



The Value of an Educational Emphasis: Child Care and Restructuring in Spain since 1975

Celia Valiente

In many advanced industrial societies, child care provisions have fallen victim to the trend toward welfare state retrenchment that has occurred in the wake of recent global economic restructuring. This is not, however, true in Spain, where child care, in contradistinction to other forms of welfare, has increased steadily since the fall of the regime of Francisco Franco in 1975. How can this be explained? Rationales for child care policy usually fall into one of several categories: economic or labor market, poverty reduction, gender equality, or education. In post-authoritarian Spain, the educational rationale has prevailed, generally meeting with great success.

Conditions for deploying the other likely rationales have been less than favorable. For example, child care provisions have often been expanded during periods of labor shortage in order to facilitate the employment of married women with children, the most important available reserve of labor.¹ In Spain, however, there have been no such labor-force shortages for the past three decades. Indeed, since 1982, the unemployment rate has hovered above 15 percent, and it is unlikely that labor shortages will develop in the foreseeable future. At the same time, the political and social actors who after 1975 might have defined child care measures as programs that benefit working mothers—namely, the feminist movement, state feminists,² and the women's departments of trade unions—have in practice not consistently advanced this definition.

Instead, policymakers have relied primarily on the educational rationale, focusing on measures explicitly intended to benefit children. In this mode, they have chiefly extended programs that were in place before 1975—that is, educational services. As a corollary to the educational rationale, they have also deployed an antipoverty argument, claiming that preschool programs have the potential to diminish cultural differences among children from varying socioeconomic backgrounds. While these combined rationales have succeeded in expanding the supply of places in free public preschools, the very definition of these institutions as schools rather than child care centers has limited their utility for working parents. Nevertheless, in an era when most advanced industrial societies—including Spain—have witnessed dramatic cutbacks in all types of social services, Spanish preschool programs have not only held on but even grown.

This chapter seeks to explain this seemingly paradoxical set of developments, first by presenting the analytical framework used in my research; second, by describing child care policies in post-authoritarian Spain; and third, by examining the role of the main social and political actors in the area of child care policy.

Analytical Framework

In the recent debate on the potential crisis of the welfare state in postindustrial countries, some authors have argued that demands for retrenchment have been elaborated due to economic globalization, the slowdown in the increase of productivity and economic growth produced by the transition to a service economy, the rise of conservative parties, aging populations, and increasing costs of mature welfare states. Nevertheless, they have found that in many societies retrenchment has been difficult to carry out, in part because cuts in social policy are politically unpopular and therefore risky undertakings. Certain welfare state recipients (for instance, beneficiaries of old-age pensions and welfare-state employees) have organized to preserve social policy (Garrett 1998; Pierson 1996, 1998). In keeping with such findings, these scholars tend to identify patterns of resilience in social policy rather than of retrenchment.

Other analysts, in contrast, have argued that retrenchment has indeed occurred since the oil crisis of the 1970s in countries of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), within a context of rising socioeconomic inequality (Clayton and Pontusson 1998). Generally speaking, moderate rollbacks in entitlements have been advanced, especially in the 1980s and 1990s, by left-wing and conservative parties. Nevertheless, in most (but not all) cases, the main institutional configuration of the different types of welfare states has remained in place (Stephens, Huber, and Ray 1999).

Feminist scholarship (Langan and Ostner 1991; Lewis 1992; O'Connor, Orloff and Shaver 1999; Orloff 1993, 1996; and Sainsbury 1996, among others) has argued that in all countries, women and men are differently affected by the welfare state. Historically, for instance, adult men have had access to the welfare state mainly via labor market participation, while adult women have also acquired rights to benefits through marriage, or more broadly speaking, family ties (Lewis 1992, 161; Orloff 1993, 308). Feminist scholars have emphasized the importance of some social programs for women's autonomy and their capacity to participate in equal terms in the labor market and in the community in general. In all societies, women are those who overwhelmingly provide care for people who, for any reason, need the care of others, such as the frail elderly, the disabled, the ill, or small children (Orloff 1993, 313). Therefore, some programs, such as child care, are especially important for women. These programs thus merit close attention, even if expenditure on care measures is smaller than on other types of policies, such as old-age pensions.

Child care policies provide a useful case for studying the impact and rationales

for welfare state retrenchment. According to Gøsta Esping-Andersen's typology of welfare states in industrial capitalist countries,³ that of Spain (and Italy, France, and the former West Germany, among others) is of a continental type.⁴ Although benefit provision is mainly public, the welfare state aims at reinforcing the traditionally crucial role of the family as welfare provider. Thus, the state tends to intervene only when the capacity of the family to act as social provider is exhausted (Esping-Andersen 1990, 27–28, 48).⁵

In Spain, as in any other continental welfare state, participation in the labor market is the main route of access to welfare state benefits, since, generally speaking, most of these have been historically given to workers (and their dependents) who have made the required contributions to the system (Guillén 1992, 12; 1996). The two main exceptions to this general rule are health care and compulsory education (for children six to sixteen years old), which are programs of universal coverage.

