

Barbara Kołodziej

Poznan University of Life Sciences

## **The vision of the family functioning in the perspective of young people from dysfunctional environments**

### Abstract:

Modern families function differently than families of the previous generations. The set of family functions, the way they are performed changes, and the partnership model of the family is becoming more popular. Especially the young generation considers this model as the most practical and functional, what results from the professional activity of men and women. However, in the circles formed by the dysfunctional families (understood as problematic), so far there is not only paternalism, but also authoritarianism, what implies difficult relations in these families. Supporting young people from such families is dealt with, among others, by the Voluntary Labour Detachments, conducting different types of institutions and forms of action. In the VLD centres there is implemented a program, which constitutes the comprehensive care, educational and preventive impact, while the vocational training is a specific direction. The aim of the interaction is to equip the pupils with the skills and qualification, so they are not at the mercy of poverty, unemployment and pathologies. However, these impacts focus on professional qualifications, while the problem also includes the family functioning of these young people, which are not necessarily corrected by the mere fact of acquiring professional qualifications or even obtaining employment.

Key words: family, young people, Voluntary Labour Detachments, dysfunctions

### Introduction

In many ways, the modern family functions differently than the families from previous generations. The set of functions changes, which is to be fulfilled [Bednarski 2008, p.206nn], the way they are fulfilled, serious changes apply to the relations in the family and the division of responsibilities. While until recently the paternalistic family was the basic model, currently the relations in the family are more often in accordance with the partnership model. The issue

of the division of responsibilities was, among others, the subject of the IPSOS studies<sup>1</sup>, performed in 2009, with the participation of the representative random-quota sample of 1000 Poles aged 15 and older. The results were also analysed using the division of the studied group, in terms of sex. The share of men (in the number of 483) allowed for the calculations of the results with the statistical error of the estimates no more than (+/-) 3,2% at a confidence level of 0,95 [IPSOS 2009].

As part of the above-mentioned research initiative, every second male respondent decided that *women are not necessarily better in taking care of the children than men*. Moreover, the younger the respondent and the more education, more often he considers the *full competences of men for taking care over children*. Nevertheless, up to 70% of the group decided that *women can look after the house better*, and what is important – *they can get the same satisfaction from it as from the professional work*. While *men would like to derive satisfaction from performing such a role*, only in recognition of 40% of the surveyed population. Most of the respondents ruled out the *possibility of the complete takeover of the household responsibilities even in a situation, when the partner would earn more*. In terms of performing the economic function in the family, in recognition of 85% of the respondents, *the responsibilities for maintaining the house should be divided between the man and the woman*, but 87% decided that it is the *man who is the head of the family and his fundamental obligation is to provide the necessary resources*. Differences of the presented beliefs and situations of the respondents were used for identifying 4 subgroups in the surveyed population:

- *traditional* – recognising paternalism as the most appropriate model. The man provides the material resources in it and exercises the power in the family;
- *modern* – recognising that the division of responsibilities between men and women should result from the arrangements or the current needs.
- *young oriented towards partnership* – that is pupils or students, still living with parents, but already convinced that their future families will be *modern*.
- *aware fathers* – believing that sharing responsibilities and tasks is obvious, and the professional work is equally needed by men and women. However, if necessary, the woman should quit her job to take care of the family.

---

<sup>1</sup> International research group specialising in the market and social studies.

The first, second and fourth subgroup included 30% of the population, while the subgroup of the youngest responded was represented by approx. 10%. And thus, the model of the paternalistic family is losing popularity in favour of partnership.

Regardless of the changes in the family models, not all families perform their functions in a complementary way consistent with the applicable standards (traditional or modern). Noncompliance or a different execution of individual functions can virtually apply to every family. However, if the dysfunction is permanent, this usually impairs the performance of the next functions, and the accumulation of the dysfunctions makes the family become problematic, or even pathological. Such families are also called dysfunctional, although this term does not strictly reflect the range of the derogation from the norm (dysfunctional family is a superior term; it means that every pathological family is dysfunctional, but not every dysfunctional is a pathological one). However, that is why, among others, it is recognised as more cautious or *balanced*.

