

The Gender Situation in Asturian Social Movements (Spain): Discourse or Commitment?

La situación del género en los movimientos sociales asturianos (España): ¿discurso o compromiso?

Lorena Morán Neches  <http://orcid.org/0000-0003-1089-3378>

Universidad de Oviedo, España, moranlorena@uniovi.es

Julio Rodríguez Suárez  <http://orcid.org/0000-0003-4373-8905>

Universidad de Oviedo, España, rodriguezjulio@uniovi.es

Juan Herrero  <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-0146-2464>

Universidad de Oviedo, España, olaizola@uniovi.es

Original article
language:spanish

Translated by:
Caridad Rodríguez

Corresponding author:
Lorena Morán Neches,
moranlorena@uniovi.es

Reception:
08/02/2024

Approval:
12/04/2024



Abstract: Although progressive social movements begin from egalitarian discursive positions, this does not necessarily imply that their practices are neutral to the existing axes of oppression in society. The aim of this study is to determine to what extent gender equality is present in their internal dynamics. For this purpose, the Battery for the Psychosocial Analysis of Mobilization (BAPsM) was created and implemented, obtaining a sample of 920 participants. The results show a high awareness of sexism that translates, to a lesser extent, into actions to promote equality in the groups, especially in areas such as public representation or the distribution of tasks. This highlights the role that gender plays in the motives, ways, and actions of social participation.

Key words: social participation, mobilization, activism, equality, awareness.

Resumen: A pesar de que los movimientos sociales progresistas parten de posicionamientos discursivos igualitarios, esto no implica necesariamente que sus prácticas sean neutrales a los ejes de opresión existentes en la sociedad. El presente estudio tiene como objetivo conocer en qué medida la igualdad de género está presente en sus dinámicas internas. Para ello, se ha creado y difundido la Batería para el Análisis Psicosocial de la Movilización (BAPsM), obteniendo una muestra de 920 participantes. Los resultados muestran una alta sensibilización respecto al sexismo

que se traduce en menor medida en acciones para promover la igualdad en los colectivos, especialmente en áreas como la representación pública o el reparto de tareas. Con ello se visibiliza el papel que el género cumple en los motivos, vías y acciones de la participación social.

Palabras clave: participación social; movilización; activismo; igualdad; concienciación

Introduction.¹ Configuration of current social movements

In examining the state of gender equality within social movements, it is crucial to examine how these movements evolve and to what extent their structural characteristics align with those of other social organizations. To pursue this line of inquiry, we define social movements as organized collective entities that are structured around a cultural and political agenda for change from the margins of the institutional, as postulated by authors such as Batliwala (2012) and Biglia and Luna (2012).

The “new social movements” (Della Porta and Diani, 1999; Tarrow, 2012), which emerged in the second half of the 20th century, leave behind the class struggle to acquire a more heterogeneous character, affecting the citizenry as a whole. As opposed to the more strategic approach of traditional movements, these do not respond to individual acquisitive needs, but to collective “post-acquisitive needs” (Alonso, 1998), giving voice to more “proactive” or transformative organizations, such as pacifists, ecologists or feminists (Bergantiños and Ibarra, 2007), than “reactive” or conservationist ones (Castells 1997), such as the defense of public services, for example: health or pensions.

Thus, these new social movements exhibit multiple particularities in their forms of organization and action, distancing themselves from the influence of parties, associations, or unions, and even from ideologies, to focus on carrying out collective and concrete tasks in service of a common cause (Villasante, 2020).

¹ This work was supported by the Aid for University Teacher Training (FPU) of the Ministry of Universities of the Government of Spain, under grant 998758, and the Aid for Research Groups of the Principality of Asturias (Spanish Foundation for Science and Technology), under grant -FCYT-SV-PA-21-AYUT/2021/51411.

In this context, the growing interrelation and convergence of different struggles and social movements stands out. The transversality and intersectionality that characterize current demands often link them with other mobilization spaces, such as the connection between feminism and environmentalism or the LGTBIQ+ movement (Morán-Neches and Rodríguez-Suárez, 2022; Prévost, 2023; Mediavilla *et al.*, 2023).

As a consequence, current social movements deploy rebellious actions through contentious and disruptive political tactics from more horizontal and egalitarian organizational structures (Tilly, 2008). In this regard, global protests by movements like #OccupyWallStreet, #Yosoy132, the Arab Spring, or 15M in the Spanish context marked a significant shift in the forms of organization and action of social movements (Lugo, 2017; Díez and Betancor, 2019). Their emergence entailed a qualitative change in political action repertoires (Sandoval, 2020), paving the way for current forms of mobilization and beginning to shape what some authors have referred to as the “new-new social movements” (Cammaerts, 2021). In this way, current progressive social movements are envisioned as projects towards new bottom-up democratic processes, thereby contributing to reducing the distance between citizens and the state (Dunetzat, 2017a).

Generally, engagement with various claims involves certain socially shared regularities (Tajfel, 1982), such as positioning themselves as counter-hegemonic movements opposed to dominations and privileges deemed unjustified (Obreque & Cárdenas, 2023). This encompasses widespread condemnation of gender-based discrimination within progressive movements, or at the very least, a discursive rejection of the most overt forms of violence against women. However, the fact that these organizations aim for greater democratization and equality does not necessarily mean that their practices consistently align with these values (Pedraza & Jhael, 2023). Little is still known about the role gender plays in social mobilization and to what extent this egalitarian discourse translates into a genuine commitment to avoid reproducing power dynamics, even inadvertently (Cortés & Zapata, 2021).

