

FACTORS IMPEDING FAMILY POLICY FORMATION

RAMINTA BARDAUSKIENĖ

MYKOLAS ROMERIS UNIVERSITY, LITHUANIA

The article presents the results of a qualitative research regarding experts' attitude to family policy formation. Pursuant to the outcomes of the qualitative research, family policy formation faces the following obstacles: the problem of family policy as a priority area, change of political powers, inadequate situation analysis and the use of its results in the decision-making process, insufficient cooperation between different authorities, politicians and scientists, comparatively weak non-governmental organisations and inadequate representation of interest; insufficient attention to monitoring and evaluation of implemented family policy measures.

INTRODUCTION

The economic and demographic analysis of the family situation in Lithuania revealed that children are one of the factors determining poverty in families. According to the statistical data, the financial situation of families raising children is much worse than that of the childless families. The majority of young families do not want to have children or have only one child because of the bad financial situation and lack of a possibility to reconcile work and family life. Birth rate in Lithuania remains one of the lowest in Europe and does not ensure generational changes. The number of unregistered marriages and children born in unregistered families is increasing. Half of the married couples split up and this shows the instability of marital family. Such a family situation requires special attention of politicians and adequate decisions in the field of family policy.

There has been a substantial amount of research in the sphere of European family policies. Yet, there is a lack of attention to the process of family policy formation. Usually the focus is given to the concept of family policy, the objectives and implementation of certain measures (maternity, paternity leave, childcare services, flexible employment forms), i.e. to the content of policy. There is also lack of research on the specific features of the family policy formation process which are essential for the decision-making and implementation of family policy. All the above raised the interest in the family policy formation in Lithuania.

The aim of the paper is to identify problems of family policy formation based on the concept of the policy cycle model.

Family policy formation analysis is complicated because of the complexity of the phenomena. It requires broad systemic approach which involves both, the content and process of policy formation, as well as its context. The research is based on the concept of the policy cycle model. In general, family policy formation stages include: input/process/output (Pierre, 1995). *Input* connects two main family formation stages: the analysis of a family policy situation and identification of problems. The concept of family policy is defined in this part of policy formation. *Process* includes: the search for alternative solutions, evaluation and selection of an alternative (i.e. decision-making process). *Output* connects the stages of implementation, control and evaluation of operational measures. All the three parts of family policy are influenced by the *context*, i.e. a dimension encompassing policy formation and implementation in relation to socio-economic, cultural and institutional factors.

The article presents the results of a qualitative research regarding experts' attitude to family policy formation which was carried out in two stages: 1st stage in 2006 and 2nd stage in 2010. A repeated expert inquiry was aimed at triangulation of qualitative data sources. During the 1st stage a total of 7 experts were interviewed (N=7). The research involved: an informant related to the development of family policy (1 member of the Seimas), informants responsible for implementation of family policy (2 officials from the Ministry of Social Security and Labour) and informants observing and evaluating family policy (4 scientists of the Lithuanian Social Research Centre). Expert selection criteria included: at least three years of experience in the field of family policy formation;

at least three years of experience in implementing family policies; substantial experience in the field of scientific research and family policy as its objective (research of the recent ten years aimed at analysing family policy issues). The research technique is an in-depth experts' interview. The data is placed in tables specifying categories, sub-categories and examples from experts' presentations. The objective of the 2nd stage of a qualitative research is to specify the results of the 1st stage of a qualitative research by applying the amended research instrument and the expanded expert selection criteria. Pursuant to the analysis of outcomes of the 1st qualitative research stage expert selection criteria were supplemented by taking into account the increasing role of non-governmental organisations in the formation of family policy. Therefore the sample of experts included additional selection criteria: the experts should have at least a three years work experience in non-governmental organisations related to family problems. A total of 34 experts were inquired (N=34): 10 scientists (from Vytautas Magnus University, Mykolas Romeris University, Vilnius University and Lithuanian Social Research Centre), 8 members of the Seimas, 8 officials from the Ministry of Social Security and Labour (Family Welfare Division, Equal Opportunities and Social Integration Department, Children and Youth Division, Financial Support Division, Family Policy Division) and 8 representatives from non-governmental organisations (Large Families Association, Family Planning and Sexual Health Association, National Family and Parents Association).

FAMILY POLICY FORMATION PROCESS

A major importance for successful family policy formation and implementation has good governance system in the state, which evidence, according to Ghai, Hewitt de Alcantara (1994) consists of the institutional framework, legislation, procedures and standards that allow citizens to express their interests and fight for them. In other words, it is the public administration system, which exists in all countries, but is not uniform due to economic factors, the specific political forces, interests and so on (Yiu, 2002).

