

UNIVERSITY OF GOTHENBURG  
School of Global Studies



# UNIVERSITY OF GOTHENBURG

“This is the guys’ home ground, you know”

A qualitative study about masculinity, homosociality and work identity  
among male and female dockworkers in the Port of Gothenburg

Author: Karin Hallberg

Supervisor: Gunilla Blomqvist Sköldberg

Master Thesis in Global Studies, 30 hec

School of Global Studies

Spring 2016

Wordcount: 19.998





(Photographs by the author and Elin Axelsson).

## Table of Contents

Abstract.....	1
Acknowledgements.....	2
1. Introduction and background .....	3
1.1. Aim and research questions .....	5
1.2. Relevance to Global Studies.....	6
1.3. Delimitations .....	7
2. Previous research.....	7
3. Theoretical framework and analytical tools .....	9
3.1. The sex/gender debate .....	9
3.2. Hegemonic masculinity.....	10
3.3. Masculinity and class.....	11
3.3.1. Working-class masculinity.....	11
3.3.2. Middle-class masculinity .....	12
3.4. Homosociality .....	13
3.4.1. Homosociality and male dominance.....	13
3.4.2. A "raw but hearty" jargon.....	15
3.4.3. Heteronormativity and sexism .....	15
3.5. Gender, work and identity .....	16
3.5.1. Class, gender and respectability.....	17
4. Methods and material .....	19
4.1. The emergence of the project .....	19
4.2. Respondents.....	20
4.3. Sampling methods .....	20
4.4. Semi-structured interviews.....	21
4.5. Data analysis.....	22
4.6. Ethical considerations.....	22
4.7. Language concerns .....	23
4.8. A female researcher in "the guys' home ground" .....	23
4.9. Validity and reliability .....	24
5. Results and analysis.....	25
5.1. Masculinity, hegemony and resistance.....	25
5.1.1. Constructing working-class masculinity.....	25
5.1.2. Constructing and resisting middle-class masculinity .....	28
5.2. Challenging and re-creating the homosocial environment .....	30
5.2.1. Raw jargon and sexism .....	30

5.2.2.	Homophobia and heteronormativity.....	33
5.2.3.	Challenges to the homosocial environment.....	34
5.3.	Women creating identity in a masculine space.....	37
5.3.1.	Women in a masculine-coded profession.....	37
5.3.2.	Working-class femininity .....	39
5.3.3.	Difference and uniqueness.....	41
6.	Conclusion and future research.....	42
7.	References.....	46

## Abstract

Harbour work in the port of Gothenburg has historically been a male-dominated working-class profession where dockworker identity has been strongly connected to working-class masculinity. Harbour environments are often characterized by homosocial cultures, where bonding between men is confirmed through male, heterosexual, working-class norms. Over the last decades of strikes and conflicts, harbour work in Gothenburg has become a well-paid and attractive job. But although some women have entered the profession, most recent recruits are men from higher educational and economic backgrounds. The objective of this thesis is to investigate how gender relations, work identity and the homosocial environment in the port of Gothenburg are created, reproduced and challenged when women and new groups of men enter the workforce. The study is based on semi-structured interviews with male and female dockworkers. It explores how masculinity in the port of Gothenburg is constructed and how the homosocial environment is reproduced and challenged. It also discusses how female dockworkers create work identity in a masculine-coded profession. The findings show that the hegemonic working-class masculinity and the homosocial culture in the port of Gothenburg are resistant, but that these structures in some ways are challenged by the increased influence of neoliberal middle-class masculinity. Moreover, it is difficult for female dockworkers to create work identity due to the gender coding of working-tasks in the harbour. However, their position as “different” is a source of positive identification. This study shows how power structures created by the globalization of gender influence gender regimes in local contexts.

## Acknowledgements

First and foremost, I would like to thank the dockworkers who have participated in this study. To share your narratives and to get an insight into the world in the port of Gothenburg has been an unforgettable experience. Secondly, I want to thank my supervisor, Gunilla Blomqvist Sköldberg, for your engagement in this project and for your comments, support and inspiration. Thirdly, greatest thanks to my family who tirelessly discuss masculinity, homosociality and work identity with me week after week at the dinner table. Last but definitely not least, I want to thank my wonderful friends in the library who stick by my side in sunshine as well as in rain.

## 1. Introduction and background

A profession is not only a way to provide for oneself, but is also central to how people identify and are classified by others (Ericson 2011; Mumby 1998). Work identities often intersect with gender identities, since definitions of masculinity and femininity not only create ideas of what men and women are, but also of what kind of work they are expected to do, and how these different kinds of work are valued (Blomqvist 2004; Cockburn 1991; Franck 2012). Not only bodies are gendered, but also professions and certain working tasks, which is called gender coding. For example, occupations that involve care and service are often coded as feminine, whereas physically demanding and technical work is coded as masculine, although there is nothing inherently feminine or masculine about them (Blomqvist 2004; Cockburn 1991).

In Sweden, the gender segregation has decreased in professions which demand higher education, but is still one of the highest in the world in traditional working-class professions (Löfström 2005:19). This affects women more negatively than men, since many women-dominated working-class sectors such as care and service are characterized by low salaries, part-time employments and few prospects for career-advancements. By contrast, many male-dominated working-class professions, particularly in industry and production, have over the last decades changed from being low-paid and low-status jobs into well-paid, attractive and secure professions (Gonäs et. al 2001). Many of these male-dominated sectors have also gone through a process of mechanization and technological developments, thus reducing the physical barriers that used to prevent women from being employed there. But although there are strong incentives for women to seek employment in these sectors, they are still underrepresented (Löfström 2005:19). The port of Gothenburg<sup>1</sup> is one such male-dominated manual occupation which, due to the last decades of strikes and conflicts, has changed from being one of the lowest paid and lowest status working-class professions in the city, into a well-paid job that attracts new groups of people from different educational and economic backgrounds. It is also a workplace where most of the previously physically heavy working tasks now are replaced by machines and computers. During the last ten years, the number

---

<sup>1</sup> The port of Gothenburg is the biggest port in Scandinavia (Hilmerson 2015). Until 2010, the port was owned by a municipal port-company, Göteborgs Hamn AB. In 2010, the terminals were sold out to different private operators. Currently, Älvsborg Ro/Ro is operated by DFDS and Cobelfret, Gothenburg Car Terminal by the Swedish logistics-company Logent, and Skandia Container Terminal by APM Terminals. APM is a multinational terminal network and is part of the Danish MAERSK-group. Älvsborg Ro/Ro employs 228 dockworkers, out of which 11 % are women. Logent employs 43 dockworkers, out of which 9 % are women. APM employs 287 dockworkers, out of which 12 % are women.



of women working in the port of Gothenburg has slightly increased, but not as much as one might anticipate given the increased economic status and removal of the physically heavy work. Instead, it is men from higher educational and economic backgrounds who are increasingly being employed in the harbour.

One central reason to the gender segregation in the labour market is that definitions of masculinity and femininity are so closely tied to work identity (Abrahamsson 2006; Alimahomed-Wilson 2011; Ericson 2011). When it comes to working-class professions, manual labour and working-tasks that demand technical knowledge and physical strength are important sources of identity, pride and confidence among working-class men. Attributes associated with labour have also been similar to those associated with masculinity. For working-class women who work in this kind of masculine-coded professions, the reverse is often true since identifying as a manual labourer comes into conflict with how a woman is expected to behave and what a woman is expected to be (Morgan 2005; Skeggs 1997/2000). There are several examples throughout history where women have been banned from certain kinds of physical and technical work since it was deemed “un-respectable” work for women (Abrahamsson 2006; Alimahomed-Wilson 2011; Bergholm & Teräs 1999; Bradley 1989). A number of studies have been conducted about how masculinity constructions affect gender segregation in different areas of production and industrial work in different parts of the world (Blomqvist 2004, Cockburn 1991, Collinson 1998, Heron 2006, Kanter 1983, McDowell 2010, Nayak 2006). Other studies are from the fields of mining (Abrahamsson 2006, Blomberg 1995, Bradley 1989, Breckenridge 1998, Cuvelier 2014, Sommerville 2005), care work (Nordberg 2005), education (Mac an Ghail 1994), and firefighters (Ericson 2011). However, there is an empirical gap when it comes to studies about gender relations in harbour work<sup>2</sup> (but see Alimahomed-Wilson 2011; Bergholm & Teräs 1999).

According to Alimahomed-Wilson (2011), the harbour is the perfect place for investigating how gender relations change in a male-dominated and masculine-coded working-class profession. It is especially relevant since the harbour is a workplace where collective masculine identities are challenged by technological developments, increased status of the profession and women’s entrance into the workforce. The port of Gothenburg is a particularly interesting field, since our previous studies there indicate that although there are diverging opinions among the dockworkers regarding gender relations and the entrance of women to the workplace, the structures and practices that keep women out are still resistant. Harbour work is often characterized by a homosocial environment, where community and intimacy between men historically has been

---

<sup>2</sup> Throughout this thesis, the words “port”, “harbour” and “dock” will be used interchangeably.

achieved through the confirmation of working-class masculinity, heterosexuality and absence of women (Abrahamsson 2006; Alimahomed-Wilson 2011; Ericson 2011; Holgersson 2006; Kiesling 2005). Workplaces with strong homosocial cultures tend to exclude women from becoming part of the workforce, but can also be challenged. Most studies about homosociality focus on how the entrance of women challenges homosocial environments, but our previous studies in the port of Gothenburg indicate that it is not only women who are the agents of this change. Instead, also the above-mentioned new groups of men, who due to the increased economic status of harbour work are seeking employment in the harbour to a larger extent than previously, are challenging the homosocial culture. Since the kind of physical and manual labour that constitutes most working-tasks in the harbour often are negative sources of identification for women, it also becomes interesting to investigate how female dockworkers overcome this and create work identity. Thus, the relevance of this research springs out of the necessity to understand some of the mechanisms that continue to keep women out of increasingly well-paid working-class professions, such as harbour work in Gothenburg. Investigating the processes that reproduce a gender segregated labour market, and understanding why the segregation continues to be high in certain sectors, is important if we are to develop strategies that can change the situation. This study is intended as a contribution to this debate, both within the academy and in society at large.

### 1.1. Aim and research questions

*The aim of this thesis is to investigate how gender relations, work identity and the homosocial environment in the port of Gothenburg are created, reproduced and challenged when women and new groups of men and masculinities enter the workforce.* Through interviews with male and female dockworkers this study seeks to answer the following research questions:

1. How do dockworkers in the port of Gothenburg construct masculinity?
2. In what ways is the homosocial environment reproduced and/or challenged when women and new groups of men and masculinities enter the workforce?
3. Given the historically strong connection between harbour-work and working-class masculinity, how do female dockworkers create work identity?

The findings are intended to contribute to a general debate about how constructions of masculinity and femininity affect the gender segregation in the labour market, and what obstacles that exist for women to be employed in the increasingly well-paid, male-dominated sectors. Most of the academic literature about homosociality discuss how women challenge homosocial environments, but my result indicates that it is not only women who are agents of this change. Instead, it is also men who perform middle-class masculinity who challenge the homosocial culture. In addition, some women

manage to become part of the homosocial group by performing working-class masculinity and desexualize themselves. By investigating these process, I hope to make a contribution to the academic theories on homosociality and women's performances of masculinity.

## 1.2. Relevance to Global Studies

According to Connell (1998), in order to understand local expressions of masculinity, one needs to understand the global gender order. With globalization, a variety of local gender orders start to interact, but economic and cultural power is also concentrated to certain groups of men, and dominant masculinities are created in tandem with colonial power structures and neoliberal ideologies. As in local contexts, different expressions of masculinity exist parallel to each other in the global arena, and hegemonies are constantly renegotiated and challenged. Connell (2008:24) argues that there is still a lack of research about how local expressions of masculinity are affected by the globalization of masculinities. In the port of Gothenburg, the hegemonic masculinity is created in close proximity to working-class identity and dockworker identity, and has remained unchallenged for a long time. As will be further elaborated in chapter 5, when men who perform masculinities which are hegemonic in society at large enter the workforce, their expression of masculinity is (to some extent) able to challenge the hegemonic masculinity in the harbour. Thus, this study is an example of how local expressions of masculinity never exist independently from the global gender order, and how the power structures that are created by the globalization of gender influence gender regimes in local contexts.

Another way in which this study is relevant for Global Studies is that it is an example of how the globalization of capital affects masculinity constructions in a local context. According to Scholte (2005:160), a central aspect of globalization is the growth of transnational companies which play an increasingly important role in the global economy. As noted above, the port of Gothenburg was previously owned by Gothenburg's municipality, but in 2010 the terminals were sold out to different private operators. Throughout the interviews, a recurrent opinion among the respondents was that with the new owners, there were higher demands for tempo and productivity compared to when the terminals were owned by Gothenburg's municipality. In particular, APM was, from the dockworkers' perspective, especially concerned with profit-making, efficiency and standardization of production. In addition, several respondents said that nowadays, there is a different kind of people who are being employed in the harbour, since the companies prefer to recruit people with relatively high educations. These new recruits often perform masculinities which are hegemonic on a societal and global scale. Thus, this study is an example of how masculinity-constructions change when a workplace which was previously owned by a local company becomes part of a global corporation.

### 1.3. Delimitations

One way to delimit this study has been that I only focus on the experiences of dockworkers who perform manual work in the port of Gothenburg. The main reason for this is the historically strong relation between manual harbour work and working-class masculinity, which makes that group especially interesting to study. Thus, I have not interviewed clerks, other people working in the offices in the harbour, or people on the employer-side. The study's main focus is gender in relation to homosociality and work identity. Due to the limited space, I will not discuss how class identity is constructed in the port of Gothenburg. However, since class is so intimately connected to masculinity in my empirical field, I will analyse how class identities intersect with gender and work identities in order to nuance the discussion. Ethnicity is a social category that could also have been relevant to problematize. Throughout the field work, questions about discrimination based on ethnicity were included in the interviews. However, few respondents had heard of or experienced discrimination based on ethnicity, whereas most of them gave examples of sexism and homophobia in the harbour. Hence, I have chosen to not focus on ethnicity throughout this thesis.

