of family benefit and states that the strongest distribution effect comes from the multi-child allowance (p. 182). This fact shows that the Austrian family policy reacts to the social risks of aging population and lower fertility rate which are typical characteristics of post-industrial societies.

The document also admits that the private sector is involved and has always been involved in care *"The majority of care continues to be done in the family"* (p. 29) this statement gives the reader a feeling that the document has no will to change in this sense anything or supporting anything. However this then does not correspond with further description of part time jobs and the need to establish enough places in caring institutions. However the generational solidarity is further supported in the text by the statement *"The generations not only meet each other more often, they also support each*

other. About 40% of Austrian grandparents look after their grandchildren” (p. 31). This gives us the feeling that care should stay by the private sector. However it does not take into account that along with the prolonging of the life expectancy also the retirement age is being prolonged and that grandparents will more often be still active on the labour market when grandchildren or their older parents need them. On the other hand it brings up also negative side of multigenerational care, for example, for families who live far away.

The report points to the traditional division of the family. As a traditional model, the report understands the description of Male bread winner, what the description in the theoretical part corresponds to *“The traditional model had clearly assigned the gender roles”* (p.41). Although Austria has recently moved towards the partially modernized model, where the man is employed full-time and the mother has a part-time job so that she has time for family duties, a large part is still gender-specific and therefore traditionally divided. The report supports this with interviews where women state that they *“often feel more stressed and stressed”* (p. 172). This traditional separation changes with the changing family structure and the increasing divorces and separations, where there are no longer two adults and the male bread winner. The changed situation of the family structure has also economic consequences (p. 172).

Austria, as well as, the Czech Republic, is facing a low birth rate. One of the next New Social Risks described in the document is forming family and in particular postponing family for later. Nevertheless, the institute family remains an important part of family life plans in Austria. Although, according to surveys, the norm in Austria is still two child families, however the figures are 1.2 children per woman. Only a minority in Austria stated that they did not want to have children. The ideal number for Austria is 2, a realistic number is 1.4. Behind these numbers are decisions to postpone family for later and then there is no time for other children or another reason for not having children or delaying starting a family is the fear of financial loss. The report gives *“professional establishment and financial security”* as reasons for late motherhood. Another feature of post-industrial society is, according to the document, delay for later. The reasons for the delay are: longer training periods, delayed entry into employment or high demands on active parenting.

Also when it comes to the issue of family and the world of work, the report admits that society and lifestyles have changed and emerge within New Social Risks *"Today, the family and the world of work are less clearly separated from one another in terms of time, space and emotions. New tensions arise"* (p.118). The report admits that social changes result in New Social Risks for which new measures are needed. The document mentions that changes in the relationship between men and women resulted in new structures of family life and work *"This is due to the fact that fundamental structural changes have been emerging both in the world of work and in the family area for at least ten years, which are associated with a change in gender relations"* (p.118). The report confirms the development of modern society through changes in the world of work. Not only are the social structures changing, but also the world of work and the so-called normal employment relationship; the former full-time employment is lately not the only standard.

The report also admits that the Austrian Society of the Male Bread Winner Model, is characterized by the fact that many part-time jobs are created. Although the marginal employment increases in both sexes among women, the proportion was significantly higher at 69 percent in 2007. Nevertheless not only women, but also men are affected by more precarious and marginal employment than before. Between 2000 and 2007, Austria saw an increase in female employment. Of particular importance for families, as across the EU, the increase in female employment is mainly due to increased employment of mothers. It is important to note that part-time work plays a very important role for mothers with children *"Part-time work is still the decisive solution to the reconciliation problem here"* (p.120). The report admits that part-time employment is particularly suitable and used by mothers with children *"Mother employment only takes the form of part-time work"* (p.120).

Hereby, the document also draws attention to other changes in the framework of structural development, and these are modern technologies that enable work from home, especially through the use of telework. However a decisive role in employment plays the possibility of childcare either within the family or in an institution. *"Above all, the possibility of childcare in the family network and offers of institutional childcare are beneficial"* (p.122). The cultural characteristics also play an important role, in a conservative democratic system to which Austria also belongs to, almost 45 women are

of the opinion *“that a mother of a child of preschool age should not be employed”* (p.122). The report sees a further problem of work life balance in the lack of time and the offers of the children's institutions.

6.5.2 Childcare outside of the family

The report dedicates the second half to childcare outside of the institute family and puts it as an important part of Austrian family policy. It talks about the institutional support for children as being very important and by the following statement it puts a big emphasis at the division of duties between federal states, municipalities as well as the federal government, which show a clear division of duties *“A large number of responsible childcare places have been created in recent years through expansion initiatives by the federal states and municipalities as well as financial support from the federal government”* (p. 88). The concept also draws on the opinions and statements of experts, who state that institutional support plays a very important role in childcare *“From the point of view of experts, extra-family care is an important addition to family care in order to guarantee, care and upbringing “* (p.88).

It is clear from the document that changing roles of male and female, where the society is not mainly based on the male bread winner model plays a very important role in the development of other measures. Due to the fact that women are more and more involved in the participation in the labour market and take part in the financial support of the family it is clear that not all the work in the household must be done by women and it is obvious that more childcare is needed either in the private sphere done by grandparents or through institutional care. There, the emphasis of the measures presented as being important in the modern society is the expansion of institutional childcare services. The report also shows that the development of the benefits and measures is developed through the Barcelona criteria *“Not only triggered by the Barcelona criteria, the federal states have developed performance standards and professionalism criteria”* (p.153). The main Barcelona objectives are set to expansion of childcare services and flexible working arrangements as these measures help to reconcile work and family life. Therefore the aim is to have 33% of children below 3 and 90% of preschool children in a caring institution, therefore to provide enough places that are financially accessible.

Another important part in the connection between new social risks and employment of women as a result of modern society the document presents the need of existence of new forms of employment. Therefore the report goes a long way towards New Social Risks in Employment and emphasizes the link between working hours and family time. As the Barcelona objective present the aim is to reach 75% of an employment rate, however as the document states this is impossible without the participation of women, therefore it is important to arrange working conditions that would go along with family duties (Barcelonas objectives 2013). Austria, like the Czech Republic, faces gender inequalities in the labour market, which are mainly caused by horizontal gender segregation in the labour market. There are still areas that bear the label of a "feminized" profession and are financially undervalued (a typical sector is social work and care). Interestingly, the report does not present the work-life balance as a reason for family postponement. Another positive aspect is the fact that Austrian Family Policy tries to provide universal benefits. *"From the increase in the child tax credit, which amounts to 180 Euro per year for two children, all households, regardless of their employment and income situation, benefit to the same and full extent"* (p.185) *"As a whole, the family package of the 2009 tax reform provides a positive impetus for promoting female employment "* (p.185) However, it is not clear from the document whether it is support for women in the labour market with young children or support for women in the labour market in general. Based on the fact that this is the case, and the Family concept, we conclude that it is primarily a matter of supporting women with dependent children. The report also repeatedly stresses the importance of being able to choose. This can be due to parental allowance and the option of choosing between different variants or the option of coming back to work after a baby break.

