

Table 38: Public Expenditure in Social Protection (million Euros.)

| | 1995 | 1996 | 1997 | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 |
|-----------------------------|--------|--------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Total Expenditure in Social | | | | | | |
| Prot | 93.564 | 98.836 | 101.682 | 105.882 | 109.819 | 117.842 |
| Unemployment | 15.441 | 14.395 | 14.206 | 14.080 | 14.129 | 14.922 |
| Illness, Public Care | 26.886 | 28.580 | 28.944 | 30.634 | 32.008 | 34.063 |
| Disableness | 6.865 | 7.557 | 7.756 | 8.461 | 8.599 | 9.242 |
| Old age | 37.147 | 40.136 | 42.292 | 43.882 | 46.030 | 49.933 |
| Rent of survival | 4.068 | 4.276 | 4.388 | 4.566 | 4.693 | 5.013 |
| Family and Sons | 1.624 | 1.895 | 2.053 | 2.205 | 2.303 | 2.599 |
| Housing | 1.009 | 1.239 | 1.234 | 1.334 | 1.309 | 1.310 |
| Social Exclusion | 524 | 759 | 809 | 722 | 748 | 761 |

Source: MTAS, "Cuentas Integradas de Protección Social"

The growth of employment and an important reform on unemployment benefits in 1995 explain the reduction in unemployment expenditure during the last years. The social protection has lost 2 percentage points of GNP and the unemployment expenditure has reduced for 1.1 points, next to 1/3 in these relative terms.

Table 39: Evolution of Gross National Production, Social Protection and Unemployment Expenditure

| | Million € (of 2000) | | | GNP ratio (%) | |
|------|--------------------------|-------------------|---------|--------------------------|-------------------|
| | Unemployment expenditure | Social Protection | GNP | Unemployment expenditure | Social Protection |
| 1995 | 17.423 | 105.575 | 495.138 | 3,5 | 21,3 |
| 1996 | 15.679 | 107.649 | 506.822 | 3,1 | 21,2 |
| 1997 | 15.180 | 108.651 | 529.235 | 2,9 | 20,5 |
| 1998 | 14.792 | 111.243 | 555.977 | 2,7 | 20,0 |
| 1999 | 14.533 | 112.960 | 583.009 | 2,5 | 19,4 |
| 2000 | 14.887 | 117.569 | 608.787 | 2,4 | 19,3 |

In real terms, during the last 6 years, the social protection expenditure has grown half of the GNP, while unemployment expenditure has cut down by 14,6%. The better off in households' economies have mainly come from the employment expansion.

Even saving 2.6 millions € of year 2000 on unemployment expenditure, the reduction of unemployment rates has allowed to maintain (with a little improve) the coverage of benefits (very low anyhow) and to increase the active policies (mainly training) while the low levels of benefit amounts were maintained (21,9% of the full time medium wage for the non contributory mean-tested benefits what means around 382 Euros).

Table 40: Public expense on Unemployment (€ of 2000)

| | Public expenditure on unemployment (Mill €) | Growth per year | € / Estimated Unemployed | € / Registered unemployed | € / Recipients |
|------|--|--------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------------|----------------|
| 1995 | 17.423 | | 4.868 | 7.157 | 11.944 |
| 1996 | 15.679 | -10,0 | 4.490 | 6.929 | 11.681 |
| 1997 | 15.180 | -3,2 | 4.610 | 7.199 | 12.235 |
| 1998 | 14.792 | -2,6 | 4.992 | 7.917 | 13.090 |
| 1999 | 14.533 | -1,8 | 5.673 | 8.871 | 13.818 |
| 2000 | 14.887 | 2,4 | 6.468 | 9.626 | 14.278 |

3.4 Poverty rate

Family impact of these Spanish development seems to be positive in terms of employment but also explains Spanish proportion of family living with low income and the difficulties to eradicate extreme poverty.

Although Spanish poverty rate it is only one point superior to European the estimation of this rate on the basis of the European Union poverty line the proportion of personas living under the poverty rate in Spain will grow until reaching the 33% of the population in 1996 (ECHP).

