



SWST - International
Society of Wood
Science and Technology

Workplace Harassment in Forestry Organizations – Gendering the Experiences of Women and Men



Kristina Johansson^{1*}, Elias Andersson², Therese Sehlstedt¹

Abstract

Based on a case study of one large company in the Swedish forest sector, this article explores the nature and practice of workplace harassment in forestry organizations. A questionnaire answered by 645 employees (92.5% response rate) shows that both women and men report experiences of harassment at work, although in different forms, with different frequencies and with different consequences. A total of 38% of women and 14% of men employed by the company report experiences of harassment at work. Both women and men most often experience verbal and psychological harassment by coworkers during day-to-day activities. However, unlike men, women also experience workplace harassment that takes place on and across a wider range of spatial and temporal relations and with various perpetrators involved. Also evident was that women respondents had a more negative perception of company culture and gender equality status compared with men, and the most negative perceptions were from women reporting experiences of harassment. Based on this case study, the article provides quantitative descriptions of workplace harassment experienced by women in Swedish forestry organizations that were previously explored from a qualitative perspective. This article also adds new insights into the existence of workplace harassment in forestry organizations that is not of a sexual nature and that not only women but also men report.

Keywords: Swedish forest sector, forest industry, gender equality, male-dominated, workplace survey

1. Introduction

Historically, forestry has primarily involved physically demanding manual work tasks, with practical and symbolic associations with men and particular forms of rural, blue-collar, nature-mastering masculinity (Ager 2014, Johansson 1994). The introduction of new technology and automatized operations, together with the development of a service-based economy and an increased focus on forestry planning and management, have created a need for more varied competences and skillsets (Ager 2014, Häggström et al. 2013, SweGov 2007). This development has, at least in the Swedish forest sector,

motivated policy makers and company representatives to promote gender equality, often with a focus on increasing the representation of women, as one of the means to modernize the sector and make it more attractive and competitive (Andersson et al. 2018, Johansson & Ringblom 2017, cf. Hansen et al. 2016).

Promoting gender equality in forestry requires nuanced knowledge of the various ways in which structures, practices, professional values, and skillsets of forestry organizations are constructed in relation to norms of masculinity. While progress has been made (e.g., Andersson et al. 2018, Andersson & Lidestav 2016, Brandth & Haugen, 2005a, 2005b; Johansson et al. 2019b), the existing literature provides limited insights regarding the extent to which gendering structures and practices in forestry take the form of workplace harassment. In a qualitative analyses of women forestry professionals' testimonies from the Metoo-campaign #slutavverkat, Johansson et al. (2018) found that sexual harassment connects to broader gendering of power relations at work

¹ Department of Business Administration, Technology and Social Sciences, Luleå University of Technology, Sweden

² Department of Forest Resource Management, Swedish University of Agricultural Science, Sweden

* Corresponding author: kristina.johansson@ltu.se

and constitutes a barrier to diversity in forestry organizations (cf. Hansen et al. 2016). More quantitative-oriented insights, including incidence or analyses of harassment in relation to specific organizational contexts, are missing in the literature. The necessity of more studies on harassment in forestry is further warranted, considering that women in male-dominated organizations are more likely to experience sexual harassment compared to women in general (e.g., Gruber 1998, McDonald 2012). According to Collinson and Collinson (1996), the sexual harassment of women by men in male-dominated organizations is a way that men manifest homosocial bonds among themselves and keep women out of their territory. In this way, sexual violence surfaces as a means of control over women (e.g., Bagilhole 2002, Collinson & Collinson 1996, Watts 2007b, Wright 2016) and as an integral part of organizational life, rather than as an isolated abnormality (e.g., Hearn & Parkin 2001, Hearn et al. 1989). As the line between experiences of ill-treatment as a minority in a male-dominated organization and sexual harassment is subjective and often times blurry, the task of mapping the incidence of harassment is far from clear-cut (Cairns 1997, Collinson & Collinson 1996).

Analyses of men's potential experiences of workplace harassment in forestry are also missing in the literature (cf. McDonald 2012). Gendered hierarchies in male-dominated organizations subordinate not only women but also some men and certain forms of masculinities. Hence, parallel to Connell's (1995) conceptualization of hegemonic masculinities, masculinities are to be understood in plural, making it important to also focus on power hierarchies among men. Men, especially newcomers, learners, and novices, tend to be subjected to different instances of ceremonial and ritualistic behavior, including, for example, degrading "practical jokes" (Collinson 1988, Plester 2015, Watts, 2007a). Ackroyd and Thompson (1999) suggest that rites and ceremonies that defile workers are functional for the group: "they are mechanisms by which informal hierarchies and group identities are developed and sustained" (p. 65). It is thus evident that harassment of both women and men plays a role in constructing and maintaining a workplace culture built on privileging some men over others.

Motivated by existing gaps in the literature and based on a case study of one large company in the Swedish forest sector, the overall aim of this article is *to analyze the role and characteristics of workplace harassment in forestry organizations from a gender perspective*. The specific research questions of the study are as follows:

- What are the characteristics and practice of workplace harassment that women and men experience in the organization?
- How do experiences of workplace harassment relate to women and men's perceptions of the organization?