Austrian family policy takes into account the wishes and opinions of the private sector. It highlights that parents should choose their employment according to their wishes and not according to the limits of institutional care *"Parents should basically have the opportunity to combine family and work according to their wishes and the needs of their children"* (p.88). For the financing of the childcare facilities, several actors have to participate. In Austria, childcare outside the family is financed by the federal states, municipalities and the private sector. The expenditure in 2007 for the institutional facilities amounted to 1.290.8 million Euros. The report also admits that, the institutional care facilities have increased by 110% in a ten-year comparison. Despite

the increase, the report admits that Austria still does not offer enough places in childcare institutions. *"Overall, it can be assumed that in Austria there is still a lack of childcare options outside of the family"* (p.95). This can also be supported by the Barcelona's objectives where Austria in ranks institutional care for children below three and for pre-school children still below the objective set. However Austrian system offers more choices than only a state nurseries and Kindergartens. This corresponds with the description of Austrian family policy and its existing measuers. In addition to the institutional facilities, there are also parent-child groups for children from zero to four years of age. Childcare providers are another form of care outside of the institute family.

The care takes place either in the private living quarters of the day parents or in the household of the caring children. The freedom of choice is further supported by giving possible strategies *"In Austria, parents can freely choose the desired form of care outside the family for their children"* (p.93). However the free choice has also its limits. In 2009 the last kindergarten year was legalized and became a duty. The first strategy for free choice is the establishment of age mixed groups. The low fertility rate resulted in the formation of mixed age groups *"The falling birth rate has resulted in a softening of the age limits and the integration of early childhood care ..."* (p. 93). The second strategy is the promotion of daily parents options and cooperation. This measure was created mainly as an alternative to free places in crèches. The socioeconomic situation of families plays a very important role in decision making weather to place preschool children in Kindergarten or not. The third strategy is to offer free kindergartens and deductibility of childcare costs *"In addition, there is a dynamic trend in the majority of the federal states with regard to free childcare for parents"* (p.94). The reimbursement of the costs goes usually through the tax deduction, which is up to 2300 Euros per year. The fee-deduction and the tax deduction for childcare costs are extremely positive for the development and socialization of children as well as for the compatibility of family and work.

6.5.3 Instruments of family policy

The report admits that social benefits in different federal states have evolved significantly in recent years. The further developments are diverse and cover a broad spectrum from health policy measures to school-related services to benefits through

family passes. Family benefits vary from state to state “*The following support benefits are used as instruments of family support in federal states*” (p. 149). In general, the family subsidies of the federal states, which are complementary to the federal financial transfer payments for families, consist of transfer payments, subsidies to institutions and benefits in kind. The report also makes it clear that between 1999 - 2009 almost double that amount was spent by the family compensation fund for financial transfer payments (from 3,745 to 6,151 Euros) (p.150).

The report divides family policy benefits into cash benefits (i.e. monetary transfers) benefits in kind (real transfers) and indirect support through deductions (indirect monetary transfers). The document states that important factors that affect family contributions are age limit, social class, or the length of the child's studies. However, if we take into account that modern society is evolving and changing, it should be noted that social class is also changing and it is therefore very important to change the measures regularly according to how modern society and its values are evolving. However if we consider the big reforms after 2005 we expect that this was the driving force and the reason to adapt the family policy of postmodern society and so better reflect the new social risks.

The document shows that Austrian family policy still distinguishes a lot of entitlement to benefits according to social class and the amount of family income, therefore it is to say that most of family support measures are not universal and are dependent on other social aspects. The report goes much further than the reports for the Czech Republic on the subject of social services. The family policy of Austria refers to support of many care facilities as well as advisory facilities operated by various charities. Help to families goes not only through direct and indirect transfers, but also home nursing, assistance for the disabled, or women's shelters that lead to an improvement in performance standards and risk assessment. Therefore it is to point out that Austrian family policy is much more connected to NGO than the family policy of Czech Republic.

Austrian family policy is very generous in sense of financial support and puts great emphasis on it: “*The Austrian family policy aims primarily at the horizontal burden sharing for families*” (p. 175). As the report states family policy rates on the third place in the social spending in Austria “*After spending on old age and health, spending on*

family policy measures is the third largest category in Austria with around 10% of social spending” (p.175). The most important instruments described in the document are direct cash benefits, which make up more than 55% of all family policy benefits. The report also indicates the indirect benefits, under which it includes tax benefits. However indirect services tend to have a subordinate role and they account for around 20% of total expenditure. Just like the theoretical part, this report also emphasizes that the direct financial expenditure is financed through the family compensation fund (S. 176).

However it is important to point out that financial support is necessary in order to replace the income loss during maternity, but it does not always contribute to the integration on the labour market after the parental leave. On behalf of financial contributions of the state the report presents Austrian family policy as one of the most generous, nevertheless it is important to say that the amount of financial contributions does not necessarily correspond with the effectiveness of measures. Even though the report admits that the child tax credit and the family allowance have a somewhat weaker distribution effect of all benefits. Tax deductions also play an important role in the motivation to be active on the labour market, however, it is important to say that with the progressive tariff development what Austria has, higher incomes benefit more from tax exemptions and the deductions, on the other hand, come to a greater extent on lower incomes benefit.

The most important factors for the distribution of family-related benefits are the number of children depending on social class, their age structure and the length of the children's education. Family-related benefits for non-self-employed households accounted for around 16% of the disposable income of households with children on average. The report continues to emphasize the importance of financial performance *“Family-related benefits are therefore an important component of the income for families” (p. 179).*

6.6 Research summary and discussion

In this chapter, I would like to summarize the results of the analysis of the strategic documents I researched and then answer the two research questions. As already mentioned, the aim of the study was based on the issue of new social risks that are met in family policies of the Czech Republic and Austria.

This paper used the analysis of national concepts of family policy from the Czech Republic and Austria. As Reichel (2009) suggests, the analytical procedure was divided into 4 phases, namely: (I) Sample selection, (II.) Content decomposition, (III) Categorization and coding, (IV) Interpretation of the results. Following Vasata (2009), in the text analysis, I tried to make the results transparent, that means that the results of the interpretation were documented through passages from the text and they were then referred to the results. In accordance with (Hanzl 2014), I used category system and codes that were then assigned to each category. I mainly focused on how the documents define new social risks and how they respond to them, it was also important to find out what measures individual documents present in terms of support of women with young children and their involvement in the labour market.

All four documents are characterized by their goal and aim and even though they differ in the content, important aspects including new social risks are present in all of them. Furthermore all four documents describe individual services and cash benefits, because, as Bonoli (2007) states, policies for new social risks mainly include expenditures for families, precisely in form of services and financial benefits. As part of the analysis, I was often forced to separate the inseparable: as I present in this thesis, new social risks and employment of women with young children are closely related. As Potucek (1995) states, it is a classic phenomenon when one deals with individual areas of social policy.

First, I would like to reflect on the first research question and therefore: How do the family policy measures of Austria and the Czech Republic take into account the new social risks that families with children currently face?