Table 41: Shares of persons with low income 1996

| | Spain | EU |
|---|-------|-------|
| Total (x1.000.000) | 38.8 | 353.0 |
| Low Income (x1.000.000) | 7,1 | 60,3 |
| Poverty Rate % | 18 | 17 |
| Income Poverty Rate on the basis of a European Union poverty line ECHP 1996 | 33 | 17 |

In most European countries women are in more risk of poverty specially focusing the age groups 45-54 and 55-64 but in Spain those differences are not so clear because poverty rate affect quite similarly to the whole population as poverty and precariousness are explained more in a household perspective than in an individualistic one.

Table 42: Poverty rates of men and women by age (%)

| | Tot | Tot | Tot | -18 | -18 | 18- | 18- | 25- | 25- | 35- | 35- | 45- | 45- | 55- | 55- | +=65 | +=65 |
|-------|-----|------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|------|------|
| | Pop | Male | Fe | Ma | Fe | Ma | Fe | Ma | Fe | Ma | Fe | Ma | Fe | Ma | Fe | Ma | Fe |
| SPAIN | 18 | 18 | 18 | 23 | 24 | 23 | 21 | 14 | 17 | 17 | 17 | 18 | 17 | 18 | 17 | 15 | 14 |
| EU | 17 | 16 | 18 | 21 | 21 | 22 | 26 | 14 | 16 | 13 | 15 | 13 | 14 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 20 |

ECHP 1996

4. Forms of Leave

These reforms have to be understood in the process of social change in the women's economic and social role and in relationship with another political measures oriented to reinforce this process. During the last decade, the women's employment has risen in one third and now it means more than 40% of the total employment.

Table 43: Women's employment in Spain (1981-2001)

| | Total employed (thousands) | Employed women (thousands) | Ratio (%) | Quinquennium growth (%) |
|------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------|----------------------------|
| 1981 | 11.227,86 | 3.170,48 | 31,1 | |
| 1986 | 10.833,82 | 3.176,73 | 32,3 | 0,20 |
| 1991 | 12.622,14 | 4.072,96 | 35,5 | 28,21 |
| 1996 | 12.342,01 | 4.314,75 | 38,5 | 5,94 |
| 2001 | 14.706,59 | 5.502,42 | 41,2 | 27,53 |

Source: Labour Force Survey (2nd trimester)

In Spain, the introduction of the specific problems of women in the political agenda has followed a chronological process of other European countries. The policies were not institutionalised till the first Government of the PSOE with the creation of the Woman Institute (Law 16/1983, of 24th October of 1983), that manages Plans for the Equality of Opportunities for Women and Men (PIOM). From 1982 to 1992 three PIOMs have been executed. In the 2000 it finished the fourth PIOM approved by Popular Party Government.

The Policies of equality between 1982 and 1997 in Spain achieved quantitative changes but did not transform some basic structural inequalities. Women at work form a sizeable proportion of paid-work but they are far from having the same opportunities than men. Social and economic changes took place with the incorporation of women to paid-work but with very little innovation in the redistribution of home tasks between sexes, in increasing social services and public support. Thus, the family and caring responsibilities were overloading the women's lives and reducing their opportunities. Jobs involving a high level of devotion or the possibility of following a career, were not easily compatible with child or elderly care.

There is no doubt that one of the reasons that limited hiring of women was the additional cost for the enterprises. To favour the equality for women at the labour market the government approved the law 11/98 of 4th of September. This law regulated reductions of the quotas to the Social Security in the

interim contracts. Those contracts can be signed with unemployed to substitute male/female workers in periods of rest by motherhood, adoption or fosterage. The employers have the right to a reduction of the 100% from the business quota to the Social Security¹. This kind of contract is known as “contratos de coste cero”².

When these contracts are signed to substitute workers in extended leave of absence by family care then the employers have right to an allowance of the quotas of Social Security by “Contingencias Comunes”.

The *Law 39/1999 of 5th of November, to favour conciliation of family and labour life* constitutes another step for the elimination of these obstacles to women labour integration, but it does not sufficiently solve, in an effective way, the different problems that bring up the conciliation of family and labour life and the equality of opportunities.

