
Power and representation: feminist movement challenges on work

Poder y representación: retos del movimiento feminista en torno al trabajo

Sonia Ruiz García

Oxford Brookes University

ruizgs@gmail.com

Resumen

El presente artículo analiza la representación del movimiento de mujeres y feminista (MMF) y sus relaciones de poder en torno al trabajo. Constatamos que estas retan las relaciones laborales y el sistema formal del trabajo a partir de la apertura de nuevas aproximaciones discursivas e innovaciones en la acción colectiva. Esto se ilustra mediante un análisis de los discursos del MMF sobre trabajo y género en el estado español entre 2009 y 2012. Se discute cómo los marcos de interpretación del MMF reestructuran la noción de trabajo, cómo los sujetos del trabajo desplazan al trabajador tradicional y hegemónico de los sindicatos, y cómo la acción colectiva del movimiento social transforma el lugar donde tiene lugar la representación del trabajo. El artículo se centra en teorías y perspectivas sobre poder para mostrar cómo el MMF formula nuevas demandas que empoderan redes y voces feministas.

Palabras clave: movimiento de mujeres y feminista, representación, poder, empleo, trabajo domestico y de cuidados, trabajo político, análisis de discurso.

Abstract

In this paper we analyse the Women's and Feminist Movement (WFM)'s representation of work and power relations. We state that these are challenging the labour relations and the formal system of work by means of opening up new discursive approaches and innovative possibilities in terms of collective action. We will illustrate this through an analysis of the WFM's discourses about work and gender in Spain between 2009 and 2012. We will discuss how the WFM's interpretative frames are reshaping the notion of work, how their subjects of work displace the hegemonic and classical workers of trade unions, and how their collective action is transforming the place where representation about work occurs. We draw on power theories and representation approaches to show that the WFM is shaping new forms of work claims, which empower feminist networks and voices.

Keywords: women's and feminist movement, representation, power, employment, care and domestic work, political work, discourse analysis.

INTRODUCTION

This paper draws on data collected from a research project that presents discourses about ‘work’ of the Spanish women’s and feminist movement (WFM). The primary objective of that study was to enrich through a gender perspective the knowledge on work developed around the turn of the last century (Ruiz, 2013). In this paper we will analyse the representation and power relations of the WFM through their discourses on work and gender and collective practices in Spain between 2009 and 2012. We will focus on the representation practices and power resources of the WFM through analysing the problems of and claims on work. The majority of these WFM approaches challenges the discursive hegemony that rules ‘work’ today. These disputes are shown in the changes of already consolidated interpretative frames, as well as in the intersectionality of gender with other categories of inequality expressed in the subjects of work and in the systems of inequalities — capitalism, patriarchy, racism, heteronormativity, sustainability, amongst others. The concept of work that emerges in these discourses also includes employment and care and domestic work, and takes political work into account, understanding representation, activism and power relations of the WFM itself as work.

Due to the WFM’s organisational freedom and to the informal style of many examples of female leadership, women’s collective action has not received the deserved attention in social movements’ literature (McAdam, McCarthy and Zald, 1999; Tarrow, 1997; della Porta, Kriesi and Rucht, 1999). Many women’s actions have been ignored or analysed as ‘tendencies’ or means to other movements, but not as spaces of insurgence, social change or resistance (Kaplan, 2008; Alfama, 2007; Ferrée and Martin, 1995). The fact that female collective action has not adopted mainstream forms — i.e., male and heteronormative forms — has resulted in political exclusion. What is at stake is the way that political representation is built, allowed to be built and legitimized. In addition, we suggest that the delimitation of the WFM should be a flexible task, situated by the subjects, by the context and by the interpretation of gender produced by the different groups. We propose pluralism, institutionalisation, atomization and ubiquity as four features of today’s Spanish WFM (Walby, 2011; Ferrée and Hess, 2000). For our purposes, it is important to bear in mind the break-up of the single subject ‘woman’ inside the WFM (Gil, 2011; Rich, 1984; Spivak, 1988; Braidotti, 2000). In this sense, we believe that feminist politics may not require the stable unitary subject (Lloyd, 2005: 7). This subject has to be also recreated in a situated way, taking into account each claim and each context. That is, a subject in process. In turn, we pay attention to the crisis of the dominant worker and the decline or changing situation of trade unions today (Engels, 1845; Roth and Ebbinghaus, 2011; Prieto, 1999; Letamendia, 2009; Comité invisible, 2009).

The main aim of this paper is to scrutinize the representation and power resources of the WFM on work. The objective is threefold. First, we shed light on the question of who the WFM is representing, by showing the voices and the different subjects in their discourses. Second, we address the main frames on work produced by the social movement.

And third, we bring into focus the question of where representation of work occurs. In this paper we argue that the WFM's representation of work challenges established labour relations and the formal system of work, as it opens up new possibilities for discursive and collective action. This article begins with a review of theoretical debates regarding the main concepts that guide our research, followed by an explanation of the methodology used, presentation of results, and conclusions.

WORK, POWER AND REPRESENTATION: THEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS

In this section we consider the key concepts discussed in the paper and bind them together to theoretically support our main argument. In order to present how the WFM's representation and power resources are reshaping the system of work, we start describing our approach to the concept of work. Second, we draw on the feminist approaches to power. Finally we discuss the concept of representation.

Defining "work" as any person's activity that generates economic, human and political value

Economic and political systems, together with the international sexual division of labour, have shaped and maintained the concept of work as being employment only and excluding any other form of work (Méda, 1998; Gorz, 1995; Gardiner, 1999; Federici, 2004). The crisis of the economic rationality that supports this one-dimensional approach can be seen in the erosion of the welfare state, globalisation processes as well as in the present precarious and unprotected labour market (Sassen, 2003; Benería, 2005; Mies, 1998; Beck, 1998; Castells, 1997). The analysis of emotional work and social relations that are established through work processes echo feminist approaches (Hardt, 2000). Gendered perspectives — valuing other activities beyond paid work and ensuring that citizenship rights are not only granted through employment — challenge the process of commodification of life and the planet, placing peoples' needs at the centre of political action. When analysing the discourses on work produced by the WFM, care and domestic work has a prominent position. Gendered literature has mainly focused on the characteristics of those activities, given them visibility and exploring how to measure them, through tools that have been proven valid to analyse employment or through the development of methods that are not linked to financial purposes but to the sustainability of life (Borderías, Carrasco, Alemany 1994; Leira and Saraceno, 2002; Carrasco, 1998; Pérez Orozco, 2006, Davis, 2004). The analysis of domestic work and care should not be separated from what happens in the labour market. Equally it has to be regarded through the lenses of autonomy, dependency and peoples' needs, and should also highlight all works at the margins: informal work, sex work or subsistence work (Durán,

2001; Mayordomo, 2004; Walby, 1990; Nussbaum and Sen, 1992). Nevertheless, the bifocal notion of work being regarded as employment and care and domestic work also suffers from dichotomy, dualism and hierarchy problems. In order to try to break these down, we propose to integrate political work in the definition of work. Political work exists beyond the public sphere, as empowerment happens also in the private field. Political work presents similarities with domestic and care activities: the exclusion of the latter from the category of the 'economic' has meant the exclusion of 'political' activities related to women. What stands out is the invisibility and lack of value of political work in generating economic and political rights in the current social and work models. Therefore, a triadic perspective on work (defining work as any person's activity that generates economic, human and political value) — open and in progress — also finds a place for what has not been considered as political and that should be taken into account, seeks a balance among its three elements and is especially useful to help us rethink the connections between paid and unpaid work.

