

---

## The Re-Creation of Gender in a Male Workplace

This paper draws on participant observation in a male-dominated blue-collar job to understand how the concepts of masculinity and femininity are re-created through coworker interactions on the shopfloor and the effect of this on women. Men typecast women in these jobs as either feminine or unfeminine and treated them differently, but in both cases, women's presence was useful for defining—and in the case of sex-role appropriate women—enforcing masculinity. Such treatment isolated women from the on-going work culture and constrained them to certain behaviors.

---

**Irene Padavic\***  
Florida State University

The idea that gender, rather than being a property of individuals, is created in the course of social interaction is relatively new in sociology (Goffman 1977; Kessler and McKenna 1978; Leidner 1991; West and Zimmerman 1987). West and Zimmerman (1987) argued that gender is continually constructed in everyday life, a process they describe as "doing gender." In what is essentially a process of reification and legitimation of gender differences, "participants in interaction organize their... activities to reflect and express gender, and they are disposed to perceive the behavior of others in a similar light" (West and Zimmerman 1987:127). Gender construction is a process negotiated among participants, but symmetry between the negotiators is often lacking. Male and female participants negotiate from the basis of different resources stemming from historical contexts and organizational structures (Hall 1987), and do not necessarily contribute equally to the definition of gender that prevails in a situation (Margolis 1985; Warren 1988).

Gender is enacted in institutions, one of the most important of which

---

\*Direct all correspondence to: Irene Padavic, Department of Sociology, Florida State University, Tallahassee, FL 32306.

is work (Acker 1990). A particularly interesting work setting for the purposes of understanding how gender is enacted is that of the traditionally all-male world of blue-collar work as it undergoes integration.<sup>1</sup> It is at points of change that the social construction of gender is especially visible (Gerson and Peiss 1985), so that women's entry into such work groups should throw into stark relief the processes by which gender is "done."

People continually "review, reconstitute, and revise" the negotiated social order, but always within limits set by larger historical and structural contexts (Hall 1987). When women enter a historically-male, blue-collar work setting, the renegotiation of gender is similarly carried out in a context of established traditions. In particular, male blue-collar workers have created work cultures that lend meaning to what they do: work cultures create dignity out of indignities (Yarrow 1987) and labor peace out of dormant labor conflicts (Burawoy 1979). Work cultures mediate strife among workers and reaffirm a core set of values (Halle 1984; Roethlisberger and Dickson 1975). One important social construction in predominantly-male workplaces is masculinity.<sup>2</sup> Halle (1984:181–183) found that masculinity was second only to friendship and generosity in the pantheon of values that male production workers affirmed through jokes and insults in the course of their day-to-day interactions. Underground cable splicers enhanced their masculine status by referring to installers and repairmen as "women" (Epstein 1988), steelworkers considered their jobs a "rugged test of manhood" (Strohmeyer 1986), coal miners respected a union president predominantly for his "toughness" in battle (Yarrow 1987), printers considered willingness to tolerate physically-demanding conditions evidence of their masculinity (Cockburn 1983), and the opposition of electrical workers to women's entry into their ranks stemmed mostly from fear that masculine turf would be feminized (Gray 1984). For a group of working-class British lads, their jobs' requirements of a masculine readiness and hardiness infused manual labor with a "grandeur and heroism" that were otherwise quite lacking (Willis 1977). The formal, stylized, and predominantly symbolic masculinity enacted in blue-collar workplaces, as Tolson (1977) argued, exists partly as a defense against the alienation and humiliation (and symbolic castration) implicit in factory work. In other words, the constant iteration of masculinity is an important element of the job because it compensates for the job's deficiencies (Leidner 1991; Willis 1977).

Furthermore, a reified femininity is constructed in male workplaces, often through pin-ups and off-color jokes (Schroedel 1985). What happens when real women rather than the pin-up variety make an appearance in such workplaces? This paper is about how gender is re-created when

women are introduced to the workplace and the effect of masculine response on them.