Main principles and aims of the law

- Spanish Constitution, Articles 14 and 9.2 eliminate the obstacles for men and women to participate in the public and private life.
- To apply the European Community Guidelines over motherhood and forms of leave for parents (92/85/CEE of 19th of October of 1992 and 96/34/CEE of 3rd of June of 1996).
- To incorporate the conclusions from the IV World-wide Conference of Women celebrated in Beijing. One of these conclusions is the harmonisation of the family responsibilities between men and women.
- To give a greater cohesion to the norm that has suffered partial reforms in the last years.
- To attend the social and union demands.

Most outstanding advances of the law

- Greater protection against dismissal during maternity, risk during pregnancy leaves and extended leave of absence for family care.
- New circumstances for the suspension of the contract of employment, (including right to social benefits) by risk during the pregnancy when the conditions at work can influence negatively the health of the pregnant workers or in the health of the foetus.
- New figure of working day (reduction in 1/2 or 1/3) and extended leave of absence to take care of relatives to a second degree of consanguinity.

¹ Allowance by “Contingencias Comunes” –illness and no labour accident- and business quotas by unemployment, training and FOGASA –“Fondo de Garantía Salarial” -.

² Contracts of zero cost.

- The possibility to enjoy the leave form by motherhood, fosterage and adoption, simultaneously or successively, when both parents work. Extends father's leave from 4 to 10 weeks.
- 16 weeks of leave by motherhood/adoption/fosterage for children under 6 years.
- In cases of multiple birth/adoption/fosterage: 18 weeks of leave.
- Workers can determine the time of breast-feeding in the working day.
- Workers have right to a period of extended leave of absence of three years to care children under 6 years (before this law it was under 5 years) natural or adopted, and one year in case of direct care of a relative, who is sick or physically/mentally handicapped till a second degree of consanguinity

According to the competences assumed in specific matters, some *Autonomous Communities* in Spain can regulate measures to complement the state norms.

The "Comunidad Foral de Navarra" for example, has approved the Foral Order 82/2001, of 5th of July, to favour the labour insertion of women and the conciliation of the family and labour life. The main objectives are to provide economic aids to female workers that reduce working day by reasons of childcare, birth or adoption, and to subsidize those enterprises that hire those women for their substitution.

The Foral Order 82/2001, of the 5th of July, favours the labour insertion of women and the conciliation of the family and labour life. It designs aids for workers that reduce their working day by legal situations of guard by birth or adoption as well as to the enterprises that hire women for their substitution. Beneficiaries:

- a) in agreement with the article 37.5 of the Statute of Workers, they will have the right to reduction of the working day immediately after the maternal period of rest.
- b) the enterprises that hire women in unemployment, by means of contract that cover reduced working day. Amount and duration of the subvention in depth lost equivalent to 10% of its salary with a maximum limit of 120,20 euros (20.000 ptas.) monthly by maximum period of one year, and by household.
- c) the enterprise will perceive a subvention equivalent to a reduction of the 50% of the business quotas to the Social Security for all the contingencies - quotation to the Social Security, Unemployment, Salary Fund of Guarantee and Professional Formation-, with a limit of 120,20 euros (20.000 ptas.) monthly, while maintain the worker maximum of one year. When the woman hired by enterprise is long term unemployment, the subvention will be the equivalent to the 75% of the business quotas for all the contingencies, with a limit of 180,30 euros (30.000 ptas.) monthly. The aids contemplated in this Foral Order have the character of "minimis"

according with the conditions established in the Regulation (CE) 69/2001 of the Commission of 12 of January, relative to aids of minimis (DOCE 13-1-2001).

The European Community guidelines suggested that the right to enjoy the leave of motherhood/fatherhood should be individual and not shared by both parents as it is defined in the Spanish laws. In addition, we underline, all these schemes are very based on the traditional ones for supporting motherhood with little extend in time and casuistry. The reductions in working time are very moderates and with strong cutbacks in worker's income, while the public effort is limited. (See the annex I table for a detailed description of all forms of leave analysed here)

Implementation and effectiveness of Forms of leave for caring

It has not been easy to find statistical references to measure the impact of these reforms. In the extreme, the Government of Navarra doesn't show statistical data because of the very low level of implementation of these measures. In other cases, as it is possible to see below, the reference dates are different for different variables and the period from the new laws is too short.