In this regard, the gender perspective remains inadequately integrated within studies of social movements, being predominantly present in Spanish context research focused exclusively on feminist movements (Morán-Neches & Rodríguez-Suárez, 2022). Taking this into account, the following research question is posed: To what extent

is gender equality actually present in the internal dynamics of progressive social movements? Accordingly, this study aims to analyze the role of gender in participation within current social movements in Asturias, Spain. Specifically, the specific objectives include delving into the particularities of female social participation and understanding the extent to which progressive social movements (encompassing ecological, labor, feminist, LGBTQI+, and linguistic-territorial claims, as elaborated later) operate according to egalitarian work dynamics.

Development

The situation of gender in progressive social movements

It is undeniable that, despite the progressive achievements of the feminist movement, there still exists substantive real inequality between women and men. Regarding social movements, according to Osborne (2005), this translates into differences across various aspects such as access to resources (López-Rodríguez & Gutiérrez, 2023), socialization models (Mazzucchelli *et al.*, 2021), available time (Ajenjo & García, 2019; Moreno-Colom *et al.*, 2023), or the influence of friends (Amorós, 1990).

Consequently, women have occupied a particular role within social movements, often rendered invisible and significantly reduced throughout history by being relegated to the private sphere of domesticity, thereby excluding them from the public spaces to which politics has been restricted (Di Liscia, 2007). On the other hand, as female presence in social spaces has increased, it has also been limited by transforming them into “female” contexts or debates, thereby maintaining a distinction from “male” domains (Suárez *et al.*, 2024).

Furthermore, despite their democratic intentions and specific claims (such as social rights, ecology, or feminisms), which may appear more accessible to women, progressive movements are not neutral to the axes of oppression operating within the societies they inhabit (Horn, 2013). As Dunezat (2017b) argues, patriarchal logics within activism are not only a consequence of this unequal context but also reproduce hierarchical power structures through, for example, the division of activist labor. It is within the inconsistency of simultaneously delegitimizing and reproducing domination where the special interest lies in analyzing the dynamics of internal functioning in collective mobilization.

Authors like Acker (1990) have been pointing out for decades that gender is a structural element in all social organizations, despite organizational logic appearing neutral in this regard. It is precisely behind this apparent neutrality toward gender where all expressions, experiences, and perspectives that do not conform to the “universal” male subject have been obscured (Cortés & Zapata, 2021). Moreover, this neutrality also serves to individualize biased behaviors or gender-based discrimination, thereby deflecting organizations from acknowledging the causal and structural origins of such inequalities and their responsibility (Cerva, 2014). However, it is in the “deep structure” (Batliwala, 2012; Horn, 2013), latent and sometimes unconscious, of movements where deeply rooted gender roles are located, which crystallize in their patterns of participation.

For this reason, the analysis of the gender situation within social movements should not be reduced to merely the presence or absence of women in them but should instead delve into their organization and militant work to understand the extent to which they reproduce unequal patterns in this regard (Horn, 2013; Dunezat, 2017b).

In this regard, although the struggle for women’s rights is established in the social agenda, it is common for it to be viewed within organizations as a movable or secondary priority compared to the principal claims of the movement (Cortés and Zapata, 2021). Thus, the presence of women is considered a matter of quotas that supposedly resolves the issue, instrumentalizing women’s participation to legitimize the movement as progressive.

Consequently, the everyday reality of activism continues to place women in invisible tasks: roles dedicated to caregiving, perceiving them as “tea-makers rather than speech-makers” (Meer, 2005: 37); peaceful forms of participation, with radical or violent actions seen as inherently male (Morán-Néches and Rodríguez-Suárez, 2022); or positions far removed from decision-making and the representation of the collective (Biglia and Luna, 2012).

It should be noted, however, that even within movements where there is explicit rejection of feminism or identification with it, specific or indirect practices of what Dunezat (2017a) terms “practical feminism” do occur. These include the distribution of activist work or the denunciation of situations of violence, although such actions are not always well received within the group (Biglia & Luna, 2012). Failing to acknowledge the existence of gender inequalities or discriminations

within the collective under the guise of equality (Valcárcel, 2008) is more common among those with a more negative stance towards feminism (Velasco, 2016).

Furthermore, as posited by Mazzuchelli *et al.* (2021), participation can be transformed into an act of resistance against collective oppression, as is the case with feminisms. Thus, feminist identity can manifest through various behaviors, both explicit and implicit (Obreque & Cárdenas, 2023), with individuals more deeply involved in collective movements (even those unrelated to these specific claims) maintaining a more positive attitude towards feminisms (Velasco, 2016).

Methodology

The results presented are based on the analysis using the Battery for Psychosocial Analysis of Mobilization (BAPsM), a quantitative instrument constructed *ad hoc* from various scales that investigate issues such as life satisfaction, social well-being, group identification, and intention for activism and radicalism. Specifically, for the current study, the results of a block of custom questions concerning participation in general and gender equality within collectives in particular will be analyzed. This includes a deep dive into the following issues:

- Dynamics of social mobilization (degree of participation, main thematic focus, specific collective involved, reasons for participation or abstention).
- Characteristics of participation within the collective (time commitment, intensity of involvement, gender parity).
- Perception of gender equality within the collective's work (task distribution, representation, consideration of proposals, gender equality training, avoidance/condemnation of sexist attitudes).
- Measures taken to promote gender equality within the collective (gender-balanced participation, equal distribution of tasks, gender-balanced representation, equal consideration of proposals, gender equality training, avoidance/condemnation of sexist attitudes).
- Identification of sexist attitudes within the collective.