Drawing on feminist and mainstream literature, as well as feminist practices, we define work as any person's activity that generates economic, human and political value. This definition is useful for the analysis of the WFM's representation of work. It highlights the hegemonic one-dimensional concept of work as a merely productive activity that only takes place in the labour market. It also integrates the feminist perspectives of domestic work and care as reproductive and economic activities. In addition, this proposal aims to shed light on political work as an occupation that gives room to tasks necessary for personal and public development in order to achieve a fuller experience of living. This triadic notion allows for political action that sidesteps the commodification of labour and life and helps to reformulate the processes of representation taking into account a meaningful existence.

Furthermore, in this paper we draw on another triadic proposal, namely Nancy Fraser's theory of justice (1997; 2006; 2008) — encompassing the concepts of redistribution, recognition and representation — to analyse the WFM's representation and power relations on work. We focus on the scales of redistribution and recognition contrasting and discussing the tensions between them as a central dilemma of Political Science (Laclau and Mouffe, 2004; Benhabib, 2006). Analytically, Fraser (1997) links redistribution to claims placed around exploitation, economic marginalisation and deprivatisation. They are economically rooted and mainly expressed by social class. Recognition presents other social injustices that are assumed as cultural. These are interpretative patterns that show cultural domination, non-recognition and disrespect and are mainly expressed by status. Fraser assumes that justice requires both redistribution and recognition as well as distinct remedies, political-economic restructuring and cultural and symbolic change. Redistribution and recognition are imbricated with one another and every struggle against injustice implies claims along both dimensions. Another main focus of this paper is the scale of representation discussed at the end of this section from different perspectives.

Gender-empowered

Gender literature identifies three main approaches to power: as a resource that has to be redistributed, as domination, and as individual and collective empowerment (SEF, 2005). Feminists claim that power is gender-related in the way that women and men have unequal access to resources, men have power over women, men and women tend to understand power differently and power relations constitute gender identities (Squires, 1999). While liberal feminists have argued for a share of men's power, radical feminists and some materialists have addressed power as men's domination, pointing to the historical subordination of women. But by rejecting the masculine form of power, feminists have reframed it as an ability to do things, as a creative experience (Lloyds, 2005). Thus, power relations also constitute subjects and create possibilities, choices, decisions and practices (Sawicki, 1991). Power presents reproductive features for the production of alternatives (Kantola, 2006) and resistance. These approaches are well developed in Allen's (1999) triadic conceptualisation of power with a gender perspective: 'power-over', 'power-to' and 'power-with'. Her proposal reveals some of the key issues related to power, mainly, domination, empowerment and solidarity (Lombardo and Meier, 2014). 'Power-over' is the "ability of an actor or set of actors to constrain choices available to another actor or set or actors in a nontrivial way" (Allen, 1999: 123). Lombardo and Meier (2014: 159) raise the example of male overrepresentation in parliaments as an instance of power-over in political representation. 'Power-to' is "the ability of an individual actor to attain an end or series of ends" (Allen, 1999: 126). That is "the power that women have in spite of the power that men exercise over us" (Allen, 1999: 122). For the purposes of this paper, 'power-with' is a key feature, as it shows the collective dimension of the WFM that we want to draw on. It is defined as "the ability of a collectivity to act together for the attainment of an agreed-upon end or series of ends" (Allen, 1999: 127). Power in representation is never either just domination or empowerment (Lombardo and Meier, 2015). Although the political field is male dominated — and the work arena, especially in its hegemonic notion is exclusive territory — "women have given enough proofs of their resistance and alternatives by making feminist claims in institutions and by acting collectively and building alliances to obtain their goals" (Lombardo and Meier, 2015: 172).

Finally, we embrace Lloyd's (2005) attempt to conceptualize the configuration of domination through an anti-determinist and contingent understanding of power relations. Lloyds uses the foucaultian 'global strategy'¹ as well as emphasizes economic materialism to both highlight the subordinate status of women in society and to acknowledge difference. She argues that to understand women's subordination in its multiplicity, the different

1. Foucault bio-power emerges from two set of techniques, those for population control and those of discipline. Those together generate a form of concrete arrangements that he calls a 'global strategy' (Foucault, 1980 in Lloyd, 2005: 85).

discourses and mechanisms of power that effect this domination have to be addressed historically. This approach to power connects our theoretical framework with the methodology applied to analyse the discourses of the WFM. It recognises the multiple forms of subordination “across, within and between gender, class, race and geographic location” and it offers a perspective “through the intersections between institutional forms of domination and the production of subjectivities” (Lloyd, 2005: 87-88). Thus it suits our intersectional approach, historically-driven and aiming to take into account subjectivity and structural or socio-economic mechanisms.

WORK REPRESENTATION IN THE MULTIDIMENSIONAL CRISIS

Hanna Pitkin (1967) distinguishes four dimensions of the concept of representation: formalistic, descriptive, symbolic, and substantive. Formalistic representation deals with the formal rules and procedures of representation; the descriptive dimension refers to the presence of an actor as “standing for” the represented and how this representative resembles those being represented (Pitkin, 1967). The two dimensions that have been more explored by feminists are descriptive and substantive representation (Childs and Lovendusky, 2012). According to Pitkin the latter refers to “acting in the interest of the represented in a manner responsive to them” (Pitkin, 1967: 209). Lately, substantive representation has received attention from both a mainstream and a gender perspective. Saward (2009) argues that representation can be made by a variety of actors, which may include non-elected claims-makers. While Celis (2013: 181), concerned about not diluting “feminist activist ambitions”, suggests the use of responsiveness as the key criterion to assess the quality of women’s substantive representation. By doing so, she aims to reflect women’s diversity and their often conflicting concerns. Recently, symbolic representation has deserved attention through innovative approaches stressing a gender focus (Lombardo and Meier, 2014). These scholars understand symbolic representation as more than a simple effect of the other dimensions. Adopting an idea of political representation as a construction, they analyse the symbolic representation of gender through the discursive construction of women and men as political symbols.