The aim of the paper was not to analyze the causes of social risks that have arisen as a result of post-industrialism, but to identify them and find out whether the established and planned measures of family policies in the Czech Republic and Austria reflect their

existence. The fact that the analyzed documents present the need to implement new measures in order to improve social problems in terms of the demographic situation, the description of changing family structures and high divorce rates and an increasing number of single parents show that the model of male bread winner, which existed until now in both countries, is in retreat. However both countries still show the inclination to the model where men are responsible for the financial background and women are seen as the main care givers and part time earners. Blum (2010) states that adapting this model was slower in strongly Christian countries with conservative values due to their traditional beliefs (Blum 2010). Also Saxonberg (2006), claims that the strongly conservative approach of the Czech Republic would be due to Catholic beliefs, stating that even though the country became very secular during the communist regime, it became even more conservative after the fall of communism. However, together with the change of the family model the system needs to adapt its supportive measures, therefore the system of existing measures is insufficient in today's society, and needs to be changed. This can be supported by the statement of Bonoli (2007) who states that the old welfare models do not correspond to the new social risks that well, because they were mainly aimed at protecting the workers from invalidity, sickness or loss of employment and furthermore because most of the workers during the industrialism were male and therefore women did not benefit that much from social protection. Nevertheless, time has changed and with the social changes women have become full-fledged part of the labour market. According to Klímplová (2010), this is associated with another social risk, namely the adequate provision of care for small children. With the emergence of post-industrial society, new social risks arise, which, according to Bonoli (2006), cause a loss of well-being.

In addition demographical changes, discussed in all four concepts, caused by low reproduction rate in western societies, represent one of the new social risks, and according to Saxonberg (2006) the policies implemented by societies today are encouraging women more to remain in the labour market than to start a family and have children. Although the analyzed texts perceive the existence of an aging population as a risk for future societies, nevertheless there is no direct solution offered in any of the concepts. Therefore, new social risks are constructed according to scientific literature in the documents researched and correspond with the description found in the theoretical part of this paper. Nevertheless, we can say that the analyzed texts only partly reflect the

new social risks that families with children have to face and new social risks are constructed more on a descriptive and critical basis, rather than as an effective solution. However, it is obvious that concepts do often not know how to work effectively with the term new social risk. The documents construct these risks mainly on the basis of theoretical insight and present them in the following points. Firstly, the concepts perceive and describe the presence of new social risks that families with children have to face. However, the description remains mainly on a theoretical-critical basis. Secondly, The surveyed categories are constructed by the fact that women are more often exposed to new social risks within the framework of family policy, which is reflected in the examined concepts mainly by the effort to involve men more in childcare. Thirdly, there were no other new social risks found in the concepts than those described in the theoretical framework, so it can be assumed that the concepts were drawn from scientific sources. Fourthly, the role of municipalities and regions in the Czech Republic is not yet clearly defined and therefore concepts probably encourage more cooperation among other actors. In comparison the document *Familyland Austria* presents flexible measures with the involvement of other actors.

The continuity of new social risks is ensured by the set family policy objectives in which all four concepts coincide. Furthermore, in all concepts the link between family policy and employment policy is noticeable. In terms of employment policy, all four concepts examined are very positive in developing flexible forms of work and, overall, in implementing legislative measures to ensure equal opportunities between men and women. However, not all documents take into account the negative aspects of part time employment and the fact that women working part time are more dependent on the breadwinner.

Even though the term "new social risks" is not used directly in the documents, due to the information given in the theoretical part, it is clear to the reader to which social risks the documents respond. It is worth saying that, despite the content reservations, I appreciate the presence of new social risks in all four examined documents. The sufficient description of new social risks in all concepts makes it clear to the reader what social problems the measures described in the text will be directed to. However, the 2008 and 2017 concept for the Czech Republic lack a precise specification of what measures reflect specific social risks and therefore the reader can only guess what the primary

objective of the described measure was. Austrian documents for family policy also lack a description of new social risks, but they give a rich offer of modernized measures that reflect measures supporting families with the hope for higher reproduction, or measures that are directly connected to mothers' employment. Even though the third document for Austrian family policy gives a very brief description of new social risks and gives the reader the feeling that they are not seen as priority, the measures introduced show an indirect connection between those measures and new social risks. Therefore, the four concepts consider new social risks by perceiving them. However, it is important to say that effective solutions exist only on a theoretical basis, without detailed information as for example under what conditions and from what sources these measures should be implemented. Furthermore it is important to mention that a frequent strategy of the analyzed documents is to point out the effort of negotiations and active approach in the implantation of new measures presented in response to the needs of families, which can sometimes evoke populist actions rather than an effective fight against new social risks.

At this point, I would now like to answer the second research question: How is the participation in the labor market of women with young children encouraged in both countries?

In this paper, I looked at social support of families, mothers and fathers with small children through the state social family policy of the Czech Republic and Austria. As mentioned in the concepts, the Czech Republic offers one of the longest parental leaves in Europe, where a parent might take up to 4 years of parental leave. However, Blum (2010) describes parental leaves as a big help as well as a big barrier when trying to reconcile family life and career. Kucharova (2009) also describes long parental leaves as obstacle when returning to the labour market after the leave. Blum (2010) also states that too long parental leaves lead to negative effects of women's participation in the labour market and thus worse earnings or lower chances in career assignment. In Austria, the variety of parental leave choices is much bigger and therefore enables the parent an earlier comeback to the labour market.

The concept of new social risks is defined by the analyzed texts from the point of view of the balance between work, career and family responsibilities (Klimplová 2010). The already mentioned historical development of the given country plays an important role in the development of women's participation in the labour market. This statement is

confirmed by Saxonberg (2006) who states that during communism women as well as mothers were expected to participate in the labour market and for this purpose enough childcare facilities were provided. Although a mother had access to the labour market with young children, as she was able to use good institutional care for her children, the system was still based on the traditional division of roles and the male bread winner model, which is described in Chapter 2.4.3. Thus, the ideology of the communist regime and the then family policy in the Czech Republic did not support greater involvement of the father in care and the woman found herself with a double burden and remained the main caregiver who is responsible for the unpaid work at home (Saxonberg 2006). Even though the Czech Republic makes steps to include fathers more in care - the evidence for this is the introduction of paternity benefits in 2018 - the society and mothers themselves still stick to the traditional division of roles.

Looking at the family policy scheme regarding the care arrangements it seems to be easier for women to stay at home and fulfil the duties of a mother for the first three years, this corresponds with Saxonberg (2006) who states that women are expected to leave the labour market for 3 years with every child. This is literally an obstacle in their professional career choices because they have to decide whether and when to have children, knowing they will drop out from the labour market for a longer period. The second point of view is the traditional views of mothers themselves as many think their duty is to care and men's duty is to earn money (Saxonberg 2006). This might again have a connection with the communist regime, when women were forced to work and they had no choice.

