

Unraveling the Political Economy of Social Policy Formation: The Spanish Compulsory Maternity leave, 1900-1936

Online Appendix

A 1. Considerations on the Public Information (INP 1927)

This Appendix section aims to provide a more detailed explanation of the representativeness and contents of the public information 1927. Although it has been used in many works (Cuesta 1988, 2012; Samaniego 1988; Pons and Vilar 2014), this paper is the first attempt to treat its information systematically, so this Appendix may be helpful for future researchers to use this source. The public information published summarises multiple reports gathered by the INP. Therefore, combining a more systematic approach with a more careful, qualitative reading is fruitful. In particular, it shows the underlying ideological preferences of social groups regarding women, the family, the State and the labour market (an approach to these topics in Cuesta 1988, 2012).

Table A1.1 disaggregates the responses from social groups. Working-class organisations (trade unions and individual representatives), employers' associations (companies, chambers of commerce and employers' mutual benefit societies) and the medical sector (medical associations and schools, and individual doctors) are the three most important groups. The report also allows for an analysis of the views of women and Catholics separately. Catholics predominate among the mixed trade unions —they were actively Catholic and included both employers and workers— and among the cultural and political associations. They were also well-represented among workers.

On the other hand, some female respondents overlapped with the Catholic ones—in the case of cultural, political or trade unions. Moreover, most female trade unions were actively Catholic, as only one socialist women's union, The Female Awakening, answered the survey¹. The report also shows respondents linked to the incipient —though weak— Spanish feminist organisations, such as Clara Campoamor, Victoria Kent, and Julia Peguero².

¹ Founded in 1903 and with ramifications in the agriculture and textile sectors, it was an important socialist union of working women (Simón 2014).

² Clara Campoamor was a leading figure of the Spanish suffragettes. She and Victoria Kent —who would eventually oppose women's suffrage some years later— were part of the Women's Lyceum Club, and Peguero was a leading figure at the National Association of Spanish Women.

Table A1.1. Respondents to the 1927 public information by social group

Group	Total (n°)	% of total	Catholic (n°)	Catholic (% of category)	Women (n°)	Women (% of category)
Working-class	49	29%	12	24%	7	14%
Employers	32	19%	0	0%	0	0%
Medical sector	46	27%	0	0%	2	4%
Welfare Institutions	9	5%	1	11%	0	0%
Friendly societies	8	5%	1	13%	0	0%
Charity and philanthropy	7	4%	1	14%	0	0%
Mixed Unions	3	2%	3	100%	0	0%
Cultural and political associations	8	5%	5	63%	6	75%
Other individuals	6	4%	0	0%	1	17%
Total	168	100%	23	14%*	16	10%*

Note (*) These numbers indicate the share of Catholics and women within the total respondents

Source: Own elaboration based on INP (1927)

Among workers, it includes some UGT provincial branches and the leading socialist figures Lucio Martínez and Santiago Ramos³. The report also identifies remarkable Catholic unions such as the Regional Confederation of the *Libres* in Northern Spain or the Regional Confederation of Catholic Unions in Eastern Spain. Nevertheless, one of the report's most problematic omissions is the under-representation of Catalan workers. It only collects one —feminine and Catholic— union in a region which clustered the bulk of the ongoing maternity allowance's beneficiaries and female labour force participation⁴. Primo de Rivera's prosecution of anarchists, together with socialists' meagre presence in Catalonia, explain this underrepresentation⁵.

The INP also collected opinions from some employers' leading associations, such as the Federation of Manufacturers of Spinning and Textile Industries of Catalonia, the

³ Lucio Martínez was a member of the National Commission that coordinated UGT and PSOE and, during the Republic, a member of the UGT executive. Santiago Ramos was a spokesman at the INP (Martín 2008).

⁴ Between 1923 and 1929, Catalonia and the Balearic Islands concentrated 48,57% of the maternity allowance recipients (Pons 2010).

⁵ While Catalonia concentrated nearly half of the CNT membership, in 1931, the UGT only had 16.683 members in the region— 2.41% of their militancy (Bizcarrondo 2008).

Employer's Federation of Guipúzcoa, and the Employer Commercial Defence of Madrid. However, the information did not record any answers from agricultural employers. Given the importance of agricultural employment among the Spanish labour force, and as it was a primary focus of social conflict, successive Governments and the INP struggled to include agricultural workers in social policies (Espuelas 2022)⁶. However, Spanish agriculture was dominated by large, labour-intensive exploitations and small-sized family farms with fluid class relations, both with a high degree of seasonal employment. Such characteristics persistently hampered the implementation of new social policies in the sector and the proper performance of the existing ones, largely due to employers' resistance (Espuelas 2022). This opposition may explain the lack of agricultural employers in the report.

The report did not record the participation of any insurance company either. Again, their opposition to the development of public social insurance and the conflicts that the INP maintained with the General Insurance Board during this period could explain their absence (Pons and Vilar 2014; Cuesta 1988).

⁶ According to census data provided by Núñez (1989, 164), agriculture employed 48% of the Spanish overall labour force and 24% of working women. Nicolau (2005, 149) provides a similar picture. Moreover, considering that official statistics highly underrepresented female agricultural employment (Humphries and Sarasúa 2012), their importance would have been even higher.