2. Theoretical Background — Gendering Workplace Harassment

Harassment in the workplace, ranging from bullying to direct violence/assault, has been a focus of research over the last three decades – primarily from psychological and legal perspectives (e.g., Branch et al. 2013, McDonald 2012). Parts of this research have highlighted the gendered nature and implications of workplace harassment and the explicit sexual dimensions which distinguish sexual harassment from other types of harassment (Samuels 2003, Zippel 2006). Although these types of behaviors are prohibited by law in most industrial countries (McCann 2005), they are still frequent across all types of sectors and organizations. In its various forms, workplace harassment, regardless of whether it is identified as such, has negative consequences for both the organization and the individual exposed to the harassment (Berdahl & Aquino 2009, Welsh 1999). Male-dominated organizations and workplaces have been identified as particularly problematic and hostile in terms of the frequency and nature of harassment (e.g., Gruber 1998, McDonald 2012). In these environments, women are less likely to define their experiences as harassment perhaps because, as Collinson and Collinson (1996) suggest, they want to be considered equal members of the male collective. Additionally, the tendency of being harassed is associated with poorer psychological outcomes (Collinsworth et al. 2009). This is partly due to the asymmetrical power relations between women and men (Thomas 1997) and the fact that heterosexuality is a dominant characteristic of these male-dominated settings (Epstein 1996).

Workplace harassment not only affects the exposed individuals. The witnessing and awareness of harassment in organizations have also been shown to produce negative impacts and stress in persons who are not the targets of these actions and behaviors (e.g., Miner-Rubino & Cortina 2007, Raver & Gelfand 2005). For both of these groups, harassment has been linked to job-related factors such as absenteeism, lower job satisfaction, lower productivity, reduced motivation,

and employment withdrawal (e.g., Chan et al. 2008, Fitzgerald et al. 1997). Harassment has also been linked to different organizational levels, indicating differences between blue-collar and white-collar occupations, with a lower reported frequency in the latter (Chamberlain et al. 2008, de Haas & Timmerman 2010, Ilies et al. 2003).

The most frequently reported forms of workplace harassment are nonphysical harassment, such as verbal remarks and comments (Berdahl & Aquino 2009, Fitzgerald et al. 1997), suggesting that they appear less threatening and are more socially accepted than physical harassment within different contexts, especially in male-dominated and masculinized spaces (Cockburn 1991a, Collinson & Collinson 1989, Collinson et al. 1990). In these spaces, masculinized cultures of misogyny can contribute to masking, reinforcing and reproducing harassment in a socially acceptable way through, e.g., various forms of humor, imagery and jargon (Cockburn 1991a, Thornton 2002, Witz et al. 1996).

In this study, workplace harassment, in its various forms, is understood as a part of the on-going production of gender (Acker 1992) and the organization as it shapes and structures gendered interactions and relations through various forms of control (e.g., Berdahl 2007, Hearn & Parkin 2001, Hearn et al. 1989). This is particularly the case in relation to sexuality and male-dominated industries and organizations (Bagilhole 2002, Cockburn 1991b, Collinson & Collinson 1989, Collinson & Collinson 1996, Paap 2006, Watts 2007b, Witz et al. 1996), where harassment often constitutes the basis for performing masculinity (Paap 2006) and the institutionalization of heterosexuality (Ingraham 1994). Thus, following MacKinnon (1979, p. 1), we define sexual harassment as “the unwanted imposition of sexual requirements in the context of a relationship of unequal power.”

3. Methods

This article analyses the responses to a questionnaire collected as part of a case study of a large company within the Swedish forest sector conducted during 2017-2018. The study was initiated and funded by the company and focused on gender patterns, harassment, and organizational culture. As most companies within the forestry sector, positions and tasks in the company were divided along lines of gender: 80% of the respondents were blue-collar workers, and 20% of the respondents were office-based workers. Men constituted 85% of the respondents, and women constituted 15% of

the respondents. The proportion of women was larger among office-based personnel compared to blue-collar workers, mainly because women were predominant in lower-level administrative positions. Men held the majority of managerial and upper-level positions. The company approached the researchers wanting to learn more about the particular circumstances that prevented the company from promoting gender equality. Gender equality was defined in the study with both quantitative (the representation of men and women on different levels of the company) and qualitative (the workplace culture and its connection to exclusion and subordination) aspects in mind.

The researchers, in dialog with the company, decided on a study design that included a qualitative interview conducted with office staff and a quantitative survey administered to all personnel, covering gender patterns, workplace culture, and harassment. The company's role was mainly to coordinate the practical aspects of the study that enabled the researchers' access, while the researchers were in charge of the scientific design. Twenty-four semi-structured interviews with men and women office staff at different sites and different levels were conducted during the autumn of 2017. The interviews were analyzed and reported back to the company in the form of qualitative insights on identified problems relating to a macho workplace culture, the dominance of men in management, and sexual harassment, as well as a list of recommended measurements. These insights were then complemented by a questionnaire sent to all personnel measuring their attitudes and their perceptions of the company and its gender equality statutes, including the existence of workplace harassment, presented and analyzed in an additional report. In accordance with the scope of this article, the 645 responses (92.5% response rate) to the questionnaire were placed at the focal point.

3.1 The Questionnaire

The questionnaire, developed and conducted using the survey automation software program EvaSys, consisted of three blocks. Block one, *Introduction*, included six questions with fixed-answer options focusing on demographic and employment matters (gender, age, allocation, type of employment, form of employment, and education). Block two, *My workplace*, consisted of 28 statements about organizational culture, use of language, and career opportunities. Sixteen of the 28 statements concerned women's and men's career opportunities and ill-treatment, derived from the interviews

with office staff. Each statement was designed to cover a specific (but interrelated) aspect of gendered organizations, such as influence, value of competences, and access to networks and different managerial levels. The respondent was asked to state how well each statement described their workplace or work situation on a four-point scale ranging from *strongly disagree* to *strongly agree*. Organizational culture, use of language, and career opportunities are all complex issues that are difficult to reduce to a number of short, demarcated statements. In relation to the overall case study, this part of the questionnaire was designed as a form of complementary, quantitative illustrations or “thermometers” of the more elaborated, qualitative descriptions and analyses provided by the interview portion of the study. Block three, *Offensive treatment and harassment*, consisted of questions with fixed-answer options. Respondents who stated that they had not experienced harassment answered four questions on their knowledge of company protocols. Respondents who stated that they had experienced harassment answered 13 questions (which also surveyed the type of harassment experienced and whether it had been reported to the company).