During the past decades the changes in all spheres of human life has

necessitated the alteration of the role of government. Bullock, Mountford, Stanley (2001, p. 14) point out that “The world for which policy-makers have to develop policies is becoming increasingly complex, uncertain and unpredictable. The electorate is better informed, has rising expectations and is making increasing demands for services tailored to their individual needs”. Such a context makes the complicated family policy making process even more confusing. Globalization, increasing complexity of a society, low fertility rate and society ageing as well as limited fiscal resources have risen the demand for good family policy development. Good policy-making has to be forward looking, outward looking, innovative, flexible and creative, evidence-based and inclusive, joined up, reviewed and evaluated as well as learning lesson (Bullock, Mountford, Stanley, 2001). All these aspects of good policy-making covers clear definition of outcomes, scenario planning and long term strategies; experience of other countries and specificity of national context; usage of alternatives to the usual ways of working and definition of success in terms of outcomes already identified; taking the holistic view and looking beyond institutional boundaries to the government’s strategic objectives; constant review of established policy and learning from experience of what works and what does not work. Evidence based means that decisions of policy makers are based upon the best available evidence from a wide range of sources. These sources first of all are based on existing and new commissioned research as well as consultation with experts. Dunn (2006) calls it policy analysis and describes as “an applied social science that utilizes multiple research methods, in argumentation and debate contexts, to create, estimate critically, and communicate knowledge that is relevant to the policies.” Other scholars like MacRae and Wilde (1979) or Patton and Sawicki (1993) point the purpose of the policy analysis, which is to identify, evaluate and select the best policy among a number of alternatives. MacRae and Wilde (1979) or Patton and Sawicki (1993)) add two important characteristics of policy analysis – client oriented and informed by social values. This involves one more aspect of good policy making – inclusiveness, which according to Bullock, Mountford, Stanley (2001) means that the policy-making process takes account of the impact on and meets the needs of all people directly or indirectly affected by the policy.

CONTEXT OF FAMILY POLICY FORMATION IN LITHUANIA

The research on expert approach to family policy formation has revealed a number of issues related to context of family policy formation (see Table 1).

TABLE 1. THE CONTEXT OF FAMILY POLICY FORMATION IN LITHUANIA

Category	Subcategory
Question of family policy as a real priority	Family policy has never been underlying field of policy
	Family policy is declared as an important field of policy but never has taken real priority
	Family is an attractive topic during the election campaigns
	Attention to family policy issues is periodic
Undervaluation of family policy significance and complexity	Politicians believe that everybody can be experts in family policy
	Underestimation of scientific research
	The importance of family policy is underestimated
Question of stability	Goals of family policy changes together with political powers
Question of civil society	Civil society is yet under the development
Question of political consciousness	Lack of experience in policy formation
	Historical context of Lithuanian society
	Lack of systems thinking
	Low level of strategic planning
	Problem of political culture
	Populism
Lack of democracy	

Experts emphasised that one of the biggest problem of family policy formation is that it has never taken the real priority:

...you could never feel that family policy takes priority. It is economic or fiscal policy, but not family policy. (Scientist No. 3).

...it is only when election campaigns starts. Suddenly family becomes very

important as well as social issues. But when time comes for implementation of real measures family policy does not take priority. (Scientist No. 4).

When financial interests are confronted and budget is distributed decisions usually are made not for the benefit of family and children. (Policy maker No. 1).

Usually politicians do not agree that there is a lack of attention to family issues. They argue that there are a lot of measures taken for the sake of family. Experts stress that these measures are not adequate to family needs. It is because family policy significance and complexity is underestimated. Politicians believe that everybody can be experts in family policy:

...family is so natural and simple object. Everybody can be experts here. For example, not everybody can be experts in economic policy, but family policy it is easier. (Scientist No. 4).

...the most important thing is that family policy is not recognized as significant one, as an important part of public governance. A lot of problems that exist in economy, society life are related to family policy. (Scientist No. 3).

Such thinking determines the poor use of scientific research in family policy formation:

I mean the professor who met representatives from conservative parties and presented her research findings. She was snubbed and barracked. And this is terrible. (Policy maker No. 1).