The consequences of the dysfunctional aspect of the family generate serious social costs, what justifies the more and more complex systems supporting the family of the modern countries. These forms of support are, which aim at the family in performing its educational function, treated in a special manner. Those forms of aid are the most desirable, which result in the improvement of the relations of the family members, focusing attention on the children's needs and the equipment of the adults with the educational skills. However, if this is not possible, it is necessary to use the forms, which aim at the direct compensation of the deficits of the children or youth from these families. The tasks in this trend are implemented, among others, by the Voluntary Labour Detachments.

This organisation is a state budget institution supervised by the Minister of Family, Labour and Social Policy. [Journal of Laws 2011 no. 155 item 920]. Because VLD implement tasks related both to education and employment of the youth, the activity of this institution is determined, among others, in the act of 1991 on the *education system* [Journal of Laws 1991 No. 95 item 425] and the act of 1994 on the *employment and counteracting the unemployment* [Journal of Laws of 1995 No. 1, item 1].

Currently, VLD conducts 217 care and education units, among which there are 7 education and upbringing centres, 31 training and upbringing centres, 165 labour detachments and 14 environmental labour detachments [VLD.pl, A]. These institutions support the young people belonging to two subgroups:

- the first one is created by juveniles aged 15 to 17, *from educationally insufficient environments, which do not implement the school obligation and the teaching obligation, have got problems with graduating and need to acquire professional qualifications;*
- the second one are people aged 18-25, *including people, who are looking for work or want to retrain, the unemployed, school graduates and students* [ohp.pl, B]

The people mentioned in the second subgroup can also use the offer of the market subjects, the first subgroup includes people, who do not seem too interesting for the market subjects (hence they are also called the *disfavoured youth*). The deficits of this youth make it necessary to use the support of a broader scope, much exceeding the mere education or professional qualifications, what is recognised as *building, organising and supporting the forms of getting out of the poverty, unemployment and social pathologies*. These actions in detail include *diagnosing the needs of the pupils; ensuring the conditions for continuing the general and vocational education; for increasing qualifications, encouraging the lifelong education; including the preventive, educational and rehabilitation impacts; implementation of the comprehensive care and education actions /.../ and cooperating in this scope with their parents or carers; promoting the activities /.../ VLD; and studying the care and education actions towards the VLD participants* [ohp.pl, B].

The underlined sentence (briefly including a huge area), emphasises the educational mission of the discussed institutions, which is carried out mainly in the course of the boarding school activity. It is often repeated that the youth using them *are no angels*, however, it is worth emphasising that the decision to stay is connected to their voluntary consent and referral, which are issued by the *curators, pedagogical and psychological counsels, social welfare centres, emergency care, juvenile courts, police and children's homes* [ohp.pl, C].

Therefore, VLD is a specific form of supporting youth, and its previous achievements are the best proof for the purposes justifying the existence of this type of institutions. Such a request was put forward in 2012 by the Supreme Chamber of Control [SCC 2012], as a result of the conducted control. Nevertheless, several shortcomings of VLD have been pointed out, among which there was the lack of effectiveness studies of the care and educational actions. In addition, in the SCC relation, (just like in the descriptions of the VLD itself), the educational and vocational actions are emphasised, while the remaining issues, related to the family functioning seem to be treated as secondary. Does this mean that the program offered by VLD guarantees the alignment of deficits in terms of the family and social functioning, through the above-mentioned educational actions and vocational training?

## The perception of family home by youth from the dysfunctional environments

The above question was the base for undertaking this study. To obtain answers for them, I reached for the results of the studies conducted in one of the Training and Education Centres of VLD<sup>2</sup>, aimed at, among others, describing the vision of the family and social functioning. In the research initiative, first the documentation study was used, and then the questionnaire study. The pupils were invited to the studies, who had at least one year of experience in the establishment, and so their age ranged from 16 to 18. In the facility there are 89 pupils, 50 of them decided to undertake the role of the respondents. The vast majority (39) were boys, so the girls constituted one fifth of the surveyed population.

The first task, which was implemented during the studies, was the description of the families of the respondents. As it resulted from the documentation, 42 respondents came from complete families; 4 people grew up in families of single mothers, while one person was brought up by *grandparents*. The survey included, among others, a question about the *biggest family problems*. The answers could be given by circling the selected answers (table 1) or you could add your own version.