3.2 Analyzing and Reporting the Data

The survey data consisted of responses from 645 employees (92.5% response rate). The analysis of the survey data was conducted using IBM SPSS Statistics software and focused on descriptive and bivariate statistical analysis. The results from cross-tab analyses are the focus of this article. The analyses were performed to identify statistically significant differences between different groups of respondents (e.g., harassed/non-harassed, men/women and blue-collar/white-collar workers) that would characterize and explain the structure of harassment and the experience of different groups within the organization. Chi-square tests were used to test the variations between the different groups, and $p < 0.05$ was used as the level of significance. The chi-square test was carried out on the four-point scale.

The data presented in this paper are descriptive, based on quantitative survey data focusing on women’s and men’s experiences of workplace harassment based on the responses to the fixed-answer questions (block three in the questionnaire) and analyses of how the experiences of harassment may relate to variations in women’s and men’s perceptions of the company. The second theme is based on analyses of how women and men (with or without experiences of harassment) rated

each of the 28 statements focusing on organizational culture and gender equality statutes (block two in the questionnaire). To illustrate the indication of patterns identified during the analytical process, the data presented in this paper focus on the differences between the responses to one alternative of the four-point scale of each statement. Statements formulated on a positive note focus on the response alternative “strongly agree,” while statements formulated on a negative note focus on the response alternative “strongly disagree.” The analyses of the statements identify more overarching variations and similarities in the relation between men’s and women’s experiences of workplace harassment and their perception of the organization. More in-depth analyses of the particular instance of the workplace culture for each evaluated statement are beyond the scope of this article.

Last, given the subjective nature of harassment, we interpret this result as the percentage of women and men who *state* that they have experienced harassment, rather than the experiences of harassment per se. Due to this study’s grounding in gender theories, “men” and “women” do not refer to essential or natural characteristics but to the result of “situated doings” (cf. West & Zimmerman 1989). Hence, women and men, and their experiences, are seen as the result of hierarchical ordered subject positions, organized in accordance with normative conceptions of gender differences in male-dominated organizations.

4. Results and Discussions

4.1 Women’s and Men’s Experiences of Harassment

Nearly four in ten women (38%) at the company stated that they have experienced workplace harassment. The corresponding share among men is 14% (Table 1). The questionnaire also included a question asking if the harassment experienced was of a sexual nature (yes/no/don’t know). The finding showed that women were far more likely than men to report experiences of sexual harassment; 57% of women – but only 6% of men – have experienced harassment “of a sexual nature.”

The majority of workplace harassment experienced by men and women in the company is not reported to management (Table 2). Only approximately one-fifth (19.5%) of men and women reported the/all workplace harassment they have experienced to the company,

and almost as many (16.9%) have reported one/several, but not all instances, of harassment they have experienced. A total of 63.6% of women and men who had experienced workplace harassment had not reported the harassment to the company. Regarding potential differences between men’s and women’s reports, the findings suggest that men were less likely than women to report harassment.

In terms of motives for not reporting harassment to the company, a large share of respondents reported not feeling that the incident was serious enough (Table 3); as many as 45% of the 62 persons who had not reported harassment stated this as the reason. The results show limited differences between women and men respondents, with the exception that women were significantly more afraid of the consequences following a report of harassment than were men. While 30% of the women not reporting harassment were afraid of the

consequences, this only applied to 16% of the men not reporting harassment.

Verbal abuse was the most frequent *type of workplace harassment* among both women and men who had experienced harassment (Table 4). Seven out of ten (72%) respondents who had experienced harassment reported verbal abuse, followed by psychological abuse (50%), and physical violence (1%). Women and men both reported experiences of psychological abuse (ignoring/excluding, feeling of being left out and/or not listened to), but women (68%) experienced these types of abuse more often compared to men (41%). Also evident is that one out of three women (32%) but zero men reported the experience of unwelcome physical contact. In terms of *regularity of harassment*, the harassment reported in the survey generally occurred more than once: 46% stated that harassment had occurred “more than once, but on isolated occasions.” 30.7% stated that harassment was “repeated,” while only 22.7% stated that the harassment only happened once. Regarding the *context of harassment*, incidents that occurred as part of day-to-day work dominated both women’s and men’s responses: 97% of women and 78% of men stated this option. Among women, 13% stated that the harassment occurred during conferences and 29% stated that it took place during “social events,” while none of the men stated these options. Most commonly, the *offender* was a coworker

Table 1. Respondents who have been subjected to workplace harassment in some form, either at or in relation to their workplace. All employees, n = 548 (women n = 81, men n = 467).

	Women		Men		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Yes	31	38.3	63	13.5	94	17.2
No	50	61.7	404	86.5	454	82.8

Table 2. If respondents reported workplace harassment to the company. Respondents who have experienced harassment, n = 77 (women: n = 31; men: n = 46).

	Women		Men		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Yes, this incident/all incidents experienced	8	25.8	7	15.2	15	19.5
Yes, one/several incidents but not all	8	25.8	5	10.9	13	16.9
No	15	48.4*	34	73.9*	49	63.6*

* = p < 0.05

Table 3. Motive for not reporting workplace harassment to the company. Respondents who have experienced harassment but have not reported it, n = 62 (women: n = 23; men: n = 39). Multiple selections are possible.