By the same token, because the Spanish welfare state (like others of the continental type) is heavily transfer-oriented and offers very few social services,⁶ it does little to facilitate female labor-force participation. In the early 1990s, approximately one-tenth of the expenditures of continental welfare states was dedicated to social services (health care excluded), while for social democratic welfare states, the figure was one-third.⁷ Nevertheless, the continental welfare state is more resistant to cuts, because it is “the most consensual of all modern welfare states” (Esping-Andersen 1995, 1–2). Since most of its programs are contributory, these generate a sense of entitlement in many citizens/voters. Moreover, welfare programs have been advanced as part of breadwinners' salaries in the labor markets of these countries, on the assumption that these would support whole families, not only individual recipients.

Central State Child Care Policies in Spain

Since 1975, the main form of central state child care (for children under six, when mandatory schooling starts) has been the supply of free educational preschool programs for children aged three or over, administered chiefly by the Ministry of Education and Culture (Ministerio de Educación y Cultura, or MEC).⁸ In the academic year 1996–1997, the proportions of children attending public preschool programs were 70 percent for those aged four and five, and 43 percent for three-year-olds. Since the private sector also provides preschool places, school attendance rates for three-, four-, and five-year-olds are comparatively high in Spain, at 67, 99, and 100 percent respectively. In contrast, the proportion of Spanish children aged two or under cared for in public centers is one of the lowest in the European Union (EU): only 2.5 percent. The proportion of children aged two or under cared for in private centers is also very small: 3.5 percent (Ministerio de Educación y Cultura 1999, 79, 132–34; my calculations).⁹

The absolute number and proportion of children who attend preschool programs

in public centers has been on the increase since 1975. While such programs enrolled 347,026 children under six in the academic year 1975–1976, by 1996–1997 this figure had more than doubled, to 754,196 children. Seen from another perspective, in 1975–1976, more than one-third (38 percent) of children enrolled in preschool education attended public centers, and by 1996–1997, this proportion exceeded two-thirds (68 percent) (Instituto Nacional de Estadística 1977, 101; 1981, 12; and Ministerio de Educación y Cultura 1999, 53; my calculations). As the number of places in public child care centers has increased, that in private centers has fallen. In 1975–1976, 573,310 children were enrolled in private centers, while in 1996–1997, this figure had fallen to 361,948 (Instituto Nacional de Estadística 1977, 101–03; 1981, 12; and Ministerio de Educación y Cultura 1999, 53; my calculations).

Public preschool programs cannot be used by parents (or mothers) as perfect substitutes for child care, since preschool hours are shorter than working hours (and sometimes much shorter and interrupted by a break). Preschool holidays are also much longer than working holidays. For instance, preschool summer holidays last approximately three months, while paid summer holidays for workers last only one month. It is important to note that even if the percentage of women in employment is lower in Spain than in most EU member states, most Spanish women who work for wages have full-time jobs. In 1998, the Spanish female employment rate (35 percent) was the lowest in the EU, and much lower than the EU average (51 percent), but 83 percent of Spanish women workers were employed full-time. This figure (together with those of Portugal and Finland) was the third highest in the EU, after those of Greece (89 percent) and Italy (86 percent), and sixteen points above the EU average of 67 percent (Franco 1999, 8–9).

Other child care policies (state regulation of public centers, tax exemptions for child care expenses, and state scholarships for pupils in private centers) are much less important than the supply of preschool places in public centers. Regarding the regulation of private centers, in 1990, the state decreed that the minimum conditions required of public preschool centers (for instance, in terms of space per child or the number of children per care provider) would also apply to the private sector.¹⁰ Nevertheless, private centers opened before 1990 were given until 2002 to conform to this regulation. In contrast to other countries, paid care provided for children under six in private homes (by baby-sitters, child minders, etc.) is not regulated by the Spanish state; there are no regulations regarding, for instance, the qualifications of care providers, the maximum number of children who can be cared for by one adult, or the characteristics of the home where care is provided.