Table 1. *The biggest problems* of families of the Centre's pupils

Versions of answers	N	%
<i>Alcohol problems</i>	32	64
<i>Cramped housing</i>	24	48
<i>Poverty</i>	13	26
<i>Educational awkwardness</i>	12	24
<i>Low standard of the apartment</i>	7	14

Source: studies of A. Klimczyk (*hereafter labeled with the initials A K.*)

The most often circled version (choice of 32 people), indicated the *alcohol problems*; almost every second respondent indicated the *cramped housing*; a dozen people – *poverty* and *educational awkwardness*, while 7 people *the low standard of the apartment*. The postscript of one respondent was significant: *it is not so bad at home, it is much worse elsewhere*.

---

<sup>2</sup> Centre for Training and Education of the Voluntary Labour Detachments in Dąbrowa Górnicza. The studies were performed by Adrian Klimczyk, for the needs of the master's thesis prepared under the supervision of the author of this article.

What relations exist in the discussed families, i.e., who exercises the power, who is the most helpful, how do the respondents perceive its individual members? – these are another issues, which have been explained.

In response to the question: *Who rules at home is the so-called head of the family, makes important decisions on significant family matters*, the vast majority of the respondents (43 people) stated that the role of the *head of the family* is performed by men (42 people indicated *Fathers*, one – living with “grandparents” – the *Grandfather*); The power of women was indicate (logically) by four people living only with mothers and three people, from complete families.

- *Who will understand you best, to whom do you turn in matters that are important to you?* – was the next question (table 2). In the response, 70% of the surveyed population listed the family members (22 people indicated the *mother*; 10 people *brother/sister*; 2- *father*; one – *grandmother*). Almost every fourth person (24%) indicated people outside the family (*a friend*; one person indicated a *teacher*), while 2 people answered: *nobody understands me*. Similar results were obtained with the task, with a question: *Who is the most important person to you?* Almost everyone circled the same people as they indicated before, as supportive. However, several people previously indicating *friends*, this time made different choices, circling the *grandfather* or *grandmother*.

Seemingly the semantic scope was included in the next question: *Whom from your family can you call a friend?* However, this time the results indicate different choices that in the previously discussed tasks, as more often that every second respondent (26 people), ignored the clarification include in the question (*whom from the family/.../*), writing *friends* in the answer. Among the other respondents the siblings were considered to be friends (11 people), while *mothers* this time were indicated by 9 people (table 2).

Table 2. People supporting respondents.

Person:	<i>understanding</i>		<i>most important</i>		<i>friend</i>	
	Number	%				
<i>mother</i>	22	44	22	44	9	18
<i>father</i>	2	4	2	4	2	4
<i>grandmother/grandfather</i>	1	2	4	8	1	2
<i>brother/sister</i>	10	20	9	18	11	22
<i>Other relatives</i>	-	-	1	2	-	-

<i>friend</i>	12	24	11	22	26	52
<i>Other people</i>	1	2	-	-	1	2
<i>Other answers (nobody)</i>	2	4	1	2	-	-
<b>total</b>	50	100	50	100	50	100

source: studies of A.K.

For obtaining a more complete picture of the family life of the respondents there were also questions: *Who in your household does the homework with you, goes to the parent-school meetings or goes to the doctor with you when you are sick?* Only 6 respondents indicate the family members (4 - mother, 1- father, 1 – grandmother), while 44 people marked the answer: *Nobody helps me.*

The issue of relations in the families was also to be explained by the tasks, in which respondents evaluated (using a 5-point scale) a series of features/behaviours. The task had an introduction: *to what extent do the features mentioned in the set apply to your family?* (table 3. The sequence of features/behaviours with the weighted average scores).

Table 3. Atmosphere and rules in the respondents' families; evaluation of features/behaviours

Assessed features/behaviours		Scale values					averag
		1	2	3	4	5	
positive	<i>Mutual love</i>	21	12	2	7	8	2.38
	<i>Support</i>	16	22	2	7	3	2.18
	<i>Forgiveness</i>	23	15	12	0	0	1.78
	<i>Atmosphere of peace</i>	23	17	9	1	0	1.76
	<i>Kind conversations</i>	28	14	2	5	1	1.74
	<i>Praising others</i>	33	13	2	1	1	1.48
	<i>Satisfying the children's needs</i>	29	21	0	0	0	1.42
	<i>A lot of happy moments</i>	35	15	0	0	0	1.30
	<i>Repeating "I love you"</i>	39	10	1	0	0	1.24
	<i>Concern about health of the</i>	41	9	0	0	0	1.18
negative	<i>Verbal violence, quarrels</i>	6	7	11	14	12	3.38
	<i>Discipline</i>	10	12	7	6	15	3.08
	<i>Physical violence</i>	1	18	23	1	7	2.90