## 2. Previous research

Previous research about men and masculinities have to a large extent been influenced by the researcher R.W Connell, who introduced the concept *hegemonic masculinity*. This is one of the central analytical tools that will be used throughout this thesis, and refers to the power relations that exist between different masculinities (and other gender identities). How the concept will be used in this thesis will be further discussed in the theory chapter. Michael Kimmel is another researcher who is often cited in masculinity studies. He has theorized about how the hegemonic masculinity is suppressing also against men in the dominant group, since the gender regime forces men to live up to the expected gender norms and to be "man enough". Jeff Hearn is one of the main proponents for studying gender relations on a global level, since globalization and the current information society has a strong impact on local gender regimes.

Several researchers have studied how masculinities are created in relation to other power structures in society (Alimahomed-Wilson 2012; Baron 2006; Breckenridge 1998; Flood 2008, Kimmel 2015, Mac an Ghail 1994; Rhodes 2011; Sedgwick 1985). Throughout this study, I have (mainly) been influenced by research about how different expressions of masculinity are linked to different social classes (see Alimahomed-Wilson 2011; Anderson 2009; Baron 2006; Ericson 2011; Heron 2006; Mac an Ghail 1994; Morgan 2006; Pyke 1996; Rhodes 2011). There is also a number of studies conducted about how working-class masculinity intersects with the identification as a manual labourer (Cockburn 1991; Collinson & Hearn 1996; Embrick et. al 2007; Jackson 2001; McDowell 2010; Nayak 2006; Sommerville 2005). Since the port of Gothenburg traditionally has been a

manual working-class profession, these studies have been important for my understanding of how the construction of working-class masculinity intersects with dockworker identity. However, there is a lack of studies which focus on how constructions of masculinity are transformed when a traditional working-class profession becomes increasingly well-paid and starts to attract men who do not perform working-class masculinity. As noted in the introduction, there is also an empirical gap when it comes to studies about gender relations in harbour work. Thus, this thesis is intended as a contribution to fill these gaps.

This thesis will investigate how the homosocial culture in the harbour is challenged and reproduced when women and new groups of men enter the workforce. The concept *homosociality* was introduced into feminist theory in 1976 by the organizational theorist Jean Lipman-Blumen. She argues that homosociality can be used to analyse how patriarchal structures are reproduced by men turning to other men for fulfilling their social needs (Lipman-Blumen 1976, in Ericson 2011:47). Several researchers have investigated how homosocial cultures are reproduced by men (Abrahamsson 2002; Alimahomed-Wilson 2011; Ericson 2011; Flood 2008; Fundberg 2003; Hammarén & Johansson 2014; Holgersson 2006; 2013; Kalat & Kalat 2001; Kiesling 2005; Sedgwick 1985), and challenged by women (Abrahamsson 2006; Alimahomed-Wilson 2011). As noted above, my previous studies indicate that it is not only women who challenge the homosocial environment in the port of Gothenburg, but also new groups of men. Thus, this study is intended as a contribution to the academic theories on homosociality.

Three studies have been especially influential for me when writing this thesis. A study which has been important for my understanding of masculinity and homosociality in harbours is Jake Alimahomed-Wilson's (2011) article *Men along the shore: working-class masculinities in crisis*. In this study of masculinity among longshoremen in California, he argues that the dockworkers are experiencing a collective crisis of masculinity. This is both due to technological developments in the harbour and the changed gender practices at the workplace, but also since the entrance of women challenge the homosocial culture. Alimahomed-Wilson's article has been highly relevant for this study since similar processes are currently going on in the port of Gothenburg.

Mathias Ericson's (2011) dissertation *Nära Inpå: Maskulinitet, intimitet och gemenskap i brandmäns arbetslag* has both influenced my understanding of how masculine identities are related to work and class identities, but also how homosocial relations between men are created through a "raw but hearty" jargon and normative heterosexuality. One of Ericson's conclusions is that the "raw but hearty" jargon among the men at the fire-station was an expression of a certain form of intimacy which was only possible in relations between men. While his study investigates masculinity as being

performed by men, my study includes how women can perform masculinity, desexualize themselves and reproduce the jargon in order to be part of the homosocial culture. Thus, this study is intended as a contribution to the academic debate about women's performances of masculinity.

Marie Nordberg's (2005) dissertation *Jämställdhetens spjutspets* has been an important contribution to my understanding of how constructions of gender intersect with work identity. While her study focuses on men working in feminine-coded professions, she requests more studies that focus on the opposite: women working in masculine-coded professions. This is a gap that my study intends to fill. The port of Gothenburg has traditionally been a male-dominated workplace, but during the last decade the number of women has slightly increased. Thus, my empirical field is an excellent place to investigate how women in a masculine-coded and male-dominated profession create work identity.

### 3. Theoretical framework and analytical tools

This chapter shows the theoretical perspectives and analytical tools that will be used to analyse the empirical material. The relevance for these specific tools and how they will be used in the analysis will be explained. The chapter starts with an overview of the sex/gender debate. It then discusses the concept hegemonic masculinity and how masculinity is created in relation to class identities. This is followed by a section about homosociality, and the chapter ends with a section about gender, work and identity.

#### 3.1. The sex/gender debate

There is an ongoing academic debate about perceptions of gender and sex. Some authors make a distinction between biological sex and socially constructed gender, as expressed by Simone de Beauvoir in 1949: "*One is not born a woman, but rather becomes one*". Her argument is that women's subordinate position in society is not natural or biological, but rather created socially. However, the sex/gender dichotomy has been questioned for example by Judith Butler (1990) who argues that also sex is performed and created culturally and discursively. Our bodies are disciplined by cultural discourses which determine what our bodies look like and how we use them. Throughout this thesis, Nordberg's (2004:48) understanding of masculinity and femininity as a set of practices which are categorized as belonging to either men or women, but which can be embodied by both sexes, will be used. This approach to gender allows masculine and feminine identities to be detached from male and female bodies. Also women can perform, create and recreate masculinity, and what is coded as masculine behaviour is in constant transformation. Wasshede (2010) emphasizes that social and cultural gender norms are slow to change and often appear as static. Gender is an important source of identity for most people, and the masculine/feminine dichotomy is central to

how we categorize and understand the world. Through socialization we learn which behaviours and actions that are coded as feminine and masculine, which sets the limits for our actions. By identifying as a woman or a man one is given an identity, but also confined to a category where one is subject to control. Transgressing the boundaries of these categories, for example men engaging in behaviours that are categorized as feminine, are likely to lead to suspicion and social reprisals. In the port of Gothenburg, female dockworkers are expected to transgress the gender categories and perform masculinity in order to be part of the homosocial culture. In section 5.3 it will be further discussed how female dockworkers develop strategies to balance the expectations of performing masculinity and at the same time not transgress the gender boundaries to the extent that their identification as women becomes questioned.

### 3.2. Hegemonic masculinity

This thesis connects to a research field that investigates gender in terms of masculinity. Constructionist perspectives of masculinity research has to a large extent developed in relation to the concept *hegemonic masculinity*, formulated by R.W Connell (Connell 2011:53). The concept seeks to explain the patterns of practices that allow men's dominance over women and other gender identities and groups in society to continue, but also to analyse power relations between different masculinities and their relation to and struggle for hegemony (Connell & Messerschmidt 2005:832). Hegemonic masculinity can be seen as an "ideal image" of a man, "the currently most honoured way of being a man" (Connell & Messerschmidt 2005:832). It subordinates other men and masculinities that do not display this image, and forces men to position themselves in relation to the ideal (Bird 1996; Connell 2008). Although few men live up to the hegemonic ideal, by just being a man they get some of the respect, authority, power and the material and economic benefits that follow with the top-masculinity, but without the risks that also follow from being in the frontline (Abrahamsson 2006). Connell calls this "complicit masculinities" and uses the concept to explain why men, although they do not live up to the hegemonic masculinity-type, often glorify, protect and promote it. Connell (2005:2) also emphasizes that masculinities do not first exist and then come into contact with femininities. Rather, masculinities and femininities are created in relation to each other in the process that constitutes a gender order. Thus, hegemonic masculinity is to be understood as a certain dynamic within social processes rather than a specific characteristic or personality. The hegemonic masculinity in a given context is never static, but constantly challenged and negotiated by alternative masculinities (Collinson & Hearn 1996; Mac an Ghail 1994; McDowell 2001). In the port of Gothenburg, the hegemonic masculinity has historically been a specific form of working-class masculinity which is closely tied to dockworker identity. However, the increased economic status of harbour work has attracted new groups of men from high

educational and economic backgrounds who perform different expressions of masculinity. Although the “old” working-class masculinity is still hegemonic in the port of Gothenburg, expressions of middle-class masculinity are also gaining influence. How the hegemonic masculinity in the harbour is constructed and the resistance that occurs when it becomes challenged will be further discussed in section 5.1.

According to Ericson (2011:53), *hegemonic masculinity* is useful for analysing gender relations in workplaces, since the concept makes it possible to analyse how competence and work identity are often closely connected to masculinity. Ericson further argues that in workplaces where men are constituting the norm of what an ideal worker is, women and men who do not perform the hegemonic masculinity tend to be seen as the “abnormal”. This was recurrent in my fieldwork, since both men and women had to perform working-class masculinity in order to be accepted in the harbour. According to Mumby (1998), certain constructions of masculinity can at the same time be hegemonic and expressions of resistance. The author exemplifies with working-class masculinity at a shop-floor, which is based on collectivism, honesty, identification as manual workers and breadwinners. At the same time, this hegemonic masculinity at the workplace is a form of resistance to the hegemonic masculinity in society, which is based on individualism, mental labour and focus on production. Mumby’s findings are similar to my empirical field, where expressions of working-class masculinities are hegemonic in the harbour, but can at the same time be interpreted as resistance to the dominating masculinity in society. His understanding of hegemonic masculinity as resistance will be used to highlight how the local hegemonic masculinity in the port of Gothenburg interacts with and resists hegemonic expressions of masculinity on a societal and global level.

### 3.3. Masculinity and class

Expressions of masculinity are always created in tandem with other power structures in society, and different expressions of masculinity are strongly linked to different social classes (see Baron 2006; Johanson 2000; Mac an Ghail 1994; Morgan 2005). In the port of Gothenburg, working-class masculinity has been strongly tied to dockworker identity. However, with new groups of men entering the harbour, expressions of middle-class masculinity are also gaining ground. This will be further elaborated in section 5.1. The following paragraphs will outline how other scholars have theorized these two kinds of masculinity.

#### 3.3.1. Working-class masculinity

Men working in manual professions with strong trade unions often identify in opposition to employers, women, men working in offices, and unorganized men (Blomberg 1995; Colgan & Ledwith 2002; Collinson & Hearn 1996; Cunnison & Stageman 1993). Working-class men are often



associated with collectivism, solidarity and physical strength (Alimahomed-Wilson 2011; Ericson 2011; Frykman 1990; Heron 2006; Morgan 2005; Pyke 1996). Working-class professions have historically been physically demanding and team-based, which has made collectivism and community central components of working-class masculinity. By emphasising the conflict-perspective in relation to the managers and promoting unity between the workers, working-class men resist the companies' never-ending demands of performance and profit-making. In the port of Gothenburg, the trade union's slogan is "unity brings victory"<sup>3</sup>, which indicates that by standing together as a collective against the employer, unreasonable demands from the companies can be resisted. Thus, these theories are useful to analyse my empirical field. Several authors argue that working-class identity to a large extent is constructed in relation to masculinity, and attributes that have historically been associated with labour are similar to those associated with masculinity (Abrahamsson 2006; Alimahomed-Wilson 2011; Blomberg 1995; Ericson 2011). For example, physical strength, handiness and aggression are traits that have been associated both with manual labour and with masculinity. Thus, in many accounts of working-class history, being a worker has been equated with being a man. Another common notion in the literature about working-class masculinity is that it is characterized by expressions of "hyper-masculinity" (Alimahomed-Wilson 2011; Embrick et. al 2007; Heron 2006; McDowell 2010; Morgan 2005; Nayak 2006; Nixon 2009; Pyke 1996; Rhodes 2011). The body is an important power-resource for working-class men, since they compensate for their lack of social and economic power in society by displays of physical strength, aggressions and competitiveness, in order to construct their masculinity as more "male" than men from higher classes. Thus, emphasising physical strength, collectivism and solidarity is a way for working-class men to create an alternative to the hegemonic masculinity which is associated with managers and other men working in offices. But "hyper-masculinity" can also take the shape of homophobia and misogyny, since working-class men try to secure places of privilege in opposition to women, minorities and homosexuals due to their subordinate socioeconomic position.

### 3.3.2. Middle-class masculinity

In section 1.2 it was argued that in order to understand local expressions of masculinity, one needs to understand the global gender order. According to Connell (1998), the current global hegemonic masculinity, which all men also in local contexts must somehow relate to, is the neoliberal, rational, individualistic, entrepreneurial middle-class man. In the academic literature, this expression of masculinity is characterized by competitiveness, self-discipline, over-confidence, career and status-consciousness, and focus on hierarchy and individuation (Collinson & Hearn 1996; Haywood &

---

<sup>3</sup> "Enighet ger seger" in Swedish.