Existing research on the experience of women introduced to these workplaces provides some guidelines on what happens. Men hasten to restore a sense of order and meaning, and heightening the salience of gender is a common way to do so (Kanter 1977; Meyer and Lee 1978; Swerdlow 1989; Walshok 1981).<sup>3</sup> For example, men may subject women intruders to remarks intended to remind them of their subordinate gender status. Men's "sulking and grumbling" are common experiences women blue-collar workers face (Aga 1984), as are teasing and practical joking (Meyer and Lee 1978; O'Farrell 1980; Schroedel 1985; Walshok 1981), social isolation (Walshok 1981), and sexual harassment (Gruber and Bjorn 1982; Jacobs 1988; Schroedel 1985). Newcomers of both sexes experience hostility and initiation rituals, but these are intensified when the newcomer is an outgroup member (Hughes 1958; Kanter 1977). Part of the hostility work groups feel toward outsiders—in this case women—is due to uncertainty about whether they can be counted on to share the same unspoken understandings that the rest of the group shares.

In my research, I attempt to provide an in-depth and first-hand look at the dynamics that follow the introduction of women into a blue-collar workplace. More generally, beyond looking at specific male behaviors, I, like Swerdlow (1989), argue that men adjust to women's presence by developing collective interpretations of experience that allow them to preserve male ideology while still accepting women's presence. Women in turn shape their work identities in response to these interpretations.

This research is based on participant observation that I, a white, unmarried, at the time 30-year old woman, conducted while employed in a predominantly male plant. For two months in 1986 I worked as a coal handler in a power plant alongside eleven coworkers (ten males and one female). Although women had worked at this plant before, the 60-person plant was all male—except for me—until my second month, at which time a woman (white, unmarried, and in her early 40s) transferred into my work group. All fellow employees were aware of my identity as a researcher. Although I was there with the help of management, there is no evidence to indicate that anyone thought I was a company spy. Coworkers told me about theft, showed me the best hiding places in the coal yard, openly violated safety regulations, and were profligate with supplies. In short, they said and did things they would not want management to know about.

In addition to participant observation, I conducted informal interviews with my coworkers while on the job, an easy task since most of the jobs were performed by two-person teams, and usually took less than the

allotted amount of time to perform. Additionally, I had about 35 minutes at the end of each shift to talk to my female coworker, as all workers were sent to the locker rooms well before we were allowed to leave the facility.

This paper is what Geertz (1988) called an "I-Witnessing" report in which data are frankly products of a personal confrontation of Self with Other. Clearly, the attributes I brought to the setting were strategic, not marginal, to the ongoing business of world-making in blue-collar jobs. Women field researchers must decide their field persona and the degree of sexist treatment they are willing to tolerate in the pursuit of information (Warren 1988:37). My stance, like Gurney's (1985:44), was based on the acknowledgement that my "continued presence . . . [was] contingent upon passing certain loyalty tests, including ignoring derogatory remarks or allowing (female) gender to provide a source of humor for the group." I did not question or challenge any of their behaviors towards me, but I did participate in conversations about gender that were not about me in particular. Indeed, it would have been impossible not to do so, as coworkers would raise issues like the motivation of women who pose for nude calendars or the morality of mail-order brides and solicit my opinion.

## **FINDINGS**

In this section, I first describe how these men created bonds with each other as a work group in two ways: through rituals of food-buying and talk about sex. Although many other aspects of work culture also transcend organizational hierarchies, this bond-creating aspect is relevant to the project of re-creating gender. In the next section I address what happened when women intruded into this workplace in which vigorous representations of masculinity were central elements of the informal moral order and a basis for class solidarity.

### **Bond-Creating Aspects of Work Culture**

The "coal gang" at this plant was comprised of three groups: "A" operators, middle-aged white men, operated the mobile equipment, were the highest-earners and had the longest tenure at the company; three "B" operators, two black men and one white man, operated stationary equipment and occasionally shoveled coal; two "C" operators, the woman who arrived at the plant a month after I did and I, shoveled coal that spilled off the conveyor belts.

