This chapter examines the role of the Women's Institute (Instituto de la Mujer, WI) in three job training debates in Spain since the 1980s. The Women's Institute is the only national-level women's policy office in Spain. As Table 6.1 illustrates and the analysis of the chapter further develops, the Women's Institute did not participate in the main policy debates in the field of job training at the national level. Subsequently, agents from the office could neither represent women's movements goals nor gender the frame of the debates. The women's movement elicited a no response in all three debates; the content of all policies failed to contain feminist ideas.

Table 6.1 Women's Policy Agency Activities (WPAA) and Women's Movement Impact/State Response (WMI/SR) in Spain

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Debate</th>
<th>Decision Date</th>
<th>WPAA</th>
<th>WMI/SR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. National Plan on Job Training</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>Symbolic</td>
<td>No response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Creation of Coordinating Authority</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Symbolic</td>
<td>No response</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The symbolic women's policy agency activities and the lack of state response to the women's movement occurred during two decades, under Socialist governments, a women's movement in a stage of consolidation and an active Women's Institute that paid a certain degree of attention to the development of job training measures for women since the late 1980s. This continuity, the chapter argues, was mainly a result of the nature of the policy subsystem. The constellation of actors that participated in job train-
ing policy formation was firmly closed to policy actors outside of the Ministry of Labor, trade unions, and employers' organizations. Members of parliament took part in job training policy debates to a lesser extent than the Ministry of Labor, organized labor, and management. Although some feminist groups, the Women's Institute and women's departments of trade unions participated in policy implementation and program delivery, the women's movement did not stake out any strong position on job training around the specific problems that the main debates on job training addressed.

THE CONTEXT
Defining Job Training

In the Spanish context, job training is designed for individuals who hold jobs or unemployed individuals, whether they are looking for a first job or not. Job training is also directed to people who are already in the labor market. The terms continued training (formación continua) and occupational training (formación ocupacional) are also used to discuss job training in Spain. There is a clear division between training for individuals in the labor market and educational programs for students. Vocational training (formación profesional) is an education track after compulsory education. This chapter does not analyze vocational training. It focuses on job training policy issues situated in labor market discussions alone because of the sharp separation between the education and employment spheres.

Policy Subsystem

From the mid-1930s to 1975 Spain was governed by a right-wing authoritarian regime headed by General Francisco Franco. During the Francoist period, the most important job training scheme developed in the 1960s was managed through the Program for Professional Workers' Promotion (Programa de Promoción Profesional Obrera, PPO). Short-term occupational courses were given to provide individuals with agricultural backgrounds with the basic skills to work in industries and the service sector. Agricultural workers were also trained in the use of farming technology. A variety of other occupational programs, less important than the Professional Worker's Program, were also developed (García 1993:20; Pérez-Díaz 1995:9; Pérez-Díaz and Rodríguez 1994:24).

During the transition to democracy, these job training programs languished. In 1978, the National Institute of Employment (Instituto Nacional de Empleo, INEM) was created with three main functions: administer unemployment benefits, place individuals in jobs, and manage training courses. The Professional Worker's Program (which had changed its name in 1973) became part of the National Institute of Employment. The

Institute did take on the enormous task of managing unemployment subsidies, enormous due to rising levels of unemployment. It did not carry out its other two responsibilities mainly due to staff shortages. As a result, the number of people who attended occupational courses sank: from approximately 300,000 in 1975 to around 60,000 in 1985 (Pérez-Díaz and Rodríguez 1994:25).

Since the mid-1980s (with the 1985 approval of a National Plan on Professional Training that preceded Spain's integration into the European Community on January 1, 1986), job training developed into big business. The amount of resources dedicated to job training rose immediately after the approval of the National Plan. Public expenditure was 15,306 million pesetas—$77 million (in 1985); 47,710—$241 million (in 1986); and 134,000—$676 million (in 1989) (Fundación Encuentro 1993:186). The number of people taking training courses also grew, from around 60,000 in 1985 to more than 400,000 in the early 1990s (Pérez-Díaz and Rodríguez 1994:25). The programs were mainly directed to unemployed individuals and to young people looking for their first jobs and not to people already employed (Fundación Encuentro 1993:187). In general, beneficiaries of job training programs had a low level of education: in the late 1980s and early 1990s approximately 50% of them had attended, but not necessarily completed, compulsory school (Fundación Encuentro 1993:188).