Source: studies of A. K. \* scale 1 no, 2 rather no, 3.I don't know 4.rather yes, 5. yes

Generally, in the assessment of the desired features/behaviours, respondents rarely used the scale values other than 1 (*no*) and 2 (*rather no*). The largest amount of answers *yes* and *rather yes* (a total of 15), was noted in the *mutual love*, nevertheless, the votes of the majority of the

group still prevailed on the negative assessment. The other desirable features/behaviours, were assessed more and more consistently, as rarely occurring in the discussed families. A more significant change in the distribution of the results was obtained during the assessment of the negative features/behaviours, because unless the respondents expressed a certain reticence in the assessment of the *physical violence* (23 people marked: *I don't know*), the *verbal violence, quarrels and discipline* have already achieved the average of 3,38 and 3,0. Only 13 people denied as if the *verbal violence and quarrels* are used in their families; and 19 people stated that there is no *physical violence* in their families.

The choices of the respondents are also expressive, which concern the assessment of the provided statements about the family. The largest number of indications (19) was noted for the sentence *for me the family is: love, warmth and safety*; although 7 people crossed out the word *love* from the above sentence. The next 11 respondents circled the version: *for me the family is the lack of warmth and safety*. The own version was provided by 20 people, while the sense of these additions can be summarized in two sentences: the family is a *place for living or a place for sleeping*.

In summary, respondents come from dysfunctional families. The image of dysfunction of these families, however, is not the same, as the alcohol problems can concern two thirds; the cramped housing – the half, poverty – one fourth, etc. However, in terms of their atmosphere and the applied rules and performance of individual functions, similarities are considerable. And so, they primarily concern the power, which officially belongs to men, however, the women – mothers are the most important to children. However, also the performance of the mother's role is limited, as this does not meet supporting the children every day, caring for their needs. As a result, in the discussed families we can point out the numerous deficits in terms of *support; forgiveness; atmosphere of peace; praising others; satisfying the children's needs; joyful moments; repeating "I love you"; caring for the health of the household members* (table 3). Worth mentioning is the result indicating the position of children: no respondent confirmed that the *satisfaction of the children's needs* was significant in his family. So, therefore, they are not deemed worthy of attention.

All in all, the surveyed population has a different way of evaluating the essence of the family: the positive associations (warmth, safety and love) were indicated by almost every fourth person (12 people); more often than every fifth person denied as if the family could be compared with these qualities; the others associate the family with the place for sleeping or living... And still, the family is important, what is evidenced by the identification of the most important people with the family members. This does not mean that the most important

people are always the most helpful, supportive, sometimes the support comes from people from outside the family, but this in turn means that they are the most important for the respondents. Therefore, the family ties are a priority, despite the relations implying deprivation of the respondents' needs.

#### Future: visions and perspectives

- *What rules, standards, do the pupils of the Centre want to use in their future families?* – this is the second question, which oriented this research.

In the first task included in the discussed thematic group (table 4) the task was to assess a number of the provided values (using a 5-point scale). The highest marks, applied by all respondents, were noted for *happiness* (average of 5,0), and *money* (average of 4,92); the *family* was on the third position (average of 4,88). The majority has also positively assessed the *good job, love; and health*; The remaining values did not achieve bigger recognition of the most of the respondents, while for these three values (*education; children; helping others*), 45 and more respondents applied the assessment 1 (the value of the lowest degree). Thus, respondents declaring the high position of the family in their hierarchy of values have regard to its specific and unusual image, as there is little room in it for *children*, who tend to be a by-product. This issue was differently viewed by only 4 respondents (who chose the highest mark for the *children*). The low marks of the *education* are also worth emphasising.

Table 4. Priorities and values

scale	1	2	3	4	5	averag
<i>Happiness</i>	0	0	0	0	50	5.00
<i>Money</i>	1	0	0	0	49	4.92
<i>Family</i>	0	0	0	6	44	4.88
<i>Good job</i>	0	1	1	3	45	4.84
<i>Love</i>	1	10	3	7	29	4.06
<i>Health</i>	14	8	2	2	24	3.28
<i>Friendship</i>	27	2	4	1	16	2.54
<i>Education</i>	45	0	0	0	5	1.34
<i>Children</i>	45	1	0	0	4	1.34
<i>Helping others</i>	47	1	1	0	1	1.08

Source: studies by A.K., \*1- to the lowest degree, 5- to the highest possible.