	Women		Men		Total	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
I didn’t think it was serious enough	11	47.8	17	46.3	28	45.2
I didn’t know how to go about it	5	21.7	5	12.8	10	16.1
I was afraid of the consequences	7	30.4*	3	7.7*	10	16.1*
Don’t know	3	13.0	4	10.3	7	11.3
Other	3	19.4	9	23.1	12	19.4

* = p < 0.05

Table 4. The characteristics of workplace harassment women and men have experienced in relation to work. Respondents who have experienced harassment.

Type of harassment ^a	Women		Men		Total	
	n(31)	%	n(63)	%	n(94)	%
Physical violence	0	0.0	1	1.6	1	1.1
Verbal abuse	23	74.2	45	71.4	68	72.3
Psychological abuse	21	67.7*		41.3*	47	50.0*
Unwelcomed physical contact	10	32.3*	0	0.0*	10	10.6*
Context of harassment^a						
	n(31)	%	n(63)	%	n(94)	%
Part of day-to-day work	30	96.8	49	77.8	79	84.0
Conferences	4	12.9*	0	0.0*	4	4.3*
Social events	9	29.0*	0	0.0*	9	9.6*
Outside working hours	9	29.0*	5	7.9*	14	14.9*
Regularity of harassment						
	n(28)	%	n(47)	%	n(75)	%
Once	4	14.3	13	27.7	17	22.7
More than once, but on isolated occasions	16	57.1	19	40.4	35	46.7
Repeatedly	8	28.6	15	31.9	23	30.7
Offender^a						
	n(31)	%	n(63)	%	n(94)	%
Customer/client	2	6.5*	0	0.0*	2	2.1*
Coworkers at the same workplace	19	61.3	38	60.3	57	60.6
Coworkers at other company workplaces	15	48.4*	11	17.5*	26	27.7*
Manager	9	29.0	10	15.9	19	20.2

* = $p < 0.05$

a = multiple selections possible

at the same workplace. This answer was reported by six of ten (61%) respondents who experienced workplace harassment, and the percentage was almost the same among women and men. The second most common type of offender was coworkers at other company workplaces, an alternative stated by almost half (48%) of the women and almost one out of five (18%) of the men. While no men reported harassment by customers, 7% of women did. In addition, 29% of women and 16% of men reported harassment by managers.

4.2 Experiences of Workplace Harassment Influence Perceptions of the Organization

How do experiences of workplace harassment relate to women's and men's perception of the organization? Respondents' perception of organizational culture and use of language were surveyed via 12 statements (Table 5).

The findings show that all respondents, independent of comparison group, most strongly agreed that "It is OK to ask others for advice and help to get work done,"

while the smallest number strongly agreed that "I find the conversation topics during break and lunch relevant and interesting." Also evident is that persons stating that they have experienced workplace harassment reported a more negative perception of the company, compared to persons who did not report harassment, and this was especially true for women. Overall, this discrepancy is the result of a general tendency among persons stating that they have experienced harassment to be less inclined to strongly agree with the statements. However, the responses to a number of statements indicate that harassed respondents were more negative and have a slightly different perception of the organizational culture compared to non-harassed respondents. Among women, this difference was found most often in relation to the statements "I am treated with respect" and "My workmates are there for me (support me)," which women who have experienced workplace harassment were far less likely to agree with, compared to non-harassed women. Among men, the largest discrepancy between harassed and

non-harassed respondents was related to “*Harassment is not accepted*” and “*I am treated with respect.*” Also evident is that in relation to “*Harassment is not accepted*” and “*I am treated with respect,*” harassed men and harassed women demonstrated far more similar perceptions of the organizational culture, compared to women and men with no experience of harassment.

All seven statements relating to women’s and men’s career opportunities (Table 6) show that women in general have a more negative perception of the company compared to men. The most negative responses came from women reporting experiences of workplace harassment, and while men who reported experiences of harassment were more negative than men who did not, the

Table 5. Experiences of workplace harassment influence women’s and men’s perceptions of organizational culture and use of language. Respondents that strongly agree with the statement.

	Women				Men			
	Harassed		Not Harassed		Harassed		Not Harassed	
	n(30-31)	%	n(48-50)	%	n(61-63)	%	n(396-403)	%
I get along with my superiors	13	41.9	49	61.2	21	33.9	188	46.7
There is good collegiality at work	8	25.8*	50	58.0*	28	44.4*	230	57.4*
I find the conversation topics during break and lunch relevant and interesting	3	10.0	50	30.0	13	21.0	125	31.1
I am treated with respect	7	22.6*	50	66.0*	18	28.6*	221	54.8*
People’s differences are accepted	4	12.9*	50	40.0*	13	21.3*	146	36.2*
Harassment is not accepted	8	25.8*	49	55.1*	21	33.3*	241	60.3*
My workmates are there for me (support me)	6	20.0*	50	54.0*	22	34.9*	218	54.1*
People at work understand that I may have a “bad” day	6	19.4*	48	45.8*	18	29.0*	164	40.8*
It is OK to ask others for advice and help to get the work done	17	56.7	50	66.0	40	63.5	281	71.0
My workmates share their knowledge and experience of the job	10	33.3	50	60.0	30	47.6*	239	59.5*
My skills and/or competences are made use of	7	22.6	50	40.0	13	21.3*	136	33.7*
We help one another to work safely	9	29.0*	50	60.0*	31	49.2	191	47.6

* = p < 0.05

Table 6. Experiences of workplace harassment influence women’s and men’s perceptions of women’s and men’s career opportunities in the company. Respondents that strongly agree with the statement.