The expansion of job training programs for employed individuals has occurred mainly in the 1990s. After the 1992 signature by state, labor, and management of two agreements on job training, the number of employed people following occupational courses has continually increased, to reach the proportion of around 15% of the waged working population in 1996 (Consejo Económico y Social 1997:253). This is an achievement given the low qualification of a significant number of workers (Consejo Económico y Social 1997:254), although highly skilled and skilled workers attended professional courses more than semi skilled or non skilled workers (Consejo Económico y Social 1999:337–339).

In postauthoritarian Spain, the job training policy system operated as a "closed" system; in Anderson's terms, "with its limited participation, resistance to external influences, and preoccupation with material interest" (1994:75). The main actors include highly ranked politicians and bureaucrats in the Ministry of Labor and Social Security (since 1996, the Ministry of Labor and Social Affairs), the principal trade unions—the Workers' General Union (Unión General de Trabajadores, UGT) and the Workers' Commissions (Comisiones Obreras, CCOO), and the main employers' organizations—the Spanish Confederation of Employers' Organizations (Confederación Española de Organizaciones Empresariales, CEOE) and the Spanish Confederation of Small and Medium Employers...
(Confederación Española de la Pequeña y Mediana Empresa, CEPYME). When job training policies are articulated through legislative Acts, members of parliament (MPs) automatically participate; however, they are not the only actors in this policy subfield. Policy statements made by the chief executive, such as Royal Decrees or (Ministerial) Ordinances (which do not appear before parliament), are also quite common.

A major policy instrument for professional training is also agreements between management, labor, and the state. Management and labor do take decisive roles in the formulation of job training policies and labor market policies in general. Often, the contents of agreements between labor and management are subsequently translated by the Executive and/or the Legislature into legislation. Thus, the tripartite nature of decision-making permeates most policymaking instruments of job training policy. Up until 1986, there was no central coordinating agency for occupational training policy except the National Institute of Employment. Following 1986, the General Council for Professional Training became another forum for setting the overall goals and content of national job training policy.

The administration of public job training programs is complex. Since its establishment in 1978, the National Institute of Employment managed the delivery of all job training schemes up to 1992. Since 1992, the Institute remained responsible for the administration of occupational courses for unemployed individuals. Courses for employed people were managed jointly by representatives of workers and employers (but not of the state). The money to finance public job training programs continues to be collected by the state. Finances for all programs (whether directed to unemployed or employed individuals) comes either from the European Social Fund or mandatory contributions by employers and workers (0.7% of the payroll).

During the Francoist dictatorship, the state was highly centralized. 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. Responsibilities that had previously belonged to the central state, such as job training, were transferred to some regions, for instance, to Catalonia (1991), Valencia (1992), Galicia and Andalusia (1993), and Canary Islands (1994). Thus, in the 1990s, the job training system became more open, including new players from the regions and loosening somewhat the tight control of the central government agencies. Still, it is the tripartite dynamics among state, labor, and management that drive the politics of job training.

The debates that preceded the main decisions in the area of job training have not been affected by the rise of feminism in Spain, even though feminists have entered the trade unions and women's sections have been established. Indeed, the dominant discourse of policy negotiations on job training has continued to be gender neutral, partially because of the highly closed nature of policy discussions that impeded feminist actors to influence policy. Neither the women's sections of the major trade unions, the Women's Institute, nor feminist groups participated in the development of the chief occupational training measures. Feminist trade unionists, femocrats and women's groups representatives along with feminist scholars have consistently denounced the secondary position Spanish women occupy in the labor market in comparison with men. They assert that job training could be one part of solving the problem of women's inferior status by helping women to enter the labor market and to find better jobs. Feminist activists have also consistently demanded that job training courses benefit women as well as men.