Anyhow, something may be concluded from these data. The leaves for motherhood, up to 192.449 last year, meant a half of the total births in Spain, and these have been growing at a bigger rhythm than the total births. The new approaches on risks during pregnancy represent only a very little proportion of total leaves but it is growing fast.

Table 44: Number of leaves by maternity (yearly)

| | 1999 | 2000 | Growth |
|--|---------|---------|--------|
| | 165.946 | 192.449 | 16% |

Source: MTAS

Table 45: Development in the number of processes of leave (January-August)

| | 2000 | 2001 | Growth |
|-----------------------|---------|---------|--------|
| Maternity | 129.494 | 140.445 | 8,5% |
| Risk during pregnancy | 122 | 441 | 261,5% |
| Sum of leaves | 129.616 | 140.886 | 8,7% |

Source: MTAS

All these measures seems to produce a real impact in Social Security expenses, but from the basis of a very low level. The total expenditure growth 10% in 2001, from 721 to almost 800 millions €, but this meant an amount of 3,747 € per leave and 1,822 € per birth.

Table 46: Accumulative expenditure (January-August) by maternity and risk during the pregnancy (millions)

| | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | Growth 2000/1999 (%) | Growth 2001/2000 (%) |
|---------------------------|--------|--------|--------|----------------------------|----------------------------|
| Maternity | 68.326 | 79.240 | 89.662 | 16,0 | 13,2 |
| Risk during the pregnancy | | 40 | 322 | | 705,0 |
| Sum of leaves | 70.325 | 81.280 | 91.985 | 15,6 | 13,2 |

Source: MTAS

Table 47 : Cost per process of leave (€)

| | 2000 | 2001 | Growth |
|-----------------------|-------|-------|--------|
| Maternity | 3.678 | 3.837 | 4,3 |
| Risk during pregnancy | 1.971 | 4.388 | 122,7 |
| Sum of leaves | 3.769 | 3.924 | 4,1 |

Source: Calculation from MTAS data

Table 48: Interim contracts

| 1998 (Sep. - Dec.) ³ | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 (Jan. – Feb.) |
|---------------------------------|--------|--------|--------------------|
| 11.825 | 29.627 | 37.241 | 3.248 |

The interim contracts have developed so quickly and may represent 19.4% of total motherhood leaves, but less than one tenth of the total births.

With these figures it's not easy to evaluate the real impact of the measures. Another perspective is to watch at the statistical data on labour force. In the next table we may see how the growth of leaves for motherhood has been bigger just before the new laws. This is more significant in a context of birth rates that shows the contrary sign, with more births just in the last two years.

³ Law passed in September.

Table 49: Employees who did not work in a week of reference because of leave of maternity (thousands)

| | Male | Female | Total | Growth (%) |
|------|------|--------|-------|------------|
| 1995 | .2 | 20.3 | 20.4 | -- |
| 1996 | .3 | 26.0 | 26.3 | 28,9 |
| 1997 | .0 | 29.9 | 29.9 | 13,7 |
| 1998 | .2 | 34.0 | 34.2 | 14,4 |
| 1999 | .4 | 36.9 | 37.2 | 8,8 |
| 2000 | .3 | 34.7 | 35.0 | -5,9 |
| 2001 | 1.0 | 36.0 | 37.0 | 5,7 |

Source: Labour Force Survey

Table 50: Total births by year.

| | Births | Growth by year |
|------|---------|----------------|
| 1995 | 363.469 | -1,80 |
| 1996 | 362.626 | -0,23 |
| 1997 | 369.035 | 1,77 |
| 1998 | 365.193 | -1,04 |
| 1999 | 380.130 | 4,09 |
| 2000 | 395.756 | 4,11 |

Source: INE, MNP (Natural Population Movement)

5. Quality and employment: final comments

To put in context the analysis on Spanish labour market from the point of view of social quality, and to help us to conclude in both aspects, theoretical and methodological, it may be useful to clarify the different approaches on the concept of quality and the different implications in the political and social debate and in the decision making processes.