With respect to tax relief, between 1991 and 1998, those who paid personal income tax could benefit from a deduction for child care expenses (for those under three) of a maximum of 25,000 pesetas per year (around U.S.\$150) or the equivalent of 15 percent of child care expenses. There was a ceiling on the taxpayer's income, and both parents had to work outside the home. In fiscal year 1997 (corresponding to income generated in 1996), 116,371 taxpayers took advantage of this benefit, with an average deduction of 12,073 pesetas (approximately U.S.\$70)

(Ministerio de Economía y Hacienda 1997, 119; data from the whole of Spain except the Basque country and Navarre). This form of tax relief was increased in 1998 but disappeared in 1999, as the result of a comprehensive reform of the personal income tax code.

Finally, with regard to state scholarships to attend private centers, the MEC has given grants to some families whose three- to six-year-old children attend private preschool programs. In academic year 1997–1998, 42,479 children received these scholarships, at an average amount of 54,729 pesetas (approximately U.S.\$300; Consejo Escolar del Estado 1999, 34; my calculations).

Besides the pronounced expansion of the supply of public preschool programs, the other most important change in the area of child care policy has been territorial decentralization. Under Franco, the state was highly centralized, but during the transition to democracy, a broad process of devolution of powers from the central state to the regions (not so much to localities) was set in motion. Since the early 1980s, some regional governments have been acquiring responsibilities previously assigned to the central state (for instance, education). The process of devolution of full responsibilities on education to all regions was completed in the year 2000.¹¹

Finally, it should be noted, the expansion of public preschools in Spain has occurred within a context of continuously declining fertility rates: the synthetic index of fertility decreased steadily from 2.79 in 1975 to 1.15 in 1998 (the 1998 data are provisional; European Commission 1999, 102). The decrease in fertility rates has meant that it was easier to provide a public preschool place for a higher proportion of children younger than six, but these school services were not used as pronatalist devices. As I have argued elsewhere (Valiente 1995), there have been no (explicit or implicit) pronatalist policies in postauthoritarian Spain. This can be explained in terms of the determined rejection of the type of family measures established during Franco's dictatorship. Population increase was one of the chief aims of this regime, and long after 1975, political and social actors have remembered the family programs that were so salient in Francoist official discourses and propaganda. Since then, any pronatalist policy has been associated with Francoist symbols and measures, and has thus been avoided.

Social and Political Actors in the Policy Area of Child Care

Since 1975, then, the pattern in Spain with regard to child care has been one of neither retrenchment nor resilience but of substantial expansion of the supply of public preschool programs—the main child care policy. This trend runs contrary to the predictions of the literature on welfare state restructuring, which foresees either retrenchment or resilience (but not at all a pronounced expansion) of social policy, including child care, in the last three decades. Why, then, is Spain an exception in this area? In order to answer this question, it is useful to study the role played by social and political actors with regard to child care.

As the foregoing description suggests, within the central state, child care falls under the rubric of education policy. This assignment has been confirmed by policy-makers from all the political parties that have come to power in postauthoritarian Spain. The main unit of the central state overseeing educational policy is the MEC. As such, the MEC has been chiefly responsible for defining the “problem” of child care for those under six years of age in Spain as one of a shortage of educational programs. This MEC definition has, in turn, influenced the proposed “solution”: expanding the number of preschool places for children over three in public centers—that is, extending the type of services introduced before 1975.

In general, since 1975 there has been a continuous expansion of expenditures within the area of education, affecting all levels; the increase of public expenditure on education has been particularly marked (Bonafant 1998; Calero and Bonafant 1999; Uriel et al. 1997). In 1975, public expenditure on education amounted to 3.4 percent of the gross domestic product (Ministerio de Educación y Ciencia 1995, 124), while in 1997 the figure was 4.7 percent (OECD 2000, 15, 43). The increase in expenditure has been reflected in the growing number of children and youngsters of all ages enrolled in education. For instance, the proportion of children aged fourteen attending school rose from 72 percent in 1975 to 100 percent in 1996. The proportion of eighteen-year-olds who were enrolled grew from 31 percent in 1975 to 44 percent in 1996 (Instituto Nacional de Estadística 1977, 44; 1981, 12; and Ministerio de Educación y Cultura 1999, 64; my calculations).

In Spain, child care is not a part of the set of policies that welfare state researchers usually study—namely, pensions, health care, and social assistance. Restrictive reforms (but also expansionary measures) have primarily affected income maintenance programs (pensions and unemployment benefits). Nevertheless, according to Guillén and Matsaganis (2000), “on balance, though the evolution of the Spanish welfare state underwent trends of expansion as well as of retrenchment during the last twenty years, the former were much more pronounced than the latter.” In contrast to some of the main welfare programs, expansionary measures have almost exclusively been undertaken in the area of child care policy.