Women and men('s)...	Women				Men			
	Harassed	Not Harassed	Harassed	Not harassed	Harassed	Not harassed	Harassed	Not harassed
	n(29-31)	%	n(46-50)	%	n(59-62)	%	n(391-401)	%
Skills and/or competences are given equal value	6	19.4*	22	44.9*	34	54.8*	252	63.0*
Have the same amount of influence	5	16.1*	20	40.0*	27	44.3*	239	59.6*
Have the same access to networks in the company	8	25.8*	30	61.2*	30	63.9	275	69.4
Have the same opportunities to combine work and parenthood	10	34.5*	32	65.3*	41	66.1	281	70.6
Have the same opportunities to become line managers	9	30.0	28	57.1	32	51.6*	263	65.8*
Have the same opportunities to become middle managers	8	26.7*	25	54.3*	33	54.1*	250	63.1*
Have the same opportunities to join senior management	6	20.0	20	43.5	26	44.1*	222	56.8*

* = p < 0.05

Table 7. Experiences of harassment influence women's and men's feelings of being mistreated because of their gender in the company. Respondents that strongly disagree with the statement.

Because of my gender, I feel that...	Women				Men			
	Harassed		Not Harassed		Harassed		Not Harassed	
	n(28-31)	%	n(47-49)	%	n(59-63)	%	n(389-400)	%
My skills and/or competences are called into question	4	12.9*	28	58.3*	37	59.7	291	72.9
I have less influence	5	16.1*	29	59.2*	40	63.5	293	73.3
I have limited access to networks in the company	12	40.0	28	63.6	40	67.8	292	75.1
I have fewer opportunities to combine work and parenthood	12	42.9*	39	81.3*	41	65.1*	306	77.1*
I have fewer opportunities for promotion within the company	8	28.6	28	57.1	35	56.5*	275	69.4*
I receive unwelcome attention	6	19.4*	39	83.0*	42	66.7*	311	78.3*
I am overlooked during meetings or discussions in my workplace	9	29.0*	31	64.6*	41	65.1*	302	75.9*
I get less support from my workmates	13	43.3*	40	81.6*	43	68.3*	318	80.1*
I am less able to enjoy my time at work	10	34.5*	41	85.4*	43	68.3*	316	79.8*

* = $p < 0.05$

differences between the two groups are not as evident as differences in the statements relating to organizational culture and use of language. A general pattern is that independent of comparison group, respondents were least inclined to strongly agree with statements relating to influence and prospect to join senior management, while they were most inclined to agree with statements relating to the ability to obtain work-life balance. The former most likely reflects the hierarchical distribution of women and men in the company, with the top positions at the organization still being strongly reserved for men. Interestingly, non-harassed women, harassed men, and non-harassed men strongly agreed far more often than harassed women with the statement "*Women and men have the same access to networks in the company.*" In fact, non-harassed women's perceptions of women's and men's access to networks resembled those of men. This suggests that being a woman *and* having experiences of harassment (rather than just being a woman) is related to a more negative perception of the equal distribution of access to networks in the company.

Statements surveying the respondent's feelings of being mistreated because of their gender show the greatest differences between women who reported experiences of workplace harassment and women who did not, while differences between men exist but are less evident (Table 7). All women, although to different extents and in different relative orders, were less likely to disagree with statements concerning feelings of having

their skills called into question, being overlooked, having less influence, and receiving unwelcome attention. The statements that showed the greatest differences among women concerned feelings of being less able to enjoy their time at work and having their skills called into question. Interestingly, women who did not report experiences of harassment rated the statement concerning their ability to enjoy time at work and support from coworkers nearly the same as men who did not report harassment. Compared to women's reports, men's reports suggest that they feel mistreated because of their sex to a lesser extent than women, and if they do, the feeling is related to opportunities for promotion, their skills being called into question, and having less influence. Also evident was that in relation to these statements, the smallest differences were found between men who did report experiences of harassment versus men who did not.

5. Conclusions and Future Research

The survey responses analyzed in this article have made it evident that both women and men employed by a company in the Swedish forest sector report experiences of harassment at work, although in different forms, at different frequencies and with different consequences (cf. Fielden et al. 2000, Guerrier et al. 2009, Tallichet 2000). Both women and men were most likely to report workplace harassment in the form of verbal abuse (cf. Berdahl & Aquino 2009, Fitzgerald et al. 1997), followed

by psychological abuse, by workmates, occurring more than once and as part of their day-to-day work. In addition, compared to men, women also reported more experiences of sexual harassment, of unwelcome physical contact, of harassment by coworkers from other departments and customers, and of harassment during social events and outside work hours (cf. Johansson et al. 2018).

A relation between experiencing workplace harassment and a more negative perception of the organization was also evident in the case study explored in this article (cf. Chan et al. 2008, Fitzgerald et al. 1997). Most evident was the relationship between gender and the perception of the organization. Women as a group viewed organizational culture, use of language, and gender equality status of the organization more negatively than did men. Women who reported experiences of workplace harassment were significantly more negative than women who did not, especially concerning feelings of mistreatment because of their sex (cf. Chan et al. 2008, Collinsworth et al. 2009, Fitzgerald et al. 1997). Men who reported experiences of harassment demonstrated a more negative perception related to organizational culture and use of language than men who did not experience harassment, but their perceptions concerning gender equality status and feelings of mistreatment because of their gender were more similar. This result suggests that while women's reports of harassment are related to an increased likelihood of interpreting the organization from a gender perspective and perceiving the company as shaped by gendered hierarchies, men's reports do so to a lesser extent. Why, then, do harassed women have more negative perceptions of the organization? One interpretation is that the experience of workplace harassment itself results in a more negative perception of the company, making the act of workplace harassment the main signifier. Another is that a negative (and gender-oriented) perception of the company increases the likelihood of individuals interpreting their experiences in terms of workplace harassment, making perception the main signifier. A third, more dynamic interpretation aligned with the blurry and often subjective line between experiences of ill-treatment as a minority in a male-dominated organization and sexual harassment (cf., Cairns 1997, Collinson and Collinson 1996) is that workplace harassment is one component of women's more overarching experiences as minorities in organizations that are numerically and culturally dominated by men and masculinity. If so,

the strong relation to gender suggests that workplace harassment and perception are part of an on-going production of gender within organizations (Acker 1992).