Given that the study population consists of participants in social movements, to ensure the processes of statistical inference, a convenience sampling was conducted using the snowball technique, aiming to overrepresent both women and individuals who are relatively active

in social movements. Dissemination was carried out by generating a database of 155 entities, organizations, and social action collectives in the Spanish region of Principality of Asturias, as well as direct contacts to ensure maximum thematic diversity. Consequently, the final sample comprised 920 participants. Sociodemographic characteristics are detailed in Table 1.²

Fieldwork took place between October 2021 and May 2022. The questionnaire was self-administered online via the SurveyMonkey platform. Prior to participation, participants were informed about the research objectives and methodology, as well as the confidentiality and anonymity of their responses, and their voluntary participation was obtained. The research was conducted in accordance with the requirements and protocols established by the Ethics Committee of the Department of Psychology at the University of Oviedo (Spain).

Data analysis was performed using the statistical software package SPSS version 27.0 (IBM Corp., 2021) (see Table 1).

Results

With respect to the social participation exhibited by the entire sample, 33.1% reported minimal or no involvement in any social movement, 29.6% indicated occasional participation, and 37.3% reported regular or high involvement in some social movement. Thus, the initial analysis of the research findings indicates, firstly, that regular and high participation is present in slightly more than one-third of the sample, aligning with the overrepresentation sought.

A brief overview of social participation in Asturias

Despite the observation that active participation is limited, within this group, we find a particular profile characterized by high mobilization across multiple areas. Thus, beyond the traditional organized and centralized participation within a specific social collective, there is a more extensive mobilization profile aimed at raising awareness and involvement in various types of advocacy.

2 All tables are in the Appendix at the end of this article (Editor's note).

Individually, 18 social issues were posed, and respondents rated their level of participation on a Likert scale from 1 to 5, where 1 means “I do not participate” and 5 means “I participate very actively.” The results are presented in Table 2, ranked from highest to lowest based on the overall average. The topics with the highest social participation include feminism, education, the environment, healthcare, and LGTBIQ+ rights, with scores exceeding 2.4 out of 5. In contrast, the topics with the lowest participation are religion, sports, as well as other issues specified by the respondents themselves, among which the most highlighted were functional diversity, mental health, solidarity economy, defense of rural areas, and childhood (see Table 2).

When asking those who participate in more than one movement in which their participation is most active, feminism is the most frequently mentioned, accounting for 27.2% of the sample, followed by education (9.2%) and labor rights (9%). When this data is disaggregated by gender, we find that the most active movement for women is feminism (35.2%), while for men, where thematic diversity is greater, it is labor rights (17.9%).

Delving into participation in specific collectives (associations, entities, and organizations), we find that nearly half of the individuals participating in any general social movement (52.1%) do so as part of a particular collective. Comparing this result by gender, 60.9% of men participate in a collective, compared to 51.2% of women. Among these individuals, 37.5% have been actively involved in such a collective for more than five years, 46.9% for one to five years, and only 15.6% have been involved for less than a year.

This indicates that bonds are highly consolidated in most cases, despite the relatively young sample. This is reflected in the fact that more than seven out of ten participants (73.6%) consider their involvement in the collective to be active or very active. Only 5% perceive their participation in the group as low or very low. However, it is noteworthy that this mobilization appears to be even more entrenched among men, with 91.7% having been involved in their collective for over a year, compared to 85.2% of women. Although the difference is small, this data underscores the enduring influence of a tradition where social participation in public spaces has historically been considered predominantly male.

On the other hand, when analyzing the reasons given by respondents who do not participate in any social movement, these have been

grouped into two different categories based on their origin. On one hand, there is a set of endogenous reasons, originating from the individuals themselves, such as lack of interest, lack of knowledge, and indifference or apathy. On the other hand, there are exogenous reasons, external to the individuals, such as lack of opportunities in their environment, economic constraints, work incompatibilities, and family incompatibilities. Comparing the presence of these reasons between women and men, it is observed that women report more exogenous reasons for not participating than men. This means that their participation is more limited by external factors compared to men, whose main reasons for non-participation are self-originated.

The results are straightforward to understand when women are often the ones explicitly or implicitly assuming the burden of family responsibilities, consequently experiencing greater difficulties in reconciling work and family life. In this context, social participation takes a backseat. Similarly, women face worse working conditions in terms of temporality, hours, and schedules, as well as remuneration, which also explains their greater economic limitations and difficulties in balancing their work performance with social participation.

Moreover, while a majority of individuals involved in social movements would like to dedicate more time than they currently do to these issues, this desire is more pronounced among women (83.1% compared to 73.1%). Likewise, among the reasons limiting their participation, the same pattern of endogenous and exogenous factors emerges. For women, family responsibilities and economic limitations carry more weight as reasons compared to men, for whom factors like indifference or apathy have a greater influence.

Gender situation

Despite gender equality not solely being defined by the mere presence of women in a space, the size and composition of a group significantly influence its internal dynamics, especially when members hold differing levels of social power (Osborne, 2005). Regarding participation in social movements within the sample, 44.1% predominantly consists of women, while in 31% of cases, men and women participate in roughly equal numbers. Only 3.9% of cases report entirely female participation, and 3.6% predominantly male; the remaining cases lack this information.

When questioning participants of specific collectives, associations, or organizations about the presence of women and men in their groups, the most frequent responses indicate roughly equal participation (37.8%) and predominantly female participation (34.9%). However, when narrowing down data from broader movements to specific collectives, entirely female participation (15%) and predominantly or entirely male participation (12.3%) become more significant.