Mac an Ghail 2003; Mac an Ghail 1994; Mumby 1998). Men performing this kind of masculinity often identify strongly with the management's values and goals and are conscious about delivering profit for their companies. According to Mumby (1998), middle-class masculinities tend to have a more individualistic conception of the self, and use theoretical and technical knowledge as positive sources of identification. Some researchers argue that middle-class masculinities are "softer" than more conservative ideals and working-class ideals (Anderson 2009; Ericson 2011; Mac an Ghail 1994; Mumby 1998). Anderson (2009:43) argues that since middle-class men have higher social status than working-class men, the latter are met with stronger social or physical reprisal for violating gender norms and for incorporating feminine-coded behaviours. Due to middle-class men's cultural capital, they are able to transgress gender boundaries to a larger extent than working-class men. In particular, men who perform the masculinity which is hegemonic on a global level often have the power to influence local gender orders. Although the neoliberal middle-class masculinity is not hegemonic in all local settings, it is backed up by power structures on a larger scale. Thus, neoliberal masculinities have the power to challenge local gender hegemonies (Connell 2008:24-25). In the port of Gothenburg, middle-class masculinity is the ideal among the companies who own the terminals, who strive to increase the productivity by employing people with higher educations than previously. How this affects the local masculinity-constructions will be further elaborated in section 5.1.

### 3.4. Homosociality

The port of Gothenburg has historically been a homosocial workplace where bonds between men have been created and reproduced through the confirmation of working-class masculinity. The following sections will outline how different scholars understand homosociality, and how the concept will be used for analysing the empirical material.

#### 3.4.1. Homosociality and male dominance

Gender hierarchies in the workplace are commonly established and reproduced by men seeking community with other men, which is often referred to as homosocial behaviour (Ericson 2011; Flood 2008; Hammarén & Johansson 2014; Holgersson 2006; 2013; Kiesling 2005). Homosociality is defined by Holgersson (2006:27) as "a process where men orient themselves towards and identify with other men". This is one of the answers to why men continue to dominate in high positions at workplaces. Homosocial environments are based on male bonding, likeness and identification, and the structure controls and reinforces the similarities between workers (Abrahamsson 2006). Women also do homosociality, but since women have less resources and less power than men, they need to orient themselves towards men and establish heterosocial relations, in order to get a share of the power and influence (Ericson 2011; Hammarén & Johansson 2014; Holgersson 2006). From

this perspective, women's homosociality is different from men's. However, homosociality can be reproduced also in groups consisting of a majority of men and a few women, if the women adapt to the symbolic order and to the men's communication and interaction-patterns (Holgersson 2006). Moreover, a group is not necessarily homosocial just because it consists of only men, since not all men reproduce the homosocial order. My empirical material indicates that in order to be accepted in the group, female dockworkers need to adapt to the men's interaction-patterns and to perform masculinity. In addition, not all male dockworkers reproduce the homosocial structure. Thus, theories about homosociality will be used in this thesis to analyse how the homosocial environment in the harbour is created and reproduced, but also in what ways it becomes challenged by new groups of men and women.

All researchers do not agree with the notion that homosociality should exclusively be defined as a means for men to maintain their power over women and subordinated masculinities. Hammarén & Johansson (2014) argue that defining homosociality as a process that upholds and maintains patriarchy is to simplify the concept. Instead, they suggest a discussion about two different dimensions of homosociality. While *vertical homosociality* refers to the process of men creating bonds and strengthening male power, *horizontal homosociality* is used to point towards more inclusive relationships between men that are based on emotional closeness and intimacy. Although not using the same concepts, Ericson (2011) problematizes the common view of manual male-dominated professions with a strong sense of team-spirit as characterized by a special kind of community that is based on a constant struggle over confirmation of masculinity. In his empirical context, a fire station in Sweden, he finds that masculinity is rather a means to reach the overarching goal: community and intimacy between men. Holgersson (2013) argues that homosocial bonds between men may serve other purposes than reproducing patriarchy, such as intimacy, community and emotional attachment. However, the bi-product of homosocial bonds is always, consciously or unconsciously, male dominance. In her study of Swedish male managers, she reaches the conclusion that homosociality and gender discrimination should be understood as two sides of the same coin. Throughout this thesis, I will draw on the perspectives outlined by Ericsson (2011) and Holgersson (2013). In the port of Gothenburg, homosociality is a means to reach community and intimacy, but it also discriminates against men and women who do not live up to the male, heterosexual, working-class norm. Throughout the presentation of empirical material, the ambivalence that this creates will be analysed: although the dockworkers care about preserving the homosocial environment, they are also critical to the discrimination that it reproduces, especially against women and homosexual men.

### 3.4.2. A "raw but hearty" jargon

A recurrent theme in the literature about homosociality is that a central part of manual male workers' homosocial bonding is the jargon (Bird 1996; Collinson 1988; Ericson 2011; Holgersson 2006; Kiesling 2005). This is of high relevance to my field, since all the respondents brought up the "raw but hearty" jargon as being a central characteristic of the community in the harbour. At the same time as the jargon strengthens the cohesion between the dockworkers it also risks to be excluding since it is based on a white, masculine, heterosexual working-class norm (Collinson & Hearn 1996; Embrick et. al 2007; Johanson 2000). According to some studies (see Ericson 2011:105), the jargon is a configuration of hegemonic masculinity and serves to maintain and reproduce a community which is reserved for working-class men. Thus, squabbling and being able to "take shit" are used as class-identifications among men in working-class professions. This relates to the port of Gothenburg, where the jargon was understood as a central component of working-class masculinity and dockworker identity. One of Ericson's (2011) conclusions is that the "raw but hearty" jargon strengthened the social ties between the men at the fire-station, but was also excluding, for example towards interns and new recruits. Thus, the jargon functioned as a marker between "us" and "them": in order to be part of the community at the workplace, one had to understand what was the "hearty" and not just the "raw" in the jargon. But the jargon was also an expression of a certain form of intimacy which was only possible in relations between men. Thus, a precondition for the creation of this form of intimate relationships was that they were non-sexual. In Ericson's study, the firemen find it unthinkable to have the same raw jargon with a woman as with a man, since sexuality renders impossible the type of intimate community that the jargon serves to reproduce (see also Collinson 1988). In section 5.2, it will be analysed how the jargon functions as a marker between "us" and "them", but also to dig deeper into under what preconditions men and women are allowed to be part of the homosocial group in the port of Gothenburg. It will be argued that in my empirical context, one does not necessarily have to be a man to be part of the homosocial environment, but it is necessary to perform the hegemonic working-class masculinity.

### 3.4.3. Heteronormativity and sexism

Male homosociality is by some authors defined as a mechanism and a social dynamic that explains the maintenance of hegemonic masculinity (Bird 1996; Ericson 2011). Homosocial interaction between heterosexual men serves to upgrade identities compatible with this hegemonic ideal, whereas alternative masculinities are subordinated. Thus, a common feature of hegemonic masculinity is normative heterosexuality. If men in a homosocial group were allowed to be openly homosexual, it would challenge their collective hetero-masculinity (Alimahomed-Wilson 2011; Ericson 2011; Fundberg 2003; Johanson 2000). Hence, homosocial environments are often

characterized by the subordination of and discrimination against homosexual men and objectification of women, since constructions of masculinity, and to be a man, to a large extent are based on not being a woman and not being homosexual. Several researchers argue that sexualisation and objectification of women in homosocial environments works as a confirmation both of the heterosexual norm and of being a “real man” (Alimahomed-Wilson 2011; Bird 1996; Mac an Ghail 1994). The objectification is based on the idea that men are not only different from, but also better than, women. These theories will be used in this thesis to analyse the sexist and homophobic aspects of the homosocial environment in the port of Gothenburg.

### 3.5. Gender, work and identity

Throughout this thesis, it will be explored how gender identities are related to work identities in the port of Gothenburg. Blomqvist (2004:59) finds in her study about export industry workers and construction workers in India that something that is perceived as “typical of women” is sometimes in another context seen as “typical of men”. The difference is rather created in relation to the “other” gender, than according to the actual expected behaviour associated with the different genders. According to Bradley (1989:8), “it would be hard to find any single activity which has not been, at some time or place, “women’s work””. However, when a working task or profession is coded as male its status and value increases, whereas when the exact same working task in another location is coded as feminine, it is valued lower than tasks that count as “men’s work” (Blomqvist 2004; Bradley 1989; Gunnarson 1995). Lena Abrahamsson (2002) argues in the article *“The moment it became important it became male”* that organizational changes transform the social constructions of work and explains how working tasks and competences are coded and valued. She exemplifies with how social competence has changed from being viewed as a feminine characteristic into being seen as an important professional competence that also men can possess. However, this change in the gender coding did not upgrade women’s status in the organization. Women’s social competence was seen as residing “naturally” within their bodies, whereas men’s social competence was viewed as being learned and handled intellectually (see also Blomqvist 2004; Briskin 2006).

Although definitions of masculinity and femininity are constantly changing, they often appear as static. In Nordberg’s (2005) dissertation, she explores the relation between gender and work identity among men working in women-dominated professions in Sweden (nurses, hair-dressers and nursery-school teachers). She finds that the men in her study are seen as carriers of a delimited “manliness” which is viewed as both a problem and an asset in the “women’s culture” at the workplace. Her study also indicates that these men are expected to “bring something new” to the workplace, that is, they are expected to perform masculinity. Nordberg also finds that one important component of the men’s identities is the emphasis on difference. Whereas the position

as a “man” is a central identification for her respondents, their own difference towards the imaginary collective of “men” is pointed out. Thus, it is important both to be perceived as a “real” man, but also as a different man. By being different, the men in Nordberg’s (2005: 253) study justify their incorporation of feminine and “forbidden” behaviours. Theories about how gender identities intersect with work identities will be used to analyse how the female dockworkers in the port of Gothenburg create work identity. Nordberg’s theories about difference will be used to analyse how female dockworkers, who work in a masculine-coded profession, use their position as being “different” as a positive source of work identity.

Abrahamsson & Johansson’s (2006) study of technological changes in the Swedish mining industry is important for understanding how certain working-tasks can be constructed as masculine in order to be used as positive sources of identification for men in the port of Gothenburg. Like harbour work, mining has historically been hard, physical and dangerous manual work performed under difficult conditions. In addition, both mine work and harbour work have gone through processes of mechanization and technological developments, which has reduced the previously heavy work. Abrahamsson & Johansson find that when the technology in the mines developed and the work demanded less physical strength, the hegemonic masculinity became threatened, since the work could no longer be used as symbols of masculinity. In order to maintain men’s power over women, other working tasks such as operating machinery became constructed as masculine, even though these mechanized tasks did not demand any physical strength. In this way, the men at the workplace strived to continue using mine work as a positive source of identification. To avoid the risk that these constructions would be challenged, women were verbally and emotionally abused. Abrahamsson & Johansson conclude that technological changes do not equate changes in the gender order at workplaces. They call this “identity-lag” since the mine workers were holding on to old constructions of masculinity rather than embracing the new, high-tech working conditions. This study is useful to analyse the resistance that occurs when working-tasks that used to be positive sources of identification for working-class men are replaced by machines and technology. It will be argued that in the port of Gothenburg, the resistance is not only directed towards women, but also towards middle-class men who can use the mechanized working-tasks as positive sources of identification.

### 3.5.1. Class, gender and respectability

What counts as men’s and women’s work is strongly related to cultural notions of respectability (Bergholm & Teräs 1999; Bradley 1989, Kalat & Kalat 2001; Morgan 2005; Skeggs 1997/2000). In addition, whether a job or a working task is seen as respectable or unrespectable depends on which social class the work is associated with. Several researchers argue that attributes that have

historically been associated with labour are similar to those associated with masculinity (Abrahamsson 2006; Alimahomed-Wilson 2011; Blomberg 1995; Ericson 2011). For example, physical strength, handiness and aggression are traits that have been associated both with physical labour and with masculinity. Thus, working-class men have been able to use their class position as a positive source of identity, whereas the reverse is often true for women since they risk to be judged as masculine and unrespectable (Kalat & Kalat 2001; Morgan 2005; Skeggs 1997/2000). Skeggs (1997/2000) argues that during industrialization, the working-class woman was constructed as the cultural “Other” by women from higher classes. Feminine work was seen as clean, light and preferably indoors, in contrast to the often physical, dirty and outdoors labour that the working-class woman performed. Thus, the working-class woman was constructed as the opposite of femininity. The feminine ideal was constructed as passive, dependent and weak, but also as moral and respectable. Thus, by performing femininity, middle-class women could reach limited status and moral superiority, but also a position to judge those women who lacked femininity and, consequently, respectability. One example of this is Bergholm & Teräs (1999) study of female dockworkers in Finland in the early and mid- 1900’s. Harbour work is a profession which has historically been strongly associated with the working-class and has been constructed as unrespectable for women. Chastity, purity, decency, sobriety and other virtues linked to womanhood and motherhood were in danger in harbour environments, which were associated with images of vice, violence, serious drinking and prostitution. Women in the harbours had to adapt to the sexist environment by being as rude and rough as the male dockers, which was regarded by the public as implying promiscuity. This is also confirmed by Skeggs’ (1997/2000) study of working-class women in England in the 1990’s. Through their class-background, her interviewees are categorized as unfeminine and sexual, in contrast to the respectable middle-class women. It was therefore necessary for the interviewed women to dissociate themselves from the sexual, vulgar and pathological stereotype, and instead display feminine appearances and behaviours. By contrast, middle-class women were free to play with notions of not being middle-class or to challenge social constructions of accepted femininity, since they did not risk losing their cultural capital or being deemed unrespectable if they failed. Throughout the result and analysis, theories about respectability will be used to analyse how female dockworkers in the port of Gothenburg construct work identity in a masculine-coded and male-dominated profession. It will be argued that both the negative stereotypes of the working-class woman and the difficulty for women to use the working-tasks in the harbour as positive sources of identification have consequences for female dockworkers’ possibilities to construct work identity.

## 4. Methods and material

In this chapter, the methods used throughout this research will be explained and motivated. The chapter starts with a section about how the project emerged, and how the choices of sampling methods have affected the results. This is followed by a description of how the material has been gathered and analysed. Moreover, ethical considerations, language concerns and the researcher's positionality are discussed, and the chapter ends with a section about validity and reliability.