The findings provide quantitative descriptions of the workplace harassment experienced by women in Swedish forestry organizations previously described from a qualitative perspective derived from the findings of the Swedish #Metoo (cf. Johansson et al. 2018). Adding insights into incidences further emphasizes the gendered (cf. Gruber 1998, McDonald 2012, Samuels 2003, Zippel 2006), potentially heterosexual (cf. Epstein 1996) and integral nature of sexual harassment in organizations (cf. Hearn and Parkin 2001, Hearn et al. 1989). It also supports the analytical and practical necessity of acknowledging sexuality in research and gender equality work in the context of forestry organizations (cf. Bagilhole 2002, Cockburn 1991b, Collinson & Collinson 1989, Collinson & Collinson 1996, Paap 2006, Watts 2007b; Witz et al. 1996) and of understanding, and practically engaging with, workplace harassment from an organizational and managerial perspective.

The findings add new quantitative descriptions of the incidences of workplace harassment in the forest sector that are not of a sexual nature that both women and men report experiencing. Verbal and psychological harassment occurs during day-to-day activities and by workmates, and it can thereby be understood as a product not only of a general gendered and male-dominated workplace culture but also of specific gendered characteristics that have consequences not only for women but also for groups of men. The harassment reported by men is more closely associated in time and space with the workplace and their coworkers (e.g., the culture and jargon) (cf. Cockburn 1991a, Thornton 2002, Witz et al. 1996). While these forms of workplace harassment also dominate women respondents' reports, women report harassment that takes place on and across a wider range of spatial and temporal relations and with various perpetrators involved. Similar tendencies have also been shown in previous studies of the Swedish forest sector (e.g., Johansson et al. 2019a, Johansson et al. 2018), describing how the sexualizations of women in the forest sector tend to be made more obvious and become more explicit during social activities involving alcohol, sauna baths, etc. The findings also suggest that women who have been harassed emphasize a feeling of limited inclusion in the workplace (based on, e.g., the respect and support of coworkers), while men more

often highlight the potential acceptance of harassment. For the harassed women, the experience is generally more negative and is often also related to their professional identity and role (such a career opportunities and influence) – something that resonates with gendered hierarchical constructions of skills and competences in male-dominated organizations in general (cf. Acker 1992, 2006) and within the forest sector more specifically (cf. Johansson et al. 2019a, 2019b). The access to networks is one of those structuring aspects that has also been highlighted in previous studies (Andersson & Lidestav 2016; Brandth et al. 2004, 2015).

Regarding the limitations of this study, drawing from one company case study means that it is not possible to translate the reports on incidence to a sector level. However, combined with existing knowledge of the gendered nature of forestry organizations (e.g., Andersson et al. 2018; Andersson & Lidestav 2016; Brandth & Haugen 2005a, 2005b; Coutinho-Sledge 2015; Johansson et al. 2019a, 2019b; Johansson et al. 2018), it seems likely to suggest that the overarching patterns reported in this case study are applicable to other companies in the sector. Although these patterns resonate across different national and organizational contexts, there is still a need for more in-depth, detailed and contextualized knowledge to better understand the structures and mechanisms behind these patterns.

Also worth evaluating in relation to limitations is the fact that researchers and company representatives collaboratively developed the survey. The company's involvement in the practical arrangements of this study enabled the employees to respond to the survey on site during working hours. This was beneficial, considering the 92.5% response rate. If the employees had responded to the survey outside of work, this would probably have severe effects on the response rate. However, responding to a questionnaire surveying sensitive issues such as workplace harassment on site, in the same room as your coworkers might impose other limitations. This circumstance might explain why so few of the respondents used the opportunity to make additional reflections and comments on the open-ended question at the end of the questionnaire. From previous experiences, we know that responses to open-ended questions can enable nuanced, qualitative analyses (Johansson et al. 2019a, 2019b), but this was not the case here. Hence, while the practical arrangement of the study enabled almost all employees to respond to the questionnaire by ticking all

its boxes, it was not ideal for obtaining more elaborate descriptions and reflections. However, as this case study also included interviews, securing a sufficient response rate was prioritized.

To strengthen the results reported in this article, further inquiries of both a quantitative and qualitative nature are called for. To validate the quantitative descriptions of women's and men's experiences of harassment, surveys covering additional organizations and/or forestry labor markets are necessary. To deepen the understanding of men's experiences of harassment and their relation to the culture and practices of forestry organizations, interviews and on-site observations are needed. This is partly to better understand harassment, not primarily as individual negative "errors," but as informal interactions of "doing the work" within specific organizational settings (cf. Acker 2006). Developing and communicating such knowledge is particularly vital for the ability to create policies and routines that prevent and counteract the harassment of not only women but also of men in male-dominated organizations. From a managerial perspective, the study argues primarily for the necessity to engage in antidiscrimination from an organizational perspective and to go beyond the narrow, legal and routine-focused engagement of sexual harassment (cf. Andersson et al. 2018, Johansson & Ringblom 2017). To promote equality beyond equal opportunities and create sustainable conditions for substantial diversity in forestry organizations (cf. Hansen et al., 2016), it is vital to incorporate this work into more organization transformation processes of gender mainstreaming/gender equality integration.