While child care has been firmly lodged under the rubric of educational policy, it has not formed part of discussions of gender equality. Since 1975, gender equality policies have mainly been of three types. First, the 1978 constitution declares that female and male workers are equal before the law, a principle that has required certain revisions in labor legislation. Second, measures to help parents combine their family and professional duties (principally paid maternity leave and nonpaid parental leave) have been expanded. Third, a few affirmative action schemes favoring women (chiefly, special training and preferential hiring) have been passed (Valiente 1997, 147–53). In other countries some social and political actors (mainly feminists, state feminists, and feminist trade unionists) have advanced the demand for more extensive child care policies to help mothers reconcile professional and family obligations. In Spain, however, these actors have scarcely advanced this demand.

With regard to child care, Spain’s major political parties have also remained rel-

atively silent. The center-right Unión de Centro Democrático (UCD) governed Spain between 1977 and 1982. Absolutely nothing about child care was said in the UCD electoral program of 1977 (Unión de Centro Democrático 1977), but the 1979 program affirmed, in the section on education, that free preschool programs should cover all four- and five-year-old children (Unión de Centro Democrático 1979, 35). Although this objective was not fully achieved under UCD mandate, it is clear that already in 1979 child care programs were being defined as an extension of existing educational preschool activities.

The social democratic Partido Socialista Obrero Español (PSOE) held government positions from 1982 until 1996, was the main opposition party from 1977 until 1982, and has been again since 1996. The PSOE electoral programs and resolutions of federal congresses also contained a commitment to develop programs for those under six, again conceptualized as educational policies. Preschool programs are understood as tools to achieve a higher degree of class equality. According to this view, children from underprivileged social classes should be enrolled in public preschool programs, which would provide them with the educational skills necessary to succeed in elementary school. Preschool attendance would also diminish cultural differences among children from varying socioeconomic backgrounds. All these ideas reflect the PSOE leaders’ opinion that the educational system should function as an efficient mechanism to reduce social inequalities (Partido Socialista Obrero Español 1979a: política sectorial 90, política municipal 8; 1981, 91, 277–79; 1982, 23–24; 1984, 66; 1986, 61, 63; 1988, 44; 1989, 29–30; 1990, 109; 1993, 29; 1996, 51–53). PSOE documents also contained some references to child care in the sections related to “gender equality,” though these are far fewer than in the sections on “education” (Partido Socialista Obrero Español 1976, 19; 1979a: política sectorial 19–20; 1979b, 22; 1981, 233; 1982, 29; 1989, 66; 1990, 61, 109; 1993, 59; 1996, 66–67; 2000, 17).

The conservative party (under the names of Alianza Popular, Coalición Democrática, Coalición Popular, and Partido Popular [PP]), has been in power since 1996, and was the main opposition party from 1982 to 1996. The PP has also proposed extending the preschool programs already in place, understanding them as chiefly educational (Alianza Popular, 1977, 31; 1982, 104–5; Coalición Democrática 1979, 45; Coalición Popular 1986, 9; Partido Popular 1989, 10; 1993, 56–58; 1996, 98–99; 2000, 29), and to a much lesser extent as gender equality measures and/or family policies (Coalición Democrática 1979, 37; Alianza Popular 1982, 135; Partido Popular 1989, 29; 1993, 81; 1996, 181–82, 187–89; 2000, 18, 58).

Policymakers in the Ministry of Education and Culture¹²

Policymakers from the MEC have conceptualized preschool experiences mainly as measures beneficial to children because, among other reasons, they promote sociability and develop learning abilities. In addition, MEC officials have maintained that

such programs provide life-enhancing experiences to children from economically, socially, and culturally underprivileged families, partly compensating for the differences between these children and those who come from families from more privileged backgrounds (Boyd-Barrett 1995, 10; Ministerio de Educación y Ciencia 1989, 104).

In order to reverse the past trend of unequal access to preschool educational services, MEC policymakers have been increasing the number of available places in public centers. In the 1970s and 1980s, educational services for those under six were mainly provided by the private sector. As a result, preschool education was restricted chiefly to families who could afford to pay the fees charged by private centers, and proportionally fewer families from more modest socioeconomic strata enrolled their children in these centers (Puelles 1986, 448–49; González-Anleo 1985, 74; Medina 1976, 123; Muñoz-Repiso et al. 1992, 21–22).

The emphasis on the educational nature of services offered by public centers has led MEC officials (in cooperation with experts, teachers, and directors of centers) to devote considerable energy and resources to the development of the pedagogical techniques and materials used in centers (Puelles 1986, 315; Ministerio de Educación y Ciencia 1989, 41). In this respect, MEC policymakers have tried to distance themselves from the past, when (in their own view) public centers were either just places for children who could not be cared for by their working mothers during working hours (in Spanish derogatorily called “places for parking children”—*aparcamientos de niños*) or pseudo-elementary schools, with pedagogical techniques and materials appropriate for children aged six or older but not for younger children (Ministerio de Educación y Ciencia 1989, 89).