Therefore, another important aspect in family and work life balance are atypical forms of employment, which lead to flexible distribution of time in both work and private sphere. Therefore, flexible forms of work are often presented in the context of family and career reconciliation. The ability of work and care compatibility is primarily achieved through an appropriate setting of working hours, where, for example, there is the possibility of flexible working hours or part time employment. Further important aspects are the choice of employment in the place of residence. Last but not least, flexible working conditions are achieved by choosing an employer who meets the needs of single mothers regarding the adjustment of the working regime (Pfeiferová (2010). Pfeifrová (2010) also states that the employer's approach is crucial for removing barriers

that disadvantage single women in the labour market. This factor again links employment and family life reconciliation as well as new social risks, where due to higher education of women, more and more women are participating in the labour market, therefore it is more than wanted and accepted to adapt the working conditions in order to reflect today's societal norms better. Therefore I fully rate as positive the 2008 proposal of the Czech Republic for reductions for employees in the case of offering flexible work, but again a more precise content for introducing this measure is missing. On the other hand, the concept 2018 mentions negative effects of flexible jobs that could later lead to additional social risks, namely inadequate insurance contributions and the resulting low pension, which could subsequently lead to widespread poverty, especially among women who are mainly affected by the new social risks. This corresponds with Klimplová (2010), who describes insufficient social security coverage during periods of unemployment, illness, disability or old age due to atypical (intermittent) careers as a new social risk.

The perception of negative effects concerning flexible forms of work is missing in the concept family land Austria, even though the information could have fatal consequences for the future life of the participants, and therefore I judge this fact as a serious shortcoming in the content of the document. Since all examined documents agree that the participation of women in part-time work is higher than that of men, we can assume that women are particularly at risk of these negative factors. If a person is faces with lower pension income in the future, due to the amount of the social insurance contribution, then this person, predominantly women of retirement age, is dependent on the income of a husband, which leads again to inequality of gender. However, none of the four documents deals in detail with the negative aspects of part time employment and its future effects. Looking at the analysis of all documents and the numbers presented there, we have to mention that in contrast to the Czech labour market, the Austrian labour market offers a much greater number of jobs for women in parenthood. It boasts a rich offer of part-time jobs, with up to 46.9% of all working women working part-time. More than 70% of these women have children under 15, while only 5.6% of men with children under 15 are employed in part-time jobs (Statistik Austria, 2016). However, it must be said that these part-time jobs are often created with the intention to fill them with women. This means that they are far more common in professions that are referred to as "female", therefore less valuable and often with lower income.

The strategic conceptual documents of the Czech Republic show strong political influence within the decision making in family policies. This is in accordance with Blum (2010), who states that political power has a big effect on social reforms and says that conservative parties prefer regressive family policies, whereas social democratic parties prefer progressive family policies. The right-wing government stands for a liberal social policy, which is characterized by the principle of family autonomy and seeks austerity, and a left-wing government is characterized by its strong leaning towards social democratic policy, which seeks broad state support, and which corresponds to partisan theories. In both countries we can discern a visible influence of leading parties. This also corresponds to Blum (2010), who admits that there is a connection between the ruling party and a reform making process where there are more progressive policies preferred when Social Democrats and more traditional policies when conservative parties are in power.

In summary, the measures described indicate a relatively high level of willingness and effort by the state to involve women with young children in the labour market, but in the overall context there are often insufficiently described measures which raise some doubts as to their validity and reliability. Austria, for example, even though belonging to a conservative typology with the male bread winner model, since the last reforms puts great emphasis on involving more men in care. Saxonberg (2012) describes that leave policies as for example a parental leave scheme lead to defamilization, because they encourage fathers to share the time spent on parental leave and makes it easier for women to return quickly to the labour market and so become more independent from the child's father's income. Through the introduction of income related leave in Austria, the system also became more defamilizing because if the mother takes maternity leave and still receives 80 percent of her previous income, it is enough to be economically independent of the children's father (Saxonberg 2012). On the other hand, the Czech Republic is a typical model of refamilization through its flat rate system of parental leave. This argument is also supported by Saxonberg (2012) who states that the post-communist countries are refamilialized due to flat rate variations. Cerami (2005) also describes refamilialism as a turn from universalism to mean tested benefits, which is typically a feature of post-socialist family policy. However, it is important to point out that the decision who takes which part of parental leave also has cultural and socioeconomic reasons. This is also mentioned by Saxonberg (2012) who writes that the

percentage of leave policies taken by fathers is influenced on one hand by cultural factors and the decision whether to send a child to a public facility and on the other hand by socio-economic factors resulting from the pay gap, where it is usually the men who on average have a higher income. Another point is that employers do not often want to enable men going on parental leave and leave their job for more months. Another important measure in terms of involving more men in childcare is the paternity leave. Austria has much longer history of paternity leave than the Czech Republic where paternity has been implemented first in 2018, there is most probably a cultural and historical reason behind this as men were not allowed to go on parental leave during the communist era (Saxonberg 2012). Even though many changes things have been implemented in terms of gender equality it still needs to be mentioned that the family related measures of the welfare states of both countries are most often oriented towards the family as a whole and do not sufficiently take the differences between partners into account . According to the measures described, the social system of family policies focuses on the “employment core” (Bonoli 2006), therefore on full-time employment contracts and uninterrupted work careers, which corresponds to the male bread winner model, where the priority is to maintain the income of the breadwinner.

In the following part there is a table which gives us a brief summary of identified groups in all four concepts. The concepts are described by numbers from 1 to 4 according to the chronological order used in the paper. The first category shows identified social risks presented in the national concepts. The identified new social risks are decrease in birth rates, aging population, change in family structure, change in employment, Education or bad socioeconomic conditions by certain groups. We can say with certainty that identified social risks in all four concepts correspond with the description of new social risks described in the theoretical part of this thesis. The second category describes the identified tools of family policies. The concepts were mainly concentrated on financial support, which corresponds to the fact described by Kucharova (2009) that financial support still plays an important role in family policy. From the concepts or the Czech Republic it is visible that the length of parental leave does not correspond with the early return in the labour market. There is an uncertainty and lack of nursing schools as well as still limited number of kindergartens.

The third category shows the most distinctions and thus concept number includes the introduction of paternity leave as a step forward in reconciliation of work and family life and the important part is the introduction of micro crèches or child groups, which should reflect on the lack of institutional childcare facilities and wants to motivate employers with a tax subsidy to form more part time employment. Concept number 3 sets clear goals to make Austria the most family friendly country in Europe and introduces Barcelona goal, describes income related paternity as a motivation for men to take childcare allowance and introduces a big expansion of childcare institutions in Austria. In Austria, the number of public kindergartens is growing from year to year, thus actively responding to the current trend of families. due to the political influence of former leading party The situation in the Czech Republic regarding the Barcelona goal is different. At a time when the requirements for the Barcelona goal were discussed at EU level, the former Minister Petr Nečas (ODS) defended the right of the Czech Republic to go its own way, because traditionally most mothers want to stay at home with their children until they are three years old. Namely, *“It lacks the logic to build care facilities where families prefer a different model of childcare. And to change the demand from Brussels by shortening parental leave and allowances is unthinkable, despite the fact that it is the competence of member countries ”*(Petr Nečas, 2009 in Vlada.cz, 2016).

The next table summarizes all four concepts and the analysis of all categories and its signs identified in all four documents.