We draw on both substantive and symbolic representation to address the discourses of the WFM around work. We focus on the symbolic construction of work and on several features of substantive representation by shedding light onto three rephrased questions. These questions are — among others — central to the research agenda of substantive representation according to Childs and Lovenduski (2012): who is represented by WFM collective action? Is the WFM an agent that represents gender interest around work? And where does this representation occur? Our outline to analyse representation in the discourses of the WFM around work will follow Fraser’s triadic proposal on social justice. Fraser proposes the integration of redistribution and recognition claims (Fraser, 2008). To the best of our knowledge, Fraser has not developed the scale of representation by pointing out the characteristics of non-representation. Accordingly, we propose the following

dimensions of non-representation: (dis)empowerment, non-representation and (de)legitimation. We note factors of symbolic and substantive representation in these three dimensions. *(Dis)empowerment* is regarded as political marginalisation to the point of not knowing that you can raise your voice or the total oppression of your voice. The concept is not limited to formal politics, because it includes the private sphere as a political place of action. It seeks to capture the suppression of agency: to not recognise or be unable to express your experiences either at home, in the labour market or in an organisation. *Non-representation* is the breakup of the guarantee of participation in political structures and systems. It is defined by the functioning of hegemonic systems, so that non-representation reflects inequalities that are formally established. It reflects the institutional conditions necessary to exercise and develop full political individual and collective capacities (Young, 2000: 71). Finally, *(de)legitimation* implies mainly discursive elements that influence the structural features of democracies. It also hints at what can be thought or represented as political. It reflects framing processes, as well as discursive challenges.

The slogan “they do not represent us” that started to be echoed in the streets in Spain in 2011 referring to the low confidence that representative democracy generates among the population is an example of representation being at stake nowadays. It is also one political characteristic that has to be added to the socio-economic factors that together with the gendered aspects of austerity, the sexist neoliberal trends and ecological disdain, which describe the current multidimensional crisis (Grisoni and Ruiz, 2015). This crisis can also be observed when analysing both the context where work representation occurs and the subject represented in claims around work. The exclusion of any work other than paid work, and the maintenance of the traditional worker as the only one represented by trade unions are factors that reinforce this situation. Political institutions have fiercely endorsed for the sake of representation trade unions and employer organizations exclusively. Conley (2012) describes the widening of political representation of women in the labour market traditionally held by trade union organisations. Actions organised by a UK feminist organisation — the Fawcett Society — represent an explicit challenge of the status quo of employment representation today and a way to establish new legitimated political subjects as well as strategic alliances among actors (Grisoni and Ruiz, 2015). Trade unions have been attached to a homogenous worker — male, white, heterosexual, with no care responsibilities — who does not encompass the multiple work activities that exist. The hegemonic subject of work is a result of economic rationality and the international and sexual division of labour. There are four factors that question the primacy of this worker. The first one is the false homogeneity of the worker throughout history (Engels, 1845; Roth and Ebbinghaus, 2011). The second is linked to the trade union’s single focus on the labour market and the hiding of activities other than employment and the marginalized workers. Finally, the last two factors relate to the current disorganisation of the working class. On the one hand there is a weakness of the working class due to the new precariousness of its hegemonic context, the labour market. On the other hand, the traditional worker is still too tied to social class as the only category of inequality valid for

struggles around work (Bilbao, 1993). This suggests a scenario where, even if the figure of the traditional worker is in decline, this does not stop the emergence of new subjects and the problems to articulate with other social struggles and claims in order to legitimize new subjects of work.

In this section we have presented the main theoretical concepts that are used in order to clarify our main argument. Our approach to work, power and representation is bounded with this review. In the next section we will present the methodological perspective that guides the paper.

POWER, DISCOURSE AND FEMINISM: THE CHOICE OF A METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH

The discursive turn in Political Science has been often linked to the study of power in work. As Foucault highlighted: “discourse is not simply that which translates struggles or systems of domination, but that by which, and through which, one fights that power that one wants to own” (1992: 6). Our methodological approach unites Critical Frame Analysis (CFA) and Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA). CFA pulls together various perspectives on policy analysis and social movement theory, both constructivist and deconstructivist and has been proven to be an excellent tool to address intersectionality as well as to emphasize different voices in discourses (Verloo, 2005; Bustelo and Lombardo, 2007). The CFA allows us to present the main frames of the WFM on work. Ferrée (2003: 307) calls a frame “an interpretive package in a dynamic model of interaction between challengers and power holders which links frames to hegemonic ideas (discursive opportunity structures), to the historical contention of groups over codes (repertoires), and to the core values, identities, and interpretation of material interests of social groups (ideologies) that guide their use”. We also draw on collective action frames as interpretative schemes developed by activists to promote collective action through reframing a problem and classify them as marginal, minor and dominant (Krizsan and Verloo, 2006). Displacements and changes in the hegemonic frames are considered transformations or extensions (Snow and Benford, 2000). In turn, CDA is related to intertextual discourse study and it provides a method for analysing discourse as a social practice taking into account institutional, political, gender and mass media discourses that reflect conflicts and power in work (Fairclough and Wodak, 1997; Van Dijk, 2005). The combination of both methods allows us to bring to the fore the strategic and the emotional aspects of the framing processes amongst others.

In order to conduct the CFA and the CDA, we have used two sets of guiding questions — one for written documents and another one for interviews — that capture the multiple meanings of work, the hegemonic discourses and the counter-gendered ones. These guidance questions are divided into two main sections of diagnosis and prognosis. The empirical material consists of written documents and interviews. Eight written documents produced by the WFM between 2009 and 2012 have been selected for the

present paper. Twenty-five interviews were conducted in 2009 and 2010 with social activists, trade unionists and policy-makers working in gender equality and in employment bodies, to enhance knowledge of perspectives that might have not been covered in the documents.

Gender is the main category of inequality for the WFM's work. In this paper, it is set out as a structural inequality applied to the collective action of the social movement. In this sense, the paper draws on Squires' (1999) gender strategies, which are inclusion, reversal and displacement. In the Spanish tradition this could be easily translated to equality feminism, to include women in the political; difference feminism, to value women's contribution to the political; and post-feminism, to problematise gender. Moreover, a gender perspective is applied from an intersectional approach (Crenshaw, 1989) in order to shed light on the complexity of gender and work discourses. We use a dynamic intersectionality analysis (Ferrée, 2009) as it stresses processes, contexts and dominant discourses and in line with an anti-determinist and contingent understanding of relations of power (Lloyd, 2005). We draw on intersectionality to interpret the concept of work, the subjects and the systems of inequality (Butler, 2004; Fraser, 2006). We pay attention to how gender intersects with origin (race, ethnic and geographical origin), class, age, sexual orientation and identity.

PRESENTATION OF RESULTS: THE POWER OF FRAMES, SUBJECTS AND REPRESENTATION

Based on the results of the empirical analysis, in this section we will outline the subject of work according to the WFM's discourses, the interpretative frames of the movement around work, and analyse the barriers of work representation as well as the collective action frames of the social movement. Finally we will present the relations of the WFM with the trade unions, the governmental bodies and the employers' organisations.

Workers, carers and activists: Gender displacements in the subject of work

The WFM discourses cover all the activities that we consider in the triadic definition — *any person's activity that generates economic, human and political value*. We verify a series of changes in the hegemonic 'worker' that occur especially through the recognition of domestic activities and political action as work. The frame work-precarity-life² reshapes the subjects in combination with an intersectional impact. All types of workers are outlined in all the spheres where human activities are to be found. By the interaction of several

2. See Annex I.

categories of inequality with gender new subjects of work are shaped. The combination of class with gender is not dominant. The hegemony of class in the production of subjects of work is under siege by the WFM's conception of work. In our research period, the precarious worker — and even the '*precarious identities*' of the worker (d25) — are dominant.