If preschool programs are defined as a service for pupils, one might ask: At what age should children start to attend education centers? In the past this was presumed to be around age six (Puelles 1986, 447–48), but three decades ago, it was lowered to four or five (Instituto de la Mujer 1990; Medina 1976, 115). At present, however, there is no consensus on the answer to this question, although numerous MEC officials have agreed that it should be at approximately age three. Significant sectors of the population concur with the views about the advantages of the preschool experiences described above and the age at which children should start attending preschool activities (Instituto de la Mujer 1990, 50–54; McNair 1984, 41–42). In practice, this consensus has important implications for child care provision, since it has resulted in the creation of numerous places in public centers for children aged three or older, but hardly any for those under three.

Finally, MEC officials have repeatedly emphasized that public centers are intended to provide children under six with educational services but not with care (Ministerio de Educación y Ciencia 1989, 103). MEC policymakers have implied that education and care are two completely different types of service. According to this discourse, those who work in public centers are teachers, an occupation requiring professional training. The staff of public centers is not composed of caregivers, a position for which professional skills are not required.

Feminist Advocates

I have argued elsewhere (Valiente 1995, 254–56) that, in contrast with those of other countries, Spanish feminist advocates (the feminist movement, state feminists, and the women’s departments of the main trade unions) have advanced few rhetorical demands in the policy area of child care, primarily for two reasons. First, the right-wing authoritarian regime headed by Franco that governed Spain from the mid-1930s to 1975 actively opposed the advancement of women’s rights and status. After 1975, the feminist movement had to pursue numerous objectives, including equality before the law and reproductive rights. In this situation, it was reasonable for feminists to concentrate on some demands and leave others—including child care—aside. Second, in paying considerably less attention to motherhood and child care than to other issues, Spanish feminists were rejecting, *moreso* than in other countries, a problematic past. After almost forty years of being literally bombarded by authoritarian policymaker’s messages that mothering and caring are the most important tasks in women’s lives, the last thing Spanish feminists wanted to do after 1975 was to pay much attention to those issues. At that point women’s liberation was understood as an effort to broaden the definition of women’s lives to include such concerns as waged work and control of the body. This definition carefully excluded motherhood and child care from the life of newly liberated female Spaniards.

Conclusion

This chapter has shown that the principal child care policy in Spain since 1975 has been a relatively ample supply of preschool services in public centers for children aged three to six. The extension of public child care programs has been reflected in a marked increase of the number of children who attend public preschool programs, paralleled by a continuous reduction of the number of children enrolled in private preschool programs. This trend represents a significant expansion of the existing programs in the of child care policy, rather than the cutbacks or the maintenance of the status quo predicted by the comparative literature on the welfare state retrenchment and resilience.

Spanish policymakers have framed preschool programs primarily as educational measures that benefit children, especially those coming from lower classes, not as measures to allow parents (especially mothers) to participate in the labor market. By contrast, demands for the establishment of child care alternatives which help women combine their professional and family responsibilities have not been advanced successfully by any social or policy actor, including feminists. To the extent that that last group has done so, it has been as part of an attempt to distance itself from the authoritarian past, where the official discourse continuously affirmed that motherhood was the principal duty of women toward the state and society.

In countries like Spain, where child care is part of the educational system, it is

regarded as a special social policy rather than as one of the schemes to be included in the set of policies that welfare-state specialists usually study, such as income maintenance programs (pensions, unemployment benefits, etc.), the health system, or social assistance; for this reason it has been largely overlooked by these scholars. But it is also the case that the dynamics of child care policy have been different from those of other parts of the welfare state in Spain over the past three decades, and thus may require a different mode of explanation.

Notes

1. For Denmark, see Borchorst (2000, 9); for a qualification of this argument regarding Sweden, see Bergqvist and Nyberg (2000, 6–7).

2. Since the 1960s, institutions with the explicit purpose of promoting gender equality have been set up, developed, and sometimes even dismantled in most industrial countries. In social science literature such institutions have been called “state feminist” institutions or bureaucracies. The people who work in them are described as “femocrats” or “state feminists” (Stetson and Mazur 1995).

3. Esping-Andersen (1990, 3–4) analyzes the variation across welfare states along three dimensions: the type of social rights; the type of stratification that the welfare state produces; and the interrelation of the state, the market, and the family in the provision of welfare.

4. For a discussion on whether the Spanish welfare state is a continental welfare state or a Mediterranean welfare state see Esping-Andersen (1999, 74, 90); Ferrera (1996); Leibfried (1992); and Lessenich (1995).