It should be stressed that many strands of the feminist movement in Spain in the 1980s and 1990s supported the proposition that a higher degree of formal and real gender-based equality could be attained through legal reforms and equality policies. Also, many feminists publicly argued that state officials need to take into consideration the demands of different groups of women in elaborating public policies. These feminist positions, however, have not targeted job training policy as a top priority area. Moreover, unlike groups in many other countries in this book, feminist groups do not attempt to influence the content of occupational training policy. Some feminist groups such as the Women's Foundation (Fundación Mujeres) (among others) are very active at the implementation stage of job training policies, delivering courses for women. These groups are not the main actors formulating policies.

Universe of Debates

Since the 1980s, in general, job training debates tend to be difficult to trace given that discussions often receive little coverage in the media and are usually conducted far from the public eye in ministerial meetings or closed meetings of organized labor, management, and state. When policy actors do make policy statements, they tend to make sweeping highly rhetorical generalizations that do not actually reflect the specific decisions on job training. As Pérez-Díaz (1995:8–9) asserts, the rhetorical dynamics of training politics continued into the 1990s.

The universe of debates on job training reflects the processes of institution building since the transition to democracy. Indeed, many of the debates in job training are related to the design of the public infrastructure for both making general policy decisions and implementing specific programs. These debates over responsibility and institution development focus on the following questions. Should national or regional governments be responsible? Should a single set of institutions administer all training programs or should there be one set of agencies for unemployed workers and
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the entrenched unemployment in Spain. Most job training debates in dem-

tional training is the issue of Spain's escalating unemployment. Since 1982,
the unemployment rate has always been higher than 15%.5 Some political
and social actors consider job training programs as part of the solution to
the entrenched unemployment in Spain. Most job training debates in dem-
ocratic Spain have a European dimension, particularly since 1986 when
Spain joined the European Community. European Social Fund cofunding
of professional training was an important impetus in the growth of Spanish
training policy as well.

The following debates were the major debates over job training in
Spain since the 1980s: the discussion that led to the 1985 National Plan of
Professional Training and Insertion; the ongoing debate over the need for
an effective centralized coordinating agency, punctuated by the 1986 Act
on the General Council on Professional Training; discussions on the appro-

The first three debates were selected for analysis following the three RNGS
criteria of decisional system importance, life cycle, and issue area salience.
As for decisional system importance, the National Plan represents a policy
decision made by the cabinet, the 1986 Act allows debates to be traced in
the parliamentary arena, and the articulation of the 1992 Agreements pro-
vides an opportunity to study the debates in the context of tripartite nego-
tiations among labor, management, and the state. Regarding life cycle, the
three debates cover the period when Spain had a comprehensive job train-
ing policy in place, from the 1980s to the 1990s. In terms of issue area
salience, job training experts and practitioners consistently point to the
1985 National Plan, the 1986 Act, and the two tripartite Agreements in
1992 as the most significant policies in establishing the framework of
Spain's job training system.6 The debates that preceded the three 1996 tri-
partite Agreements (on expansion of job training programs and the estab-
ishment of the National System of Certificates) are not studied in this
chapter because the National System of Certificates was not elaborated in

Debate Selection

the closed nature of the subsystem means that policy discussions on the
topic are rarely covered in the media. Reconstructing the flow of debates
therefore, quite problematic. The following sources were used: legisla-
tion, resolutions of trade union congresses, journals published by employ-
oerizations and trade unions, press articles, a parliamentary debate,
published and unpublished documents from the Women's Institute, politi-
cl party electoral programs and resolutions of party congresses, a period-
tal journal on job training that contains (among other things) interviews
with the main political and social actors in the subsystem of occupational
training (Herramientas: Revista de Formacion para el Empleo), and sec-

Debate 1: EU Funding in the 1985 National Plan: Symbolic/No Response

Debate Trajectory and Dominant Frame

On October 9, 1984 one of the main trade unions (the UGT) and the main
employers' associations (the CEOE and the CEPYME) signed the Social
and Economic Agreement (Acuerdo Economico y Social, AES). The AES
followed other tripartite and bipartite corporatist pacts endorsed in the
preceding years. The AES mainly focused on unemployment issues. It also
contained some training objectives including the promotion of youth entry
into the labor market through occupational programs (Cruz 1996:7-8).7