TABLE 7: IDENTIFIED CATEGORIES IN DOCUMENTS

| | Concept 1 | Concept 2 | Concept 3 | Concept 4 |
|------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Identified New Social Risks | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Decrease in birth rates ➤ Aging population ➤ Change in family structure ➤ Uncertainty | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Unfavorable demographic development ➤ Change in family structure (single parent families) ➤ Bad socioeconomic- | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Aging of population ➤ Disappearing traditional role of family | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Aging population ➤ Occupation and Qualification ➤ Low fertility rates ➤ Changing |

| | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> in employment ➤ Women reach higher education | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> cal conditions | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Family structure | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> society |
| | | | | |
| Instruments of Family policies | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Maternity ➤ Parental leave | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Parental leave ➤ Too long parental leave has negative impact on employment, too short parental leave: imited places in nurseries | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Maternity ➤ Parental leave ➤ Childallowance (Universal) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Financial support ➤ Tax subsidies |
| | | | | |
| Reconciliation process | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Micro crèches ➤ Childrengroup ➤ Introduction of paternity ➤ Part time-tax subsidy | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Subsidiary principles ➤ More flexible jobs ➤ Involve other actors | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Introduction of income base parental leave ➤ Expansion of childcare facilities ➤ Barcelona 's goal | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Daily parents and children groups ➤ Expansion of childcare institutions ➤ Cooperation with municipalities ➤ Flexible working arrangements |

7 Conclusion

The main principle of the traditional welfare model was to protect male-bread winner families against social risks, these risks were, however, different from those we face today (Bonoli 2007). According to Bonoli (2007) the New Social Risks are long-term unemployment, precarious employment, being a working poor, single parenthood, but also the problem of reconciling work and family life. Due to a different family structure as well as different economic conditions in pre-industrial society these types of social security were not present so far. In my paper I concentrated in particular on those risks that are closely related to family policy, such as single parenthood, or reconciling private life and career. According to Saxonberg (2012) family policy has a great influence on labour market participation and includes policies like maternity, paternity, or parental leaves, sharing leaves, access to day care institutions and to sum up all policies leading to support women on the labour market after having children, and keeping them financially independent. Reconciliation of work, family and personal life means a situation where the ratio of work corresponds to the life priorities, needs or intentions of an individual. Reconciliation of work, family and personal life is an option for combining a career with other non-work spheres of an individual's life. These opportunities are changing, together, with changing demands and needs of employed people, but also with changing possibilities and willingness of organizations and how they respond to these demands and requirements (Bonoli 2007).

The submitted master thesis should present a comprehensive overview of information on family policies of both countries, related to New Social Risks and work life balance, specifically with a research focus on national strategic documents. The results cannot be perceived as a generally valid rule, however, the work should serve anyone who wants to learn something about the issue.

The symbolic goal of this paper was to point out how the New Social Risks are reflected in the family policies of the Czech Republic and Austria and by what measures do the policies of both countries react to them. During writing the master thesis, it was necessary to sometimes deal with unclear definitions such as family, part-time jobs, but also with a certain ambiguity in the definition of New Social Risks. Therefore, based on

the theoretical part of the paper, I got a clear explanation of these definitions in advance. The first empirical part, describing in detail the family policies of the Czech Republic and Austria, on the other hand, helped us to compile information on existing measures in the field of family policy on the basis of secondary literature and thus contributed as a basis for the analysis of national strategic documents.

In my analysis I focused on the key areas of financial support of the state (maternity, parental leave), institutional care for pre-school children, and the tendency of the labour market to employ parents with young children. As described by Saxonberg (2012) these are also policies that greatly influence labour market participation.

In the Czech Republic, unlike Austria, political decisions are made within the framework of family policy without the family itself. The reason for this, could be that Czech families are not used to formulating their needs and present them to the state. This may also be due to the fact that people in the Czech Republic perceive political activity differently and are not accustomed to it, nor do they believe that their voice could change anything in specific cases. In Austria, for example, not only municipalities and individual federal states are actively involved in the development of measures, which take into account the needs of families, but also the families themselves. This fact gives them more self-confidence to raise their hand.

Based on the analysis of the four texts on the family policy of both countries, it is noticeable that the Austrian concepts are trying to involve the reader more in the events and thus arouse more public interest, while the Czech national measures tend to describe the decisions that the governmental measures are based on.

From the examined literature and from the analysis of strategic documents, the main values of a functioning family policy and harmonization of work and family life are the quality and availability of institutional facilities, flexibility in decision-making, as well as gender equality. As part of the New Social Risks, it has become necessary to flexibly respond to the modernization of society and changes in its structure.

References:

- Baldock, J. et. al. (2007). *Social policy*, Oxford
- Beck, U. (2004). *Risikogesellschaft: Auf dem Weg in eine andere Moderne*. Suhrkamp Verlag
- Berghammer B., Riederer C. (2018). *The part-time revolution: Changes in the parenthood effect on womens' employment*
- Biffl, G. (2008). *Family policy in Austria in comparison: How to reach sustainability?* Österreichisches Institut für Wirtschaftsforschung working papers No. 331/2008 Wien
- Bonoli, G. (2005). *The politics of the New Social Policies: Providing coverage against New Social Risks in Mature Welfare States*
- Bonoli, G. (2006). *The Politics of Post-Industrial Welfare States. Adapting Post-War Social Policies to New Social Risks*. 1. vyd. New York : Routledge, p. 143 – 168.
- Bonoli, G. (2007). *Time Matters. Postindustrialization, New Social Risks, and Welfare State Adaptation in Advanced Industrial Democracies*. Comparative Political Studies. Sage publication
- Cesky statistický úrad. (2018). *Zamestnanost nezamestnanost dle veku a dle vzdelání*: available at: <https://www.czso.cz/documents/10180/61565960/25013018147.pdf/814903a1-3206-4980-a48d-211abbb00ea8?version=1.0>
- Cesky statisticky urad. (2017). *Nezamestnanost pro rok 2017*: available at: <https://www.czso.cz/csu/czso/cris/zamestnanost-a-nezamestnanost-podle-vysledku-vsps-3-ctvrtleti-2017>
- Cerami, A. (2008). *New Social Risks in Central and Eastern Europe: The need for a new empowering Politics of welfare State*. IN *Sociologický časopis/czech soziological Review* 44 (5),pp. 1089-1110
- Čevela, R. (2015). *Sociální a posudkové lékařství*. Praha: Univerzita Karlova v Praze.
- Chzhen, Y. (2019). *Are the world's richest countries family friendly: Policy in the OECD and EU*, UNICEF
- Delanty, G. (2006). *Modernita a postmodernita: II. část*. IN : HARRINGTON, A. et al. *Moderní sociální teorie: Základní témata a myšlenkové proudy*. Praha: Portál
- Disman, M. (2009). *Jak se vyrábí sociologická znalost*. Praha: Karolinum, pp. 375

Dudová, Radka. (2009). "Work as a solution? Livelihood strategy of single mothers in the Czech Republic." *CZECH SOCIOLOGICAL REVIEW* 45 (4): 753-784. ISSN 0038-0288. Available at : http://sreview.soc.cas.cz/uploads/7480a1aebc8987dbcf7ab33a059cc8b1f76ef896_dudova.pdf.