The intersection of gender with racial-ethnic and geographical origin is the most prevalent when analysing the subject in the WFM discourses (e.g. '*migrantas*'= female migrants). The "*transfagdykequeer*" (d25) subject is also displayed. Classical subjects of work for the WFM — 'mothers, housewives and domestic workers' — are subjects of care and domestic work. Likewise, we have noted the progressive consolidation of a "new" subject in paid and in unpaid activities: the caregivers. In turn, domestic workers appear within economic-gender and race intersections in a disharmonic and competing way. The emergence of political subjects as workers in the discourses analysed is a key feature to take into account. 'Feminists' is not a major subject, nevertheless it is to be found in the texts, as well as 'women citizens' or 'activists'. In the time of a fragmented subject in progress, the main one present in the text is still 'women' followed by 'working women'.

Frames of the WFM on work and gender

There are seven main frames — each with subframes — that have been identified³. In the diagnosis of the problem of work, the time period that starts in 2009 endorses a perspective where both the recognition and the redistributive scale have a similar weight, after a decade of domination of a recognition approach. In that moment, a second expansion of the scale of recognition starts. In the first expansion, there is a hierarchy to be found in the WFM's discourses, as well as a dichotomous identity approach: male *vs.* female. For these discourses, female work — domestic and care — is more important than male work, employment. The current second expansion is led by the displacement feminist strategy, by the dominance of the frame work-precarity-life and by the multiplicity and interaction of systems of domination. If previously the focus of recognition was located in the domestic and care work, the displacement feminist strategy blurs the boundaries of work. When life is precarious, all tasks and everybody might be seen as such:

"We denounce the commodification of non-normative sexualities, which are only acknowledged through purchase" (d25).

3. The main frames of the period of analysis are shown in table 1 and a description of those is in Annex I.

The recognition scale is also expressed by means of the frame *value/to value*, which highlights a lack of respect by institutions:

“Official statistics promote a false idea of labour activity” (d24).

“Social acknowledgement is given to male activities, denying women citizenship rights” (d20).

The diagnosis of redistributive problems has remained imprisoned in the labour market during most of the former period because of the scarcity of references to economic systems, and the low intensity with which the category of social class is used. With the multidimensional crisis, especially from the inclusion and displacement feminist strategies, causality points out the governments and the systemic and subject intersectionality represents new problems that generate marginalization, deprivation and exploitation:

“We want to denounce that economic crisis involves the reduction of social services and the increase of domestic and family work for women!” (d20).

Likewise, the crisis involves the emergence of marginal tasks — “street vendors, begging, prostitution” (d20)(d24)(d26) — related to an increase of the feminisation of poverty.

In the prognosis, the metaframe “reorganisation of time and works” previously kept in the claim of gender policies and legislation, mutates by means of new forms of time and work management. These proposals support self-management and community work as a solution of redistributive problems around work:

“Social justice requires solidarity in the labour market and in all the works [...] it requires an economic transformation towards a model with an increased importance of community management and self-managed work” (d24).

This doesn’t mean that the claim for policy action is forgotten. The WFM discourses also stress the need for state resources on gender equality and the universalisation of rights and services:

“Universalisation of social services, those related to dependency as well as education for children under three years” (d26).

The following table summarizes the main frames of the period:

TABLE 1.
FRAMES ON WORK AND GENDER

Subframes			
Frames	Redistribution	Recognition	
Diagnosis	Non-redistribution	Cuts and privatisation (d24) Curtailling social rights and work-related rights (d24)(d20)(d21) Increase of women's workload (d20)(d24)(d27)(d21) Care and domestic work (CDW) are not officially accounted for (d20)	CDW are invisible (d27) No acknowledgement and undervaluing of domestic workers (d22)(d26)
	Inequalities in the labour market	Unemployment rate (d21)(d26)(d24)Sexual harassment (d24) Gender pay gap (d24)(d26) Labour reforms (d27) Gender occupational segregation (d24) Exploitation of domestic workers (poorly paid) (d20)(d22)(d24)(d26)	
	Work — Precarity — Life	Precarious work days (d20) Poverty is increasingly gendered (d24)(d26)(d27)(d21) Commodification and objectification (d24)(d25)	Care and precarity (d22)
	Reorganisation of time and work	Lack of male co-responsibility in the household (d22)	
	Value / to value		Official figures (d20)(d24)
	Non-recognition	Non recognition (acknowledgement) of particular situations (d21)(d22)(d23)(d24)(d25)(d26) The stigma of prostitution (d25)	
Prognosis	Frames	Redistribution	Recognition
	Reorganisation of time and work	Parental leaves (d21)(d24) Co-responsibility (between women and men and among the members of a household) (d20)(d23)(d24) Self-management and community work (d24) Solidarity / mutual support (d24)(d26)	

TABLE 1.
FRAMES ON WORK AND GENDER (CONT.)

	Frames	Redistribution	Recognition
Prognosis	Reorganisation of time and work	Parental leaves (d21)(d24) Co-responsibility (between women and men and among the members of a household) (d20)(d23)(d24) Self-management and community work (d24) Solidarity / mutual support (d24) (d26)	
	Recognition		Shed light on women's work (d24) Dignify all care works (paid and unpaid) (d22) (d24)(d26)(d27) Prostitution as violence (d25)
	Value / to value	Integration of domestic workers in social security's general regime (d22) Reform of immigration law (d22)	
	Redistribution	Changes in economic management (d21) Universalisation (d20)(d21) Exploitation of care and sexual work (d20) (d21)(d22)(d24)(d26)	
	Policies and legislation	Labour gendered policies (d20) (d21)(d24) Domestic workers (d20)(d21)(d22) (d24)(d26)	

Source: Own data.

Political representation of the WFM around work

In this subsection, first we present the main diagnosis frames of representation of the WFM and second the prognosis in the form of collective action frames. We describe the findings in terms of (non)representation, (non)empowerment and (de)legitimation. We also outline the relations of the WFM with the trade unions, employers' organisations and governmental bodies.

The diagnosis of WFM's discourses around the representation of work establishes the subframe 'contradictions' as dominant. These chisel into women's political disempowerment throughout the analysis, and when expressed together with the frame work-precarity-life they also highlight stress, submission and lack of capacity of protest. Drawing from the WFM discursive production, we suggest that the non-representation of women is determined by the division-continuum of public and private life, by the organisation of time and work and by the dominance of a male model of work, which involves a non-recognition of other forms of work and the permanence of both a male universal subject of work and a male universal

political subject. This influences women's lower political participation and their reduced presence in the public space. Likewise, the WFM also makes explicit the under-representation of certain groups (housewives, precarious workers) by traditional trade unions. Activists feel reprisals are taken against their claims and we describe this as a delegitimation problem in work representation. This is shown by the use of the subframes 'invisibility', 'domestication' and 'criminalization', always linked to the suppression of voices: "*we are not taken into account for the solutions, but yes when it comes to paying the consequences*" (d27).