5. Two other types of welfare states exist in the classification made by Esping-Andersen (1990, 27–28): the social democratic and the liberal welfare states. In the social democratic welfare state, which exists in Scandinavia, universal benefits are numerous. Decommmodification is high. Social programs are directed to all social classes. The purpose of social policy is to attain equality. The state provides generous care services for children, the elderly, and other people in need of care.

In the liberal welfare state, which exists in the United States, Canada, and Australia, among others, “means-tested assistance, modest universal transfers, or modest social-insurance plans predominate. Benefits cater mainly to a clientele of low-income, usually working-class, state dependents.” Decommmodification is very low; the state encourages market provision of welfare.

6. For an analysis of the Spanish welfare state made with an analytical focus on gender, see Cousins (1995) and Guillén (1997).

7. If health care is excluded, social services include, among other things, “day care and youth services, care of the aged and disabled, home help services, and the like, but also employment-related services such as rehabilitation schemes and employment exchanges” (Esping-Andersen 1995, 2).

8. Before 1996 it was called the Ministry of Education and Science (Ministerio de Educación y Ciencia).

9. For preschool attendance rates in Spain and other EU and OECD member states see

Borchorst (2000, 2); European Commission (1998, 76); and Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (2000, 135).

10. These minimum conditions were established in the Royal Decree 1,004 of June 14, 1991, and subsequent legislation.

11. As a result of the process of devolution, programs formulated by the MEC have affected a decreasing number of regions. Then, the data provided in this chapter on the 1990s (for example, the percentage of children younger than six who attended public preschool programs) are the result of public policies elaborated by the central state and regional governments with responsibility on education.

12. In order to analyze the role of policymakers of the Ministry of Education and Culture (MEC), I have used the following sources: the Act 1 of October 3, 1990 (one of the main education acts of postauthoritarian Spain) and other pieces of legislation, published MEC documents (for instance, Ministerio de Educación y Ciencia 1989); the writings of MEC policymakers (for example, Marchesi 1990, 34–35 [Marchesi was a vice minister of education]); and in-depth interviews with three MEC senior civil servants.

References

- Alianza Popular. 1977. *¿Qué es Alianza Popular?* (What is the Alianza Popular?). Madrid: Alianza Popular.
- _____. 1982. General Elections: electoral program.
- Bergqvist, Christina, and Anita Nyberg. 2000. “Childcare and Welfare Restructuring in Sweden: From Universalism, Generosity and Egalitarianism to a Mean, Lean and Stratifying Welfare State?” Paper presented at the European Social Science History Conference, Amsterdam, April 12–15.
- Bonal, Xavier. 1998. “La Política Educativa: Dimensiones de un Proceso de Transformación (1976–1996)” (Education Policy: Dimensions of a Process of Transformation 1976–1996). In *Políticas Públicas en España: Contenidos, Redes de Actores y Niveles de Gobierno* (Public Policies in Spain: Contents, Networks of Actors, and Territorial Levels of Government), ed. Ricard Gomà and Joan Subirats. Barcelona: Ariel.
- Borchorst, Anette. 2000. “Danish Childcare Policy and Gender Equality.” Paper presented at the European Social Science History Conference, Amsterdam, April 12–15.
- Boyd-Barrett, Olivier. 1995. “Structural Change and Curriculum Reform in Democratic Spain.” In *Education Reform in Democratic Spain*, ed. Olivier Boyd-Barrett and Pamela O’Malley. London: Routledge.
- Calero, Jorge, and Xavier Bonal. 1999. *Política Educativa y Gasto Público en Educación: Aspectos Teóricos y Una Aplicación al Caso Español* (Education Policy and Public Expenditure on Education: Theoretical Aspects and Application to the Spanish Case). Barcelona: Pomares-Corredor.
- Clayton, Richard, and Jonas Pontusson. 1998. “Welfare-State Retrenchment Revisited: Entitlement Cuts, Public Sector Restructuring and Inegalitarian Trends in Advanced Capitalist Societies.” *World Politics* 51: 67–98.
- Coalición Democrática. 1979. General Elections: electoral program.