The pay differential between the three groups amounted to slightly less than a dollar an hour between the highest-paid "A" operators and the lowest-paid "C" operators. In addition to these regular employees, four

contract employees (two black men and two white) worked at minimum wage as plant cleaners, coal shovelers, and general laborers.<sup>4</sup>

The social distinctions that overlapped with the official hierarchy were strong. Each group had a separate lunchroom. The "A" operators had a separate shower room. They were considered the most masculine, perhaps because they operated the bulldozers and scrapers; as one told me in explaining his large size, "It takes a big man to operate big equipment." The "A" operators exercised their superior status by dominating conversations and making "joking" racial slurs directed at the "B" operators.

Workers as a group employed different means to mitigate status distinctions in order to achieve some level of group solidarity. Not all attempts to create unity invoke gender. For example, all workers in the coal gang participated in a ritual that centered on "who's buying." Every ten days to two weeks someone would buy Egg McMuffins at McDonalds for the group. On a separate rotation schedule was the "who's buying" ritual for breakfasts on weekends when overtime was required. The final turn-taking system was doughnut buying, which occurred about twice a week. Workers took these schedules very seriously, and remembered and continually brought up perceived inequities. The issue of whose turn it was to buy a particular meal took up a great deal of conversational time. Reputations were built on this basis; one person was described as being "so tight that he squeaked," and others as regular guys, dependable when their turn came around. This unity around the nexus of buying-rituals in which everyone, regardless of the status of his or her particular job, took turns paying was a form of status-leveling and solidarity-enhancement among otherwise segregated work groups where status distinctions were strong.<sup>5</sup>

A second mechanism for breaking down status barriers was to create bonds with each other through an atmosphere that enhanced masculinity, disparaged women and promoted conversations about sex. Centerfolds displayed on bulletin boards portrayed women as sexual creatures, as did a sexually allusive list of "twenty reasons why beer is better than women," that presented women in a narrow range of roles from sex object ("beer is better because you always know you're the first one to pop a beer" and "you don't have to wine and dine a beer before you drink it") to dishrag wife ("when a beer goes flat you can throw it out").

Coworkers told me about how my arrival upset the conversational ebb and flow which had centered on tales of remarkable sexual exploits—"all lies," according to one. "Haven't you noticed how we'll all stop talking when you walk in the lunchroom? Now we talk about local politics and cars and insurance. That wasn't what we were talking about." While fabricating tales of one's sexual exploits may serve many functions at once, one function is to break down status barriers and thus enable relationships of

solidarity. Status, after all, has no bearing on sexual prowess, and the contract employee can brag as much as the "A" operator, with no one to claim otherwise, and a cohesion of sorts is established.

These examples are consistent with other studies about the influence of work groups in the world of male work (Becker 1972; Burawoy 1979; DeMan 1927; Goode 1957). Studies of how workers adapt or are socialized to the social relations of production typically analyze the experience of white men. However, when women are being integrated in blue-collar jobs, two things occur: (1) men must come to some accommodation with the women and (2) the women must adapt to a male workplace and to people who define their relationships with one another in part by their difference from and objectification of women.

### **The Re-Creation of Gender through Women's Presence**

The rituals described above existed before the arrival of any women at the plant. This arrival presented an opportunity for a new articulation of gender. I argue that men responded to this challenge not by changing their stereotypes, but by (1) assimilating women into those stereotypes and (2) exaggerating the differences between themselves and the women (Kanter 1977), both of which narrowed the possible range of responses open to women.

In this section I recount a two-part cycle. First, female workers are examined to see how well they fit the male workgroup's collective pre-existing definition of "the feminine role." Second, they are treated accordingly in ways that affect their inclusion in the workgroup. Ultimately this may affect both women's performance and their interest in remaining in bluecollar jobs.