TABLE 2.
REPRESENTATION-DIAGNOSIS FRAMES⁴

Non-representation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lower participation in public life • Male universal subject of work • No trade union representation • Male universal political subject
Non-empowerment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contradictions • Stress • Submission • Lack of capacity to protest
Delegitimization	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Domestication of political fights • Criminalisation of protests • Discourses are hidden

Source: Own data.

Collective action frames on work (CAF)

The following table presents the CAF identified in the discourses of the WFM in order to overcome the diagnosed problems related to the political representation of work.

TABLE 3.
COLLECTIVE ACTION FRAMES ON WORK⁵

Representation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strike • Political participation: Demonstrate-reclaim the streets; Signature (manifiesto or action support); Vote; Campaign; Women's participation model; Union between feminist movement and trade unions; Participation in governmental bodies; Refuse to participate in governmental bodies; Autonomy
-----------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

4. This table shows frames from the period between 1988 and 2012 from the following documents (d3) (d7) (d9)(d10)(d13)(d14)(d17)(d26)(d27).

5. This table shows frames from the period between 1988 and 2012 from the following documents: (d1) (d5) (d6) (d7) (d8) (d9) (d10) (d11) (d12) (d13) (d14) (d16) (d17) (d18) (d19) (d20) (d21) (d22) (d24) (d25) (d27).

TABLE 3.
COLLECTIVE ACTION FRAMES ON WORK (CONT.)

Empowerment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strike • Negotiation power • Empowerment • Communicate
Legitimation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strike • Politicize • Humanize • An own agenda

Source: Own data.

CAF which aim at stopping women's disempowerment are the most marginal ones. They are a needed step in order to acquire political agency; they have an individual perspective and often a domestic approach, which finally brings together collective fights:

"[...] we want to communicate to the citizens of Donosti that we are fed up"
(d20).

"to work out our fears and our wisdom" (d22).

Responsibility for women's failed representation around work is attributed to governmental bodies — which should channel the WFM's claims — as well as in the dangerous *liason* between the state and enterprises. This delegitimation of the WFM's discourses around work can be overcome by means of the creation of an own agenda — women's own and independent priorities — as well as through discursive transformations. For instance, to grant the category of political to the issues that the social movement wants to contribute to. Or to reshape the meaning of concepts that have proven to be successful in the public sphere:

"To socialize and politicize care" (d17).

"Parity also at home. Campaign 40-60: Co-respond" (d23).

There are two dominant CAF, 'political participation' and 'strike'. The former especially covers a wide range of activities and it is a frame for all the feminist strategies of inclusion, reversal and displacement. The CAF 'strike' is mainly developed by the reversal and displacement strategies. Among the variety of subframes that we have codified under the general CAF of 'political participation', the most dominant ones are "to reclaim the streets" and "to demonstrate". This is followed by two CAF that show opposed models of collective action in the WFM. On the one hand, the feminist strategy of inclusion

supports the participation in governmental bodies, as well as in trade unions. On the other hand, the reversal strategy supports a “women’s model of participation”. This is built through the practice of daily life and it implies a breakup and a transposition of the male universal model of work:

“To improve work (political and employment) in the public sphere, society should learn from women” (d10).

In a similar line there are discourses that strengthen “not to participate in governmental / formal representation”, and also to promote “self-management”. The latter also expresses different solutions to the non-representation of the WFM in work issues. It is articulated as a need for control of the tasks that are performed in a job, in terms of the workers’ agency. It also legitimates the WFM’s strategies to directly negotiate with the state and enterprises in employment disputes, by passing formal channels. Moreover the CAF “self-management” opens up new possibilities in the management of work and its representation, linked to the WFM’s agency. In turn, the CAF ‘strike’ expresses forms of collective action that aim at overcoming problems in the three dimensions of representation. It is an empowerment tool, for those who support it. It also has an impact in representation, reshaping the place where it should occur. And by discursively displacing work and the subject of traditional strikes it also extends the legitimation of a strike to all forms of works and to new and intersectional subjects:

“Who calls a strike? How can the precarious women and men workers participate in a strike? Is a 24 hour strike effective? [...] There is a gap between the work experience and the political struggles” (d14).

In the WFN’s discourses, this CAF appears as a women’s strike (d8), as a precarious one (d14), as a general strike on care (d22) or as a home strike (d27). It is voiced that a traditional strike doesn’t take into account the claims and experiences of care and domestic work and of those workers at the margins. These new strikes open up new political and vital scenarios: “*What would happen if one day we decide not to go to work?*” (d22), is a fundamental question raised by the domestic carers.

Finally, we take a close look at the discursive relation between the WFN and the main actors in the formal representation of labour, collective bargaining. We will first present the findings on the relations with trade unions, moving to employers’ organisation and ending with governmental bodies.

Trade unions are often stated as patriarchal and sexist both by the feminist activists and by the trade union representatives who have been interviewed. Many discourses promoted a differentiation in claiming tasks: trade unions should focus on the labour market, while the social movement should only address care and domestic work. We argue that this differentiation, dichotomizing work, abounds in the representation barriers of the WFM.

There are *three frames* that explain the relation between the WFM and the trade unions. The first one is the “pact” between the social movement and the trade unions to defend women’s interest. The second is the “feminist autonomy” in front of enterprises and the third one is the “integration of women” in trade unions to participate in collective bargaining. In fact, although currently questioned, collective bargaining is still the official and only place to negotiate labour conditions. Despite this closed representation channel, “feminist autonomy” has made up many other collective forms of representation around work that have been sometimes successful. The domestic workers’ mobilisation is key to understanding the WFM’s representation around work, despite their competing intersectional situation between class and origin, and despite the trade union’s disregard towards domestic workers’ interests. Although legally unsuccessful, domestic workers’ struggle is an example of representation of voices at the margins that are being constantly neglected, innovative forms of collective action that go beyond the structured channels, and collective organisation that rekindles feminist solidarity:

“Trade unions don’t want to defend domestic workers, because what can be claimed is always little [...] Once we even had to denounce a trade union for their practices” (e29).

“If we decide to demonstrate on the 1st of May we always march after the domestic workers” (e30).

The WFM’s discursive production points at the responsibility of enterprises in causing problems for women in relation to work. The relation between them is not fluid and the position towards employers’ representation varies widely. While, for instance, domestic workers’ associations choose to confront them by denouncing them or by demonstrating in front of the enterprises that exploit them, other activists feel disrespect towards gender equality, and many think that it is not useful even to approach them:

“Every time we talk about gender equality to an employer, he doesn’t see a social justice issue but a cost” (e35).

“We do not have contacts with enterprises. They used to laugh at us, now at least they do not have fun anymore” (e49).

“In the negotiations of the Equality Law I had terrible fights with certain employer organisations due to parental leave” (e39).