In the context of Spain's entry into the EC in 1986, policymakers knew
that the European Social Fund financed up to 65% of occupational train-
ing activities in EC member states, provided that member states financed
the remaining part. Top-level politicians and bureaucrats realized that
Spain would risk missing the opportunity to receive European money in the
absence of a comprehensive job training policy. Prior to 1985, piecemeal
measures had articulated national job training policies. In 1985, the gov-
ernment adopted the National Plan of Professional Training and Insertion
(Plan Nacional de Formacion e Insertion Profesional) or the National Plan
(Ministerial Ordinance of 31 July 1985 by the Ministry of Labor and Social
Security).6

As with most job training debates in Spain, public discussions of the
National Plan were brief and outside of the public eye.3 The major players
were the Minister of Labor and the top-level politicians and bureaucrats
working for him, the main trade unions—the UGT and the CCOO, the
main employers associations—CEOE and CEPYME, and representatives of the major political parties. All participants agreed on the need to take advantage of European money to foster job training programs in Spain. These were seen as a tool to combat unemployment, given the fact that the Spanish unemployment rate was already the highest in the EC, 21% in 1985 (Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development 1992:43). Indeed, one of the main objectives of the National Plan was to develop occupational programs directed to specific groups, among their unemployed people. Thus, occupational training was seen as part of active labor market policies more generally (Cruz 1996). Even the Conservative party and employers’ organizations were not opposed to the enhancement of job training courses with European funds; however, they still did emphasize the necessity to foster private investment as the most important means to reduce unemployment.

Gendering the Debate

There were no specific references made to gender or women’s issues in the negotiations that led up to the 1985 Agreement. Instead, a highly gender-neutral frame was taken throughout the closed negotiations that produced the plan. For example, unemployed individuals were referred to without any mention of whether they were women and men. This is striking given the fact that in the past two decades female unemployment rates had been significantly higher than male unemployment rates.

Women’s Policy Office Activities, Women’s Movement Impact, and State Response

The absence of any references to gender in the debate on the National Plan was not only due to the apathy of the social partners and the top politicians and bureaucrats in the Ministry of Labor to women’s inferior position in the labor force and the solutions a gendered approach to job training could bring. Although the Women’s Institute had a broad mandate to promote initiatives to improve the status of women in all areas of public policy, it did not participate in the discussions on the National Plan, primarily because it was not yet fully operational until 1986; hence women’s policy agency activities during this first debate were symbolic.

The various women’s movement groups neither took a public stance on the Plan nor directly participated in the Plan’s formulation. Individual feminists activists affiliated with the major trade unions and women’s section in the unions did not express a position on the details of the National Plan prior to its approval either. Indeed, there was no evidence of feminism influence from the trade unions in any of the debates, even though many of the trade unions took public positions on women’s rights and training issues more generally. For instance, feminists in the major trade unions (the Workers’ Commissions and the General Workers’ Union) drew attention to the fact that more men than women participated in job training courses, and that women tended to take part in courses related to traditionally female professions, such as secretaries (Secretaría Confederal de la Mujer de Comisiones Obreras 1980:27; Unión General de Trabajadores 1978:26).

The Women’s Secretariat of the Workers’ Commissions asserted that occupational training was of little use to women in finding a job or in improving individual job prospects, that women over 30 years hardly participated in job training courses due to family responsibilities, and that the content of some courses was clearly discriminatory, particularly those on home economics (Secretaría Confederal de la Mujer de Comisiones Obreras 1980:27–29, 1983:220). The women’s section also demanded that training programs provide women with more useful skills to compete in the labor market, that job training reorient women toward traditionally male occupations, and that some job training schemes should be especially targeted to women (Secretaría Confederal de la Mujer de Comisiones Obreras 1980:30). Although they saw job training programs as a potential aid to women, trade union feminists tended to consider the creation of jobs in the public sector a more effective means of promoting employment equality between men and women. One women’s section criticized occupational schemes, partially financed by workers’ contributions, for placing an unnecessary financial burden on workers (Trabajadora May 1985, number 4:4).

Feminists in the General Workers’ Union (UGT) saw training as a means to narrow the difference in education and skills between women and men. The overall goal of training, for UGT feminists, was to place women in traditionally underrepresented professions and in upper management positions in all occupations. They called for the scheduling of training courses for women during work hours, full pay for time spent in training classes, and special courses for women seeking to reenter the labor market (Unión Year 1978, Number 45:1; Year 1978, Number 58:28; Unión General de Trabajadores 1978:26, 34). Given the absence of women in the debates leading up to the National Plan and the lack of any mention of the issues raised for the most part by trade union feminists, the National Plan represents a no response on women’s movement impact and state response.