The historical context of Lithuanian society is very different from that of welfare states. Soviet times left a clear imprint in the minds, life pattern and behaviour of Lithuanian society and especially of older generation. The experts emphasise that problems of political consciousness first of all depends on this historical context and lack of experience in policy formation:

I do not know if family policy formation can be different, as we have been having it for the very short period of time. (Scientist No. 1).

...and this experience is under the development. (Policy maker No. 3).

This shortage of experience in family policy formation determines the lack of systems thinking and low level of strategic planning, inadequate political culture and lack of democracy as well as populism:

...there is lack of systems thinking...; ...we have strategic planning but the knowledge of it is insufficient. (Policy maker No. 3).

...we have problem of political culture, but it is not easy to change. (Policy maker No. 2).

...we do not have democracy. (Scientist No. 3).

The responsibility for family policy formation lies not only with politicians but also with citizens. The new management models emphasise the importance of citizen participation in public affairs.

It should be noted that a civil society in Lithuania is in the stage of formation, when the citizens are yet to feel their power and willingness to take part in public affairs. Experts see this as an important obstacle for democratic family policy formation:

We do not have a civil society. If we had a civil society, it would not allow to happen what is happening now. (Policy maker No. 3).

...all this is related to the fact that there is no civil society yet. (Scientist No. 4).

INPUT: THE CONCEPT, GOALS AND ACTION COURSES OF FAMILY POLICY

A great importance for successful family and demographic problem solving has definition of clear vision and trends of family policy. The analysis of expert approach discloses the problems of development of family policy concept (Table 2).

Experts pointed out that “there is no conceptual thinking, no vision” (Scientist No. 4). It should be noted that there has never been a long-term strategy for family policy development in Lithuania:

...why do we criticise politicians? Because there is no long-term vision. (Scientist No. 2).

Some years pass and the law is changed. (Scientist No. 1).

Lithuanian really has from time to time expressed attitude, that are supported by those in power. (Scientist No. 3).

TABLE 2. THE QUESTION OF FAMILY POLICY VISION

Category	Subcategory
Question of family policy vision	There is no conceptual thinking, no vision
	There is no long-term strategy
	Lack of stability and continuity
Question of preparation of family policy acts	Concepts are prepared without advance planning
	Problem of acts reduplication
	There is no need for new acts
	There is a need for adequate measures
Question of coordination of different strategic plans	Measures are dispersed in different strategic documents
	Measures in different strategic plans correlate
	Need for better coordination of measures
Question of family definition	It is not enough to define one category of family
	Negative attitude towards same-sex family
	Marriage does not guarantee the child's welfare
	Need to accept cohabitation as an alternative to marriage

Goals and action courses of family policy were dispersed in different strategic documents and different Ministries were responsible for their implementation:

Different measures correlate in different strategic plans, but they need to be coordinated. (Policy maker No. 1).

The State Family Policy Concept adopted by Parliament on 3 June 2008 did not solve the question of family policy vision. In 2011, The Constitutional Court of the Republic of Lithuania has declared the State Family Policy Concept unconstitutional on the grounds that it restricted the definition of family to those families with an official marriage license only.

According to the experts, one of the reasons of the problem of acts reduplication and their weakness is that they are made and adopted chaotically, without planning:

...these concepts are made by whoever wants. (Scientist No. 3).

The question of family policy vision, stability, consistency, compatibility of action courses and measures as well as their coordination remains unsolved. Experts stress that instead of making new documents there is a need for real decisions and concrete measures for solving family problems:

...we have enough strategic documents, for example, "State demographic population policy strategy" where is clearly defined that families should be supported and there are very clear action courses, we have just to see situation complexity. (Policy maker No. 3).

We do not need new concepts, we need real measures. (Policy maker No. 1).

Experts underline the importance of family policy that would cover all the families and that the family would not be classified as "healthy" and "unhealthy":

I am liberal and I hesitate to say that we are able to distinguish healthy and unhealthy, yet another family. (Policy maker No. 1).

The subject to financial support should be a child, regardless of the family he/she lives:

Is it healthy or unhealthy family the child lives in, if he/she needs support he/she must be supported. (Policy maker No. 1).

Experts recognize that same-sex family issues are still not tolerated and dealt with, as in other welfare states. Thus, recognition of the diversity of families remains limited and does not cover all possible types of family issues:

...the same sex families does not exist and in the near future will not be legalized, considered as a family and I cannot imagine that in Lithuania because the society is very conservative. (Policy maker No. 3).

The State Family Policy Concept aim to support the marriage-based family does not receive the expert support:

I'm afraid of one, that if we choose only one category of families and support them I do not know how it will look like in the sense of social solidarity. And it worries me. (Policy maker No. 2).