Finally, we tackled the relation of the WFM with the governmental institutions. The channels are clear and direct when it comes to negotiate with gender bodies, but diffuse, non-existent or dependent on the will of the politician with regards to the employment

bodies. Employment bodies confirmed that their main and only interlocutors are trade unions and employers' organisations. The WFM's discourses establish that the state is responsible for generating, holding and deepening the problems of the representation of the WFM around work. Discourses express the lack of democratic procedures, the fact of not allowing gender interests to be properly represented and the maintenance of power mechanisms against women. Most of the discourses placed in the reversal and displacement feminist strategies grow apart from governmental bodies and describe gender equality policies often as a fraud to women. The representation problems of the WFM in relation to the state are shown in relevant frames disputes. An important one is embodied in the metaframe '(re)organisation of time and work' which is the key concern and challenge of the WFM. Certain WFM's discourses hold that 'work, family and personal time conciliation' — work-life balance policies — have been created in order to benefit corporate interests. 'Co-responsibility' — with an increased responsibility of men at home, but also the state and even enterprises — is one of the counter-frames proposed by the social movement and even by many equality bodies. Another WFM frame is 'cuidadania' ('care citizenship'), which results from a word combination of citizenship and care. This frame is especially meaningful for the representation scale as it aims at reshaping the logic of conciliation by care rights through a participatory and political approach.

CONCLUSIONS

In this paper we have argued that the WFM's representation of work is challenging labour relations and the formal system of work by opening up new discursive approaches and innovative possibilities in terms of collective action. We have illustrated this through a discourse analysis of the WFM's production on work and gender in Spain between 2009 and 2012. We have discussed how WFM interpretative frames are reshaping the notion of work, how their subjects of work displace the hegemonic and traditional workers of trade unions, and how their collective action is transforming the place where representation of work occurs. We have drawn on power theories and representation approaches to show that the WFM's activities are a key instance for Allen's power-with dimension. The WFM is able to act together for the attainment of their claims, creating alternatives and resistances, even if the formal representation of work issues is closed in terms of interpretative frames, subjects, actors and places. These are the three fronts that we have outlined:

First, most Spanish WFM discourses on work and gender challenge positions anchored in economic rationality (work=employment). The three main frames that explain the most important changes under discussion — life, precarity, and (re) organization of time and work — show discursive disputes that impact in the notion of work, extending it to other activities beyond employment. The struggle over the life frame explicitly indicates that it is there where the economic, political and human current struggles are developed. The frame precarity-work-life goes beyond the dichotomy of paid and unpaid work. Precarity

is rooted in the labour market but it ends up projected in the subjective and every-day life. In this sense it refers to all forms of work and is often shown at the intersection of the systems of inequality and through the intersection of gender with other categories. Precarity is not in contradiction with the previous main category of work, social class. It does not deny it, as it is partly integrated and included in it, giving meaning to the limitations of social class in the current context. Likewise, precarity and life explain the confluence and articulation of the Spanish WFM with antique social movements — e.g., environmentalism — and emerging ones — e.g., precarity, anti-globalisation groups or the Indignados movement. These two frames emphasize the distance between the Spanish WFM and the trade unions. Additionally, the triadic concept of work that we draw on and that is also used in many WFM discourses integrating employment, reproductive work and political activities also reformulates the representation and power processes that we have analysed.

To answer the question of who is the Spanish WFM representing on gender and work disputes, we conclude that the discourses from the three feminist strategies provide multiple subjects of work resulting from the recognition of domestic and care work as well as political work, each characterized by the high presence of gender intersectionality with other categories of inequality. These workers are present in all areas of human activities. Related to the dominant (male) worker, three features have been suggested: the exclusion of women, the invisibility of any other category beyond class that might generate inequality and the marginalization of any task that is not paid work. This implies several extensions of the dominant worker. The first one is linked to domestic and care workers — whether paid or unpaid — and it provides agency to housewives, mothers, neighbours and friends, among others. Men are present in these activities as the absent and passive workers. In the labour market there are workers that have no place in trade unions. A myriad of new professions (teleworkers, freelancers), the sex workers or domestic workers are not taken into account at the same time that they challenge the limits of the traditional worker. In addition, the intersectionality of gender with other categories is a source of displacement that redefines the boundaries of the traditional worker. Likewise, class is placed in a fragile and ambivalent situation due to both its classical dominance and its low intersectional porosity to new discourses. In turn, race, ethnic or geographical origin is the main category that is expressed in the documents intersecting with gender and it is also an identity that activists struggle to rally: “*sisters, with ID or IDless, we are all one*” (d22).

Finally, is the WFM an agent that represents gender interests on work in the public sphere, and if so, where is this representation taking place? Taking into account that the formal representation — through collective bargaining — is a place currently banned to social agents that are not trade unions or employer organisations, the WFM has put in place a wide range of representation actions that challenge these classical channels. Through the recognition of work beyond employment and a worker beyond the traditional conception of a worker, the WFM forges new places where this representation can occur, innovative claiming methods and new ways of managing work issues. The WFM projects a mutation

of the representation of work issues by means of a discursive and collective action innovation. The strikes (e.g. women's strike, precarious workers' strike, home strikes) cover new problems and challenge the traditional worker. They subvert failed representation including personal contradictions, trying to overcome the lower participation of women in public life or their lack of union representation. This is done by means of CAF that appeal to empowerment, self-organization, covenants among women, parity in the private sphere and the public and expanding the subject of political action to all those who have been excluded from classical labour strikes. Although there are struggles with the trade unions and the state, and despite the state being the agent that is supposed to put in place policies to overcome the identified gender problems, the WFM shapes new ways of solving problems relating to work. These proposals empower the social movement and open up new opportunities for the representation of work claims. Gender injustices are seen as problems caused by patriarchy in interaction with capitalism, racism, heteronormativity, problems on ecological sustainability and current democratic systems. Therefore, they are economic, political and human. And in terms of management, the WFM expresses choices that deviate from the hierarchy of governmental structures. They opt for horizontality, diversity, citizen participation and collective management. They speak about community work, self-managed work, solidarity and mutual support, empowering the feminist networks and women's voices.

ACNOWLEDGMENTS

The author is grateful to James S.F. Wilson, Kate Clayton-Hathway and the Centre for Diversity Policy Research and Practice–Oxford Brookes University, and the anonymous reviewers for valuable comments and helpful contributions.

References

- Alfama, Eva. 2007. "Límits, avanços i obertures sobre la participació en els moviments socials", *Nous Horitzons*, 186: 16-22.
- Allen, Amy. 1999. *The Power of Feminist Theory: Domination, Resistance, Solidarity*. Oxford: Westview.
- Benería, Lourdes. 2005. *Género, desarrollo y globalización: por una ciencia económica para todas las personas*. Barcelona: Hacer.
- Benhabib, Seyla. 2006. *Las reivindicaciones de la cultura. Igualdad y diversidad en la era global*. Madrid: Katz.
- Bilbao, Andrés. 1993. *Obreros y Ciudadanos. La desestructuración de la clase obrera*. Madrid: Trotta.
- Borderías, Cristina, Cristina Carrasco and Carme Alemany, 1994. *Las Mujeres y el Trabajo: Rupturas Conceptuales*. Barcelona: Icaria.