Similar conclusions are indicated by the task results, in which the people were asked to assess the provided versions of the *vision of the future*. All respondents likely decided that they will

have a wife/husband (average of 4,80); the vision: *I will have a good job*, was taken for granted by only 34 respondents (average of 3,98); the subsequent positions included the predictions regarding the ownership of a *car* (3,82); *children* (2,98); Most respondents has rejected the visions indicating the ownership of *own house* (2,42); *travelling* (average of 2,32); *living in a different country* (1,98) and *studying* (1,28).

- *What will your future family be like?* – was the next question, this time bearing the versions of the answers to choose from. Most often (26 times) the following version was selected: *Happy, joyful, without quarrels and tensions*; every fourth respondent (13 people) selected the answer *I don't know right now*; every fifth (11) concluded that *It will be better, because he knew what to improve*. Nobody chose the answer: *my family will be the same as the present one*.

There was also an attempt to determine what conditions, according to the respondents, are significant in the preparations for living with the chosen person. Respondents again evaluate the similar statements using the Likert scale. The first of them: *We will come from similar families*, was recognised as right by 22 respondents; while 18, on the other hand, assessed it as untrue (average of 3,32). The truth of the condition included in the sentence: *The fact that we will get to know each other, we will talk*, was recognised by 19 respondents, while 21 rejected it (average of 3,14). Two statements related to the potential findings of the partners: the first one, about the performance of the *head of the family* role concerned the management of the finances (*who is to give the money to whom at home*). These sentences did not receive the approval of the majority (the first of these sentences was accepted by 9 people, the second one by 7; the average for the above-mentioned statements 2,62 and 1,94).

Likewise, the questions related also to the assessment of the rules, which are to organise the life of the future respondents (table 5). The greatest recognition went to the statement *Respect for the elders by children* (average of 4,86); The majority also agreed that in their families *the raising of children will be stress free*. While 32 people negated the *Sparing of problems and a lot of conversations* (with the confirmation of 17 people); The majority (this time: 37 people) has rejected this option, which is the *partner model of a family*; Almost in line (votes of 48 people) *Shared meals at the table, without a TV* (average of 1,18!) were rejected.

Table 5. Rules organising the future families of the pupils from the centre.

Scale*	1	2	3	4	5	average
<i>Respecting the elders by children</i>	1	1	0	0	48	4.86

<i>Raising children will be stress free</i>	7	4	5	0	34	4.00
<i>Sharing problems and a lot of conversations</i>	31	1	1	1	16	2.40
<i>This will be a partner model</i>	35	2	1	1	11	2.02
<i>Shared meals at the table, without a TV</i>	47	1	0	0	2	1.18

source: studied by AK \*1. no, 2. rather no, 3. I don't know 4. rather yes, 5. yes

The previously reported problems of the respondents' families are often based on the abuse of alcohol. That's why we tried to determine to what extent these problems are a warning to the respondents. The questions were: *to what extent are you worried that the psychoactive substances will complicate the life of your future family?* In response, 31 people decided that *Their use can break down their family* (average of 3,78), however, the bigger compliance of the group (average of 4,36), accompanied the assessment of the sentence *I more fear the lack of money*. While 38 respondents found the following sentence to be true *I will eliminate them after starting a family*.

The last question, somewhat summarising the previous tasks, is: *what are your chances for a nice family in the future?* Every second respondent (26) chose the answer *25%*; The next 22 people indicated the answer *maybe 50%*? Only 6 people estimated their chances *from 75 to 100%*.

## Conclusions

Pupils of the Centre are oriented to start a family, however understood specifically, as generally they have in mind the partner, and even more literally: their own happiness, while the presence of children in these families is indeed predicted, but not necessarily expected, treated in the category of values. The future families of the respondents are to be happy, but the pupils of the centre do not know how to achieve this goal. Most of them declare that love is important to them, but friendship is appreciated only by some; sharing thoughts and the pursuit of understanding, getting to know the other person and his/her priorities are rarely considered important.