Women’s Policy Agency Characteristics

The mid-1980s was the founding period for the Women’s Institute. It was officially created in 1983 (Act 16 of October 24). The scope of the Women’s Institute was very broad including five comprehensive goals: to
promote policy initiatives for women through formal enactment of policy statements, to study all aspects of women’s situation in Spain, to oversee the implementation of women’s policy, to receive and handle women’s discrimination complaints, and to increase women’s knowledge of their rights. The Women’s Institute is a permanent bureaucratic agency located within an established ministry, the Ministry of Culture up to 1988, from 1988 to 1996 the Ministry of Social Affairs, and since 1996 the Ministry of Labor and Social Affairs. As an administrative subunit, the Institute has little formal policymaking power. In the mid-1980s, the Institute was only just acquiring a limited staff and budget. It took almost two years to hire the complete staff and to establish the management authorities of the Institute. From 1983 to 1988 the director of the Institute was Carlota Bustelo, a well-known former Socialist deputy and feminist activist. Job training was not among the top priorities of the Women’s Institute in the 1980s. For example, training issues were not mentioned in any of the issues of the Institutes publication, *Mujeres* (Women), in the 1980s.

**Independent Variables**

In general, the Spanish feminist movement has been historically weak, but not negligible, with its activities involving only a minority of women. The movement has shown some signs of strength, among others, the organization of national feminist conferences being regularly attended by between 3,000 and 5,000 women. In comparison with other Western countries, the movement in Spain has not achieved high visibility in the mass media or initiated many public debates. In the 1980s, the women’s movement was in a stage of consolidation and decline after a stage of emergence in the 1960s and early 1970s and the period of growth from 1975 to early 1980s. Most of the feminist groups were close to the Left. There were high expectations among feminist groups close to the Socialist party about the potential gender equality achievements of a socialist government, given the fact that the party was in power in 1982 for the first time since the 1930s. Job training was not a priority for the movement, although many feminists supported the general principle that policymakers had to elaborate policies in all areas that took into account the interests of different groups of women. There was no evidence of any antifeminist movement mobilizing around the issue of job training during this period.

The job training subsystem remained closed and structured by the tripartite relations among management, labor, and the state under the control of the Socialist Party (PSOE).
Gendering the Debate

Throughout the debates there was no mention of men’s and women’s role or the need of a representative for female workers or women’s groups. As was also the case of the first debate, this debate was not gendered. The legislative outcome did not contain any reference to women or gender either.

Women’s Policy Office Activities, Women’s Movement Impact, and State Response

The Women’s Institute did not participate in the debates on the General Council. Not only was the Women’s Institute absent from public discussions, but the Institute’s publication, *Mujeres* (Women), and its activity reports in the mid-1980s made no mention of the need for women’s representation on the tripartite authority. Thus, women’s policy agency activity can be characterized as symbolic.

Feminist women were not directly involved in the parliamentary discussion that led to the establishment of the General Council. Although isolated women participated in the parliamentary debates as Members of Parliament, they did not speak out in favor of women’s/gender issues. The policy content of the Act that established the General Council did not coincide with women’s movement goals (presumably the inclusion of representatives of women’s interests in the General Council). The composition of the Council clearly represented the tripartite nature of the job training policy establishment with a total of 36 representatives, 13 from state, labor and management. The 1986 Act gave the power of appointment for the state representatives to the Ministers of Labor and Education. The presidency of the Council was to alternate between the Ministers of Labor and Education. Four vice presidents were established: one from the Ministries of Labor or Education, a second from the Ministries of Agriculture and Industry, a third from organized labor, and a fourth from management. Not only was there no specific position on the Council for the Women’s Institute, but its parent Ministry, at the time the Minister of Culture, was not allocated a seat. Thus the movement impact/state response was non-responsive.

Women’s Policy Agency Characteristics and Independent Variables

Given the similar time frame on the Act on the Council, see the discussion on the previous debate.