### 4.1. The emergence of the project

In the autumn of 2015 I was doing an internship as a research assistant in the research project *Men and Masculinity in Gothenburg's Trade Union Movement* at the School of Global Studies. Throughout this internship, I was conducting interviews with members of the trade union in the port of Gothenburg, Hamn4an. These interviews were conducted together with my supervisor Gunilla Blomqvist Sköldberg (who is also the supervisor for this thesis). The project focused on how masculinity constructions in Hamn4an have changed during the last century and how the trade union works with gender equality. Participating in this project made me interested in digging deeper into gender relations in harbour work. Thus, the internship inspired me to study this particular field, although the aim and research questions in this thesis are different from the internship-projects' objective. After analysing the empirical material that we gathered throughout the internship, a picture emerged where the masculinity constructions in Hamn4an have not changed very much during the last century. Our preliminary conclusion was that it is still the working-class masculinity which is strongly connected to dockworker identity that is dominant in the trade union. The empirical material also indicated that this expression of masculinity forms the foundation of the strong homosocial bonds between men in the harbour. In the light of these findings, I became curious to find out how female dockworkers create work identity in a masculine-coded profession where dockworker identity is so intimately connected to working-class masculinity. A recurrent theme in the academic literature about homosociality is that homosocial relations are based on male bonding and non-sexual relations, and that the entrance of women often challenge the homosocial bonds. This made me interested to explore whether a similar process was taking place in the port of Gothenburg. However, when I started to collect material for this thesis, I realized that the field was much more contradictory and miscellaneous than I had first anticipated. Throughout the interviews, the respondents often answered the questions in a certain way, and later expressed the exact opposite. Eventually I realized that there are two parallel processes going on in the harbour. While the "old" working-class masculinity is still hegemonic and many of the older dockworker care about passing it down to the younger generation, this masculinity is also challenged by other masculinity-ideals that are hegemonic in society at large and on a global level. To make things even



more complicated, I gradually realized throughout the interviews that it is not only women who challenge the homosocial environment in the harbour, as the literature study had indicated. Instead, it is also men who perform middle-class masculinity who challenge the homosocial culture, whereas some women develop strategies to become part of the homosocial group.

#### 4.2. Respondents

According to Ahrne & Svensson (2015:42), at least 6-8 interviews are necessary for a qualitative study to be representative. However, in order to distinguish patterns and gather material that is relatively independent of individual people's personal opinions and experiences, between 10-15 interviews are recommended. My analysis is mainly based on 11 qualitative interviews with dockworkers in the port of Gothenburg, out of which 4 were conducted throughout the internship. These 4 interviews were conducted together with my supervisor. The other 7 interviews were conducted independently, but since some of the topics that were covered were useful also for my supervisor's research project, she was there to listen and sometimes add a few questions. As noted above, the empirical material is both complex and contradictory. Thus, in order to get an even more nuanced picture, a few more interviews would have been needed. However, due to the limited time frame of this project, the delimitation to only conduct 11 interviews was made.

In order to create a more representative picture of the empirical field, I have also used sources in the form of 4 interviews with dockworkers that my supervisor conducted before I entered the project, which have been used in combination with the other interviews. On a few occasions I have used citations from these secondary sources in the result and analysis, when these respondents have expressed an interesting theme in a particularly illuminating way. Out of the all-together 15 interviews, 11 respondents worked in the harbour at the time of the interview, and 3 respondents used to work in the harbour but were now full-time employees in the trade union. One respondent was retired since one year and had previously been employed in the trade union for the main part of her working life. Out of the 11 interviews that constitute my primary source of material, 6 are women and 5 are men. Out of the secondary sources, 1 is a woman and 3 are men. The respondents' ages range from 34 to 67 years old.

#### 4.3. Sampling methods

Two main sampling methods have been used throughout this project: *snowball sampling* and *quota sampling*. During the first interviews, snowball sampling was used, where I asked the respondents to recommend people I could interview. According to Ahrne & Svensson (2015:41), snowball sampling is a useful method when the researcher wants a sufficient number of respondents who can provide information on a specific topic. However, it also entails the risk that the respondents have similar attitudes and experiences. Thus, in order to get a more nuanced picture of the

processes in the harbour, quota sampling (see Bernard 2011:144) was used during the second part of the fieldwork. In quota sampling, the researcher creates a grid with a selected number of independent variables (see figure 1). The first interviews indicated that understandings of masculinity, work identity and the homosocial environment in the harbour differ both depending on the respondents' degree of involvement in the trade union, but also on which terminal they are employed at, and whether they are men or women. Hence, during the second part of the fieldwork, a trade union representative in the harbour helped me to find respondents who were working in all three terminals, who were more and less active in the trade union, and who were both men and women. Although I did not reach an entirely even distribution, I believe that this strategy of respondent selection is the main reason that the empirical material gradually became more complex and nuanced, since I included voices of people whose backgrounds were more diverging than during the first interviews.

Terminal 1				Terminal 2				Terminal 3			
More active		Less active		More active		Less active		More active		Less active	
M	W	M	W	M	W	M	W	M	W	M	W

Figure 1.

#### 4.4. Semi-structured interviews

The main method to collect material for this thesis has been through qualitative, semi-structured interviewing, where I asked prepared interview questions with open ends that let the respondents have an impact on the way that the interview unfolded (Dewalt & Dewalt 2011:137). I find this method useful since it allows me to direct interest to certain themes and topics that I find interesting given my object of research, but at the same time it allows for a certain amount of flexibility. Throughout the interviews, I followed an interview guide which consisted of questions which can (roughly) be divided into six different topics: 1. Harbour work and ideal images of men and women in the harbour 2. Gender relations and equality. 3. Jargon 4. Gender, class and identity 5. Trade union identity, and 6. Security in the harbour. The interview questions were based on the literature review I conducted before entering the field, since previous research about gender, work and homosociality informed which questions I asked. Due to the semi-structured nature of the interviews, the questions changed during the course of the field work. Sometimes new themes were brought up during the interviews, which I found interesting to explore in greater depth by adding them to the interview guide. During the interview with the retired trade union worker, I used a different interview guide which focused on how gender relations in the trade union have changed over the course of her working life. The interviews lasted between one and two hours. 9 of the 11 interviews were conducted at Hamn4ans trade union building. One interview was conducted at a

restaurant in one of the terminals in the port of Gothenburg, and one at the School of Global Studies. They were all recorded, upon the consent of the respondents, and transcribed into written text.

As a complement to the interviews I have also participated in two guided tours in the port of Gothenburg, in order to have an idea of how harbour work is conducted. On one occasion, I got to try to lash a container, and on another occasion I went on a tour in one of the trucks. I found these tours very interesting and useful to better understand the respondents' narratives, since lashing containers and driving trucks are two of the working tasks which were often brought up in the interviews. During these observations I engaged in informal conversations with the dockworkers who took me around. Although I have not used their narratives as material in this study, these observations have helped me to better understand the material that I collected throughout the interviews.

#### 4.5. Data analysis

As noted above, the empirical material is both rich and complex, which is often the case in qualitative research. It has therefore been important to make a selection from the material produced from the interviews. According to Ahrne & Svensson (2015:221), the sorting of qualitative material is intimately connected to the theories and analytical tools, since these inform which data that is considered relevant for the study. Throughout the analysis, the selection of material was divided into different themes, or "codes", according to which the material was structured. The codes were clustered into categories, and structured according to the research questions. Each category represents one heading in the section "Result and analysis". On the deductive-inductive spectra (see Bryman 2012:24-25), this study is closer to the latter. The theoretical framework has informed the material selection, but the empirical material has also had a strong influence on which theories and analytical tools I chose. Consequently, the themes and codes used to analyse the material were derived both from the interviews and from the literature review. When analysing qualitative data, it is important to distinguish reoccurring patterns, but also to include material that breaks the pattern, in order to make the analysis more nuanced (Ahrne & Svensson 2015:224). Throughout the analysis, I have tried to explain patterns that occurred in most of the interviews, but also to be transparent about the complexities and include material that breaks the pattern.

#### 4.6. Ethical considerations

Throughout the interviews, I have been guided by the ethical principles stated by Vetenskapsrådet (1990:7-14). I used four basic principles in order to ensure the rights for the interviewees. Before starting an interview, I informed about the purpose of the study and how I would use the material. Secondly, I asked the interviewees if they allowed me to record the interview. Thirdly, the material

will only be used for the expressed purpose. Lastly, I have used fictive names of the respondents in order to ensure some degree of anonymity, at least towards readers outside the harbour. However, in the port of Gothenburg many dockworkers know each other, and are consequently aware of each other's opinions and ways of expression. Thus, although I use pseudonyms, it is likely that dockworkers who read the thesis will know who has said what. This is an issue that has been of concern throughout the fieldwork, and also something that I have discussed with many of the respondents. With those who have expressed concern regarding this matter, I have offered to inform them about which quotes from their interview I intend to use, so that they can feel comfortable about what I share in this thesis.

#### 4.7. Language concerns

The interviews were conducted in Swedish, since it is both mine and my respondents' native language. According to Hennink (2008:21), language is a tool that qualitative researchers use to understand social processes, cultural meaning and human behaviour. Thus, translating a text implies a discussion not of only words but also of concepts. The language in the port of Gothenburg is spoken in a local Gothenburg dialect with many local expressions. Since I grew up in Gothenburg in a family who use many of these local, colloquial Gothenburg expressions, I was familiar with the language the respondents used. However, some of the words are not easily translated into English, since no exact equivalent exists. According to Hennink (2008:31), one way to increase the transparency when translating interviews is to include a language assistant in the research team. Throughout the translation process, I have been assisted by classmates and family members, who have helped me to translate certain concepts, words and sentences. I have also consulted a native English-speaker in order to not only translate the words, but also the cultural meanings attached to them. However, I am aware that my translations are not always exact. In the cases when I have not found a suitable equivalent, I have used footnotes to explain the meaning of the local term in order to increase the transparency.

#### 4.8. A female researcher in "the guys' home ground"

In research about men and masculinity, the gender of the researcher and its implications for the research process is often discussed (Nordberg 2005:48). Whereas research about other social categories have been seen as possible to investigate without belonging to the category, interpretations and results made by female researchers about men and masculinity have sometimes been questioned. Nordberg criticises masculinity-researchers such as Kimmel who argue that women researching men theorize from their (the women's) point of view, and that results reached by women do not adhere to men's experiences. Nordberg argues that although identifying as a woman inevitably effects the result in research about men and masculinity, Kimmel's argument is

problematic since he sees women's understanding of masculinity as less valid than men's. In addition, Kimmel's argument is based on an understanding of men and women as two separate groups, where each group is expected to share a common experience. Drawing on Nordberg's discussion, I will argue that the findings in this thesis have undoubtedly been influenced by my position as a young, middle-class woman who is currently conducting academic research on gender. Throughout the interviews, I experienced that the interviewees were very careful about expressing their opinions in a correct and gender egalitarian way. For example, our discussions about the jargon were always descriptions about how the dockworkers usually talked to each other. In the interview-situations with me, few reproduced the raw jargon which they claimed to be so characteristic for the harbour. The sometimes large age-difference between me and some of the respondents is also a factor to take into consideration. Some of the older dockworkers have been working in the harbour since before I was born, and hence, their reference frames are quite different from mine. It should also be noted that my ways of interacting and talking were more similar to the female dockworkers' than to the males'. Since I share some of their experiences by being a woman in the current gender order in Sweden, I could relate to some things they discussed in a way that was not always the case with the men. That being said, knowledge is always produced in specific circumstances, and those circumstances always shape the findings and interpretations in some way (Rose 1998). Thus, rather than trying to reduce the power asymmetry, researchers should strive to be as transparent as possible about how their positionality has effected the result (*ibid*). Relating back to Nordberg's argument, I will argue that although my positionality as a researcher has influenced the result, it does not make my findings less valid. Both male and female researchers are situated in specific power matrices in relation to the interviewees, and rather than considering certain positionalities as producing more accurate findings than others, I believe that conducting research from different positions is key to a dynamic academic debate.

#### 4.9. Validity and reliability

There is an ongoing debate about how validity and reliability should be measured within qualitative research. Bryman (2012:389-390) understands validity as whether the researcher is observing, identifying or "measuring" what is said to be observed, identified or measured. Thus, ensuring that the theoretical concepts are relevant for the researchers' observations is important in order to reach a high level of validity. As noted in section 4.1, the fieldwork has had a strong impact on how this study has developed. Since the empirical material turned out to be much more complicated than I had anticipated, I had to include theories and analytical perspectives which I had not considered as relevant before the study started. In this regard, this study can be said to have reached a high level of validity, since there is a strong congruence between concepts and observations.

Reliability in qualitative research can be measured by asking whether a study's findings can be replicated across different social settings. This is often difficult to fully ensure in qualitative research, since qualitative studies are difficult to repeat (Creswell 2014:201). Since the researcher is the research tool in qualitative interviews, my subjective understanding of the field affects both which parts of the interviews that I have emphasised and found interesting, but also how I have interpreted the informants' narratives. However, the reliability of qualitative research can be strengthened by being as transparent as possible about how the research has been conducted and the methods chosen (Brinkmann & Kvale 2015:282). This has been my ambition throughout this methods section, where I have tried to be transparent about how the project emerged, how the chosen sampling methods have affected the result, how the interviews have been conducted, how the data has been analysed and the concerns regarding ethical considerations, translation and positionality that have arisen throughout the study.

## 5. Results and analysis

Throughout this chapter, the results from the fieldwork are presented, and analysed with the tools explained in the chapter "Theoretical framework and analytical tools". Section 5.1 analyses how masculinity is constructed among dockworkers in the port of Gothenburg. Section 5.2 discusses how the homosocial environment is recreated and challenged. Lastly, section 5.3 investigates how female dockworkers create work-identity in a masculine space.