**Response to a Woman Stereotyped as Feminine**—Without delving deeply into analyses of what constitutes femininity, I define femininity as socially-constructed and socially-recognized notions about traits appropriate for women. Whether men perceive a woman as "feminine" or "unfeminine" will at least partly determine how they treat her. Many studies describe how it is through the give-and-take of social relations that identities are created (Goffman 1977; Mead 1935; Stone 1962; Stryker 1968). A woman who enters a male-dominated workplace encounters men's expectations of her, which in turn condition their actions toward her and, through a reciprocal process, her sense of self and her self-presentation. Although when I was alone with men coworkers it was not unusual for them to treat me as a person with an individual biography, I felt that for the most part they saw me mostly as stereotypically feminine, especially

when we were together in a group. At times I was treated as an “available” sexual creature and at others an adolescent niece who needed help.<sup>6</sup>

Evidence of the former was the way coworkers frequently used me to try to exert pressure on a shy, 32-year old never-married crew member who failed to conform to the heterosexual masculine norm of this workplace. I was told that he had always been the butt of jokes for his failure to date, but when I arrived the ribbing became quite intense. In one instance, the boss offered us both the day off with pay if he would take me out and “show her the town.” His refusal of so “generous” an offer made him the butt of jokes for a week afterwards. Similarly, when the crew locked the two of us in the lunchroom at the end of a shift, he was teased relentlessly for scrambling to find a way out, rather than “taking advantage of the opportunity.” I was a key prop in their testing of his masculinity.

More personalized instances of treating me as a pawn in masculine power games included physical displays of male strength such as picking me up and tossing me back and forth and joking attempts to push me on the coal conveyor belt or off the roof. These actions also used my femaleness as a way to define manliness. As Goffman (1976:52) noted, underneath such “mock assaults” lies an affirmation of men’s physical dominance and an implicit warning about “what he could do if he got serious about it.”

The second type of treatment, which I encountered daily during my power plant stay, was paternalistic. Some forms I appreciated; others I disliked. One positive form occurred once while I was loading a dump truck. I misjudged the mixture of ash and water and dumped mostly water in the truck, an error that a male coworker had made the week before. Whereas the truck driver had yelled angrily at the man, he simply reported my mistake to the supervisor and the next day during break made a point of mentioning how he never held grudges.<sup>7</sup> Other instances of paternalism acceptable to me occurred when coworkers provided unsolicited help with strenuous work, especially shoveling, something they never did for each other.

Usually, however, paternalism was more harmful than helpful, as the following examples show. Treating me as a young family member was constricting and isolating because it excluded me from some elements of the work culture. Fellow coal handlers tended to emphasize my status as a woman and ignore my status as a shovel-wielding coworker. For example, their refusing to swear around me (and admonishing me when I swore) isolated me from normal workplace camaraderie and constrained my male coworkers’ behavior. In another instance, evidently believing me unable to argue my own case, a coworker spoke to the supervisor regarding my ineligibility for holiday pay, overriding my preference to ignore the issue.

Several instances stemmed from the supervisor's fatherly concern. Once it led him to threaten to transfer two teenage contract employees who were, he felt, spending too much time with me. His concern was not that our productivity was suffering (we all had completed our work for the day and "hanging out" at such times was generally acceptable), but that I could not take care of myself around two teenage boys because, as he warned me, "you know how boys are and what's on their mind." This of course resulted in my further isolation. Still in fatherly mode, he once invited me to work at the plant for an extra nine months, saying I could move into his house but would have a 10:30 curfew, just like his sixteen-year old daughter.

He also pointed out that although some women can do the job as well as a man, he did not expect me to be able to because I was too small. (I am 5' 4", of medium build, am in good physical condition, and had lifted weights in preparation for the job.) In one instance, his special concern for my safety led him to tell me that although he was not allowed to administer first aid, he would do so in my case, explaining that although he would feel terrible if any of his people got hurt, he would feel even worse if it were I. He described in detail how dangerous the plant was ("If your long hair gets caught in a gear..."). He reassured me that if I were in an accident he would take me to the "emergency room and wait there so you don't get scared." Importantly, the result of the dire warnings was that I was jumpy and afraid on the job for the first few weeks. By treating me as if I were a stereotypically feminine woman—afraid of big machinery and liable to be clumsy around it or unable to control it—he succeeded in some respects in turning me into a feminine woman afraid of big machinery, which had not been a prominent component of my identity before.