These findings, which demonstrate a significant presence of women in mobilization spaces, are contextualized by the fact that feminist movements exhibit the highest participation levels in the sample, with many collectives being non-mixed. Thus, participation is predominantly or entirely female in 63.7% of collectives where women participate in the sample, compared to 18.5% for men. It is crucial to note that these results are representative of the analyzed sample but may not apply universally across all social movements.

To delve deeper into the gender situation within the internal dynamics of these movements, respondents were asked to what extent certain situations related to equality levels occur within their collective. The percentage results are displayed in Table 3, and descriptive statistics are presented in Table 4, arranged from highest to lowest presence.

Among the findings on this issue, notably high levels of avoidance and condemnation of sexist attitudes stand out, being present in 77.1% of the movements. Similarly, participants report that their participation spaces provide substantial training in gender equality (67.3%) and that both male and female proposals and initiatives are equally considered (68.2%). However, the areas with the lowest perceived levels of equality are the equitable distribution of tasks and the equal representation of the collective. When comparing the responses to these questions by women and men, we find some differences regarding the equal consideration of proposals and initiatives from both genders, as it is the women who report experiencing lower levels of equality. Specifically, while 23.8% of women believe there is little or no equality in this aspect, only 2.8% of men share this view (see Table 4).

When asking participants to what extent measures are being implemented to promote the aforementioned situations and thereby increase gender equality within their group, the results obtained are shown in Table 5 as percentages. Table 6 provides the descriptive statistics. Accordingly, a similar order is observed, where the avoidance or condemnation of sexist attitudes is the most commonly taken

measure, and the equal representation of the collective the least. This appears to demonstrate a feedback pattern within the groups. The realities with which the group is most sensitized are those for which the most measures are taken, while those with lower levels of gender equality are the least attended to, thereby reproducing the status quo of the group's unequal functioning (see Table 5).

All these results allow us to observe, collectively, that while sexist attitudes are predominantly condemned within social participation groups, practical measures to implement greater gender equality among participants are taken to a lesser extent. That is, although most groups advocate for gender equality as an ideal, representation, task distribution, and consideration of proposals are not always equally and fairly executed in their daily functioning. Specifically, better situations in terms of equality are observed in more theoretical commitments (condemnation of sexist attitudes, gender training, or equal consideration of contributions), whereas practical assumptions in collective dynamics (task distribution or representation) seem to face more challenges in implementing changes.

However, it is in the situation regarding the consideration of male and female proposals and initiatives where the responses of women and men differ the most, with women perceiving that fewer measures are being implemented. Again, the area of collective representation—the most public sphere of participation (a traditionally male-dominated space)—still exhibits higher levels of gender inequality and fewer measures of change undertaken by the groups. These results are common both in broader social movements and in specific groups (see Table 6).

Finally, when respondents were directly asked if they believe sexist attitudes exist within their group, 17.6% of participants responded affirmatively. Among those who do not participate in any specific group or organization but are involved in a social movement in a broader sense, 21.7% believe that sexist attitudes are present in the movement they are part of. There are no significant differences in the responses of men and women to this question, but differences emerge when considering the composition of participation within the group.

In groups with predominantly male participation, 41.5% of participants believe that sexist attitudes are present, compared to 17.5% in groups with predominantly female participation. In cases where the composition is gender-balanced, 11.6% believe that such behaviors occur.

An open-ended space was provided for those who wished to elaborate on their response with examples. The main situations described in this context relate to the occupation of spaces and times in both the representation of the group and in daily debates, interruptions of female participants, or a disregard for feminist work. Thus, it is evident that dialogue spaces, decision-making processes, and representation within the movements are the areas where the most sexist attitudes are identified by their members, as reflected by the overall results.

Discussion and conclusions

In 1990, Acker questioned why women are always concentrated at the lower levels of organizational structures, and the present study allows us to confirm that social movements, as a form of social organization, are no exception to this trend. In this regard, while one of the main findings is the widespread avoidance and condemnation of sexist attitudes reported by movements and collectives and an apparent awareness of this issue, it has also been found that the measures taken to promote gender equality are not evenly distributed across all involved areas. Thus, contrary to what has been found by researchers like Renzetti (1987) and Weis *et al.* (2018) from decades ago to the present—regarding women's reluctance to identify as feminists despite sharing the movement's values—in this case, a significant portion of the movements seems to align with feminist ideas by predominantly condemning sexist attitudes.

The results allow us to infer a latent unequal structure in terms of the tasks performed by men and women within participation. In this case, the aspects with the lowest perceived levels of equality are the representation of the collective and the division of tasks. Furthermore, the area where fewer measures are taken to promote equitable participation dynamics is again the representation of the collective, which is the public sphere of participation. These findings align with the theoretical background provided and demonstrate the reproduction of a system of sexual division of labor, where public spaces, historically masculinized, are most resistant to gender equality.

Thus, when referring to a division of tasks based on gender, we are necessarily talking about a sexual division of labor. And although in this case it is not primarily about economic and productive work, the same structural dynamics outlined by Acker (1990 and 2006) are

reproduced. According to the work of Dunezat (2017a and 2017b), the results of this study demonstrate how militant labor division often serves as a tool to perpetuate gender power dynamics.

Therefore, women are typically assigned organizational, caregiving, and group support tasks, while men take on activities deemed productive and prestigious, such as leadership, representation, or decision-making within the movement. This organizational structure is sustained through everyday dynamics that may appear innocuous but ultimately relegate women's presence, voice, and issues to the background, as highlighted by Horn (2013) and Cortés and Zapata (2021).