Elichová, M. (2017). *Social work: actual questions*. Praha: Grada

Esping- Andersen, G. (1990). *The Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism* (4th ed). New Jersey, Princeton University Press

European Commission., Eurostat, *Part-time employment as percentage of the total employment, by sex and age (%)*[online]. Download 14.12.2019 []. Available at: <http://appsso.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/nui/show.do?dataset=lfsa_eppga&lang=en>

Festl, E., Lutz, H. (2009). *Mögliche Ansätze zur Unterstützung von Familien*. Available at: https://www.arbeiterkammer.at/infopool/akportal/Studie_Ansaetze_Unterstuetzung_Familien_Maerz2010.pdf

Finanční správa. (2017). Available at: <https://www.financnisprava.cz/cs/financni-sprava/media-a-verejnost/tiskove-zpravy-financnich-uradu/2017/priznani-k-dani-z-prijmu-fyzickych-osob-7934>

Formánková, L., Dudová, R., Vohlídalová, M. (2011). *Bariéry a možnosti využití flexibilních forem práce v ČR z komparativní perspektivy* [online]. Sociologický ústav Akademie věd ČR. Available at: http://www.mpsv.cz/files/clanky/13789/flexi_prace.pdf.

Franková, P., et.al. (2015). *Job sharing v praxi: Jak zavádět a rozvíjet sdílená pracovní místa* [online]. Projekt METR 2013–2015. Fond dalšího vzdělávání, příspěvková organizace Ministerstva práce a sociálních věcí ČR. Available at: http://www.fleximetr.cz/storage/app/media/Clanky.PDF/web_bozura_fleximetr_jednostrany.pdf

Fraser, N. (1994). *After the Family Wage: Gender Equity and the Welfare State*. *Political Theory*. 22. (4)

Giddens, A. (1999). *Sociologie*. Praha: Argo.

Giddens, A. (2001). *Sociology* (4thed.). Cambridge: Polity Press. 2001.

Gillernová, I., Kebza, R., Rymeš, M. (2011). *Psychologické aspekty změn v české společnosti: člověk na přelomu tisíciletí*. Praha: Grada

Gornick J., Meyers, M. (2003). *Families That Work: Policies for Reconciling Parenthood and Employment*, New York: Russell Sage Foundation

Gulová, L., ŠÍP, R. (2013). *Výzkumné metody v pedagogické praxi*. Praha: Grada.

Haas, L., Hwang, P. (2008.) *The Impact of Taking Parental Leave on Fathers' Participation IN Childcare And Relationships With Children: Lessons from Sweden*, *Community, Work & Family*, 11:1, pp. 85-104

Harrington, A., et.al. (2006). *Moderní sociální teorie: Základní témata a myšlenkové proudy*. Praha: Portál

Huber, E., Stephens, J. (2001). *Development and Crisis of the Welfare State: Parties and Policies in Global Markets*, University of Chicago Press

Hašková, A., Křížová H. (2003). *Průzkum veřejného mínění o postavení žen na trhu práce*, SÚAV ČR, available at www.mpsv.cz/files/clanky/957/zprava.pdf

Hašková, H., Rabusic, L. (2008). *K nízké sňatečnosti v České Republice*. IN: *Sociální studia*. Brno: Masarykova univerzita, roč. 5, č. 2, pp. 7-33

Havelková, B. (2007). *Rovnost v odmenování žen a mužů*, Auditorium

Hašková, H., Klenner, Ch. (2010). *Why did distinct types of dual-earner model in Czech, Slovak and East German societies develop and persist: Zeitschrift für Familienforschung, 22. Jahrg., Heft 3/2010*, pp. 266-288

Hendl, J. (2008). *Kvalitativní výzkum: Základní teorie, metody a aplikace (2nd ed)*. Praha, Czechia, Portál

Holub, M., et.al. (2010). *Teoretické možnosti podpory rodin s dětmi v sociálním pojištění*, VÚPSV, Praha 2010, available at: http://praha.vupsv.cz/Fulltext/vz_318.pdf

Hofmacher, M.M., Rack, H.M. (2006). *Gesundheitssystem im Wandel, Österreich, European*

Inglot, T. (2008). *Welfare states in East Central Europe, 1919 –2004*. New York: Cambridge University Press

Jerábek, H., et.al. (2005). *Rodinná péče o staré lidi*. Praha: CESES FSV UK. Studie CESES, 11/2005

Jerábek, H. (2013). *Vývoj teorií mezigenerační solidarity a rodinné soudržnosti, Péče o staré lidi v rodině: pojmy, klasifikace, kritické momenty*. IN: JERÁBEK, Hynek., et. al. *Mezigenerační solidarita v péči o seniory*. Praha: Sociologické nakladatelství (Slon), pp. 18-30, pp. 42-56.

Kaindl, M., Schipfer R.K. (2019). *Familien in Zahlen 2019 : Statistische Informationen zu Familien in Österreich*, Wien

Keller, J. (2006). *Nová sociální rizika a proč se jim nevyhneme*, Praha Portál

Keller, J. (2012). *Úvod do sociologie*. Praha: SLON. Pp. 204

Keller, J. (2010). *Tři sociální světy. (1st ed.)*. Praha: Nakladatelství Slon

Klimplová, L. (2010). *New Social Risks and Reform Trends of European Welfare States in Reaction on These Risks*, Fakulta sociálních studií Masarykovy univerzity,

Knijn, T., Kremer, M. (1997). *Gender and the caring dimensions of welfare states: Toward inclusive citizenship*. *Social Politics* 4 (3). pp.328-361

Kodymová, P.; Kolackova, J. Sociální práce s osamocenými rodiči. In : Matousek, O.; Kolackova, J.; Kodymova, P. (2005.). *Sociální práce v praxi: specifika různých cílových skupin a práce s nimi*. Praha: Portál.

Konopásek, Z. (1991). *Trendy sociální politiky: Od populační politiky- a jiných formálně příbuzných politik – k politice „rodinné“* IN: *Sociologický časopis*, 27,1991.

Křížková, A., Pavlica, K. (2004). *Management genderových vztahů. Postavení žen a mužů v organizaci*. Praha: Management Press. pp.198

Kuchařová, V., et.al. (2009). *Zmapování dostupnosti a podmínek pobytu dětí v jeslích, mateřských školách, školních družinách a obdobných zařízeních a jiných neinstitucionálních forem péče o děti v ČR včetně identifikace překážek jejich využívání s návrhy možných opatření k jejich rozvoji*, VUPS, available at: http://www.mpsv.cz/files/clanky/7073/pece_o_deti.pdf

Krebs, V. (2002). *Sociální politika*. Praha Publishing

Krebs, V., et.al. (2010). *Sociální politika*. (5th ed.). Praha: Wolters Kluwer ČR

Lampert, H. (1985). *Lehrbuch der Sozialpolitik*. New York: Springer-Verlag

Leitner, S. (2003). *Varieties of Familialism. The Caring Function of the Family in Comparative Perspective*. *European Societies*. Vol. 5, no.4, pp. 353-375.

Lewis, J., Campbell, M., Huerta, C. (2008). *Patterns of paid and unpaid work in Western Europe: Gender, commodification, preferences and the implications for policy*. *Journal of European Social Policy* 18(1):pp.21-37.