As a first observation, we have not asked to the people (to the workers) what kind of jobs do they want. This brings us a more *subjective approach* of employment quality, as the dimensions and characteristics of job more valuable for people, the ways and conditions in that people want to fulfil their work. Are we sure of that people do really want flexibility, adaptability, qualifications and lifelong training in their lives? Are we sure that happens in the same way in all EU member states? Actually, all these dimensions could also have different senses in different social and territorial context. This subjective conception is well related to usual methodologies of researching on poverty, such as Townsend's approach on deprivation or Deleeck and Leyden's methodologies for defining poverty lines. We may be sceptical about the usefulness and possibility for introducing this subjective conception on employment quality, but, at least, it offers us a possibility to be sensitive to different social meaning for similar facts in different context. An example, from the Spanish point of view, maybe the household reference for valuating the social impact of employment quality deficits, measured in individual terms; and also the different social rules on schedules and calendars (midday meals, holydays, festivals,...). The first aspect, the more relevant, open the analysis to the ability of the family for offering security and complementary resources to the individuals (possibly very different across Europe).

The competitive approach of quality. It is the Commission's Document approach. It may be understood as high quality or good quality jobs. This concept is related with the Commission's strategy for competitiveness that is being supported in official documents on employment and social policy (Green Books and white books).

This is a complex conception of quality with very wide kinds of dimensions. The very hard core is the characteristic of work that make itself creative, innovative and with a high level of proficiency. Job qualification, flexibility, gratifying task contents, good environment conditions are some of the main dimensions. Participation and social acknowledgement are important too, as the ways for improving personal implication.

This conception may be related to the conditions of the labour market, the social policy and the social context that make possible to develop the whole capacity of production in a related society. In this

sense, it is important to focus on different dimensions as: Accessibility of jobs to women, young people, ethnic minorities or disabled persons. Adaptability and flexibility (on working time, on tasks content,...) Social protection conditions, social services availability, life long learning and worker's qualification adaptability.

It's important to underline the economic and technical content of this conception of quality. It is not clear that this processes of developing quality in employment is directly brought about by the economic competitiveness and the technological change (at least not everywhere). It seems to be, more clearly, like an opportunity for developing this kind of strategy. It is a chance: it is possible to find a place for this. Hence, we are talking about a political kind of process, aimed to preserve and improve the "European social model" in a new international context of globalisation and risks. The Lisbon European Council, in this sense, set the goal of "the most knowledge-based economy in the world capable of sustainable economic growth with more and better jobs and greater social cohesion".

This lead us to the debate of the viability of generalising this strategy, even in European context. Is it possible for all member states to be successful (in economic and social terms) with this strategy? Do all of them have the same opportunities to enjoy this process of improving quality? These are strictly political questions, but they may be a relevant reference for our reflection.

We would be talking , in this sense, about a success reference for maintaining and for improving this "European social model", whatever this may be. We may find two different scenarios inside Europe:

Countries (and central branches) with high standards of working conditions and strict labour regulation may introduce flexibility, with an economic logic, through new organization models, as the way to improve competitiveness (flexicurity strategy: flexibility+quality).

Countries (and peripheral branches) where we can find a high level of flexibility, but an insecure flexibility: Why are they to introduce new organization models? When the insecure flexibility cost are externalised (to individuals or to public sector) and the economic achievements are relevant, which will be the incentive to go over the quality road?.

Thus, the option presented here is an *increasingly dual labour market*, at national and European level. Spain, as we have shown here, is a model of this process. Some countries have make the *precarious employment as one of the central issues for their competitiveness strategy*. And this strategy becomes a vicious circle that thwarts even the reformers' attempt to improve employment (and social) quality.