- Braidotti, Rosi. 2000. *Sujetos nómadas: corporización y diferencia sexual en la teoría feminista contemporánea*, Barcelona: Paidós.
- Bustelo, María and Emanuela Lombardo (eds.). 2007. *Políticas de igualdad en España y Europa. Afinando la mirada*. Madrid: Cátedra.
- Butler, Judith. 2004. "Reescenificación de lo universal: hegemonía y límites del formalismo", in Judith Butler, Ernesto Laclau, and Slavoj, Žižek, *Contingencia, hegemonía, universalidad. Diálogos contemporáneos en la izquierda*. Buenos Aires: Fondo de Cultura Económica.
- Carrasco, Cristina. 1998. "Trabajo y empleo: apuntes para una discusión no androcéntrica", in Arantxa Rodríguez (ed.), *Reorganización del trabajo y empleo de las mujeres*. Valencia: Germania.
- Childs, Sarah and Joni Lovenduski. 2012. "Political Representation", in Georgina Waylen et al. (eds.) *The Oxford Handbook of Gender and Politics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Crenshaw, Kimberle. 1989. "Demarginalizing the Intersection of Race and Sex: A Black A Black Feminist Critique of Antidiscrimination Doctrine, Feminist Theory and Antiracist Politics", *University of Chicago Legal Forum*, 140: 139-167.
- Comité Invisible. 2009. *La insurrección que viene*. Barcelona: Melusina.
- Conley, Hazel. 2012. "Using equality to challenge austerity: new actors, old problems". *Work, Employment and Society*, 26 (2): 349-359.
- Davis, Angela. 1981/ 2004. *Mujeres, Raza y Clase*. Madrid: Akal.
- Della Porta, Donatella, Hanspeter Kriesi, and Dieter Rucht (eds.). 1999. *Social Movements in a Globalizing World*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Durán, María Ángeles. 2001. "El análisis de exhaustividad en la economía española", in Cristina Carrasco (ed.), *Tiempos, Trabajos y Género*. Barcelona: Publicacions de la Universitat de Barcelona.
- Engels, Friedrich. 1845. *La Situación de la Clase Obrera en Inglaterra*. <http://www.facmed.unam.mx/deptos/salud/censenanza/spivst/spiv/situacion.pdf> [Accessed: 1st of March, 2015].
- Fairclough, Norman and Ruth. Wodak. 1997. 'Critical discourse analysis', Teun A. Van Dijk (ed.), *Discourse Studies. A multidisciplinary introduction, vol. 2, Discourse as social interaction*. London: Sage.
- Fraser, Nancy. 1997. *Iustitia Interrupta. Reflexiones críticas desde la posición "postsocialista"*. Bogotá: Siglo del Hombre.
- Fraser, Nancy and Alex Honneth. 2006. *¿Redistribución o Reconocimiento?* Madrid: Ediciones Morata.
- Fraser, Nancy. 2008. *Escalas de Justicia*, Barcelona: Herder Editorial.
- Federici, Silvia. 2004. *Calibán y la Bruja. Mujeres, cuerpo y acumulación originaria*. Madrid: Traficantes de Sueños.
- Ferré, Myra Marx and Patricia Yancey Martin. 1995. "Doing the work of the Movement: Feminist Organizations", in Myra Marx Ferree, and Patricia Yancey Martin (eds.),

- Feminist Organizations. Harvest of the New Women's Movement*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Ferrée, Myra Marx and Silke Roth. 1998. "Gender, Class and the Interaction among Social Movements: A Strike of West Berlin Daycare workers", *Gender and Society*, 12 (6): 626-648.
- Ferrée, Myra Marx and Beth Hess. 2000. *Controversy and coalition. The new feminist movement across. Four decades of change*. New York: Routledge.
- Ferrée, Myra Marx. 2009. "Inequality, Intersectionality and the Politics of Discourse: Framing Feminist Alliances", in Emanuela Lombardo *et al.* (eds.), *The Discursive Politics of Gender Equality: Stretching, Bending and Policy-Making*. London: Routledge.
- Foucault, Michel. 1992. *El Orden del Discurso*. Buenos Aires: Tusquets Editores.
- Foucault, Michel. 1980. "Two lectures", in Colin Gordon (ed.), *Michel Foucault: Power/Knowledge — Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972-1977*. London: Haverster Wheatsheaf.
- Gardiner, Jean. 1999. "Los padres fundadores", in Cristina Carrasco (ed.), *Mujeres y Economía. Nuevas perspectivas para viejos y nuevos problemas*. Barcelona: Icaria.
- Gil, Silvia L. 2011. *Nuevos feminismos. Sentidos comunes en la dispersión. Una historia de trayectorias y rupturas en el Estado español*. Madrid: Traficantes de Sueños.
- Goetz, André. 1995. *Metamorfosis del Trabajo*. Madrid: Editorial Sistema.
- Grisoni, Louise and Sonia Ruiz. 2015. "Gender equality and Austerity: Vulnerabilities, Resistances and Change", under review for a Special Issue at *Gender, Work and Organisation*.
- Hardt, Michael. 2000. "El trabajo afectivo". <http://alepharts.org/pens/trabajoafectivo.html> [Accessed: 1st of March 2015].
- Kantola, Johanna. 2006. *Feminists Theorize the State*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Kaplan, Temma. 2008. "Social Movements of women and the public good", in Cristina Borderías, and Mercè Renom (eds.), *Dones en Moviment(s). Segles XVIII-XXI*. Barcelona: Edicions Universitat de Barcelona y Icaria Editorial.
- Krizzan, Andrea and Verloo Mieke. 2006. "D9 Frame and voice analysis methodology Manual" (QUING unpublished report). Vienna: IWM.
- Laclau, Ernesto and Chantalle Mouffe. 2004. *Hegemonía y Estrategia Socialista. Hacia una radicalización de la democracia*. Buenos Aires: Fondo de Cultura Económica.
- Leira, Arnlaug and Chiara Saraceno. 2002. "Care: Actors, relationship and contexts", in Jane, Lewis, Barbara, Hobson, and Birte, Siim (eds.). *Contested Concepts in Gender and social Politics*, Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Letamendía, Francisco. 2009. *Estructura política del mundo del trabajo: Fordismo y Posfordismo*. Madrid: Tecnos.
- Lloyd, Moya. 2005. *Beyond identity politics. Feminism, power & politics*. London: Sage.