- Coalición Popular. 1986. General Elections: electoral program.
- Consejo Escolar del Estado. 1999. *Informe sobre el Estado y Situación del Sistema Educativo, Curso 1997–98* (Report on the Situation of the Education System, Academic Year 1997–98). Madrid: Consejo Escolar del Estado.
- Cousins, Christine. 1995. "Women and Social Policy in Spain: the Development of a Gendered Welfare Regime." *Journal of European Social Policy* 5, no. 3: 175–97.
- Esping-Andersen, Gøsta. 1990. *The Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University.
- _____. 1995. *Welfare States without Work: the Impasse of Labor Shedding and Familialism in Continental European Social Policy*. Centro de Estudios Avanzados en Ciencias Sociales, Instituto Juan March de Estudios e Investigaciones Estudio, Working Paper 71.
- _____. 1999. *Social Foundations of Postindustrial Economies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- European Commission. 1998. *Social Portrait of Europe*. Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.
- _____. 1999. *Statistiques Démographiques: Données* (Demographic Statistics: Data) 1960–1999. Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.
- Ferrera, Maurizio. 1996. "The 'Southern Model' of Welfare in Social Europe." *Journal of European Social Policy* 6, no. 1: 17–37.
- Franco, Ana. 1999. "Enquête sur les Forces de Travail: Principaux Résultats 1998" (Study of the Work Force: Principal Results 1998). *Statistiques en Bref: Population et Conditions Sociales* (Statistics in Brief: Population and Social Conditions) 11.
- Garrett, Geoffrey. 1998. *Partisan Politics in the Global Economy*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- González-Anleo, Juan. 1985. *El Sistema Educativo Español* (The Spanish Education System). Madrid: Instituto de Estudios Económicos.
- Guillén, Ana M. 1992. "Social Policy in Spain: From Dictatorship to Democracy (1939–1982)." In *Social Policy in a Changing Europe*, ed. Zsuzsa Ferge and Jan E. Kolberg. Frankfurt am Main and Boulder, Colo.: Campus Verlag and Westview Press.
- _____. 1996. "Citizenship and Social Policy in Democratic Spain: The Reformulation of the Francoist Welfare State." *South European Society and Politics* 1, no. 2: 253–71.
- _____. 1997. "Regímenes de Bienestar y Roles Familiares: Un Análisis del Caso Español" (Welfare Regimes and Family Roles: An Analysis of the Spanish Case). *Papers: Revista de Sociología* 53, 45–63.
- Guillén, Ana M., and Manos Matsaganis. 2000. "Testing the 'Social Dumping' Hypothesis in Southern Europe: Welfare Policies in Spain and Greece during the Last Twenty Years." *Journal of European Social Policy* 10, no. 2: 120–45.
- Instituto de la Mujer (Women's Institute) 1988. *Primer Plan para la Igualdad de Oportunidades para las Mujeres, 1988–1990* (First Equal Opportunities for Women Plan of Action 1988–1990). Madrid: Instituto de la Mujer.
- _____. 1990. *El Reparto de Responsabilidades Familiares: Análisis de la Demanda Femenina y sus Expectativas sobre Las Redes de Cuidados de Hijos* (The Division of Family Responsibilities: Analysis of the Female Demand for and Expectations of Child Care). Madrid: Instituto de la Mujer.
- _____. 1993. *Segundo Plan para la Igualdad de Oportunidades para las Mujeres, 1993–1995* (Second Equal Opportunities for Women Plan of Action 1993–1995). Madrid: Instituto de la Mujer.
- _____. 1997. *Tercer Plan para la Igualdad de Oportunidades para las Mujeres, 1997–2000* (Third Equal Opportunities for Women Plan of Action 1997–2000). Madrid: Instituto de la Mujer.
- Instituto Nacional de Estadística (National Institute of Statistics) 1977. *Estadística de la Enseñanza en España: Curso 1975–76* (Statistics of Education in Spain: Academic Year 1975–76). Madrid: Instituto Nacional de Estadística.
- _____. 1981. *Censo de Población*, tomo I, volumen I, *Resultados Nacionales, Características de la Población* (Population Census, ser. 1, vol. 1, National Results, Characteristics of the Population). Madrid: Instituto Nacional de Estadística.
- Langan, Mary, and Ilona Ostner. 1991. "Gender and Welfare: Towards a Comparative Framework." In *Towards a European Welfare State?* ed. Graham Room. Bristol: School for Advanced Urban Studies, University of Bristol.
- Leibfried, Stephan 1992. "Towards a European Welfare State? On Integrating Poverty Regimes into the European Community." In *Social Policy in a Changing Europe*, ed. Zsuzsa Ferge and Jan E. Kolberg. Frankfurt am Main and Boulder, Colo.: Campus Verlag and Westview Press.
- Lessenich, Stephan 1995. *España y "Los Tres Mundos del Estado de Bienestar": Elementos para una Clasificación* (Spain and "The Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism": Elements for a Classification). Universitat Pompeu Fabra Working Paper 95/9.
- Lewis, Jane. 1992. "Gender and the Development of Welfare Regimes." *Journal of European Social Policy* 2, no. 3: 159–73.
- Marchesi, Álvaro 1990. "La educación infantil" (Preschool Education). *Infancia y Sociedad* (Childhood and Society) 1: 33–40.
- McNair, John M. 1984. *Education for a Changing Spain*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Medina, Aurora. 1976. "Problemática de la Educación Preescolar en España" (Problems of Preschool Education in Spain). *Revista de Educación* 247: 111–34.
- Ministerio de Economía y Hacienda (Ministry of Economy and Treasury). 1997. *Memoria de la Administración Tributaria 1997* (Report on Tax Management 1997). Available online as of April 21, 2000 at <http://www.meh.es/INSPGRAL/MT97/cap2.pdf>.
- Ministerio de Educación y Ciencia (Ministry of Education and Science). 1989. *Libro Blanco para la Reforma del Sistema Educativo* (White Paper on the Reform of the Education System). Madrid: Ministerio de Educación y Ciencia.
- _____. 1995. *Estadística del Gasto Público en Educación: Presupuesto Inicial, Años 1985–1993* (Statistics on Public Expenditure on Education: Initial Budget, Years 1985–1993). Madrid: Ministerio de Educación y Ciencia.
- Ministerio de Educación y Cultura (Ministry of Education and Culture). 1999. *Estadística de*