6. References

- Acker, J. 1992. Gendering organizational theory, in: Mills, A.J., Tancred, P. (Eds.), *Gendering Organizational Analysis*. Sage, Newbury Park, pp. 248–260.
- Acker, J. 2006. Inequality Regimes: Gender, Class, and Race in Organizations. *Gender & Society* 20, 441–464.
- Ackroyd, S., & Thompson, P. 1999. *Organizational Misbehaviour*. SAGE, London.
- Ager, B. 2014. Skogsarbetets humanisering och rationalisering från 1900 och framåt. Luleå University of Technology, Luleå.
- Andersson, E., Johansson, M., Lidestav, G., & Lindberg, M. 2018. Constituting gender and gender equality through policy: the political of gender mainstreaming in the Swedish forest industry. *Equality, Diversity and Inclusion: An International Journal* 37, 763–779.
- Andersson, E., & Lidestav, G. 2016. Creating alternative spaces and articulating needs: Challenging gendered notions of forestry and forest ownership through women's networks. *Forest Policy and Economics* 67, 38–44.

- Bagilhole, B. 2002. Women in non-traditional occupations: challenging men. Palgrave Macmillan, New York.
- Berdahl, J.L. 2007. The sexual harassment of uppity women. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 92, 425–437.
- Berdahl, J.L., & Aquino, K. 2009. Sexual behavior at work: Fun or folly? *Journal of Applied Psychology* 94, 34–47.
- Branch, S., Ramsay, S., & Barker, M. 2013. Workplace Bullying, Mobbing and General Harassment: A Review. *International Journal of Management Reviews* 15, 280–299.
- Brandth, B., Follo, G., & Haugen, M.S. 2004. Women in forestry: Dilemmas of a separate women's organization. *Scandinavian Journal of Forest Research* 19, 466–472.
- Brandth, B., Follo, G., & Haugen, M.S. 2015. Paradoxes of a women's organization in the forestry industry, in: Pini, B., Brandth, B., & Little, J. (eds.), *Feminisms and Ruralities*. Lexington Books, Lanham, pp. 57–68.
- Brandth, B., & Haugen, M.S. 2005a. Doing rural masculinity - From logging to outfield tourism. *Journal of Gender Studies* 14, 13–22.
- Brandth, B., & Haugen, M.S. 2005b. Text, body, and tools - changing mediations of rural masculinity. *Men and Masculinities* 8, 148–163.
- Cairns, K.V. 1997. Femininity and women's silence in response to sexual harassment and coercion, in: Thomas, A., & Kitzinger, C. (eds.), *Sexual harassment: Contemporary feminist perspectives*. Open University Press, Buckingham, pp. 91–111.
- Chamberlain, L.J., Crowley, M., Tope, D., & Hodson, R. 2008. Sexual Harassment in Organizational Context. *Work and Occupations* 35, 262–295.
- Chan, D.K.S., Chow, S.Y., Lam, C.B., & Cheung, S.F. 2008. Examining The Job-Related, Psychological, and Physical Outcomes of Workplace Sexual Harassment: A Meta-Analytic Review. *Psychology of Women Quarterly* 32, 362–376.
- Cockburn, C. 1991a. *Brothers: Male Dominance and Technological Change*. Pluto Press, London.
- Cockburn, C. 1991b. *In the Way of Women: Men's Resistance to Sex Equality in Organizations*. Macmillan, Basingstoke.
- Collinson, D., & Collinson, M. 1989. Sexuality in the workplace: The domination of Men's Sexuality, in: Hearn, J. (ed.), *The Sexuality of Organization*. Sage, London, pp. 91–109.
- Collinson, D.L. 1988. 'Engineering Humour': Masculinity, Joking and Conflict in Shop-floor Relations. *Organization Studies* 9, 181–199.
- Collinson, D.L., Knights, D., & Collinson, M. 1990. *Managing to Discriminate*. Routledge, London.
- Collinson, M., & Collinson, D. 1996. 'It's Only Dick': The Sexual Harassment of Women Managers in Insurance Sales. *Work, Employment and Society* 10, 29–56.
- Collinsworth, L.L., Fitzgerald, L.F., & Drasgow, F. 2009. In Harm's Way: Factors Related to Psychological Distress Following Sexual Harassment. *Psychology of Women Quarterly* 33, 475–490.
- Connell, R. 1995. *Masculinities*. University of California Press, Berkeley.
- Coutinho-Sledge, P. 2015. Feminized forestry: The promises and pitfalls of change in a masculine organization. *Gender, Work & Organization* 22, 375–389.
- de Haas, S., & Timmerman, G. 2010. Sexual harassment in the context of double male dominance. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology* 19, 717–734.
- Epstein, D. 1996. Keeping them in their Place: Hetero/sexist Harassment, Gender and the Enforcement of Heterosexuality, in: Holland, J., & Adkins, L. (eds.), *Sex, Sensibility and the Gendered Body*. Palgrave Macmillan UK, London, pp. 202–221.
- Fielden, S.L., Davidson, M.J., Gale, A.W., & Davey, C.L. 2000. Women in construction: the untapped resource. *Construction Management and Economics* 18, 113–121.
- Fitzgerald, L.F., Drasgow, F., Hulin, C.L., Gelfand, M.J., & Magley, V.J. 1997. Antecedents and consequences of sexual harassment in organizations: a test of an integrated model. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 82, 578–589.
- Gruber, J.E. 1998. The Impact of Male Work Environments and Organizational Policies on Women's Experiences of Sexual Harassment. *Gender & Society* 12, 301–320.
- Guerrier, Y., Evans, C., Glover, J., & Wilson, C. 2009. 'Technical, but not very...': constructing gendered identities in IT-related employment. *Work, Employment and Society* 23, 494–511.
- Hansen, E., Conroy, K., Toppinen, A., Bull, L., Kutnar, A., & Panwar, R. 2016. Does gender diversity in forest sector companies matter? *Canadian Journal of Forest Research* 46, 1255–1263.
- Hearn, J., & Parkin, W. 2001. *Gender, Sexuality and Violence in Organizations: The Unspoken Forces of Organization Violations*. SAGE, London.
- Hearn, J., Sheppard, D., Tancred-Sheriff, P., & Burrell, G. 1989. *The Sexuality of Organization*. Sage, London.
- Häggström, C., Kawasaki, A., & Lidestav, G. 2013. Profiles of forestry contractors and development of the forestry-contracting sector in Sweden. *Scandinavian Journal of Forest Research* 28, 395–404.
- Ilies, R., Hauserman, N., Schwochau, S., & Stibal, J. 2003. Reported incidence rates of work-related sexual harassment in the United States: Using meta-analysis to explain reported rate disparities. *Personnel Psychology* 56, 607–631.
- Ingraham, C. 1994. The heterosexual imaginary: Feminist sociology and theories of gender. *Sociological Theory* 12, 203–219.
- Johansson, E. 1994. Skogarnas fria söner : maskulinitet och modernitet i norrländskt skogsarbete = [The free sons of the forests : masculinity and modernity in forest work of Norrland] Nordiska museet, Stockholm.
- Johansson, K., Andersson, E., Johansson, M., & Lidestav, G. 2019a. Conditioned openings and restraints: The meaning-making of women professionals breaking into the male-dominated sector of forestry. *Gender, Work & Organization*, 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.1111/gwao.12403>.
- Johansson, K., Andersson, E., Johansson, M., & Lidestav, G. 2019b. The discursive resistance of men to gender equality interventions: negotiating 'unjustness' and 'unnecessity' in Swedish forestry. *Men and Masculinities* 22, 177–196.
- Johansson, M., Johansson, K., & Andersson, E. 2018. #Metoo in the Swedish forest sector: testimonies from harassed women on sexualised forms of male control. *Scandinavian Journal of Forest Research* 33, 419–425.
- Johansson, M., & Ringblom, L. 2017. The Business Case of Gender Equality in Swedish Forestry and Mining - Restricting or Enabling Organizational Change. *Gender, Work & Organization* 24, 628–642.
- MacKinnon, C.A. 1979. *Sexual Harassment of Working Women: A Case of Sex Discrimination*. Yale University Press, New Haven.
- McCann, D. 2005. *Sexual Harassment at Work: National and International Responses*. International Labour Organization, Geneva.
- McDonald, P. 2012. Workplace sexual harassment 30 years on: A review of the literature. *International Journal of Management Reviews* 14, 1–17.
- Miner-Rubino, K., & Cortina, L.M. 2007. Beyond targets: Consequences of vicarious exposure to misogyny at work. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 92, 1254–1269.