### 5.1. Masculinity, hegemony and resistance

This section analyses how masculinity is constructed among dockworkers in the port of Gothenburg. Using the concept hegemonic masculinity, this section discusses the expression of masculinity that is dominant in the port of Gothenburg and the resistance that occurs when the hegemonic masculinity becomes challenged. Since masculinities in the port of Gothenburg are strongly related to class identities, the analysis is influenced by theories about working-class and middle-class masculinities.

#### 5.1.1. Constructing working-class masculinity

Throughout the interviews, the expression of masculinity that most respondents brought up as being dominant in the port of Gothenburg is strongly related to working-class and dockworker identities. The findings in the interviews partly confirm the academic literature about working-class masculinity, since the majority of the respondents see the harbour as a male workplace and emphasize that the physically heavy, manual working tasks make them think of dockwork as a masculine profession. For many, identification as a dockworker and the competences required for harbour work were strongly tied to masculinity. "A physical job, large machines, boats, for some reason I think that's kinda male stuff" (Per). Many respondents also emphasized that the harbour

historically has been a physically heavy workplace with a raw work culture, which explains the low number of female dockworkers. Recurrent in the academic literature about working-class masculinity is that it is characterized by expressions of “hyper-masculinity” (Alimahomed-Wilson 2011; Heron 2006; McDowell 2010; Morgan 2005; Nayak 2006; Pyke 1996; Rhodes 2011). This was often brought up when the respondents described the masculinity ideals among the men who were working in the harbour and active in the trade union a few decades ago. One dockworker links the displays of “hyper-masculinity” to economic subordination and sees it as a negotiation strategy:

If we’re gonna talk about the old dudes who worked when I started here, they lived in a two-room flat in Svarte Mosse, they could fight, they could strike, because they had nothing to lose. They were really tough and hard, they could tell their foreman to fuck off, because they went straight out and got a new job, in the 50’s and 60’s there were jobs in abundance (Oskar).

In the academic literature, “hyper-masculinity” as a strategy to compensate for a lack of power in society (see theory chapter). However, in economic terms the dockworkers in the port of Gothenburg are no longer a subordinated category. The stories about the older generation’s displays of “hyper-masculinity” indicates that this was an important strategy a few decades ago when there was a need for dockworkers to compensate for low wages and a bad reputation in society. I interpret the fact that “hyper-masculinity” was not seen as an important component of working-class dockworker identity among the respondents today as a consequence of the increased economic status of harbour work. Since dockworkers in economic terms no longer belong to a subordinated class and do not need to compensate for economic hardship anymore, other attributes become more important to highlight.

Working-class professions have historically often been physically demanding and team-based. As a result, collectivism, community and solidarity have been important components of working-class masculinity (Alimahomed-Wilson 2011; Frykman 1990; Heron 2006; Morgan 2005; Pyke 1996). These descriptions were recurrent in the respondents’ discussions about what defines a good dockworker. For the majority of the respondents, “showing backbone<sup>4</sup>” and being “solidary and honest” were more important characteristics than physical strength. These traits were seen as important components of what constitutes both dockworker identity and working-class masculinity, and were sources of pride for the respondents.

---

<sup>4</sup> ”Stå rakryggad” in Swedish.

Harbour work is somehow my dream of how a workin' man should be, you've gotta pay your dues, say what you think and stand united with the rest of the working-class, be honest and not run around kissing ass (Oskar).

Many respondents also felt that the community and solidarity in the harbour is very special, and cannot be found in other workplaces.

It would have been great if it was the same unity in other workplaces. I can imagine that in the harbour the ideal image [of community, solidarity and unity in a working-class profession] is within reach, whereas in other places it is not to the same extent (Niklas).

Several authors argue that identifying in opposition to the management is common in manual professions with strong trade unions, but also central for men's working-class identity (Blomberg 1995; Colgan & Ledwith 2002; Collinson & Hearn 1996; Cunnison & Stageman 1993). This was a theme that recurred in most of the interviews. One respondent defined a good dockworker as "someone who does a good job, who is helpful, who helps others and doesn't leave the job to someone else. Who supports the collective. And who stands up for our rights against the employer" (Niklas). Collinson & Hearn (1996) argue that manual workers reproduce masculine identities by identifying in opposition to management, men working in offices and women, but also by emphasising their honesty and independence. As a consequence, they sometimes even refrain from promotion since their masculine independence and freedom might be questioned. This was brought up also in the interviews, and one dockworker went as far as to say that he would rather be unemployed than working in an office and being forced to follow the employer's orders.

I see myself as an ordinary worker, I will never become a clerk. I have said no to that kind of positions X number of times, I have replied sarcastically every time [...] Because it feels like the clerks want to take advantage of the workers in order to climb upwards, they want to stand on their backs [...] I guess that's what I'm afraid of, that if I take that job I might become like them. It feels much better to fight against the employer, I'd rather be unemployed than work like them. I'd rather sell my apartment and go to the social services. And I will never start working anywhere else (Ibbe).

This quote indicates that for those who identified with the working-class masculinity, harbour work was a positive source of identification, and this could not be found in many other workplaces (in the quote above, the dockworker goes as far as to say that it cannot be found *anywhere* else). Thus, in the port of Gothenburg, working-class masculinity is strongly tied to dockworker identity in a way that the middle-class masculinity was not. It is to the latter expression of masculinity that we now turn.



### 5.1.2. Constructing and resisting middle-class masculinity

The hegemonic masculinity in a given context is never static, but constantly challenged and negotiated by alternative masculinities (Collinson & Hearn 1996; Mac an Ghail 1994; McDowell 2001). Although the working-class masculinity described above has historically been hegemonic in the harbour, this ideal is today overlapped and challenged by other masculinities, predominantly the neoliberal middle-class masculinity described in the theory chapter. Not all of the respondents identified as working-class, and among those who did, not all agreed that the ideal working-class masculinity could be found in the harbour in the same way that it could before. Throughout the interviews, a picture emerged where the private operators who own the terminals strive to employ people with higher educations. Several dockworkers expressed how the companies value people who are productive, service-minded, problem-solving and oriented towards the company's goals, traits that are often described as components of middle-class masculinity (see Collinson & Hearn 1996; Haywood & Mac an Ghail 2003; Mac an Ghail 1995; Mumby 1998). Thus, the empirical material indicates that organisational changes have a strong impact on the performances of masculinity in the port of Gothenburg. Whereas most of the respondents described the working-class masculinity as their image of an ideal dockworker, they thought that the middle-class masculinity was the ideal among the companies who own the terminals. One female dockworker expresses her view of what kind of people the companies strive to employ and the new ideal dockworker it creates:

A person who takes the job seriously, the production is why we are here, that's number one, but also to know your limitations, for example when it gets too dangerous, you have to make sure that the work at the dock flows, be able to create a good work-environment, be good at planning, think about the co-workers, the flow, goods and customers (Cecilia).

Alimahomed-Wilson (2011) finds in his study that many older longshoremen feel that the younger have lost their connection to the past and to longshore masculine identity itself, and find it important to pass down this sentiment to the younger generation. My empirical material indicates that a similar process is going on in the port of Gothenburg. Many of the respondents were critical to the "new" middle-class masculinity which was the ideal in the companies, and were worried that the values of the older generation would be lost if the middle-class masculinity became too dominant. Thus, the "old" working-class masculinity was an ideal that they were proud of and wanted to hand over to the next generation.

A lot of the old [values] lingered on here, the older generation tried to influence us to become like them when we started here, and maybe they succeeded, at least a little bit. We have a lot left of the old, that you should pay your dues, say what you think, showing backbone, stuff like that. And I guess that's the heritage that I, when I have been here even longer, will pass down to the next generation (Oskar).

It was brought up in several interviews that the kind of people that the companies strive to employ today are different to the kind of people that have historically worked in the port of Gothenburg. One respondent describes the difference between the “old” working-class dockworkers and the “new” middle-class recruits.

Somehow it’s easy to start talking in terms of class, because I personally have the idea that as a clerk you are soft and lean, a different kind of man, wearing a shirt and being kinda weak. But here you are often a bit fatter, a bit “bööööh”, beardy and ragged, with snuff pouring out of the mouth, more of a worker. The difference is that today people study, you become a dockworker by choice instead of not having a choice, you probably want to be here (Daniel).

But although new groups of men who perform middle-class masculinity are increasingly being employed in the harbour today, the working-class masculinity is still hegemonic. One respondent expresses how the older generation, who often perform working-class masculinity, are still “the core”. Although the companies strive to increase the productivity by employing young people with relatively high educations, these new recruits need to position themselves in relation to the dockworkers who perform the hegemonic working-class masculinity.

I have been here when many from the older generation have retired, and seen the change myself. Seen all those special people disappear and be replaced with 22-yearolds who are really “work, work, work”, it’s a completely different thing. **But it’s still like the older dudes are the core, and we are a bit below them** (Emelie). (My emphasis).

Despite being challenged by new ideals, identification in opposition to the employers is something that all respondents bring up as important in the harbour.

When you get into this workplace it’s ”us” against ”them”, us against the company, the ambition that we should have a good workplace too, and as long as we are united we can also make small improvements [...] You can’t do your own thing here, then you won’t be very popular (Sara).

Thus, also the dockworkers who performed middle-class masculinity expressed strong identification against the employer. But performing middle-class masculinity could also be used as a negotiation strategy. One dockworker, who grew up in what he identifies as a working-class setting but has been working in offices and other non-manual jobs, sees it as an advantage to be able to perform both working-class and middle-class masculinity. Thus, the empirical material indicates that due to the increased influence of the middle-class masculinity, also the dockworkers who identified as working-class performed components of middle-class masculinity from time to time. This dockworker characterizes working-class masculinity as being aggressive and unable to communicate with the employer, whereas the middle-class masculinity is well-mannered and cooperative. At the same time, he is proud of the culture in the harbour where the collective takes

the fight with the employers, and thinks that this strengthens the bonds between the workers and makes the harbour a very special workplace.

For me, [working-class] is your manners in a certain situation, I guess it has also sharpened the divide between management and workers, it's just "bööööh". If you go to a regular company, enter an office, you don't walk up to your boss and say "fucking idiot", that would never happen. But here it happens, and that's also quite relieving. I'm really proud of that, that we take the fight, but you might not get very far by calling someone an idiot. That's where I feel that I have an advantage [as a trade union representative]. In the beginning when we had lots of problems and conflicts, I could be the filter between my colleagues and the management, even though it was really hard sometimes (Daniel).

As noted by Mumby (1998), certain constructions of masculinity can be hegemonic in a local setting and at the same time be expressions of resistance to the hegemonic masculinity in society. I interpret this dockworker's description of how workers behave at a "regular" office as an indication that this behaviour is an expression of the middle-class masculinity which is dominant in society at large, and the working-class masculinity as being specific for the port of Gothenburg, since performing this expression of masculinity would not be accepted in other workplaces. Thus, while the working-class masculinity is hegemonic in the port of Gothenburg, it is also an expression of resistance towards the hegemonic masculinity on a societal (and global) level. The empirical material also indicates that the reason why the middle-class masculinity (to some extent) is able to challenge the hegemonic masculinity in the harbour is the global power-structure where middle-class masculinities are valued higher than working-class masculinities. Thus, the middle-class masculinity is backed up by the power structure in society. This will be further elaborated in the end of the next section, where it will also be discussed how the challenges to the hegemony of the working-class masculinity affects the homosocial environment in the harbour.

## 5.2. Challenging and re-creating the homosocial environment

The harbour has historically been a homosocial workplace where bonds between men have been created and reproduced through the confirmation of working-class masculinity. Influenced by theories about homosociality, this section first analyses what role the jargon plays for the community between dockworkers and the sexism and homophobia that this jargon is based on. This is followed by a discussion about how the homosocial environment in the harbour is challenged by women and new groups of men.

### 5.2.1. Raw jargon and sexism

Bonding between men in manual working-class professions is often maintained and reproduced through a "raw but hearty" jargon (Collinson 1988; Ericson 2011; Holgersson 2006; Kiesling 2005). In the port of Gothenburg, the jargon can be seen as a configuration of the hegemonic working-

class masculinity described in the previous chapter. Throughout the interviews, many dockworkers described the rough climate in the harbour where one was constantly tested and had to learn to “take shit” and be snide.

I have always been a bit snide, I always have sharp comment, so you can't say something and expect me to be quiet. It has always been like that down here, but now it has calmed down a bit, or maybe we have matured. But back then it was that kind of attitude, there were no women working on our shifts, it was 33 men, and then of course it gets a bit rough (Ibbe).

Several researchers argue that sexualisation and objectification of women in homosocial environments works as a confirmation both of the heterosexual norm and of being a “real man” (Alimahomed-Wilson 2011; Bird 1996; Mac an Ghail 1994). The objectification is based on the idea that men are not only different from, but also better than, women. Throughout the fieldwork, the respondents gave examples of how female dockworkers were subject to degrading comments and were often not taken seriously, neither by the dockworkers nor by the clerks and foremen. One female dockworker expressed that sexist opinions and a conservative view of women is something that she encounters daily at her workplace, and the constant sexualisation and objectification is both annoying and frustrating.

The way they view women, overall ... for example, if we watch TV, and it's a politician there, or a researcher, a quite smart woman, but she is not wearing a bra, “how can she be on TV, with those long breasts?” It's like, excuse me, who are you? You went to primary school for two years, she has studied for 100 years and is so much smarter than you, and you dare to criticise her breasts! [...] So a woman shall first and foremost be pretty, that's the most important thing (Sofia).