In this regard, it is important to reflect on the reasons for this situation, which may be related to the high level of condemnation and avoidance of sexist attitudes claimed to exist within the movements. It is common, as discussed by Valcárcel (2008), to experience a "mirage of equality," where it is assumed that because a significant part of the movement, often from its discourse, is sensitized to gender equality, a sufficiently favorable situation has already been achieved. This perception may lead to overlooking the unequal internal dynamics within groups and a lack of concerted efforts to address them.

In the words of Acker (2006), "one of the privileges of the privileged is not to see their privilege" (Acker, 2006: 452), despite the theoretical illegitimacy of gender inequalities within the organization. Paradoxically, due to this illegitimacy, gender inequalities become more subtle and internalized, making them harder to identify and challenge, often masking themselves under the guise of "benevolent sexism" (Obreque and Cárdenas, 2023).

According to research such as that by Biglia and Luna (2012), a significant portion of participants believe that gender discriminations continue to be reproduced and perpetuated in various forms within public spaces, events, internal dynamics, and private settings of social movements. This phenomenon is both a consequence and a cause of sexism within these movements, as it allows organizational structures and operational norms to remain unquestioned and, consequently, unchanged.

The main contribution of this study, therefore, lies in shedding light on the role of gender in social participation, from the factors that promote or limit it, to the methods and actions through which it is carried out. This deeper exploration goes beyond the superficial discourse of equality to examine the underlying structural dynamics of internal work where rhetoric may not permeate as deeply. This has allowed us

to highlight that areas and spaces still exist where a sexual division of militant labor persists, posing a barrier to achieving true equality in social participation.

However, it is important to note some specifics of the research. Firstly, the results reflect the characteristics of an intentional sample that seeks overrepresentation of women and actively participating individuals, as well as the composition of social movements in the Principality of Asturias. Therefore, they are not necessarily representative of social participation across Spain. It would be valuable to include greater diversity in political orientation within the sample to understand the realities of non-progressive movements, where more pronounced disparities might be expected.

On the other hand, it is worth noting that the data obtained come from the perspective that the participants themselves have regarding the reality of the mobilization spaces to which they belong; therefore, their generalization should be approached with caution. Along these lines, it would be important to understand whether the sexist attitudes identified and mentioned by the respondents are reported or highlighted within the collectives themselves, as this can influence the development of internal group dynamics, as reflected by Cortés and Zapata (2021), and may relate to the rest of the findings.

The challenges posed by this situation, therefore, involve questioning how to initiate a debate on the hierarchy of operational trends within collectives, allowing for the identification and reconsideration of the role that gender plays within them, as suggested by authors such as Biglia and Luna (2012) or Obreque and Cárdenas (2023). Given that the gender subjectivation differs across mobilizations and is heavily influenced by their specific division of militant labor (Dunezat, 2017b), a qualitative methodological approach to the everyday life and subjectivity within the participation collectives is considered necessary to further delve into this reality.

References

Acker, Joan (1990), "Hierarchies, jobs, bodies: A theory of gendered organizations", en *Gender & Society*, vol. 4, núm. 2, Reino Unido: Sage.

Acker, Joan (2006), "Inequality regimes. Gender, Class, and Race in Organizations", en *Gender & Society*, vol. 20, núm. 4, Reino Unido: Sage.

Ajenjo, Marc y García Román, Joan (2019), “La persistente desigualdad de género en el uso del tiempo en España”, en *Perspectives Demogràfiques*, vol. 14, España: Centre d’Etudis Demogràfics.

Alonso, Luis (1998), “La producción social de la necesidad y la modernización de la pobreza. Una reflexión desde lo político”, en Riechmann, Jorge [ed.], *Necesitar, desear, vivir: sobre necesidades, desarrollo humano, crecimiento económico y sustentabilidad*, España: La Catarata.

Amorós, Celia (1990), “Violencia contra las mujeres y pactos patriarcales”, en Sánchez Muñoz, Cristina y Maquieira d’Angelo, Virginia [coords.], *Violencia y sociedad patriarcal*, España: Pablo Iglesias.

Batliwala, Srilatha (2012), *Cambiando el mundo: estudios de caso sobre conceptos y prácticas de los movimientos de mujeres*, Canadá: Asociación para los Derechos de las Mujeres y el Desarrollo (AWID). Disponible en: https://www.awid.org/sites/default/files/atoms/files/cambiando_el_mundo_-_conceptos_y_practicas.pdf [22 de diciembre de 2023].

Bergantiños, Noemí e Ibarra Guell, Pedro (2007), “Eco-Pacifismo y Antimilitarismo. Nuevos Movimientos Sociales y Jóvenes en el Movimiento Alterglobalizador”, en *Revista de Estudios de la Juventud*, vol. 76, España: Instituto de la Juventud, Gobierno de España.

Biglia, Bárbara y Luna González, Esther (2012), “Reconocer el sexism en espacios participativos”, en *Revista de Investigación en Educación*, vol. 10, núm. 1, España: Universidad de Vigo.

Cammaerts, Bart (2021), “The new-new social movements: are social media changing the ontology of social movements?”, en *Mobilization*, vol. 26, núm. 3, Estados Unidos: San Diego State University.

Castells, Manuel (1997), *La era de la información. Economía, sociedad y cultura*, España: Alianza.

Cerva, Daniela (2014), “Participación política y violencia de género en México”, en *Revista Mexicana de Ciencias Políticas y Sociales*, vol. 59, núm. 222, México: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México.