References

- Aguar, M. J., A. Casademunt y J.M. Molins, "Las organizaciones empresariales en la etapa de la consolidación democrática" en F. Mígueles y c. Prieto, *Las relaciones de empleo en España*, Madrid, Siglo XXI, 1999.
- Bilbao, A. (1988), 'El trabajador socializado', *Sociología del Trabajo*, No 4, Madrid.
- Bilbao, A. (1998), 'El trabajador precario', *Arxius de Sociologia*, No 2, Junio 1998, pp. 39-56. Valencia.
- Carbonero, M. A.(1997), *Estrategias laborales de las familias en España*. CES, Madrid
- Castillo J.J. y Prieto C. (1983) *Condiciones de Trabajo. Un enfoque renovador de la sociología del trabajo*. CIS, Madrid
- Castillo J.J. (comp.) (1999) *El trabajo del futuro*. Editorial Complutense, Madrid
- CES (1996b): *El trabajo a tiempo parcial*. Informe del Consejo Económico y Social, Madrid.
- CES (2000): *Memoria sobre la situación socioeconómica y laboral*. CES, Madrid.
- CGT (Confederación General del Trabajo), (2001), *Guía sobre empresas de trabajo temporal: todo lo que quiso saber y nadie le quiso contar*, CGT.
- Elordi, A., del Rey, S., Serrano, J. E. y Gala, C., (2001), *Trabajo, temporalidad y empresas de trabajo temporal en España*, Madrid, Asociación de Grandes Empresas de Trabajo Temporal.
- Flórez, I., "Análisis comparativo entre la reforma laboral de 1997 y la de 1994.", *Relaciones laborales*, nº 1998-I, 1998.
- García Serrano, C., Garrido, L. and Toharía, L., (1999), 'Empleo y paro en España: algunas cuestiones candentes', en Miguélez, F. and Prieto, C., dir., (1999), *Las relaciones de empleo en España*, Madrid, S. XXI.
- Gil, A., González Calvet, J. y Mir, P. (2001): "La desigualtat salarial a Catalunya" 2 Simposi sobre les desigualtats socials a Catalunya, Barcelona, Fundació Jaume Bofia.

Lope, A. y Martín Artiles, A., (1995), 'Las relaciones entre formación y empleo: ¿Qué formación, para qué empleo?', *Revista de Economía y Sociología del Trabajo*, No. 27-28, Marzo-Junio 1995, pp. 254-262.

Martín Urriza, C. Y Zarapuz Puertas, L. (2000): Empleo y discriminación salarial, Madrid, Secretaría Confederal de la Mujer de Comisiones Obreras.

Miguélez, F. and Prieto, C., dirs., (1991): *Las relaciones laborales en España*, Madrid, S. XXI.

Miguélez, F., Lope, A., Coller, X. y López, P. (1998): 'La segmentación laboral: hacia una tipología del ámbito productivo', *Papers. Revista de Sociología*, nº55, pp.45-77.

Miguélez, F. and Prieto, C., dirs., (1999), *Las relaciones de empleo en España*, Madrid, S. XXI.

Moreno, G., Rodríguez, J.M y Vera, J. (1996): La participación laboral femenina y la discriminación salarial en España, Madrid, Consejo Económico y Social.

Pérez Camarero, S. y Hidalgo, A. (2000): Los salarios en España., Madrid Argentario, Visor.

Polavieja, Javier G. (2001): *Insiders and outsiders: structure and consciousness effects of labour market deregulation in Spain (1984-1997)* Instituto Juan March de Estudios e investigaciones, Madrid.

7th of April. Article of Gaceta de los Negocios. "Seguridad laboral y Prevención de Riesgos Laborales".