That this kind of sexist comments circulated in the harbour was mentioned by several of the respondents, and all of them were critical to this kind of remarks. But at the same time, the fact that the environment in the harbour allowed for rough joking and that they can say whatever they want, was also what many respondents liked about their workplace. A common notion was that once you have become accepted as “one of the dudes”, nobody will boss you around. Instead, you are one in the gang and the other dudes back you up. In Ericson's (2011) study, there are ambivalent opinions regarding the raw jargon. At the same time as many of the firemen find it too rough and think that more women are needed in the workplace in order to create some “decency” and “discipline”, they are also afraid that if the jargon lightens, the unique form of community and intimacy between the workers will disappear. Throughout my study, the respondents agreed that the jargon gradually becomes softer when more women start working in the harbour. However, there were diverging opinions whether it was a positive or negative thing. Several dockworkers felt that the raw jargon was what made the harbour such a special workplace. One dockworker

expressed that at the same time as she is upset over the sexist view of women that many of her co-workers express, she also thinks that the work-culture, where she is allowed to talk and joke about anything she wants, is liberating since she is able to break the norms of how a woman is expected to behave:

It's very liberating as a woman to just be like that. It's like you break the norms, they don't fully see me as a woman [...] It's just relieving to say stupid things that you are not allowed to say, you break the gender-pattern there, it's very liberating. We have another girl on the other shift, she is so extremely sick, she is worse than most of the dudes. You know, women are not really allowed to joke about their bodies, we shouldn't fart, we shouldn't laugh about it, but she is totally, farting and laughing just like the dudes (Sofia).

However, there are also contradictions. At the same time as it is liberating to be raw and behave "like the dudes", it is also a strategy to be a part of the homosocial community which is based on a heterosexual male norm.

Then, on the other hand, I don't know if I do it only because it's liberating, but also because when you're the only woman in a place with only men, you somehow want to remove this male-female tension, you want to be one in the gang, not a woman in the gang, so you kinda desexualize yourself. Somehow, everyone tries to keep their ... so that it won't be sexual in any way. So that I have my place in the group which has nothing to do with being a woman (Sofia).

In a similar way to Ericson's (2011) study, the jargon in the harbour serves to create a special kind of community and intimacy between the workers. However, my study differs from Ericson's in one regard. Among the firemen, a precondition for the creation of this kind of intimacy was that the relations were of a non-sexual character, and non-sexual relations were understood as possible only between heterosexual men. However, in the port of Gothenburg it is possible for a woman to be part of the homosocial community by desexualize oneself and become "one of the dudes", as in the quote above. The word "dude"<sup>5</sup> has historically been used as an indication of belonging in harbour environments (Björklund 1998), which is still the case in the port of Gothenburg. Thus, to be a "dude" is to be part of the homosocial community. As noted in the theory chapter, the homosocial culture can be reproduced even when there are a few women present in an all-male group, if the women adapt to the symbolic order and to the men's communication-and interaction-patterns (Holgersson 2006). This was brought up also in the interviews, since the respondents made a distinction between the women who reproduced the jargon and became part of the homosocial culture, and those who did not. As in Ericson's study, a common opinion among the dockworkers

---

<sup>5</sup> "Gubbe" in Swedish.

was that when a person is not part of the homosocial culture, one has to be careful with what one says.

It depends on which girl it is. We can have a girl who is worse than us “hey Ibbe, did you get lucky last night?” and pinches my ass [...] So it might be a girl who is a bit cheeky, but then it comes another one who is quiet, and sometimes you sit there and start squabbling, you get into that sex-talk, someone makes something up, a pure lie, and then she sits there and we haven’t seen her, and then [we think], “oh crap” (Ibbe).

Throughout the study, it was clear that performing working-class masculinity was necessary in order to be accepted in the homosocial environment, and this masculinity could be performed by both men and women (see Connell 2008; Nordberg 2004; 2005). However, in order to be accepted, a more obvious performance of this kind of masculinity was required by women, and it could be difficult to find the accepted balance. Thus, many respondents thought that female dockworkers were often rawer than the male, and that they sometimes went too far. ”It’s a lot of girls today who make you think “what the hell do you sound like, you’re worse than the dudes!”” (Oskar). Another respondent expressed that “many times I would say that the girls are worse. I can imagine that it’s based on some kind of wish to fit in, that if I’m the worst, nobody will attack me” (Niklas). These quotes indicate that rather than challenging the homosocial environment in the harbour, the female dockworkers have to adapt to the men’s interaction-patterns (Ericson 2011; Hammarén & Johansson 2014; Holgersson 2006). The majority of the female dockworkers that I interviewed established heterosocial relations and performed working-class masculinity when they were in a group of men who had a rough jargon. However, it should also be noted that not all women reproduced the jargon, and some formed their own groups where they could communicate in other ways.

### 5.2.2. Homophobia and heteronormativity

A common opinion throughout the interviews was that persons who diverge from the heterosexual, white, male, working-class norm were exposed to rougher treatment in the harbour. All the respondents agreed that the absolutely most stigmatized group in the harbour would be homosexual men (compare Cockburn 1991; Fundberg 2003; Heron 2006; Hidaka 2010; Johanson 2000; Kiesling 2005). Throughout the study, none of the 15 interviewed men and women knew, and only one had ever heard of, a homosexual man working in the port of Gothenburg. Many thought that it probably exists, but that it would be difficult to be open with it. However, the number of homosexual women working in the harbour is quite high, and some even thought that they were less exposed to harassment than heterosexual women. ”It’s like that, they play in our team, so why should we jump down their throat?” (Oskar). As mentioned above, since one of the

preconditions for the creation of a homosocial environment is non-sexual relations, this is probably the reason why it is easier for homosexual women to be part of the homosocial community, since sexual attraction does not pose a threat to the intimacy between the workers.

The respondent who had heard of an openly gay man in the harbour said that he had been received with "oh finally, that's about time, of course it has to be that kind of people here too" (Niklas). As far as he knew, that man had not been mistreated or bullied. Rather, he thought that comments and jokes among heterosexual men was the main reason why it would be difficult for a dockworker to be openly gay. "It's an insult that is used quite a lot here, "fucking fag", about people who are not homosexual" (Niklas). Another respondent had heard a co-worker say "fucking homo, sit down and act like a real dockworker" (Ibbe) to his heterosexual colleague, an expression that indicates that a "real dockworker" is presumed to be a heterosexual man. One female dockworker said that "I don't think people really think like that, and they don't think like that about women either. It's just something you blurt out, "fucking fag"" (Sofia). At the same time, she finds it frustrating to hear insults and comments among heterosexual men that are based on sexism and homophobia.

If something is lame or bad, they might say "are you gay or what, fucking fag", or if someone is very weak, "do you have a uterus or what?". I think that's the most stupid thing you can say, the whole idea that if you have a uterus you can give birth, and that's quite painful! That's the kind of things we would be better off without, that certainly wouldn't affect the unity (Sofia).

### 5.2.3. Challenges to the homosocial environment

As noted above, the jargon is a configuration of hegemonic masculinity. Thus, not only women are excluded in this process, but also men who do not perform the hegemonic form of masculinity. Although the jargon was appreciated by many dockworkers, most of them were also critical to the sexist and homophobic comments that circulated, and engaged in often heated debates with dockworkers who expressed this kind of jokes and opinions. One female dockworker saw it as her duty to educate the old men when the jargon went too far:

If it gets out of hand and I get sick of it, the last time it happened was last Sunday, then I say something like "good thing that you don't have a daughter, or a mother who has to live in the kind of society that you are creating right now". Or I can say "you must really hate women", and then they get quiet (Sofia).

Much of the academic literature about homosociality focus either on how homosocial environments are reproduced by men (Ericson 2011; Flood 2008; Hammarén & Johansson 2014; Holgersson 2006; 2013; Kiesling 2005) or how they are challenged by women (Abrahamsson 2006; Alimahomed-Wilson 2011). For example, Alimahomed-Wilson's (2011) study explores on how the homosocial environment in two harbours in California is challenged when women enter the

workforce. In my empirical context, the entrance of women to the harbour challenged the homosocial environment in the sense that their entrance into the profession gradually made the jargon softer. However, when the women were in a group of men they had to adapt to the men's interaction patterns and reproduce the jargon, or formed their own groups where they could communicate in other ways. The empirical material indicates that the greatest challenge to the homosocial environment in the port of Gothenburg are the recently recruited men who perform middle-class masculinity. This group of men were often exposed to abusive treatment by the old dockworkers. One respondent recounts his first day in the harbour, when he failed at connecting an air-hose to a trailer.

Eventually this tattooed guy got sick of me, [he was] really grumpy, grey hair and a moustache, and his Claes Ohlson – specs, it was almost like imagining a smoke screen and then he pushes a button so that the back door opens, walks in [and says], almost like Leif GW<sup>6</sup>, but so much angrier, “I thought you would know this by now, you fucking little chalmerist<sup>7</sup>!” “But I don't study at Chalmers!”, I said. He was one of the old dudes. “What kind of crappy people are they employing nowadays” that's what he thought (Daniel).

What is interesting with this quote is not only the rough way in which the young man is tested by the old dockworker on his first day, but also that he is accused for being “a fucking little chalmerist”, despite the fact that the old dockworker has absolutely no idea about his educational background. This young man is the same dockworker who was quoted in the previous section, who grew up in a working-class setting but worked in many office jobs, and consequently became a filter between the old dockworkers and the new recruits, since he was able to perform both working-class and middle-class masculinity. I interpret the old dockworker's resentment as not being directed towards his (presumed) level of education, but rather towards his performance of middle-class masculinity.

In Abrahamsson's & Johansson's (2006) article, women are verbally and emotionally abused by the mine-workers who fear that the working tasks might not be used as positive sources of masculine identification if women can perform them as well as men. My empirical material indicates that in the port of Gothenburg, the resistance among the older dockworkers to perform mechanized and technological tasks was not (mainly) the fear of being feminized, but rather that these working tasks were sources of positive identification for middle-class men. I interpret the working-class men's strong resistance as being fuelled by the fact that this middle-class masculinity was rapidly gaining ground in the harbour, which challenged the hegemony of the “old” working-class masculinity and,

---

<sup>6</sup> A Swedish criminologist and author.

<sup>7</sup> Chalmers university of technology is the second largest technical university in Sweden, located in Gothenburg. A chalmerist is someone who attends this university.



in extension, the homosocial bonding which was based on this masculinity. Several respondents expressed similarly that the resistance among the older dockworkers was more towards educated middle-class men than towards women. “I think well-educated are more difficult than women, I think it’s more threatening” (Kerstin). It was also clear that the new groups of men succeeded to challenge the homosocial environment and that they were supported by many women in the harbour who appreciated workers who did not (fully) reproduce the raw jargon.

Now there are lots of young men coming in who are totally awesome. There are many of the old dudes who are really wonderful too, but there are also many who make you think “please, can’t you retire soon?” They create a really bad atmosphere, and they are really annoying. But there are more young men today, if you compare these two groups they are much more open-minded, it’s a completely different thing (Emelie).

My findings indicate that the homosocial culture in the harbour is still strong, and that it is based on a male, heterosexual, working-class norm. Women are also able to become part of the homosocial environment by performing working-class masculinity and desexualize themselves. But since a much more obvious performance is required by women, many dockworkers feel that they often go too far and become even rawer than the men. Thus, in order to be part of the homosocial environment in the port of Gothenburg, one needs to perform the accepted kind of working-class masculinity. However, it is more difficult for women, and especially difficult for homosexual men, to perform the approved expression of masculinity and to be part of the homosocial community. But with new men entering the harbour, alternative expressions of masculinity are gaining ground, which makes it possible also for women who do not perform working-class masculinity to find a place in the port of Gothenburg. As noted by Connell (2008), hegemonic expressions of masculinity on a global level interacts with local gender orders and challenge local hegemonies. I believe that this power struggle can explain the processes that are currently going on in the port of Gothenburg. It is likely that the reason that the recently recruited middle-class men are able to challenge the homosocial environment is that they are backed up by power structures on a global scale. These processes are also facilitated by the multinational companies in the harbour, who prefer to recruit people with high educations who perform neoliberal middle-class masculinities. I also believe that the more inclusive approach towards women displayed by middle-class men is made possible through the global power-structure where middle-class masculinities are valued higher than working-class masculinities. This is because middle-class men are able to transgress gender boundaries without social or physical reprisals to a larger extent than working-class men, due to the cultural capital that comes with the middle-class masculinity. Thus, the challenges to the homosocial environment by women and new groups of men are facilitated by the global gender

order. At the same time, the homosocial culture is still strong. The jargon, which is a configuration of the (local) hegemonic working-class masculinity, is appreciated by many dockworkers who think that being able to squabble is what makes the harbour such a special workplace and serves to create community and bonds between the workers. Hence, whereas the homosocial culture is challenged in some aspects, the homosocial structures are still resistant.

### 5.3. Women creating identity in a masculine space

The previous sections have discussed how dockworker identity is strongly related to working-class masculinity in the port of Gothenburg. This section investigates how female dockworkers create work identity. The analysis is influenced by theories about how class and gender intersect with work identity and respectability. Also Nordberg's (2005) research about difference and uniqueness as central sources of work identity will be used.

#### 5.3.1. Women in a masculine-coded profession

As discussed in the theory chapter, masculinity has been strongly connected to physically heavy and technical work, whereas professions that involve care and service have to a large extent been coded as feminine (Blomqvist 2004; Bradley 1989; Cockburn 1991; Gunnarsson 1995). Throughout history, it has often been argued that women are unfit to manage physically heavy working-tasks. This was brought up in the interviews, and many respondents argued that the physically heavy components of harbour work explained the history of male dominance in the harbour. "It was just too heavy and tough before, you had to stand and lift all the time. Men were better suited for that. Also a workplace that women weren't interested in, it was dangerous, bad working-hours, insecure, lots of drinking" (Per). However, most of the working-tasks in the harbour that used to be physically heavy are mechanized today, and most respondents did not see a difference in men's and women's ability to perform the current working tasks.

I mean, the girls do the same job as the guys. Of course some people manage the job better than others, both men and women. I don't know if you can generalize, that the men who work in the harbour would manage the job better than the women working here. Not in my experience. I think the women who work here cope just as well (Niklas).

Although there were diverging opinions among the respondents regarding the importance of physical strength for a dockworker, all the female dockworkers in this study argued that as a woman, your ability to perform dockwork is questioned more than men's, and you have to prove yourself worthy.