Cortés, Ramón y Zapata Martelo, Emma (2021), “Los movimientos sociales desde la perspectiva feminista: pistas metodológicas para un análisis no androcéntrico de la acción social”, en *Revista de Estudios de Género*, vol. 54, México: Universidad de Guadalajara.

Della Porta, Donatella y Diani, Mario (1999), *Social movements. An introduction*, Inglaterra: Basil Blackwell.

Díez García, Rubén y Betancor Nuez, Gomer (2019), *Movimientos sociales, acción colectiva y cambio social en perspectiva. Continuidades y cambios en el estudio de los movimientos sociales*, País Vasco: Fundación Betiko.

Di Liscia, María Herminia (2007), “Memorias de mujeres. Un trabajo de empoderamiento”, en *Política y Cultura*, vol. 28, México: Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana.

Dunezat, Xavier (2017a), “Dominación masculina y feminismo en los movimientos sociales”, en *Política y Sociedad*, vol. 54, núm. 2, España: Universidad Complutense de Madrid.

Dunezat, Xavier (2017b), “Sexo, raza, clase y etnografía en los movimientos sociales. Herramientas metodológicas para una perspectiva interseccional”, en *Investigaciones Feministas*, vol. 8, núm. 1, España: Universidad Complutense de Madrid.

Horn, Jessica (2013), *Género y movimientos sociales. Informe General, Reino Unido: Bridge*. Disponible en: <http://www.codajic.org/node/906> [22 de diciembre de 2023].

López-Rodríguez, Fermín y Gutiérrez Palacios, Rodolfo (2023), “Cambios en la composición educativa y equilibrios de empleo de las parejas en España”, en *Revista Española de Sociología*, vol. 32, núm. 3, España: Fundación Española para la Ciencia y Tecnología.

Lugo Sánchez, Luis Josué (2017), “Participación y acción conectiva en novísimos movimientos sociales: el caso del #YoSoy132 y el 15M”, en *Revista Internacional de Pensamiento Político*, vol. 12, España: Universidad de Huelva.

Mazzucchelli, Nicole *et al.* (2021), “Bordando narrativas de resistencia: Prácticas y experiencias de mujeres mayores activistas”, en *Polis Revista Latinoamericana*, vol. 20, núm. 60, Chile: Universidad de Los Lagos.

Mediavilla, María Eugenia *et al.* (2023), “Los discursos ecofeministas de las asociaciones ecologistas. Estudio de casos en Sevilla (España)”, en *Anduli: Revista Andaluza de Ciencias Sociales*, vol. 24, España: Universidad de Sevilla.

Meer, Shamim (2005), “Freedom for Women: Mainstreaming Gender in the South African Liberation Struggle and Beyond”, en *Gender & Development*, vol. 13, núm. 2, Reino Unido: Taylor & Francis.

Morán-Neches, Lorena y Rodríguez-Suárez, Julio (2022), “Perspectiva y análisis de género en las investigaciones sobre movimientos sociales y feminismos en el contexto español: una revisión sistemática”, en *Feminismo/s*, vol. 39, España: Universidad de Alicante.

Moreno-Colom, Sara *et al.* (2023), “La experiencia del trabajo a distancia durante el confinamiento en Cataluña: una aproximación desde la perspectiva de género”, en *Revista Española de Investigaciones Sociológicas*, vol. 183, España: Centro de Investigaciones Sociológicas.

Obreque Oviedo, Patricia y Cárdenas Castro, Manuel (2023), “Predictores de la identificación de las mujeres con el feminismo en Chile”, en *Interdisciplinaria, Revista de Psicología y Ciencias Afines*, vol. 40, núm. 1, Argentina: Centro Interamericano de Investigaciones Psicológicas y Ciencias Afines.

Osborne, Raquel (2005), “Desigualdad y relaciones de género en las organizaciones: diferencias numéricas, acción positiva y paridad”, en *Política y Sociedad*, vol. 42, núm. 2, España: Universidad Complutense de Madrid.

Pedraza, Arroyo y Jhael, Bertha (2023), “La ceguera patriarcal del enfoque de heterogeneidad estructural desde la óptica ecofeminista. La desigualdad como consecuencia de múltiples sistemas de opresión”, en *Ucronías*, vol. 7, Argentina: Colaboratorio Universitario de Ciencias, Artes, Tecnología, Innovación y Saberes del Sur (CONUSUR).

Prévost, Caroline (2023), “Activismos ecofeministas en la Argentina actual. El caso de AMMurA Rosario”, en *Nuevo mundo, mundos nuevos*, vol. 23, Francia: Ecole des hautes études en sciences sociales.

Renzetti, Claire (1987), “New wave or second stage? Attitudes of college women toward feminism”, en *Sex Roles*, vol. 16, Estados Unidos: Springer.

Sandoval, Juan (2020), “El repertorio de acción política en el ciclo de movilizaciones estudiantiles chilenas”, en *Revista de Estudios Sociales*, vol. 72, Colombia: Universidad de Los Andes.

Suárez, Tomé *et al.* (2024), “El borramiento del activismo feminista a través de su institucionalización y mercantilización en el activismo menstrual argentino”, en *Debate Feminista*, vol. 67, México: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México.

Tajfel, Henri (1982), “Social psychology of intergroup relations”, en *Annual Review of Psychology*, vol. 33, Estados Unidos: Annual Reviews.

Tarrow, Sidney (2012), *El poder en movimiento: los movimientos sociales, la acción colectiva y la política*, España: Alianza.

Tilly, Charles (2008), *Contentious Performances*, Reino Unido: Cambridge University Press.

Valcárcel, Amelia (2008), *Feminismo en el mundo global*, España: Cátedra.