In experts view, marriage does not guarantee child well-being, or ensure that parents carry out their duties. Thus, it is necessary to recognize

alternative forms of marriage. Different research data show that young people increasingly prefer cohabitation and partnership. Thus, the state must respect and respond appropriately to its citizens' choice.

PROCESS: DECISION-MAKING AND PARTICIPATION

The research on expert approach to family policy-making has revealed a number of issues related to family policy decision-making. The study of the decision-making procedures reveals that politicians pay too little attention to the analysis of problems and "cooperation with science occurs occasionally, while it should be a must" (Scientist No. 1), because politicians "don't need any knowledge" (Scientist No. 2) (Table 3).

TABLE 3. ANALYSIS OF SITUATION AND COLLABORATION WITH SCIENTISTS WHILE FORMING FAMILY POLICY

Category	Subcategory
Problem of politicians' attitude to scientific knowledge	Politicians do not value scientific knowledge
	Politicians know better
	We don't need any knowledge
Inefficient cooperation with scientists	Cooperation with scientists is formal
	Inconsistent cooperation
	Use under the procedure
	Family policy measures are taken thoughtlessly
Coordination of decisions	With governmental organizations
	With some NGOs
	Formal consultation with experts
	Lack of mandatory recommendations
Problem of power of NGOs	Weak NGOs
Non-democratic relationship between NGOs and the government	NGOs are dependent on the government
	Loyalty to the government
	Formal participation
Role of the Church	The Church influences decision-making
	Influence of the Church depends on the ruling majority
	The representatives of the Church should not participate

Proper analysis of the problems is associated with adequate decision-making in family policy. One of the drawbacks is ignoring scientific knowledge in forming family policy. Experts lay emphasis on unrepresentativeness of information the Members of Parliament often use:

...when I visited the voter, or what is shown on television, the case described in the newspaper. (Policy maker No. 3).

Decisions taken in family policy often lack the thorough analysis of the situation. Thus they focus more on individual family policy measures than on the development of the system of measures:

The measures are adopted almost blindly and intuitively. (Policy maker No. 1).

According to the experts, politicians are rather reluctant to rely too much on science or on scientific research: "In fact, expert knowledge and scientific knowledge are undervalued" (Scientist No. 4). Despite the fact that there is a number of competent researchers in the field of family policy, the possibilities to use their studies are not sufficiently exploited in the process of shaping family policy:

Indeed, there is very little faith in science and spread of information among non-scientists. There is such a view – oh, what they can say, we know all. (Scientist No. 3).

Cooperation with scientists is a purely formal and procedural matter rather than a permanent necessity:

Officially the cooperation is established by the procedures. (Policy maker No. 2), but they [politicians] know better, they understand better, they are the chosen ones. (Scientist No. 2).

In the course of the analysis of family policy decision-making it is vital to clarify how the agreement is reached, who is invited to participate and who has the power to adjust the suggestions. One of the shortcomings of decision-making in Lithuania, as noted by Vilpišauskas and Nekrošius (2003), is a long process of coordination between all institutions. However, it does not mean a thorough discussion on policy matters. The results of the survey show (Table 3) that not all family policy solutions are reconciled, and if they are, it is often with municipalities and only some non-governmental organisations:

I must admit to communicating only with municipalities, the heads of departments of social support. (Policy maker No. 2).

With some nongovernmental organisations. (Policy maker No. 3).

Definitely not experts. They pretend. Clients. Yes, interest groups, in other words friends. (Scientist No. 3).

The alignment with family policy experts is more formal and its only purpose is to meet standards of European Union:

The consultations with experts are often only a formality, because it is required by European standards. (Policy maker No. 1).

Recommendations are taken into consideration, formally. (Scientist No. 1).

But I suppose there are no mandatory recommendations in this field. (Policy maker No. 3).

In Lithuania it is state institutions which are usually involved in decision-making. This happens not only because the non-governmental organisations are not yet strong enough:

In NGOs all fields are still very weak due to history and insufficient financial support. (Scientist No. 1).

Many of them are dependent on government funding:

Another important thing is that the majority of NGOs is dependent on government institutions. (Scientist No. 1).

Many projects launched by non-governmental organisations are funded by Ministry of Social Security and Labour:

If government institutions allocate funds for various projects, NGOs apply for and carry them out. (Policy maker No. 3).