It's like that, unfortunately, that we girls have to prove that we can manage the work just as well or better, we have more to prove. Some of the guys can mope around whereas we have to work twice as hard sometimes in order to get accepted (Sara).

Some respondents expressed that if someone makes a mistake, the spontaneous reaction among their colleagues is that it was probably a woman.

Some people think that we shouldn't even be here, it's still like that today. If something happens, like with the traffic or something, they immediately suspect it's a girl who did it, that we are not as capable (Cecilia).

Another common theme in the interviews was that working in the harbour requires a tough personality.

You have to tolerate quite a bit, I was almost too soft when I started here. If you want to stay, you either have to learn or you quit. These girls are quite strong personalities [...] To come in here as a girl and to be lazy and a bad, unintelligent person, if you don't want to learn and improve, but accept that you suck, there are no such people here (Madde).

At the same time as one is expected to be tough and to perform masculinity in order to be part of the group and proving oneself capable, as a woman you are also expected to bring something new to the workplace and to perform characteristics associated with femininity. In a similar way to Nordberg's (2005) study, female dockworkers are both seen as a problem (questioned for their ability to perform the working tasks) but also an asset which makes the workplace nicer and softer.

I can imagine that the dudes like it when there are some girls here because it gets more cozy, we like to have a snack and talk, and the groups become more empathic and caring (Emelie).

However, performances of femininity did not generate the same status in the harbour as did masculinity. Thus, my findings confirm the academic literature about gender coding, since performances of femininity are not linked to competence in the same way as masculinity (see Abrahamsson 2002; Bradley 1989; Briskin 2006). The empirical material indicates that in the harbour, masculinity is linked to competence and seen as necessary in order to perform the working-tasks, whereas performances of femininity are seen as creating a softer and nicer atmosphere. Thus, female dockworkers are expected to naturally possess these soft characteristics since they are women, but also to perform masculinity since this is linked to competence in the harbour. As noted by Wasshede (2010), transgressing the boundaries of gender categories are likely to lead to suspicion and social reprisals. For the women in my study, it was important to find the accepted balance between performing masculinity but still be identified as a woman. One dockworker expresses how she tries to find the accepted "mix".

Yes, we are feminine all the time, but we also pick up some of the male characteristics. I guess we take whatever they want us to have, we adapt, I think you become a different person when you work here and see what kind of people they want at the workplace, and then you become like that yourself (Emelie).

### 5.3.2. Working-class femininity

As noted in the theory chapter, attributes that have historically been associated with manual labour are similar to those associated with masculinity (Abrahamsson 2006; Alimahomed-Wilson 2011; Blomberg 1995; Ericson 2011). Consequently, working-class men have been able to use their class position as a positive source of identity. Throughout my interviews, men who identified as working-class and who performed working-class masculinity were those who had the strongest identification as dockworkers and who expressed that they never wanted to work anywhere else in than the harbour. Among the women, the identification as dockworkers was not as strong, and the harbour was rather seen as a source of income than as a central component of one's identity.

This is the guys' home ground, you know. Many of the guys like machines and cars, they know a lot when it comes to that kind of stuff. For me and my [female] colleagues, it's more like we go there and do our job, then we go home and take care of our children. We just come here to make money, that's all. They [the men] are probably more interested [...] For me it's more like I do a good job, but I'm not an Einstein on machines. I guess it's the same for some of the guys too, but we don't have the same confidence as them (Emelie).

In this quote, the female dockworker expresses how the harbour is a male workplace, "the guys' home ground", and that men tend to display a greater confidence than the women when performing the mechanical and technological working tasks, which are associated with masculinity (for similar accounts, see Abrahamsson 2006; Alimahomed-Wilson 2011; Bergholm & Teräs 1999; Gunnarson 1995; Mellström 2001). It also indicates that dockwork cannot be used as a positive source of identification for women the same way as it can for men. As noted in the theory chapter, women who perform male-coded working tasks risk to be judged as masculine and unrespectable. In particular, women working in harbours have historically had a bad reputation, and harbour work has been seen as unrespectable work for women (Bergholm & Teräs 1999). This was also brought up in my study, and one female dockworker goes as far as to say that when people are surprised that she works in the harbour, she takes it as a compliment.

I think the word dockworker has very negative connotations. Roughness, alcohol, total lack of control over one's life [...] So there are situations when I prefer to not use that word, and instead say that I work with logistics, because I do [...] And it's also, thank God, many who react like "what, are YOU a dockworker?" I take that as a compliment (Madde).

This quote can also be interpreted as a strategy to not be identified as a working-class woman, despite having a working-class profession. For this dockworker, the category "working-class woman" had very negative associations. "[A working-class woman] swears a lot, and she lacks sensibility" (Madde). Similar reflections were brought up in many of the interviews, and whereas most of the respondents had a clear and often positive image of what a working-class man is, the

definition of a working-class woman was less clear and often had negative associations. ”The first thing that comes to mind, she often smokes, or drinks alcohol in the weekends, single, that’s the dark picture I have” (Daniel). Many respondents saw working-class women as defined by economic subordination.

When you say that word [working-class woman], my spontaneous reaction is that they are a little bit poorer [...] It feels like someone who works in a low-paid job, someone who really struggles, who has pain in her back, like that (Emelie).

Working-class women were seen as having low-paid jobs but also a weaker position in relation to the employer compared to working-class men.

It feels like women in these low-paid jobs are more exposed, they don’t have the same possibility to stand up against their employer for some reason, they have a weaker position (Niklas).

A common reflection was that the working-class woman is poorer than the working-class man and that she does not work in the harbour, but rather in low-paid, feminine-coded professions. “Women who work in low-paid jobs, nurses, nannies, like that” (Niklas). Throughout the study, the majority of the men identified as working-class, but among the women, the answers were more diverging. None of the women identified as a working-class woman, although some identified as working-class. One of the women who identified as working-class added that ”in terms of income I’m a working-class man” (Sofia). Thus, my study confirms Skeggs’ (1997/2000) theory that for working-class women it is important to dissociate from the negative stereotype, and that it is difficult for women to use their class-identities as positive sources of identification. Also Abrahamsson’s (2002) study *“The moment it became important it became male”* is applicable here. In her empirical context, working tasks that used to be coded as feminine increased in value and status when the coding changed into masculine. In the harbour, it is rather the economic status of masculine-coded working-class professions that increases the status of the characteristics associated with working-class men: the moment it became important it became (economic) middle-class. Today, working-class men in the harbour are an economically privileged group and consequently, characteristics associated with this group are positive and important sources of confidence and pride. Working-class men in the harbour repeatedly highlight the importance of “showing backbone” and being “solidary and honest”, which are associated with their class-identity. However, my empirical material indicates that the women in the harbour are not able to use their class-identity as a positive source of identification in the same way due to the negative stereotype attached to the category “working-class woman”. Consequently, the women in the harbour either identified as middle-class or emphasized their economic status as working-class men.

### 5.3.3. Difference and uniqueness

In Nordberg's (2005:243) study of men in women-dominated professions, she finds that one important component of their work identities is the emphasis on difference. Whereas the position as a "man" is a central identification for her respondents, their own difference towards the imaginary collective of "men" is pointed out. In a similar way to Nordberg's findings, the female dockworkers in my study repeatedly emphasised their difference from the stereotypical "woman".

You can't be the archetype of femininity, you have to prove yourself, you have to work, you can't go around and say "no, I can't do that". You have to prove yourself, in every single way. Both in your work, and against your colleagues (Sofia).

But at the same time as it was important to be a different woman, it was also important for the respondents to be perceived as "real" women.

I want to be feminine even if I look like this, I think you still can be feminine in some way. I really want to keep my identity even if I wear work-trousers. I think it's really nice to combine it with a top and a pink T-shirt, that's something they [the male dockworkers] would never wear. And never stop wearing make-up and become some kind of cave-man, just because I wear these ugly clothes (Madde).

This quote can also be interpreted as a strategy for Madde to maintain her feminine identity despite working in a profession where she risks to be judged as masculine and unrespectable (see Kalat & Kalat 2001; Morgan 2005; Skeggs 1997/2000). Working-class women who perform physically heavy labour have been constructed as the opposite of femininity throughout history. Thus, emphasising her femininity and her difference from the male dockworkers can be seen as a strategy to not be associated with the negative stereotype.

An interesting finding in the interviews was the recurrent opinion that although the women in the harbour appreciated having female colleagues, they all agreed that they did not want too many.

We said that yesterday, that it might soon be too many here! We talked about it yesterday, because they're gonna recruit some new, and then [my female colleague] said "now it's almost enough, it shouldn't be more girls!" I guess she appreciates it, that there are more men here, I guess we all do (Emelie).

Drawing on Nordberg's (2005) findings, I interpret this sentiment as being an expression of how important the "difference"-component is for the female dockers' work identity. My study indicates that it is difficult for female dockworkers to use harbour work as a positive source of identification. Not only are women's ability to manage the working tasks constantly questioned, they also need to

find the accepted balance between performing masculinity and also “bring something new”, that is, femininity, to the workplace. However, femininity is not seen as being linked to competence in the same way as masculinity. In addition, the position “working-class” does not have the same positive connotations for women as for men, and consequently, all the women in my study dis-identified with this category. Thus, the component of female dockers’ work identity with the most positive associations was the position as being unique and different, being able to dis-identify with the imaginary collective of “women”, and at the same time transgressing the gender boundaries by incorporating masculine-coded behaviours. This is probably the reason why many of the female respondents were reluctant to the idea of employing more women in the harbour, since their identification as “unique” risks to be challenged if too many women start working there.

## 6. Conclusion and future research

As noted in the introduction, the relevance of this research springs out of the necessity to understand some of the mechanisms that continue to keep women out of increasingly well-paid working-class professions, such as harbour work in Gothenburg. In order to investigate some of these mechanisms, this thesis has focused on how gender relations, work identity and the homosocial environment in the port of Gothenburg are created, reproduced and challenged when women and new groups of men and masculinities enter the workforce. The first and second research questions explored how dockworkers in the port of Gothenburg construct masculinity, and in what ways the homosocial environment is reproduced and challenged when women and new groups of men enter the workforce. As shown in chapter 5, the construction of hegemonic masculinity in the harbour is strongly connected to working-class identity and dockworker identity. Central components of this expression of masculinity are collectivism, solidarity and identification in opposition to the employer, middle-class men and women. The homosocial environment in the port of Gothenburg is based on male, heterosexual, working-class norms. Women are also able to become part of the homosocial environment by performing working-class masculinity and desexualize themselves. However, it is more difficult for women, and especially difficult for homosexual men, to perform the approved expression of masculinity and to be part of the homosocial community. Women’s entrance into the workforce does challenge the homosocial environment in the sense that the jargon lightens, but when they are in a group with only men they are expected to reproduce the jargon and perform the hegemonic working-class masculinity. However, both the hegemonic working-class masculinity and the homosocial environment are challenged by the neoliberal middle-class masculinity. This expression of masculinity was described in terms of being productive, service-minded, problem-solving and oriented towards the company’s goals. While performing working-class masculinity was the ideal among (most of) the

dockworkers, the middle-class masculinity was the ideal among the companies who own the terminals. Thus, the companies prefer to recruit people who (to a higher degree) perform middle-class masculinity. Due to the increased influence of middle-class masculinity and the increased economic status of dockwork in Gothenburg, the working-class men (and women) also perform components of middle-class masculinity from time to time. The reason why this expression of masculinity is able to challenge the local gender order (to some extent) is most likely that it is hegemonic on a societal and global scale. Thus, the empirical material indicates that when a workplace that used to have local owners becomes part of a global corporation, this also affects the local gender relations. It is also an example of how local expressions of masculinity never exist independently from the global gender order. But it should also be noted that the working-class masculinity in the port of Gothenburg is still hegemonic and that the homosocial structures are resistant and slow to change. The jargon, which is a configuration of the (local) hegemonic working-class masculinity, is appreciated and reproduced by many dockworkers who think that being able to squabble is what makes the harbour such a special workplace and serves to create community and bonds between the workers. Hence, whereas the homosocial culture is challenged in some aspects, the homosocial structures are still resistant. It can therefore be concluded that the mechanisms that keep women from being employed in the port of Gothenburg continue to be strong. However, this study indicates that with improved technology, globalization of production and a new generation of dockworkers who are being employed in the harbour, these mechanisms become increasingly challenged.

The third research question in this thesis concerns how women in the port of Gothenburg create work identity. It can be concluded that the port of Gothenburg is a masculine space and that it is difficult for female dockworkers to create work identity. While the masculine-coded working-tasks in the harbour can be used as positive sources of identification for men, women need to constantly balance between performing masculinity in order to be seen as competent workers, and perform femininity in order to be seen as “real” women. Also, identification as “working-class” has positive connotations for men, whereas the position “working-class woman” had negative associations among the respondents. Thus, the most important component of the female dockworkers’ work identity was the position as “different” and “unique”. However, the importance of the “difference”-component for the female dockers’ work identity also created a resistance among the female dockworkers towards too many women entering the profession, since this would challenge their uniqueness. Hence, this study shows that the gender coding of working tasks and the strong connection between dockworker identity and masculinity are central reasons to the gender segregation in the port of Gothenburg.



This study contributes to a number of academic debates and gaps. Firstly, it contributes to the empirical gap that exists when it comes to gender relations in harbours. Secondly, it contributes to the academic debate about how women in masculine-coded professions create work identity. Thirdly, this thesis shows how constructions of masculinity are transformed when a traditional working-class profession becomes increasingly well-paid and starts to attract men who do not perform working-class masculinity. The findings indicate that when harbour work in Gothenburg becomes more and more attractive and men with higher educations enter the workforce, constructions of masculinity do change, but not without resistance.