Velasco, Anna (2016), “No soy feminista, pero...”: *Mitos y creencias de la juventud universitaria sobre el feminismo*, España: Universitat de Barcelona.

Villasante, Tomás (2020), “De los movimientos sociales a la creatividad colaborativa con los conjuntos de acción”, en Álvarez-Benavides, Antonio, Fernández-Trujillo, Francisco, Sribman, Ariel y Castillo, Andy [eds.], *Acción colectiva, movilización y resistencias en el siglo XXI*, País Vasco: Fundación Betiko.

Weis, Alexandra *et al.* (2018), “Feminist Identity, Attitudes Toward Feminist Prototypes, and Willingness to Intervene in Everyday Sexist Events”, en *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, vol. 42, núm. 3, Estados Unidos: Sage.

Appendix

Table 1
General Composition of the Sample

Gender	
Female	69,9%
Male	28,9%
Non-binary	1,2%
Sexual orientation	
Heterosexual	79,5%
Bisexual	12,6%
Homosexual	3,7%
No response	4,2%
Household unit	
Family of origin (parents, siblings...)	34,1%
Partner and children	22,7%
Only with partner	16,8%
Alone	9,7%
With colleagues or friends	8,7%
Alone with children	3,6%
Others	3,6%
Family responsibilities	
Yes	24%
Subjective economic situation	
Good / Very good	47,6%
Average / Fair	39,2%
Bad / Very bad	13,2%

Age	
Less than 25 years old	41,2%
Between 26 and 40 years old	18,8%
Between 41 and 55 years old	25,3%
Over 56 years old	14,7%
Marital status	
Single	61,7%
Married	30,4%
Divorced	4,9%
Separated	1,5%
Widowed	1,4%
Employment status	
Works	43,5%
Studies	26,4%
Studies and works	14,5%
Others (unemployment, retirement, unpaid domestic work...)	15,6%
Political ideology (0-10)	
Left-wing (0-4)	73,4%
Center (5)	8,5%
Right- wing (6-10)	11%
Not interested	7,1%

Source: Own elaboration based on the results of the Battery for Psychosocial Analysis of Mobilization (BAPsM).

Table 2
Descriptive Statistics of Thematic Participation

	Mean women	Mean men	Overall mean	Standard deviation
Feminisms	3,03	2,23	2,8000	1,47566
Education	2,73	2,49	2,6652	1,33297
Environment	2,46	2,28	2,4152	1,29340
Healthcare	2,47	2,30	2,4090	1,30952
LGBTIQ+collective rights	2,51	2,09	2,4087	1,40042
Labor rights	2,37	2,32	2,3511	1,24549
Social exclusion	2,46	2,04	2,3367	1,36606
Culture	2,27	2,22	2,2511	1,27545
Interculturality / Racial discriminations	2,32	1,99	2,2304	1,19627
Animal rights	2,24	1,91	2,1565	1,33239
Politics	2,12	2,05	2,1130	1,22907
Community / Neighborhood	1,98	2,00	1,9859	1,18240
Housing	1,95	1,88	1,9283	1,13854
Pensions	1,89	1,91	1,8891	1,12383
Territorial and/or linguistic claims	1,71	1,69	1,7087	1,04623
Sports	1,61	1,80	1,6620	1,04724
Other (please specify)	1,49	1,31	1,4478	1,11840
Religion	1,26	1,24	1,2478	0,69937

Source: Own elaboration based on the results of the Battery for Psychosocial Analysis of Mobilization (BAPsM).

Table 3

Percentage Results of Gender Equality Situations

	None 1		Little 2		Some 3		Quite 4		Completely 5	
	M	H	M	H	M	H	M	H	M	H
Avoidance/ Condemnation of sexist attitudes	4,5%		4,5%		13,9%		27,3%		49,8%	
	4,2	5,6	4,2	5,6	16,1	9,9	25,6	29,6	50	49,3
Training in gender equality	7,4%		11%		14,3%		31%		36,3%	
	7,7	5,6	13,1	5,6	10,7	23,9	31,5	31	36,9	33,8
Equal consideration of male and female proposals/ Initiatives	11,8%		5,3%		14,7%		32,7%		35,5%	
	16,7	1,4	7,1	1,4	14,9	15,5	30,4	38	30,1	43,7
An equal distribution of tasks	4,1%		14,3%		13%		49,4%		19,2%	
	4,4	2,8	13,7	16,9	13,7	12,7	49,4	50,7	18,4	16,9
Equal representation of the group	12,7%		20%		14,3%		36,3%		16,7%	
	15,5	7	20,2	21,1	13,1	16,9	33,9	40,8	17,3	14,1

Source: Own elaboration based on the results of the Battery for Psychosocial Analysis of Mobilization (BAPsM).

Table 4
Descriptive Statistics of Gender Equality Situations

	Mean women	Mean men	Overall mean	Standard deviation
Avoidance/Condemnation of sexist attitudes	4,13	4,11	4,1250	1,10201
Training in gender equality	3,77	3,82	3,7792	1,25311
Equal consideration of male and female proposals/Initiatives	3,52	4,21	3,7250	1,31590
An equal distribution of tasks	3,63	3,62	3,6333	1,06628
Equal representation of the group	3,17	3,34	3,2375	1,29928

Source: Own elaboration based on the results of the Battery for Psychosocial Analysis of Mobilization (BAPsM).