- Paap, K. 2006. *Working Construction*. Cornell University Press, Ithaca, N.Y.
- Plester, B. 2015. 'Take it like a man!': Performing hegemonic masculinity through organizational humour. *Ephemera* 15, 537.
- Raver, J.L., & Gelfand, M.J. 2005. Beyond the Individual Victim: Linking Sexual Harassment, Team Processes, and Team Performance. *Academy of Management Journal* 48, 387–400.
- Samuels, H. 2003. Sexual harassment in the workplace: a feminist analysis of recent developments in the UK. *Women's Studies International Forum* 26, 467–482.
- SweGov. 2007. En skogspolitik i takt med tiden = [A forest policy in line with the times] (Prop. 2007/08:108). Swedish Government Bill, Stockholm.
- Tallichet, S.E. 2000. Barriers to Women's Advancement in Underground Coal Mining. *Rural Sociology* 65, 234–252.
- Thomas, A.M. 1997. Men behaving badly? A psychosocial exploration of the cultural context of sexual harassment, in: Thomas, A.M., & Kitzinger, C. (eds.), *Sexual Harassment. Contemporary Feminist Perspectives*. Open University Press, Buckingham, pp. 131–153.
- Thornton, M. 2002. Sexual harassment losing sight of sex discrimination. *Melbourne University Law Review* 26, 422–444.
- Watts, J. 2007a. Can't take a joke? Humour as resistance, refuge and exclusion in a highly gendered workplace. *Feminism & Psychology* 17, 259–266.
- Watts, J., H. 2007b. Porn, pride and pessimism: experiences of women working in professional construction roles. *Work, Employment and Society* 21, 299–316.
- Welsh, S. 1999. Gender and sexual harassment. *Annual Review of Sociology* 25, 169–190.
- West, C., & Zimmerman, D. H. 1987. Doing Gender. *Gender & Society*, 1, 125–151.
- Witz, A., Halford, S., & Savage, M. 1996. Organized Bodies: Gender, sexuality and embodiment in contemporary organisations, in: Adkins, L., & Merchant, V. (eds.), *Sexualizing the Social: Power and the Organization of Sexuality*. Macmillan, London, pp. 173–190.
- Wright, T. 2016. Women's Experience of Workplace Interactions in Male-Dominated Work: The Intersections of Gender, Sexuality and Occupational Group. *Gender, Work & Organization* 23, 348–362.
- Zippel, K.S. 2006. *The Politics of Sexual Harassment: A Comparative Study of the United States, The European Union, and Germany*. Cambridge University Press.