Table A1.2. Topics under discussion in the 1927 public information responses

Group	Total listed	Topics under discussion, in absolute numbers and as a % of total listed					
		Benefits		Coverage		Funding	
		n°	%	n°	%	n°	%
Non-Catholic workers	37	20	54%	26	70%	27	73%
Catholic workers	12	6	50%	8	67%	7	58%
Medical sector	46	26	57%	15	33%	10	22%
Employers	32	13	41%	10	31%	15	47%
Total	127	65	51%	59	46%	59	46%
Catholics	23	15	65%	18	78%	16	70%
Women	16	12	75%	11	69%	13	81%

Note: The last two rows account for all Catholics' and women's responses in the public information, not just those belonging to the categories reported in the previous rows.

Source: Own elaboration based on INP (1927).

Table A1.2 summarises the topics covered in the responses submitted by workers, employers, and doctors, which accounted for 127 out of 168 total respondents. It also reflects the topic covered in all Catholics' and women's responses collected in the public information (either belonging or not to the abovementioned categories). I rely on these groups because they were active in earlier debates and for clarification purposes. Catholic and female responses accounted for most of the opinions of cultural and political associations, mixed unions and other individuals. Among the categories I am not considering separately, almost all welfare institutions sided with the INP, while friendly societies lacked the lobbying capacity of the worker's unions and accounted for a tiny percentage of total responses.

A2. Raw distribution of social groups' preferences

This section summarises the distribution of the social groups' explicit preferences regarding maternity leave models. It is the data used to build Figures 1-3 in the paper. Providing this information aims to increase the paper's transparency and facilitate future researchers to use the data differently.

Table A2.1. Distribution of revealed preferences regarding benefits (absolute numbers)

Typology	Leave extension (weeks)				Compensation (wage proportion)*				Compensation (average)		Compensation (modal value)	Breastfeeding benefit				
	Less than 12	12 or more	Other	NS	Less than 80%	80%-100%	More than 100%	NS	Total Benefits	Daily <i>pesetas</i>		Wage proportion	Monetary	In-kind	NS	Total
INP Bill proposal		X				X				2,78	90%	2,78			X	
Non-Catholic workers	4	7	0	6	3	14	0	3	20	2,46	79%	2,78	2	0	15	17
Catholic workers	2	2	1	1	1	3	1	1	6	3,64	118%	3,09	3	0	3	6
Catholic	3	8	1	3	1	8	2	4	15	3,19	103%	3,09	8	1	6	15
Medical sector	8	4	1	11	2	8	5	11	26	3,11	101%	2,78	3	8	13	24
Women	4	5	0	3	1	4	2	5	12	3,24	105%	2,78	3	4	5	12
Employers	3	8	0	1	1	8	3	1	13	3,28	106%	2,78	2	1	9	12
Welfare institutions	1	2	0	0	0	4	0	0	4	2,76	89%	2,78	2	0	1	3
Friendly societies	1	2	0	1	0	4	0	0	4	2,64	85%	2,78	0	1	3	4
Charity and philanthropy	2	2	0	0	0	2	1	1	4	3,09	100%	x	0	0	4	4
Mixed unions	0	3	0	0	0	2	0	1	3	2,39	77%	3,09	2	0	1	3
Cultural and political associations	2	3	0	1	0	3	1	2	6	3,13	101%	2,78	1	3	2	6
Other individuals	1	1	0	3	0	1	1	3	5	4,05	131%	x	0	1	4	5
Total	31	47	3	30	9	61	16	32	118	3,08**	100%**	2,87	15	14	55	84

*This proportion refers to the average wage of textile-working women (see text)

Source: Own elaboration based on *Resumen de la Información pública sobre el anteproyecto de seguro de maternidad* (INP 1927)

Table A2.1 (cont.). Distribution of revealed preferences regarding coverage, and funding

Typology	Coverage								Contribution				
	Wives of the insured workers			Excluded sectors									
	No	Yes	NS	Domestic and more sectors	Domestic	None	NS	Total coverage	Tripartite	Employers + State	State	Other	Total Contribution
INP Bill proposal	X				X				X				
Non-Catholic workers	5	17	4	1	16	8	1	26	7	19	0	1	27
Catholic workers	1	7	0	0	0	4	4	8	6	1	0	0	7
Catholic	6	12	0	1	5	6	6	18	14	1	0	1	16
Medical sector	9	4	2	1	2	8	4	15	7	0	1	2	10
Women	7	6	0	0	3	5	4	12	7	3	1	2	13
Employers	9	0	1	4	6	0	0	10	10	0	4	1	15
Welfare institutions	1	2	0	0	3	0	0	3	5	0	0	0	5
Friendly societies	4	2	0	0	3	2	1	6	2	1	0	1	4
Charity and philanthropy	2	2	0	0	1	2	1	4	3	2	0	0	5
Mixed unions	1	2	0	1	0	1	1	3	5	0	0	1	6
Cultural and political associations	5	1	0	0	3	2	1	6	3	0	0	0	3
Other individuals	2	1	0	0	1	1	1	3	1	0	1	0	2
Total	52	56	7	8	43	39	24	114	70	27	7	9	113

Source: Own elaboration based on *Resumen de la Información pública sobre el anteproyecto de seguro de maternidad* (INP 1927).