Lastly, this study contributes to the theories on homosociality and women's performances of masculinity. Several studies have been conducted about how homosocial cultures are reproduced by men and challenged by women, but there is a lack of studies that discuss how also certain groups of men challenge homosocial environments. In the port of Gothenburg, performing working-class masculinity and reproducing the jargon are more important than whether you are a man or a woman (although it is more difficult for women to become part of the homosocial environment). Thus, I believe that understanding masculinity and femininity as detached from male and female bodies (Nordberg 2005) is crucial in order to nuance the academic discussions about homosociality. It is also important to recognize that not all men, and not all expressions of masculinity, reproduce homosocial cultures. But it should be noted that expressions of masculinity that have a higher social status are able to challenge homosocial structures in a way that subordinated masculinities (and femininities) cannot.

As noted above, the mechanisms that keep women from being employed in the port of Gothenburg are still strong. It can be concluded that in the port of Gothenburg, there are several processes that change and challenge the gender relations, but there are also structures in place that constitute a strong resistance to these changes. With the technological developments, increased economic status and removal of most of the heavy working-tasks in the harbour, it would be expected that more women would enter the workforce. However, the number of women remains low. This thesis has discussed some of the obstacles that exist for female dockworkers, such as few opportunities to create work identity, a homosocial culture and a raw and sexist jargon. However, it is likely that such hindrances only constitute some of the mechanisms that keep women from being employed in the harbour. This study has focused on narratives of male and female dockworkers who perform manual work in the port of Gothenburg. It has been argued that men who perform neoliberal masculinity are the main agents of change, and that these men are recruited by the companies who own the terminals. Thus, the influence that the companies have on gender relations in the port of Gothenburg would be an interesting field for future research. Since the

companies have the power to choose who is being employed in the harbour, it is likely that their recruitment strategies also have consequences for the low number of women. This study has focused on masculinity constructions, homosociality and work identity in a traditional working-class profession, and it can be concluded that the physically heavy and manual working-tasks in the harbour are positive sources of identification for men, whereas the reverse is true for women. Thus, it would be interesting to do a similar study in a masculine-coded profession which demands higher education and where the number of women has increased, for example among engineers. That focus could hopefully give additional answers to why the gender-segregation continues to be so high in traditional working-class professions in Sweden, but has decreased in middle-class professions.

## 7. References

- Abrahamsson, L. (2002). The moment it became important it became male. *Kvinnovetenskaplig tidskrift* 23(1).
- Abrahamsson, L. (2006). Exploring constructions of gendered identities at work. In Billet, S., Fenwick, T. & Sommerville, M. (eds.): *Work, subjectivity, and learning: Understanding learning through working life*. Dordecht: Springer.
- Abrahamsson, L. & Johansson, J. (2006). From Grounded Skills to Sky Qualifications – A study of workers creating and recreating qualifications, identity and gender when meeting changing technology in an underground iron mine in Sweden. *Journal of Industrial Relations* 48(5).
- Ahrne, G. & Svensson, P. (eds) (2015). *Handbok i kvalitativa metoder*. Stockholm: Liber
- Alimahomed-Wilson, J. (2011). Men along the shore: Working-class masculinities in crisis. *Norma* 01/2011.
- Alimahomed-Wilson, J. (2012). Black longshoremen and the fight for equality. *Race and Class* 53(4).
- Anderson, E. (2009). *Inclusive masculinity. The changing nature of masculinities*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Baron, A. (2006). Reflections of Class, Gender and Sexuality: Masculinity, the Embodied Male Worker, and the Historian's Gaze. *International Labor and Working-Class History*, 69(1).
- Bergholm, T. & Teräs, K. (1999). Female Dockers in Finland, c. 1900-1975: Gender and Change on the Finnish Waterfront. *International Journal of Maritime History*, 11(2).
- Bernard, H. R. (2011). *Research methods in anthropology: Qualitative and Quantitative approaches*. Fifth Edition. Altamira Press UK.
- Bird, S. (1996). Welcome to the Men's Club: Homosociality and the Maintenance of Hegemonic Masculinity. *Gender and Society* 10(2).
- Björklund, A. (1998). *Gubbar, historier och namn från Stockholms hamn*. Stockholm: Sjöhistoriska Museet och Kommittén för Stockholmsforskning.
- Blomberg, E. (1995). *Män i mörker. Arbetsgivare, reformister och syndikalister. Politik och identitet i svensk gruvindustri 1910-1940*. Doktorsavhandling, Stockholms Universitet, Humanistiska Fakulteten.

- Blomqvist, G. (2004). *Gender discourses at work: export industry workers and construction workers in Chennai, Tamil Nadu, India*. PhD Dissertation, University of Gothenburg, Peace and Development - research.
- Bradley, H. (1989). *Men's Work, Women's Work. A Sociological History of the Sexual Division of Labor in Employment*. Padstow: Polity Press.
- Breckenridge, K. (1998). The Allure of Violence: Men Race and Masculinity on the South African Goldmines, 1900-1950. *Journal of Southern African Studies*, 24(4).
- Brinkmann, S. & Kvale, S. (2015). *InterViews: Learning the craft of qualitative research interviewing*. Los Angeles: Sage Publications.
- Briskin, L. (2006). Victimization and agency: the social construction of union women's leadership. *Industrial Relations Journal* 37(4).
- Bryman, A. (2012). *Social Research Methods*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Butler, J. (1999). *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. London: Routledge.
- Cockburn, C. (1991). *Brothers: Male Dominance and Technological Change*. London: Pluto Press.
- Colgan, F. & Ledwith, S. (2002). Gender and Diversity: Reshaping Union Democracy. *Employee Relations*, 24(2).
- Collinson, D. L. (1988). "Engineering Humour": Masculinity, Joking and Conflict in Shop-floor Relations. *Organization Studies* 9(2).
- Collinson, D. L. & Hearn, J. (1996). "Men" at "work": multiple masculinities/multiple workplaces. In Mac an Ghail, M. (1996). *Understanding masculinities: Social relations and cultural arenas*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Connell, R. W. (1998). Masculinities and Globalization. *Men and Masculinities* 1(1).
- Connell, R. W. (2005). Globalization, Imperialism and Masculinities. The Need for a Global Perspective in Studies of Men and Masculinities. In Kimmel, Michael, Hearn, Jeff & Connell, R. W. (eds) (2005). *Handbook of Studies on Men and Masculinities*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Connell, R. W. (2008). *Maskuliniteter*. (2. uppl ed.), Göteborg: Daidalos.

- Connell, R. W. & Messerschmidt, J. W. (2005): Hegemonic masculinity: Rethinking the concept. *Gender and Society* 2005 19(6).
- Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Method Approaches*. (Fourth, international student ed.). Los Angeles, Calif: SAGE.
- Cunnison, S. & Stageman, J. (1993). *Feminizing the Unions*, Aldershot: Avebury.
- Cuvelier, J. (2014). Work and Masculinity in Katanga's Artisanal Mines. *Africa Spectrum*, 49(2).
- DeWalt, K. M. & DeWalt, B. R. (2011). *Participant Observation: A guide for Fieldworkers*. (2., [rev. and expand] ed.). Lanham, Md: Rowman & Littlefield, Md.
- Embrick, D. G., Walther, C. S., & Wickens, C. M. (2007). Working class masculinity: Keeping gay men and lesbians out of the workplace. *Sex Roles*, 56(11).
- Ericson, M. (2011). *Nära Inpå: Maskulinitet, intimitet och gemenskap i brandmäns arbetslag*. Doktorsavhandling, Göteborgs Universitet, Institutionen för sociologi.
- Flood, M. (2008). Men, Sex and Homosociality. How Bonds Between Men Shape Their Sexual Relations With Women. *Men and Masculinities* 10(3).
- Franck, A. K. (2012). *From formal employment to street vending: Women's room to maneuver and labor market decisions under conditions of export-orientation – the case of Penang, Malaysia*, PhD Dissertation, Dept. of Human and Economic Geography, University of Gothenburg, Series B, No. 121.
- Frykman, B. S. (1990). *Arbetarkultur – Göteborg 1890*. Göteborg: Etnologiska Föreningen i Västsverige.
- Fundberg, J. (2003). *Kom igen, gubbar! Om pojkefotboll och maskuliniteter*. Stockholm: Carlssons.
- Gonäs, L., Lindgren, G., Bildt, C., & Arbetslivsinstitutet. (2001). *Könssegregering i arbetslivet*. Stockholm: Arbetslivsinstitutet.
- Gunnarsson, E. (1995). *Att våga väga jämnt! Om kvalifikationer och kvinnliga förhållningssätt i ett tekniskt industriarbete*. Avhandling, Tekniska Högskolan i Luleå.
- Hammarén, N. & Johansson, T. (2014). Homosociality: In Between Power and Intimacy. *SAGE Open* 4(1).

- Haywood, C. & Mac an Ghaill, M. (2003). *Men and Masculinities: theory, research and social practice*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Hilmerson, A. (2015). *Göteborg – Sveriges största hamnstad*. Göteborg: Tukan Förlag.
- Hennink, M. (2008). Language and communication in cross-cultural research. In Pranee, L. (2008). *Doing Cross-Cultural Research: Methodological and Ethical Perspectives*. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Heron, C. (2006). Boys Will Be Boys: Working-Class Masculinities in the Age of Mass Production. *International Labor and Working-Class History* (69).
- Hidaka, T. (2010). *Salaryman Masculinity: The Continuity of and Change in Hegemonic Masculinity in Japan*. Leiden and Boston: Brill.
- Holgersson, C. (2006). Homosocialitet som könsordnande process. *Norma, Nordic Journal for Masculinity Studies*, 1(1).
- Holgersson, C. (2013). Recruiting Managing Directors: Doing Homosociality. *Gender, Work and Organization*, 20(4).
- Jackson, C. (eds) (2001). *Men at Work: Labor, Masculinities, Development*. London: Frank Cass.
- Johanson, U. (2000). *Män: En bok om manlighet*. Stockholm: LO.
- Kalat, A. & Kalat, A. (2001). Frihet, jämlikhet och broderskap. In Nordvall, H. & Lundberg, C. A. (2001). *Mannen*. Stockholm: Tidskriftsfören. Fronesis.
- Kanter, R. M. (1977/1993). *Men and Women of the Corporation*. New York: BasicBooks.
- Kiesling, S. F. (2005). Homosocial desire in men's talk. *Language in Society* 34(5).
- Kimmel, M. (2015). *Sexualities: identities, behaviors, and society*. New York; Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ledwith, S. (2012). Gender politics in trade unions: The representation of women between exclusion and inclusion. *Etui*, 18(2).
- Löfström, Å. (2005). Könsrollerna består. *Välfärd* (1). URL: [http://www.scb.se/Grupp/Valfard/BE0801\\_2005K01\\_TI\\_06\\_A05ST0501.pdf](http://www.scb.se/Grupp/Valfard/BE0801_2005K01_TI_06_A05ST0501.pdf)
- Mac an Ghaill, M. (1994). *The Making of Men: Masculinities, Sexualities and Schooling*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

- McDowell, L. (2001). Men, management and multiple masculinities in organisations. *Geoforum* 32(2).
- McDowell, L. (2010). Learning to Serve? Employment Aspirations and attitudes of young working-class men in an era of labour market restructuring. *Gender, Place and Culture: A Journal of Feminist Geography*, 7(4).
- Mellström, U. (2001). En diskussion kring maskinella män och maskulina maskiner. In Ekenstam, C., Johansson, T. & Kuosmanen, J. (eds) (2001). *Sprickor i fasaden. Manligheter i förändring*. Hedemora: Gidlunds.
- Morgan, D. (2005). Class and Masculinity. In Kimmel, M. S., Hearn, J. & Connell, R.W. (eds) (2005). *Handbook of Studies on Men and Masculinities*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Mumby, D. K. (1998). Organizing Men: Power, Discourse, and the Social Construction of Masculinity(s) in the Workplace. *Communication Theory* 8(2).
- Nordberg, M. (2004). ”Kvinnlig maskulinitet” och ”manlig femininitet”. En möjlighet att överskrida könsdikotomin?” *Kvinnovetenskaplig Tidskrift* 1(2).
- Nordberg, M. (2005). *Jämställdhetens spjutspets? Manliga arbetstagare i kvinnoyrken, jämställdhet, maskulinitet, femininitet och heteronormativitet*. Mölndal: Bokförlaget Arkipelag och Etnologiska Föreningen i Västsverige. Doktorsavhandling, Göteborgs universitet.
- Nayak, A. (2006). Displaced Masculinities: Chavs, Youth and Class in the Post-Industrial City. *Sociology* 40(5).
- Nixon, D. (2009). “I Can’t Put a Smiley Face On”: Working-Class Masculinity, Emotional Labour and Service Work in the ‘New Economy’. *Gender, Work and Organization* 16(3).
- Pyke, K. D. (1996). Class-Based Masculinities: The Interdependence of Gender, Class and Interpersonal Power. *Gender and Society* 10(5).
- Rhodes, J. (2011). “Fighting for “Respectability”: Media Representations of the White, ‘Working-Class’ Male Boxing ‘Hero’”. *Journal of Sport and Social Issues* 35(4).
- Rose, G. (1998). Situated Knowledges: positionality, reflexivity & other tactics. *Progress in Human Geography*, 21(3).
- Scholte, J. A. (2005). *Globalization: A Critical Introduction*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, second edn.

Sedgwick, E. K. (1985). *Between Men: English Literature and Male Homosocial Desire*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Skeggs, B. (1997/2000). *Att bli respektabel: Konstruktioner av klass och kön*. Göteborg: Daidalos.

Sommerville, M. (2005). "Working" Culture: exploring notions of workplace culture and learning at work. *Pedagogy, Culture and Society*, 13(1).

Vetenskapsrådet (1990). Forskningsetiska principer inom humanistisk-samhällsvetenskaplig forskning. Downloaded 2016-04-27 <http://www.codex.vr.se/texts/HSFR.pdf>

Wasshede, C. (2010). *Passionerad politik. Om motstånd mot heteronormativ könsmakt*. Bokbox Förlag.