ANNEX

GENERAL DATA ABOUT SPANISH LABOUR FORCE

| TOTAL | 1998 | | 1999 | | 2000 | |
|---|-------|--------|-------|--------|-------|--------|
| | SPAIN | EU | SPAIN | EU | SPAIN | EU |
| Total Population (000) | 39117 | 369978 | 39164 | 370917 | 39211 | 372036 |
| Population aged 15-64 | 26363 | 247558 | 26229 | 248057 | 26271 | 248640 |
| Total Employment | 14664 | 159205 | 15173 | 161772 | 15671 | 164702 |
| Population in emp. Aged 15-64 | 13222 | 151739 | 13822 | 154518 | 14443 | 157351 |
| Employment rate (%pop.aged 15-64) | 50.2 | 61.3 | 52.7 | 62.3 | 55 | 63.3 |
| Employment rate (%pop.aged 15-24) | 28 | 38.3 | 30.9 | 39.3 | 32.7 | 40.3 |
| Employment rate (%pop.aged 25-54) | 63.1 | 74.5 | 65.6 | 75.6 | 67.8 | 76.6 |
| Employment rate (%pop.aged 55-64) | 34.8 | 36.6 | 34.9 | 37.1 | 36.8 | 37.7 |
| FTE Employment rate(%pop.aged 15-64) | 47.6 | 56.1 | 50.2 | 57.1 | 52.5 | 57.9 |
| Self Employment (%total employment) | 17.8 | 15.4 | 17.1 | 15 | 16.6 | 14.8 |
| Part time employment (%total employment) | 7.9 | 17.3 | 8.1 | 17.6 | 8 | 17.7 |
| Fixed term contracts (%total employment) | 27.2 | 11 | 27.2 | 11.3 | 26.7 | 11.4 |
| Employment in Services (%total employment) | 63.5 | 67.6 | 63.4 | 68.3 | 63.5 | 68.8 |
| Employment in industry (% of total employment) | 29.1 | 27.6 | 29.6 | 27.2 | 30 | 26.9 |
| Employment in Agriculture (% of total employment) | 7.5 | 4.7 | 7 | 4.5 | 6.6 | 4.4 |
| Activity rate (%pop.aged 15-64) | 61.8 | 68.2 | 62.6 | 68.7 | 64 | 69 |

Source: Eurostat.

GENERAL DATA ABOUT SPANISH LABOUR FORCE by GENDER (source: EUROSTAT)

| FEMALE | 1998 | | 1999 | | 2000 | |
|---|-------|--------|-------|--------|-------|--------|
| | SPAIN | EU | SPAIN | EU | SPAIN | EU |
| Total Population | 20090 | 189436 | 20162 | 189868 | 20130 | 190320 |
| Population aged 15-64 | 13294 | 123728 | 13270 | 124004 | 13263 | 124267 |
| Total employment | 5205 | 66665 | 5520 | 68328 | 5833 | 69956 |
| TOTAL EMPLOYMENT | 4654 | 63789 | 4988 | 65510 | 5351 | 67120 |
| Employment rate (%pop.aged 15-64) | 35 | 51.6 | 37.6 | 52.8 | 40.3 | 54 |
| Employment rate (%pop.aged 15-24) | 21.2 | 34.8 | 23.9 | 35.8 | 26.2 | 36.8 |
| Employment rate (%pop.aged 25-54) | 44.8 | 63.3 | 47.6 | 64.7 | 50.7 | 65.9 |
| Employment rate (%pop.aged 55-64) | 18.8 | 26.3 | 19.1 | 27.1 | 20.1 | 27.9 |
| FTE Employment rate(%pop.aged 15-64) | 31.5 | 43.1 | 33.8 | 44.3 | 36.6 | 45.3 |
| Self employed (% total employment) | 15.3 | 11.6 | 14.3 | 11.2 | 13.7 | 10.9 |
| Part time employment (%total employment) | 16.9 | 32.9 | 17.1 | 33.2 | 16.9 | 33.3 |
| Fixed term contracts (%total employment) | 29.3 | 12.3 | 30 | 12.7 | 29.5 | 12.9 |
| Employment in Services (%total employmentent | 81.9 | 81.5 | 81.9 | 82.1 | 81.3 | 82.5 |
| Employment in industry (% of total employment) | 12.9 | 14.7 | 13.2 | 14.3 | 13.9 | 14 |
| Employment in Agriculture (% of total employment) | 5.3 | 3.8 | 4.9 | 3.6 | 4.7 | 3.4 |
| Activity rate (%pop.aged 15-64) | 47.8 | 58.5 | 48.9 | 59.3 | 50.8 | 59.9 |
| Total unemployment | 1693 | 8549 | 1501 | 8006 | 1396 | 7304 |
| Unemployment rate (%labour force 15+) | 26.6 | 11.7 | 23 | 10.8 | 20.6 | 9.7 |
| Youth unemployment rate (%labour force | 43.3 | 21.1 | 37.2 | | 33.3 | 17.6 |
| Long term unemployment rate (%labour force) | 14.5 | 5.7 | 11.5 | 5 | 9.5 | 4.4 |
| Youth unemployment rate (%labour force | 16.2 | 9.2 | 14.2 | 8.6 | 13.1 | 7.9 |
| MALES | 1998 | | 1999 | | 2000 | |
| | SPAIN | EU | SPAIN | EU | SPAIN | EU |
| Population aged 15-64 | 19027 | 180542 | 19002 | 181049 | 19082 | 181717 |
| <i>Highest level of ecuation completed</i> | 13069 | 123831 | 12958 | 124052 | 13008 | 124374 |
| Total employment | 9458 | 92539 | 9653 | 93443 | 9838 | 94746 |
| TOTAL EMPLOYMENT | 8568 | 87949 | 8834 | 89008 | 9092 | 90233 |
| Employment rate (%pop.aged 15-64) | 65.6 | 71 | 68.2 | 71.8 | 69.9 | 72.5 |
| Employment rate (%pop.aged 15-24) | 34.5 | 41.8 | 37.7 | 42.8 | 39 | 43.8 |
| Employment rate (%pop.aged 25-54) | 82 | 85.7 | 84.2 | 86.4 | 85.4 | 87.2 |
| Employment rate (%pop.aged 55-64) | 52.1 | 47.3 | 52.4 | 47.5 | 55 | 47.9 |