Gendering the Debate

Throughout discussions on the 1992 Agreements there was no specific mention made of special categories of women workers or gender-based causes for women’s inferior status. As in the first two debates, gender-neu-
central discourse prevailed during the whole debate prior to the 1992 agreements. The 1992 Agreements did not contain any reference to women or gender.

Women's Policy Office Activities, Women's Movement Impact, and State Response

Following the same pattern of past debates, there was no evidence of women from the Women's Institute, women's groups or women's sections in the trade unions participating in the debates on the management of job training programs. Despite the symbolic activities of the Institute in the debates on the 1992 Agreement, the women's policy agency was much more active on occupational training policy issues than in the mid-1980s. For instance, in 1988, the Institute organized a workshop on "Occupational Training from the Women's Point of View," whose proceedings were published (Instituto de la Mujer 1989). In this workshop the debate was clearly gendered. Job training was seen as particularly important for both men and women in Spain. Nevertheless, such training was perceived as especially necessary for women, since unemployment affected them differently: in 1988 the female unemployment rate as a percentage of the female labor force (27%) was almost double the male unemployment rate as a proportion of the male labor force (15%) (Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development 1992:43-44), a pattern that persisted in the 1990s. Occupational training was also understood as a tool to combat gender-based occupational segregation. Training could provide women with the skills required to perform jobs in which they had traditionally been underrepresented. Participants in this debate were also aware of the difficulties many women faced in taking part in training schemes due to their family responsibilities. As with most workshops, seminars, conferences organized by the Women's Institute, Labor Ministry policymakers and trade unionists, in most cases women, attended with very few representatives of business. International experts were also invited. 17

The women from the Ministry of Labor and trade unions who attended the specific workshops on women's issues were not present in the debates that preceded the 1992 Agreements. For the most part the participants in these discussions were men. Another important initiative of the Women's Institute on job training mainly in the 1990s was the Institute dissemination of information on financial aid from the European Community to projects that offered professional training for women (Instituto de la Mujer 1992:154-163; Mujeres Year 1991, Number 4:11).

Prior to the 1992 Agreements, the women's commissions of the main trade unions also made public general views on job training, but no detailed opinions on the specific matters regulated by the Agreements. The women's sections of both unions claimed that women were still discriminated against in access to job training; that occupational courses were of little help for women in finding jobs or improving their position in the labor market because the skills acquired in the courses were not those in supply in the labor market; and that women tended to participate in courses related to traditionally female occupations, which were associated with low salaries and scarce promotion opportunities. The commissions demanded that more money be spent on women's training, that child care be available for women with family responsibilities attending occupational programs, and that courses redirect women toward professions where jobs were available. These departments were also active in the political area of job training through the management of some occupational courses for women (Departamento Confederal de la Mujer de Unión General de Trabajadores 1985, 1989; Gaceta Sindical January 1991, number 91:7; March 1992, Number 103:15; Trabajadora March 1988, number 14:2; September 1988, Number 16:6; Unión March 1988, number 100:18; October 1989, Number 111:28).

Similarly, whereas there were no feminist organizations involved with negotiations on the two 1992 Accords, feminist groups did help administer programs earmarked for women. The Women's Foundation, Fundación Mujeres, for example, organized training courses for women in the 1990s. Still, neither the women's policy office nor women's groups publicly advanced any specific demands in the debates leading to the 1992 Agreements.

It is no surprise, therefore, that the final Agreements contained nothing that could be construed as being feminist. Again, there was no mention of gender issues or discrimination, nor did the negotiators demand that more money be spent on women's training, that child care be available for women with family responsibilities attending occupational programs, and that courses redirect women toward professions where jobs were available. Combined with the absence of any vocal female voices in the debates, the outcome of this third policy debate was no response.

Women's Policy Agency Characteristics

The Women's Institute continued to have a broad scope, to be a bureaucratic agency and to be removed from government decision-making. The resources and staff of the Women's Institute had continuously increased since its establishment in 1983. In 1992, the WI had a budget of 2,297.4 million pesetas ($11.6 million) and a staff of more than 150 people (Instituto de la Mujer 1992:18-20, 40). In 1992, the director of the Women's Institute was Purificación Gutiérrez, a lawyer and former activist in the women's movement. Since the late 1980s, job training was an important issue for the agency, although not a top priority. The Institute clearly focused on job training issues for women in its first Equality Plan—a com-
comprehensive set of gender-equality measures to be taken by state units in a given time period. The first Equality Plan adopted in 1988 and implemented through 1990 contained several sections on job training and employment issues (Instituto de la Mujer 1988:61–69, 73).