Lincoln, Y.S., Guba, E.G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. London: Sage

Matějková, B., Palanciová, J., Lampert, O. (2005). *Rodinná politika ve vybraných evropských zemích s ohledem na situaci v České Republice*, Brno: Masarykova Universita

Matousek, O., et. al. (2008). *Metody a řízení sociální práce*, Praha

Mayring, P. (1990). *Einführung in die Qualitative Forschung*. München: Psychologie Verlag Union

Mitchell, E. (2011). *Finanční podpora rodin s dětmi v České Republice a v evropském kontextu: AVČR 2*

Možný, Ivo. (1999). *Sociologie rodiny*. Praha: Slon

Možný, I. (2002). *Sociologie rodiny*. (2nd ed.). Praha: Sociologické nakladatelství.

Možný, I. (2006). *Rodina a společnost*. (2nd ed.). Praha: Slon

Možný, I. (2011). *Rodina a společnost*. (2nd ed.). Praha: Sociologické nakladatelství

- Munková, G. (1996). *Vývoj sociální politiky ve vztahu krodině*. Praha: Institut sociologických studií FSV UK. Interní studie.
- Nešpor, Z., Večerník, J. (2006). *Socioekonomické hodnoty, politiky a instituce v období vstupu České Republiky do Evropské unie*, Sociologický ústav AV ČR: Praha
- Oxford University. (2004). *New Risks, New Welfare. The Transformation of the European Welfare State*. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- OECD. (2007). *Babies and Bosses: Reconciling work and family life. A synthesis of findings for OECD countries*: available at:https://read.oecd-ilibrary.org/social-issues-migration-health/babies-and-bosses-reconciling-work-and-family-life_9789264032477-en#page3
- OECD, a. (2016). *Policy brief: Where are the fathers?* [Online]. 2016. [download: 14 April 2020.] Available at: <https://www.oecd.org/policy-briefs/paren-tal-leave-where-are-the-fathers.pdf>OECD;
- OECD, b. (2016). *Family size and household composition* [Online]. [download: 03 Juni 2020.] available at: <https://www.oecd.org/els/family/SF11Familysizeandcomposition.pdf>
- OECD. (2017). *Family benefits public spending* [Online]. [download: 10 Juni 2020.] available at: <https://data.oecd.org/socialexp/family-benefits-public-spending.htm#indicator-chart>
- Petts, R., Konester, CH. (2018). *Paternity Leave-Talking and Father engagement* IN: *J Marriage Fam.* 2018 Oct; 80(5): pp. 1144–1162.
- Pfeiferová, Š. (2010). *Sladování rodinného a pracovního života a (ne)rovné příležitosti matek samoživitelek*. Praha: Fakulta humanitních studií. Available at: <http://www.feminismus.cz/cz/clanky/sladovani-rodinneho-a-pracovniho-zivota-a-ne-rovne-prilezitosti-matek-samozivitelek>
- Pilík, V., Kostková, M., Ventluková, M. (2017). *Zákon o poskytování péče o dítě v dětské skupině. Praktický komentář*. Praha: Wolters Kluwer ČR, a. s.
- Plasová, B. (2010). *Zaměstnavatelé jako aktéři řešení rizika nerovnováhy mezi pracovním a rodinným životem*. IN: WINKLER, J., KLIMPLOVÁ, L. (2010). *Nová sociální rizika na trhu práce a potřeby reformy české veřejné politiky*. Brno: Masarykova univerzita
- Plasová, B. (2008). *Harmonizace práce a rodiny a role zaměstnavatelů? Teoretická východiska*. IN: *Sociální práce/Sociálna práca*. sv. 3. pp . 45 – 52
- Plasová, B., Válková, J. (2009). *Genderová diferenciacie nejistot na trhu práce*. IN: *Sirovátka, T., Winkler, J., Zislavský, M. (eds.). (2009). Nejistoty na trhu práce*. Brno: František Šalé – Albert

- Potucek, M. (1995). *Sociální politika*. Praha: Sociologické nakladatelství
- Potucek, M. (1997). *Nejen trh: role trhu, státu a občanského sektoru v proměnách české společnosti*. Praha: Sociologické nakladatelství
- Potucek, M. (1999). *The crisis of Czech social reforms. Prague. The Czech Republic: Slon.*
- Prusa, L., Visek, P., Jahoda, R. (2014). *Alchymie nepojistných sociálních dávek*. Praha: Wolters Kluwer
- Regnault, M. (2011). *Alzheimerova choroba. Průvodce pro blízké nemocných*. Praha: Portál
- Reichel, J. (2009). *Kapitoly metodologie sociálních výzkumů*. Praha: Grada
- Sainsbury, D. (1996). *Gender, Equality and Welfare States*. Cambridge: Cambridge University press
- Sandbeak, M. (2007). *Services to support positive parenting*. IN: DALY, M. (ed.). *Parenting in contemporary Europe: a positive approach*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe Publishing
- Saxonberg, S. (2003). *The Czech Republic before the new millennium: Politics, parties and gender*. New York, Boulder: Columbia University Press, East European Monographs.
- Saxonberg, S. (2006). *Seeking the Balance Between Work and Family After Communism*. IN: Saxonberg, S. (2006). *Marriage and Family Review*, 08/2006
- Saxonberg, S. (2012). *From Defamilialization to Degenderization: Toward a New Welfare Typology*. Black Well Publishing
- Schratzenstaller, M. (2015). *Familienpolitische Leistungen in Österreich im Überblick*, Wien
- Sirovátka, T., Wildmannová, M., Bubnová, A. (2000). *Česká rodina a sociální dávky*. IN: Sirovátka, T. (ed.). (2000). *Česká sociální politika na prahu 21. století: efektivnost, selhávání, legitimita*. Brno: Masarykova univerzita v Brně
- Sirovátka, T. (2003). *Exkluze Romů na trhu práce a šance na jejich inkluzi*. *Sociální studia*, Brno: FSS MU. Roč.3, č. 10, pp. 11 -34
- Sirovátka, T., Bartáková, H. (2008). *Harmonizace rodiny a zaměstnání v České republice a role sociální politiky*. IN: Sirovátka T., Hora, O. (eds.). (2008). *Rodina, děti a zaměstnání v české společnosti*. Boskovice/Brno: František Šalé-Albert
- Sirovátka, T., Winkler, J., Zislavský, M. (eds.). (2009). *Nejistoty na trhu práce*. Brno: František Šalé – Albert

Sirovátka, T., Winkler, J. (2010). Význam nových sociálních rizik v současné společenské vědě. IN: Sociální studia. Brno: FSS MU. Roč. 7, č. 2, pp. 7-21

Svaricek, R., Sedova, K. (2007). Kvalitativní výzkum v pedagogick'ch vedách. (1st ed.) Praha, Czechia: Portál

Štangová, V., LANG, R., et. al.(2018). Právo sociálního zabezpečení v bodech s příklady. Plzeň: Aleš Čeněk, pp. 71

Taylor-Gooby, P. (2004). *New Risks and Social Change*. IN: Taylor-Gooby, P. (ed.)