| | | | | | | |
|---|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| FTE Employment rate(%pop.aged 15-64) | 64.3 | 69.5 | 67.2 | 70.3 | 69 | 71 |
| Self Employment (%total employment) | 19.1 | 19.1 | 18.7 | 17.9 | 18.3 | 17.6 |
| Part time employment (%total employment) | 2.9 | 6 | 2.9 | 6.1 | 2.8 | 6.2 |
| Fixed term contracts (%total employment) | 26 | 10.1 | 25.6 | 10.3 | 25 | 10.3 |
| Employment in Services (%total employment) | 53.1 | 57.4 | 52.6 | 57.8 | 52.7 | 58.3 |
| Employment in industry (% of total employment) | 38.2 | 37.2 | 39.2 | 36.9 | 39.6 | 36.6 |
| Employment in Agriculture (% of total employment) | 8.7 | 5.4 | 8.2 | 5.2 | 7.7 | 5.1 |
| Activity rate (%pop.aged 15-64) | 76 | 77.9 | 76.7 | 78.1 | 77.4 | 78.1 |
| Total unemployment | 1364 | 8355 | 1105 | 7719 | 985 | 6881 |
| Unemployment rate (%labour force 15+) | 13.8 | 8.6 | 11.2 | 7.9 | 9.8 | 7 |
| <i>Youth unemployment rate (%labour force)</i> | | 18.2 | 23.2 | 16.6 | 20.6 | 14.9 |
| Long term unemployment rate (%labour force) | 6 | 3.9 | 4.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3 |
| Youth unemployment rate (%pop Aged 15-24) | 13.2 | 9.2 | 10.8 | 8.5 | 9.8 | 7.7 |

Reasons of Inactivity Population+16 (1997)

| | TOTAL | MEN | WOMEN |
|-------------------------------------|--------|-------|--------|
| Students | 3190 | 1482 | 1708 |
| Retirement | 4605 | 3328 | 1277 |
| Housekeepers | 5488 | 418 | 5416 |
| Permanently disabled | 659 | 370 | 289 |
| Pensioners (other than retirement) | 1860 | 156 | 1703 |
| Other | 379 | 376 | 103 |
| TOTAL | 16.152 | 5.655 | 10.497 |

Source: EPA (National Labour Force Survey)