The findings suggest that some of the non-governmental organisations which have won project funds are afraid to criticise the activities of the Ministry for fear of reducing their chances of winning future projects:

The organisations become loyal or they express minor criticism as some sort of unwritten agreement. (Scientist No. 1).

Thus, insufficient resources of these organisations set a limit on their power and freedom in expressing their opinions:

Those representatives of NGOs are invited but they have no power. (Policy maker No. 1).

A number of active non-governmental organisations representing the interests of a family declare Catholic beliefs. The experts emphasise that the Church plays too significant part in the development of family policy development, which becomes even more active when conservative party gains the power:

The influence of the Church under rule of conservatives is great. (Scientist No. 3).

However, the experts do not approve of the Church's active intervention in family policy-making since it favours the conservative approach to such issues as marriage, abortion, fertility and others:

I'm rather sceptical about the representatives of the Church in general, it seems to me they should to be away from public affairs. (Scientist No. 1).

I don't think the Church should be involved. But it's my personal opinion. (Scientist No. 3).

I'm against the representation of the Church, at least when it comes to issues related to family matters. (Policy maker No. 3).

OUTPUT: MEASURES OF FAMILY POLICY, MONITORING AND EVALUATION

Individual policies may not have a positive effect if there is no common system of measures (McDonald, 2000). For example, a well-developed gender equality policy can be ineffective concerning the birth rate, if the environment is not friendly to the child. Experts rather negatively evaluate the system of family policy measures in Lithuania (Table 4).

They lay emphasis on the lack of measures package as there exist more separate measures that do not condition desirable effect:

If we introduce one measure without another one, we get the negative result. (Scientist No. 2).

I was in the conference where Lithuania was presented as taking one of the bottom positions with child poverty rate. So what kind of measures do we have and what are we doing? (Policy maker No. 1).

It seems that legal aspect is alright, but it does not give an effect. (Scientist No. 3).

TABLE 4. EVALUATION OF FAMILY POLICY MEASURES

Category	Subcategory
Question of family policy measure system	Negative evaluation of family policy measure system
	Lack of family policy measures package
	Family policy measures are not effective
	Lack of services to satisfy family needs
	Benefits and services are more oriented to poor and risk families
	Ineffective benefits
	Limited support for families with children
Factors contributing to poor measures performance	Inadequate plans of measures
	Measures do not correspond motives and goals of family policy
	Lack of permanent monitoring and evaluation of family policy

Benefits system is evaluated as ineffective because it is not harmonized with services system:

...families without financial support also need services, for example they can face crisis but there is a lack of crises centres. (Policy maker No. 1).

Child care services are the weak point. (Scientist No. 2).

These 500 Lt for a child custody didn't have a big effect. There is still a shortage of foster-parents. Nobody wants these 500 Lt. (Policy maker No. 1).

Benefits and services are more oriented towards poor and risk families. Usually there is more support for families with children under three years old, but very little concern is taken about the needs of elder children:

We have support for families with children under three, but later families have to survive on their own unless they have 3 and more children. (Scientist No. 3).

Experts also highlight inadequacy of measure system to family needs.

Since private services sector is not developed and a lot of families cannot afford to buy services, families are left alone to solve their problems. It should be noted that there are some improvement in the field of reconciliation of work and family, but still the significance of gender equality is not underlined enough in family policy.

In experts view these drawbacks of family policy measures are caused by mismatch of measure plans and family policy goals and action courses named in the documents: "The measures come out of nowhere but not from the motives that were written" (Scientist No. 4). The tendency is to choose the cheapest measures so that to save limited resources and to select visible measures (like increase in benefits) in order to show that politicians do care about families. The other influential factor is the weakness of family policy monitoring and evaluation:

Monitoring and evaluation is our weakest point (...). It is done from time to time but not constantly. (Policy maker No. 3).

However, family policy monitoring and evaluation is important for the policy effectiveness (Stankūnienė et al., 2001) and adequacy of the changes (Jasilionienė, 2005), decisions quality, use of resources, accountability to society (Vilpišauskas, Nekrošius, 2005) as well as damage relief (Damirova, Šnapštienė, 2005). According to experts, there is not enough learning from experience, and therefore does not provide feedback and its contribution to policy making. All the experts pointed out the complexity of measuring effectiveness, the need to monitor and measure more than one specific measure, but the total measures system performance. Failing family policy monitoring and performance evaluation is determined by the political culture and lack of resources, shortages of professionals or inappropriate their qualification, excessive workload of the Ministry and the different concepts of efficiency. As a result, the formal declaration of family policy monitoring and evaluation differs significantly from what is actually done:

It can be said that formally it is done (...) Government presents its reports and what can be the report without effectiveness measurement. But does it show the real situation, that is the question. (Policy maker No. 1).