Table 5

Percentage Results of Measures to Promote Gender Equality

	None		Little		Some		Quite		Completely	
	1		2		3		4		5	
	M	H	M	H	M	H	M	H	M	H
Avoidance/ Condemnation of sexist attitudes	5,7%		2,9%		11,4%		29%		51%	
	5,9	4,2	3	2,8	12,5	9,8	31	25,4	47,6	57,7
Equal consideration of male and female proposals/Initiatives	9,4%		5,3%		13,5%		30,6%		41,2%	
	13,1	1,4	6,5	2,8	15,5	9,8	29,7	33,8	35,1	52,1
Training in gender equality	4,9%		9,4%		18,3%		29%		38,4%	
	4,2	5,6	10,1	8,4	15,5	25,3	31	25,3	39,3	35,2
An equal distribution of tasks	4,1%		6,9%		18%		45,7%		25,3%	
	4,7	2,8	5,9	9,8	17,8	19,7	44,6	49,3	26,8	18,3
Equal participation	10,2%		8,6%		20,4%		41,2%		19,6%	
	13,1	4,2	7,1	12,7	22	16,9	38,7	49,3	19,1	16,9
Equal representation of the group	11,4%		9,4%		19,2%		40%		20%	
	14,9	4,2	9,5	9,8	19	21,1	38,7	42,2	17,8	22,5

Source: Own elaboration based on the results of the Battery for Psychosocial Analysis of Mobilization (BAPsM).

Table 6

Descriptive Statistics of Measures to Promote Gender Equality

	Mean women	Mean men	Overall mean	Standard deviation
Avoidance/Condemnation of sexist attitudes	4,11	4,30	4,1667	1,11162
Equal consideration of male and female proposals/ Initiatives	3,67	4,32	3,8750	1,26797
Training in gender equality	3,91	3,76	3,8625	1,17588
An equal distribution of tasks	3,83	3,70	3,7958	1,02070
Equal participation	3,43	3,62	3,5042	1,19971
Equal representation of the group	3,35	3,69	3,4708	1,24389

Source: Own elaboration based on the results of the Battery for Psychosocial Analysis of Mobilization (BAPsM).

Lorena Morán Neches holds a degree in Social Work and a Master's in Gender and Diversity. She is contracted under the University Teaching Staff Training (FPU) program in the Area of Social Psychology at the University of Oviedo, Spain. Her research interests include social work, gender, and social movements. Recent publications include: 1) Morán Neches, Lorena and Rodríguez Suárez, Julio (2022), "Feminist action research: challenging dichotomies between activism and academia," in *Asparkía. Feminist Research*, no. 40. Doi: 10.6035/asparkia.6080. 2) Morán-Neches, Lorena and Rodríguez-Suárez, Julio (2022), "Perspective and gender analysis in research on social movements and feminisms in the Spanish context: a systematic review," in *Feminism/s*, no. 39. Doi: 10.14198/fem.2022.39.08. 3) Rodríguez-Suárez, Julio, Morán-Neches, Lorena & Herrero-Olaizola, Juan (2021), "Online research, new languages and symbolism of digital activism: A systematic review," in *Comunicar*, no. 68. Doi: 10.3916/C68-2021-04

Julio Rodríguez Suárez holds a PhD in Psychology and is a contracted professor in Social Psychology at the University of Oviedo, as well as a tutor at the National University of Distance Education (UNED) in Spain. He has been a visiting researcher at the Department of Sociology at the University of Cambridge. His research interests include social exclusion, job insecurity, and social movements. Recent publications include: 1) Rodríguez-Suárez, Julio, Morán-Neches, Lorena, and Herrero, Juan (2024), "Social participation and radicalism: the mediational role of group identification," in *International Journal of Social Psychology*, vol. 39, no. 2. Doi: currently unavailable. 2) Mateos-González, Laura, Rodríguez-Suárez, Julio, Llosa, José Antonio (2023), "Job insecurity and musculoskeletal disorders: A systematic review of a neglected association," in *Human Factors and Ergonomics in Manufacturing & Service Industries*, vol. 33, no. 5. Doi: 10.1002/hfm.21013. 3) Morán Neches, Lorena, and Rodríguez Suárez, Julio (2022), "Perspective and gender analysis in research on social movements and feminisms in the Spanish context: a systematic review," in *Feminism/s*, no. 39. Doi: 10.14198/fem.2022.39.08.

Juan Herrero is a Professor of Social Psychology at the University of Oviedo, Spain. His research focuses on the study of interpersonal relationships and their effects on psychosocial adjustment. Recent publications include: 1) Juarros-Basterretxea, Joel, Fernández-Álvarez, Natalia, Torres-Vallejos, Javier, and Herrero, Juan (2024), "Perceived Reportability of Intimate Partner Violence against Women to the Police and Help-seeking: A National Survey," in *Psychosocial Intervention*, vol. 33, no.1. Doi: 10.5093/pi2024a3. 2) Juarros-Basterretxea, Joel, Ocampo, Nadia Yazmín, Herrero, Juan, and Rodríguez-Díaz, Francisco Javier (2022), "Dyadic Analysis of Emotional Intimate Partner Violence: An Estimation of Dyadic Patterns and Influencing Individual, Family, and Couple Factors," in *The European Journal of Psychology Applied to Legal Context*, vol. 14, no.2. Doi: 10.5093/ejpalc2022a10. 3) Sirvent-Ruiz, Carlos Miguel, Moral-Jiménez, María de la Villa, Herrero, Juan, Miranda-Rovés, María, Rodríguez Díaz, Francisco Javier (2022), "Concept of Affective Dependence and Validation of an Affective Dependence Scale," in *Psychology Research and Behavior Management*, vol. 15. Doi: 10.2147/PRBM.S385807.