In addition to making me unduly afraid, paternalistic treatment had two other effects on me. First, it made me unsure of my abilities, afraid of undertaking something new, doing it wrong, and thereby confirming a stereotype. For example, when someone from a different work group came to repair the machine I was operating, instead of helping him by continuing what I had been doing unaided all along, I called on a coworker to do it. Second, it made me act "macho" in defiance of the paternalistic concern and in an attempt to disprove stereotypes, which led me to violate safety recommendations. For example, coal shoveling is a very dirty operation because of thick clouds of coal dust, yet none of the men wore dust masks; not wanting to appear overly concerned, I stopped wearing mine. Similarly, I was reluctant to call for help in potentially hazardous situations because I did not want to perpetuate a sense that I could not perform the job.

I also filled my shovel too full so as not to arouse suspicions that I wasn't

“pulling my weight.” This reaction was a response to the oft-repeated rumor that federal law mandated that women only had to do 75 percent of the job. This myth was very resistant to change; when informed that there was no such federal law, the rumor changed to claim, wrongly, that it was a state law and, finally, a company rule. Coworkers were fond of pointing out this “law” as a reason for not wanting women working alongside them: they would have to perform part of her job. The resilience of this myth points to these men’s sense of the inappropriateness of women in a physically demanding workplace and reifies the notion that “it takes masculine men to do masculine work” (Gray 1984).

The presence of a woman they could define as “feminine” afforded men the opportunity to demonstrate and clarify masculinity. For her part, being treated either as sex object or family member can make a woman act unnecessarily tough to the point of creating safety hazards in order to disprove stereotypes about femininity or can make her doubt her ability to perform all aspects of the job. More broadly, by selecting out one or two characteristics and treating a woman almost exclusively on that basis, men exercise and demonstrate their power to define a situation, thus perpetuating gender dominance.

**Response to a Woman Stereotyped as Unfeminine**—The other woman in the plant was a coal-shoveler who transferred from another plant in the system after I had been working for a month. She was big, strong, hard-working, and proud of not shirking muddy, cold, or strenuous work. Seemingly comfortable with men after years of working in traditionally male blue-collar work, she knew how to “roll with the punches” and refused to take offense at anything.

She also had a small farm and raised goats. When news arrived that she was transferring to this plant the next week, men who knew her from training classes told about the goats, and from that point until she arrived the standard greeting in the plant was a bleat followed by bursts of laughter. People said she smelled like a goat—strangely enough, a comment I had heard a year earlier about another unfeminine woman in a blue-collar job at another plant in the system. Even after the new woman arrived at the plant and disproved rumors that she swore like a sailor and smelled like a goat, no one warmed to her. When she told a story or a joke during break, as all of us did—and she did it well, never dragged it out or forgot the punchline—she was described behind her back as “always running her mouth.”<sup>8</sup>

To the men coalhandlers she presented a problem: she violated the feminine stereotype by being big, burly, strong, and by speaking her mind. She scorned the trappings of femininity. Her transportation was a truck.

She bought five identical Michael Jackson T-shirts for a dollar each and wore one each day of the week. Her hardhat bore stencils of typically male identifiers like "the tank." Male coworkers did not treat her with the protective paternalism they extended to me. No one trained her to do the job, perhaps because she had already been working in a power plant, but it was a much more modern one with very different procedures. In order to learn, she read a coal dust-covered 1956 job manual that she found in a cupboard under two outdated Playboys. No one ever offered to help her with a task, and in one instance, when she asked a bulldozer operator to help her, he refused. Another time she was the gang leader for a technically and physically difficult task (draining a holding pond into a larger pond in sub-zero weather); in talking about it the next day a man took credit for the "brain work." His account was uncontested.