It is complicated to form family policy which meets family needs if there is no situation monitoring, impact evaluation and learning from

mistakes. The mistakes can have a decisive significance not only for family welfare, but also the survival of the nation (for example, recently the birth rate does not secure generation replacement and this can lead to the disappearance of the nation).

Pursuant to the outcomes of the qualitative research, family policy formation faces the following obstacles: the problem of family policy as a priority area, change of political powers, inadequate situation analysis and the use of its results in the decision-making process, lack of coordination of family policy issues, insufficient cooperation between different authorities, politicians and scientists, comparatively weak non-governmental organisations and inadequate representation of interests, lack of financial resources, insufficient attention to monitoring and evaluation of implemented family policy measures.

It is very important that family policy makers would use systemic approach and see the whole not just separate parts of family policy formation. Decision makers should take into account the needs of modern family and to respond to nowadays requirements. Different research data and recommendations of EU institutions define clear trends in family policy that focus on promoting gender equality and egalitarian family models.

CONCLUSION

Family policy is not a priority sphere of politics: the change of political powers and lack of financial resources to family policy measures have negative impact on the consistency and efficiency of family policy formation.

The growing concern of the Government about the family policy is not based enough on real actions. Politicians are more fond of short-term effective family policy measures but these measures do not necessarily improve family situation.

Lack of cooperation between national authorities, relevant institutions and sectors, as well as family policy coordination problems prevent from an effective resolution of family problems.

Active involvement of civil society in family policy formation increases

the relevance of family policy issues. Low involvement of NGO's, domination of Catholic organisations (resulting in inadequate representation of interests) in forming family policy prevents from the establishment of a family friendly environment.

Monitoring and evaluation of the effectiveness of family policy is a very important stage of policy formation. However, according to experts, family policy monitoring and evaluation of its effectiveness is insufficient and prevents from an efficient formation of family policy.

When modernising family policy it is necessary to carry out an in-depth situation analysis, identify the adequacy of policy measures and actions, and apply positive family model ideas of other countries. Unused opportunities of application of the scientific research for family policy formation often determine scientifically unjustified family policy decisions.

REFERENCES

1. Bullock, H., Mountford, J., Stanley, R. (2001). *Better Policy-Making*. Centre for Management and Policy Studies. Retrieved from <http://www.nationalschool.gov.uk/policyhub/docs/betterpolicymaking.pdf>.
2. Damirova, I., Šnapštienė, R. (2005). Viešojo administravimo stebėsenos sistemos problemos ir perspektyvos. *Viešoji politika ir administravimas*, 11, 102-109.
3. Dunn, W. N. (2006). *Viešosios politikos analizė*. Vilnius: Homo liber.
4. Ghai, A., Hewitt de Alcantara, C. (1994). Globalization and Social Integration: Patterns and Processes. Occasional Paper No. 2. *World Summit for Social Development*. Geneva, July.
5. Jasilionienė, A. (2005). *Šeimos politikos modernizavimas Lietuvoje: prioritetų problema*. PhD thesis, social science, sociology.
6. MacRae, D., Wilde, J. A. (1979). *Policy Analysis for Public Decisions*. North Scituate: Duxbury Press.
7. McDonald, P. (2000). The Toolbox of Public Policies to Impact on Fertility – a Global View. Paper presented at the seminar *Low Fertility, Families and Public Policies*, organized by the European Observatory on Family Matters in Sevilla, September 15-16, 2000.
8. Patton, C. V., Sawicki, D. S. (1993). *Basic Methods of Policy Analysis and Planning*. Paperback, Subsequent Edition.
9. Pierre, J. (Ed.) (1995). *Bureaucracy in the Modern State: An Introduction to Comparative Public Administration*. Aldershot: Edward Elgar.

10. Stankūnienė, V. et al. (2001). *Paramos šeimai politika: samprata ir patyrimas*. Monograph. Vilnius: STI.
11. Vilpišauskas, R., Nekrošius, V. (2003). *Politikos įgyvendinimas Lietuvoje ir Europos Sąjungos įtaka*. Vilnius: Eugrimas, ALK.
12. Vilpišauskas, R., Nekrošius, V. (2005). *Ko verta politika? Viešosios politikos vertinimas Lietuvoje ir Europos Sąjungoje*. Vilnius: Eugrimas.