Probably omitting the issues of understanding and agreements with the given person results from the obvious (for most respondents) authoritarian model of the family, and thus in this respect they will repeat the family model, from which they come. The authority of men in these families (and probably in the families in the previous generations) is beyond dispute. Women can be the *significant people*, however, it does not seem that this is appealing at all to the respondents (as partnership). The respondents would like for their future families to be

different, better, however, they do not know that their current priorities and choices, to some extent, determine the reproduction of the family patterns from which they come. The vast majority of the respondents has difficult childhood which was the time of lonely struggles with the encountered difficulties. They were not treated as valuable people. As a result, currently they are characterised by low self-esteem, and their aspirations for their own life goals are largely due to the so far experienced deficits. Therefore, the adulthood is perceived not in terms of responsibility, but freedom and the chance to satisfy their needs. They cannot constructively build on their bad experiences. Although they know that, for example, alcohol problems destroy the family, in relation to the psychoactive substances they assume quite laid-back attitudes, often stating that after they start their families, they will make appropriate decisions in this matter. They fear that their future families will struggle with the financial shortages, but they do not even allow the thought of the earning emigration and living abroad. They do not even allow themselves such common dreams like travelling or having own house. Do such dreams or visions really not attract them? They are probably afraid of the failure, they do not feel strong enough to dream about *flying higher*. Even more, they cannot plan. In addition, the orientation of their actions, in line with the previously unmet needs, explains the lack of interest in *helping others*. This also explains, the previously mentioned, underestimation of friendship – even, as stated by the respondents, though they have friends (outside the family), the family is always the most important, and if it is constantly struggling with some infirmities, it seems to the respondents that they cannot afford to *help others*. Yet another explanation for the lack of activity in this area is the association of *helping* with material resources (other *helping* would require the appreciation of talking, sharing thoughts).

As it results from the cited SCC report, many of VLD pupils do not obtain employment [SCC 2012, p.21]. In this situation the respondents' fears are confirmed that the problem of their families will involve the financial deficiencies. Moreover according to the IPSOS researches, unlike their peers, the respondents will probably not like to perform the partner model of the family, and thus again they will create specific social circles, complied with the *margin*.

The performed studies can only be treated as the preliminary diagnosis of the undertaken issues. The research initiative including 50 respondents, in one centre, is insufficient to accept such observations as reliable and accurate, but it seems to logically explain the behaviours of the *social margin*. Therefore, they should inspire to undertake the following studies, as well as to develop projects, which aim at the more intensive support for young people from dysfunctional families, directed towards their future social and family

functioning. Issue undertaken in this research shows that family functioning seems to play an important role in the process of re-socialization of the described youth. Meanwhile it is rarely considered or recognised in scientific reports. It seems that continuation of the described initiative, with involving a broader number of respondents and other educational centers, will be appreciated.

#### Bibliography:

Bednarski H., Przemiany struktury i funkcji rodzin polskich w XX i XXI wieku, Mazowieckie Studia Humanistyczne 2/1 2, 2008.

IPSOS, Współcześni mężczyźni o podziale ról w rodzinie, 2009, <http://www.ipsos.pl/mezczyzni-podzial-rol-w-rodzinie>, [dostęp: marzec 2016]

NIK, Informacja o wynikach kontroli, Działalność ochotniczych hufców pracy, Warszawa 2013, [www.nik.gov.pl](http://www.nik.gov.pl)

VLD, <http://VLD.pl>: A: O nas; B: Działalność; C: Charakterystyka VLD, [dostęp: marzec 2016]

Szłapińska J., Współczesny kształt pedagogiki pracy w Polsce, Studia Edukacyjne nr 37/2015 Dz. U. Nr 155, poz. 920, Rozporządzenie Ministra Pracy i Polityki Społecznej z dnia 22 lipca 2011 r. w sprawie organizacji Ochotniczych Hufców Pracy.

Journal of Laws 1991 Nr 95 poz. 425 USTAWA z dnia 7 września 1991 r. o systemie oświaty.

Journal of Laws 2009 Nr 157 poz. 1240 USTAWA z dnia 27 sierpnia 2009 r. o finansach publicznych

Journal of Laws z 1995 Nr 1, poz. 1 USTAWA z dnia 14 grudnia 1994 r. o zatrudnieniu i przeciwdziałaniu bezrobociu