- Meier, Petra and Emanuela Lombardo. 2014. *The Symbolic Representation of Gender*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Mayordomo, Maribel. 2004. *Dones, treballs i economia laboral: una proposta alternativa per analitzar el món del treball*. Barcelona: CTEESC.
- McAdam, Doug, John McCarthy and Mayer Zald (eds.). 1999. *Movimientos sociales: perspectivas comparadas*. Madrid: Istmo.
- Medá, Dominique. 1998. *El trabajo: un valor en peligro de extinción*. Barcelona: Gedisa.
- Mies, Maria. 1986. *Patriarchy and Accumulation on a World Scale. Women in the international division of labour*. London: Zed Books.
- Nussbaum, Martha and Amartya Sen. 1992. *The Quality of Life*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Oliver, Pamela and Hank Johnston. 2005. "What a Good Idea: Frames and Ideologies in Social Movements Research", in Hank Johnston and John Noakes (eds.), *Frames of Protest. Social movements and the framing perspective*. Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Pérez Orozco, Amaya. 2006. "Amenaza tormenta: la crisis de los cuidados y la reorganización del sistema económico". http://www.observatoridesc.org/sites/default/files/1_amenaza_tormenta.pdf [Accessed: 1st of March 2015].
- Pitkin, Hanna Fenichel. 1967/1972. *The Concept of Representation*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Pitkin, Hanna. 1967. *The concept of representation*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Prieto, Carlos. 1999. "Crisis del empleo. ¿Crisis del orden social?", in Faustino Miguélez and Carlos Prieto, *Las relaciones de empleo en España*. Madrid: Siglo XXI.
- Rich, Adrienne. 1984. *Blood, Bread and Poetry, Selected Prose (1979-1985)*. London: Little Brown.
- Roth, Karl-Heinz and Angelika Ebbinghaus. 2010. *El Otro Movimiento Obrero y la Represión Capitalista en Alemania*. Madrid: Traficantes de Sueños.
- Ruiz García, Sonia. 2013. *Trabajo y género en el movimiento feminista y de mujeres en el estado español (1988-2012). De Obreras, Cuidadoras y Activistas*. Directors: Emanuela Lombardo and Pilar Giménez. Barcelona: Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona.
- Sassen, Saskia. 2003. *Cartografías de la globalización. Género y ciudadanía en los circuitos transnacionalizados*. Madrid: Traficantes de Sueños.
- Saward, Michael. 2009. "Authorisation and Authenticity: Representation of the Unelected", *Journal of Political Philosophy*, 17 (1):1-22.
- Sawicki, Jana. 1991. *Disciplining Foucault: feminism, power, and the body*. New York: Routledge.
- Snow, David A. and Robert D Benford. 2000. "Framing processes and social movements: an overview and assessment", *Annual Review of Sociology*, 26: 611-639.

- Spivak, Gayatri. 1988. "Can the Subaltern speak?", in Cary Nelson and Lawrence Grossberg (eds.), *Marxisms and the Interpretation of Culture*. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, Illinois.
- Squires, Judith. 1999. *Gender in Political Theory*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Tarrow, Sidney. 1997. *El Poder en Movimiento. Los Movimientos Sociales, la Acción Colectiva y la Política*. Madrid: Alianza Editorial.
- Van Dijk, Teun L. 2005. "Ideología y análisis del discurso", *Utopía y Praxis latinoamericana*, 29: 9-36.
- Verloo, Mieke. 2005. "Displacement and Empowerment: Reflections on the Concept and Practice of the Council of Europe Approach to Gender Mainstreaming and Gender Equality", *Social Politics*, 12 (3): 344-365.
- Walby, Sylvia. 1990. *Theorizing Patriarchy*. Cambridge: Blackwell.
- Walby, Sylvia. 2011. *The future of feminism*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Young, Iris Marion. 2000. *La Justicia y la Política de la Diferencia*. Madrid: Cátedra.

Documents

- (d20).2009. *¡Estamos hartas! Queremos un sistema económico social y feminista*. Consejo de Mujeres de Donostia-San Sebastián por la Igualdad.
- (d21).2009. *Igualdad de género frente a la crisis económica*. Varias asociaciones y personas individuales.
- (d22).2009. *Derivas colectivas en un taller singular: la biografía de Territorio doméstico*. Territorio Doméstico.
- (d23).2009. *La paridad, también en el hogar, Campaña 40-60 de CO-RESPONDE*, Asociación de Hombres por la igualdad de género (AHIGE).
- (d24).2011. *Capitalismo y patriarcado: multiplicando desigualdades* Asamblea Laboral de la Asamblea Popular de Arganzuela-Madrid.
- (d25).2011. *Manifiesto Transmaricabollo*. Asamblea Transmaricabollo, 15M. Madrid
- (d26).2011. [Declaración del grupo de trabajo de migrantes] Feministas Indignadas. Barcelona.
- (d27).2012. *29M ¡Esta casa en huelga! Delantales a la calle. Sí a la reforma general del sistema*. Euskal Erriko Emakumeon, Mundo Martxaroka Plataforma, Bilgune Feminista and others.

Interviews

- (e29). 2009. Asociación Trabajadoras del Hogar de Bizcaya. Isabel Otxoa, founder.
- (e30) 2009 Asamblea de Mujeres de Bizcaya Anabel Sanz del Pozo; Tere Maldonado Barahona; Marijo Sola Sarabia; Luisa Menéndez Aguirre.

(e35).2009. Mujeres Progresistas. Yolanda Besteiro, President.

(e39).2009. CCOO (Comisiones Obreras). Carmen Bravo, Equality secretary.

(e49).2010. Dones i Treballs. Cristina Carrasco, Pilar Codina, Hortensia Fernández, members.

ANNEX 1: DESCRIPTION OF FRAMES ON WORK AND GENDER

- **(Re)organisation of time and work.** Metaframe — present throughout the whole period, in all the feminist strategies. It is relevant to the three scales and it embodies several ideological approaches.
- **(Non) recognition.** Expresses nonacknowledgment or disrespect. Present in all the diagnosis and in all the feminist strategies.
- **Labour inequalities and discrimination.** A frame of diagnosis. It has a special incidence in the strategies of inclusion and displacement.
- **Value/ to value.** Not present in the inclusion strategy. It is mainly a prognosis frame and it appears linked to the scale of recognition. It also points out to redistributive justice, as it proposes several ways to end up with problems related to the undervalue of female work.
- **(Non) redistribution.** Expresses exploitation, marginalisation and economic privacy problems as well as solutions. It integrates the lack of recognition without taking solutions into account.
- **Policies and laws.** Proposes solutions in the area of public management from the dimensions of recognition and redistribution.
- **WorkPrecarityLife.** Springs at the beginning of 21st century in conjunction with the three dimensions of justice. It is a frame for work and for subjects. Its employment version covers the whole period of study under the frame of labour inequalities and discriminations. It incorporates all works.

Presentado para evaluación: 13 de mayo de 2015.

Aceptado para publicación: 5 de octubre de 2015.

SONIA RUIZ GARCÍA, Oxford Brookes University
ruizgs@gmail.com

Sonia Ruiz García, doctora en Ciencias Políticas por la *Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona* y *visiting fellow* en el *Centre for Diversity Policy Research and Practice* de *Oxford Brookes University*. Su tesis doctoral acerca de los discursos sobre trabajo del movimiento feminista en el estado español (2013) fue accésit primero del Premio María Ángeles Durán de innovación científica en género (2014). Sus investigaciones recientes

se centran en los impactos de género de la crisis multidimensional y en la acción colectiva feminista. Ha sido *policy officer* en el European Women's Lobby, forma parte del cuerpo funcionarial local como técnica en política social y en la actualidad es la responsable de transversalidad de género del *Ajuntament* de Barcelona. Sonia es madre de una niña y activista feminista.