Taylor-Gooby, P. (2005). *Welfare Reform and the Management of Societal Change. Final report*. [online].[download 23. 3. 2020]. Available at: <http://www.kent.ac.uk/wramsoc/eureports/informationforeureports/finalreport/finalreport.pdf>

Tucek, M. (1998). *Ceska rodina v transformaci- Stratifikace, delba rolí a hodnotové orientace*. Sociologický ústav Akademie věd České republiky

Thevelon, O., Luci, A. (2012). *The impact of family policy packages on fertility trends in developed countries*, Boulevard Davout

Tomeš, I. (2013). Sociální riziko. IN: Matoušek, O., et.al. *Encyklopedie sociální práce*. Praha: Portál

Trpisovská, D., Vacínová, M. (2007). *Sociální psychologie: vybraná témata*. Praha: Univerzita Jana Amose Komenského Praha

Tucek, M. (1998). *Česká rodina v transformaci: –Stratifikace, dělba rolí a hodnotové orientace*[online]. Praha: Sociologický ústav AV ČR. [download. 2020-06-26]. Available at: http://studie.soc.cas.cz/upl/texty/files/152_98-3wptext.pdf. Sociologická studie

Vančurová, A., et.al. (2008). *Současná a připravovaná opatření RP v zemích střední Evropy*.MPSV .available at: http://www.mpsv.cz/files/clanky/4354/studie_vancurova.pdf

Vecera, M. (2001). *Sociální stát*.(2nd ed). *Východiska a přístupy*. Praha: Sociologické nakladatelství,

Vlcek, M., Kantorová, V. (2003). *Rodinná politika a demografie rodiny*, *Oeconomica*

Walsh, M., et.al. (2000). *Social policy and Welfare*, Stanley Thornes

Legislative sources

Bundesgesetzblatt Act 1967 Text No. 376 on Family charges Equalisation.

Zákon č. 258/2000 Sb., o ochraně veřejného zdraví a o změně některých souvisejících zákonů, ve znění pozdějších předpisů, vyhláška č. 410/2005 Sb., o hygienických požadavcích na prostory a provoz zařízení a provozoven pro výchovu a vzdělávání dětí a mladistvých, ve znění pozdějších předpisů

Zákon č. 117/1995 Sb. State social support

Zákon č. 238 – 292 on protective working conditions

Zákon č. 58/1964 Sb.: Increasing care for pregnant women

Zákon č. 262 /2006 Sb. Zákoník práce, ve znění pozdějších předpisu.

Internet sources

Arbeitsmarktservice. (2019). Uebersicht über den Arbeitsmarkt, available at: https://www.google.at/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=&ved=2ahUKEwjcm2rgObpAhVSLewKHQA7AIMOFjANegQICBAB&url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.ams.at%2Fcontent%2Fdam%2Fdownload%2Farbeitsmarktdaten%2F%25C3%25B6sterreich%2Fberichte-auswertungen%2F001uebersichtaktuell_0319.pdf&usg=AOvVaw3yN-TMi-09xqKUu2dkBvya

Arbeiterkammer: Arbeitszeit, available at: https://www.arbeiterkammer.at/beratung/arbeitundrecht/Arbeitszeit/SonderformenderArbeitszeit/Geringfuegige_Beschaeftigung.html

BMFJ: Familienpolitik in Österreich, available at: [https://www.bmfj.gv.at/dam/jcr:4db0df38-2bc9-40fd-ba84-13e890d9d3b4/KBG-Broschüre%20Mär%202017%20\(barrierefrei\).pdf](https://www.bmfj.gv.at/dam/jcr:4db0df38-2bc9-40fd-ba84-13e890d9d3b4/KBG-Broschüre%20Mär%202017%20(barrierefrei).pdf)

BMWFJ: Familienpolitik in Österreich, available at: <http://www.bmwfj.gv.at/Familie/familienpolitik/Seiten/default.aspx>

Bundeskanzleramt: Finanzielle Unterstützungen, available at: <https://www.frauenfamilienjugend.bka.gv.at/familie/finanzielle-unterstuetzungen.html>

Cambridge dictionary: Single parent families. Online available at: <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/de/worterbuch/englisch/one-parent-family>

ECB: European Central Bank. available at: https://www.ecb.europa.eu/stats/policy_and_exchange_rates/euro_reference_exchange_rates/html/eurofxref-graph-czk.en.html

Finanční zpráva České Republiky: available at: www.financnisprava.cz

Help.at: Österreichs digitaleramt: available at: <https://www.help.gv.at/PortalNode/hlpd/public/content/194/Seite.1940282.html#Scheidung>

ILOSTAT. 2016. Key Indicators of the Labour Market. [Online]. (cit. 14. 10. 2017). Dostupné z WWW: http://www.ilo.org/ilostat/faces/ilostat-home/home?_adf.ctrl-state=15tt56xeyj_33&_afLoop=1777082593673413#

Ministerstvo, práce a sociálních věcí. Rodicovský příspěvek online download 15.04.2020 available at <https://www.mpsv.cz/rodicovsky-prispevek>

MPSV.: Ministerstvo práce a sociálních věcí: <https://www.mpsv.cz/rodicovsky-prispevek>

MPSV.: Minimum wage 2020 available at: <https://www.mpsv.cz/documents/20142/225504/Informace+o+MMe+od+1+ledna+2020+na+web+MPSV.pdf/51fb732f-1bcc-7947-b018-4346d1ca3631>

MSMT: pre-school education 2017 available at: <http://www.msmt.cz/vzdelavani/predskolni-vzdelavani/podrobny-informacni-material-ke-vzdelavani-deti-od-2-do-3>

Österreich gv.at: https://www.oesterreich.gv.at/themen/familie_und_partnerschaft/geburt/3/2/6/Seite.080720.html

Genderstudies: Rodinna politika: zamereno na rodicovství, available at: <https://zpravodaj.genderstudies.cz/cz/clanek/rodinna-politika-zamereno-na-rodicovstvi>

Sirovátka, T. 2008. Jsme stále v procesu transformace. Rozhovor. POVOLNÝ, D. [online]. (cit. 17. 3. 2018). Dostupné z WWW: <https://www.online.muni.cz/veda-a-vyzkum/1233-sirovatka-jsme-stale-v-procesu-transformace>

Statista.com: Kinderbetreuungsquote in Österreich nach Altersgruppe, available at: <https://de.statista.com/statistik/daten/studie/309635/umfrage/kinderbetreuungsquote-in-oesterreich-nach-altersgruppen/>

Data for the content analyses

MPSV., Family policy concept 2017. Available at: https://www.mpsv.cz/documents/20142/225508/Koncepce_rodinne_politiky.pdf/5d1efd93-3932-e2df-2da3-da30d5fa8253

MPSV., National concept of supporting family with children 2008. Available at: https://www.mpsv.cz/documents/20142/225508/Narodni_koncepce_podpory_rodin_s_detmi.pdf/be17dc8c-8441-952e-ef13-e13486fba929

BMFJ., Familienland Österreich: So machen wir Österreich zum Familienfreundlichsten Land Europas 2017. Available at: https://www.familieundberuf.at/sites/familieundberuf.at/files/dokumente/broschuere_familienland_oesterreich_2._auflage_2017_barrierefrei.pdf

Familienbericht 1999-2009: Die Familie an der Wende zum 21. Jahrhundert. Available at: https://www.parlament.gv.at/PAKT/VHG/XXIV/III/III_00157/imfname_190010.pdf