- la Enseñanza en España 1996/97: Resultados Detallados, Series e Indicadores (Statistics on Education in Spain 1996/97: Detailed Results, Series and Indicators). Madrid: Ministerio de Educación y Cultura.
- Muñoz-Repiso, Mercedes, et al. 1992. *Las Desigualdades en la Educación en España* (Education Inequalities in Spain). Madrid: Ministerio de Educación y Ciencia.
- O'Connor, Julia, Ann Shola Orloff, and Sheila Shaver. 1999. *States, Markets, Families: Gender, Liberalism and Social Policy in Australia, Canada, Great Britain and the United States*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development. 2000. *Education at a Glance: OECD Indicators, 2000 Edition*. Paris: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development.
- Orloff, Ann S. 1993. "Gender and the Social Rights of Citizenship: the Comparative Analysis of Gender and Welfare States." *American Sociological Review* 58, no. 3: 303–28.
- _____. 1996. "Gender in the Welfare State." *Annual Review of Sociology* 22: 51–78.
- Partido Popular (People's Party) 1989; 1993; 1996; 2000. General Elections: electoral programs.
- Partido Socialista Obrero Español (Spanish Socialist Workers' Party) 1976; 1979a; 1981; 1984; 1988; 1990; 1994. Federal congresses 27–33, resolutions.
- _____. 1977; 1979b; 1982; 1986; 1989; 1993; 1996; 2000. General Elections: electoral programs.
- Pierson, Paul. 1996. "The New Politics of the Welfare State." *World Politics* 48:143–79.
- _____. 1998. "Irresistible Forces, Immovable Objects: Post-industrial Welfare States Confront Permanent Austerity." *Journal of European Public Policy* 5, no. 4: 539–60.
- Puelles, Manuel de. 1986. *Educación e Ideología en la España Contemporánea* (Education and Ideology in Contemporary Spain). Barcelona: Labor.
- Sainsbury, Diane 1996. *Gender, Equality and Welfare States*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Stephens, John D., Evelyne Huber, and Leonard Ray. 1999. "The Welfare State in Hard Times." In *Continuity and Change in Contemporary Capitalism*, ed. Herbert Kitschelt, Peter Lange, Gary Marks, and John D. Stephens. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Stetson, Dorothy, and Amy Mazur, eds. 1995. *Comparative State Feminism*. Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage.
- Unión de Centro Democrático 1977; 1979. General Elections: electoral programs.
- Uriel, Ezequiel, María L Moltó, Francisco Pérez, Joaquín Aldás, and Vicent Cucarella. 1997. *Las Cuentas de la Educación en España y sus Comunidades Autónomas: 1980–1992* (Education Accounts in Spain and Its Regions: 1980–1992). Madrid: Fundación Argentaria and Visor.
- Valiente, Celia. 1995. "Children First: Central Government Child Care Policies in Post-Authoritarian Spain (1975–1994)." In *Childhood and Parenthood: Proceedings of ISA Committee for Family Research Conference on Children and Families, 1994*, ed. Julia Brannen and Margaret O'Brien. London: Institute of Education, University of London.
- _____. 1997. *Políticas Públicas de Género en Perspectiva Comparada: La Mujer Trabajadora en Italia y España (1900–1996)* (Gender Policies in Comparative Perspective: Working Women in Italy and Spain 1900–1996). Madrid: Universidad Autónoma de Madrid.