**Independent Variables**

Regarding women's movement characteristics, this movement was in a stage of consolidation/decline. Many strands of the feminist movement were close to the Left. Generally speaking, pushing for training reform was not on the agenda of the women's movement feminist movement, although there was some attention paid to administering training programs. There was no countermovement with respect to the policy issue of job training.

The tripartite and closed nature of the job training subsystem remained in place in the early 1990s and the Socialist party continued to control parliament and government. The job training policy subsystem was changing during this period, particularly with the transfer of powers to the regions and the administration of training programs for employed individuals by labor and management without the state. However, these changes did not make the policy system more open to feminist influence. The Women's Institute, furthermore, did not have any jurisdiction over the new responsibility given to the regions in the 1990s. The Institute can intervene (indirectly) only in issues administered by the central state.

**CONCLUSION**

This chapter has shown that the Women's Institute did not directly participate in policy debates that preceded the most important political decisions on job training throughout the 1980s and 1990s. The absence of the Institute in these mainstream debates on job training occurred while it became increasingly active in job training issues and women's rights. The closed nature of the training policy subsystem, with its fixed line-up of participants—major political parties of government, organized labor, and management—appeared to be a major factor in the limited influence and presence of the Women's Institute and of women's movements actors, feminist trade unionists, and feminist approaches to the problem of training more generally.

One should not conclude, however, that the Women's Institute was a completely irrelevant actor in training policy discussions. As the chapter pointed out, the Institute organized an important workshop on job training issues for women, inviting the major players of the job training subsystem. The proceedings from the workshop were a major publication for the Institute that year as well (Instituto de la Mujer 1989). Moreover, the Institute managed to include notions of gender into training policy decisions outside of the three examined in this chapter. For instance, the influential annual report published by the Economic and Social Council (Consejo Económico y Social) 18 on the Spanish economy since 1994 includes a section on job training that thoroughly analyzes women's and men's position in job training programs. The inclusion of this gendered component was most likely a result of the participation of the director of the Women's Institute, Carlota Bustelo, in the small committee that elaborated the report.

It appears that the Institute exercises an indirect impact in the political arena. On one hand, it is highly improbable that femocrats are asked to participate in parliamentary work, in a press conference on job training organized by the social partners and/or the state, or in tripartite meetings among the state, trade unions, and employers' organizations. Therefore, the researcher will not find any documented proof that the Women's Institute participated in the elaboration of job training policy. On the other hand, what the Institute actually does is to raise the awareness of the general public and of policy actors about the gender dimensions of professional training through organizing workshops, commissioning research, publishing research findings, etc. It also persuades women to participate in job training programs. If the Institute does this, it influences the policymaking process at the implementation stage. The assessment of such indirect influence is difficult. This chapter did not conduct such an analysis and, thus, it remains a matter for further research.

Moreover, the Women's Institute may very well have a more informal influence on decision-making through persuading individual policy actors to support feminist measures behind closed doors. Institute femocrats might informally speak with politicians from the Ministry of Labor about job training and women in casual meetings especially arranged for this purpose. Femocrats of the Women's Institute might also lobby policymakers in political party conferences and other party activities. Again, this informal type of persuasion is not investigated in this chapter and is a matter for future analysis.

This chapter does not entirely discount the claim made by some of the literature on state feminism that women's policy machineries represent a certain institutionalization of one of the most important parts of the new social movements of the 1970s. Rather, the dynamics of the three debates in the Spanish case qualifies the claim of institutionalizing women's movements. Rather than bringing women's interests into the mainstream affairs of the state, women's policy agencies may help social movements to gain influence at the margins of the state through peripheral institutionalization.
NOTES
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2. For research on the Women's Institute, see for example Threlfall (1996, 1998) and Valiente (1995, 1997).
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5. The unemployment rate is the proportion of registered unemployed people in the active population (employed and registered unemployed individuals).
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