While I found the paternalistic treatment accorded me offensive, I thought that the alternative accorded this coworker worse still (although she probably would have disagreed). Ridiculing her behind her back, excluding her, refusing to train or help her, and attributing her success to others had three consequences. First, her job performance suffered. Without the all-important hands-on informal training, she did not learn the particularities of doing the job in the safest and most efficient manner. Second, the kind of treatment accorded her at this plant, if extrapolated over her career in blue-collar jobs, may have trapped her into a one-sidedly masculine persona characterized by her willingness to tolerate men's point of view even when it was hostile to her, her rejection of femininity in all its manifestations, and her unremitting toughness. For example, she vilified women in her previous job who "weren't tough enough" or who couldn't ignore harassment, she scorned hand lotion to counteract the rash from coal dust, and was always first to volunteer for the most distasteful jobs. In her earlier jobs she had tried to fight against the harassment she experienced, either through the union, by directly challenging management, and, in one instance, instigating a law suit. With the failure of these attempts, she may have quit fighting and adopted men coworkers' world view, which seemingly rejected women who were dainty. In other words, mistreatment over many years may have led her to change her sense of herself to accommodate to her job. Just as these men "made" me more feminine than I really was, they may have pushed her into a more masculine role. Third, this kind of treatment may have been responsible for her frequent job changes. She never claimed this, but she told me how she was severely harassed and while she had been in high-paying blue-collar work for thirteen years, she had changed jobs frequently. At this plant, her favorite job was working in the fly-ash house, a job that involves no contact with others.

## CONCLUSION

Clearly gender categories are imported from outside the workplace, but a great deal of time and energy are devoted to re-creating them on the job. This paper described some of the processes whereby gender was re-created in a male-dominated workplace.<sup>9</sup> As a working group, these men formed bonds with each other in at least two ways: through rituals of buying and through talk about sex. When women entered the workplace, the talk about sex was no longer a harmless solidarity-building mechanism, if it ever was. By affirming their bond and superiority as men, by sexualizing women in the abstract and stereotyping those women who entered their domain, male plant workers re-created gender at the micro level. In re-creating gender at the level of the shop floor, men may use women whom they have sex-typed as feminine to reinforce their own masculinity. Furthermore, by treating them paternalistically, men may constrain women to behave and respond in accordance with stereotypes, and gender ideology is perpetuated. More immediately, such treatment produces negative effects which include the instillation of fear and self-doubt and a reaction-formed willingness to violate safety recommendations. Women who are perceived as masculine or who for other reasons do not fit the stereotype can also be used to recreate gender on the job. In this instance, by dismissing my female coworker as an aberration, ridiculing and ignoring her, they lessened the threat she presented and reinforced masculinity. A woman who does not conform to male stereotypes may threaten men's sense of masculinity. She could not be as easily dismissed as I could. By blurring the distinction between men and women, her presence threatened the status of the job itself.

Such treatment can lead to isolation, poor job performance, and constraints on sense of self. Such severe treatment may be the payment for sex-role deviance. As Cockburn (1985) argued, the gendering of work is a process of immense power, and the price for disregarding it is often heavy. Women sex-typed as feminine also suffer for violating expectations. Distinctions I make between these two types of male images of women are fine-grained; it is important to note that neither type is fully accepted by male coworkers.

These results raise questions about how the re-creation of gender on the shop floor relates to the larger issue of the perpetuation of sex segregation in skilled blue-collar jobs. Clearly, the obstacles to integrating skilled blue-collar jobs go beyond the problem of inducing women workers to take on physically strenuous work for which their gender socialization ill-prepares them. The patterns of face-to-face contact that emerge in

these settings are arguably a key issue in understanding the situation of women in craft jobs. Cockburn (1985) found that even in the absence of hard-and-fast discrimination against women, "sexist attitudes" and "a pervasively masculine environment" alienate women in blue-collar workplaces. This alienation may partly account for the low proportion of women in skilled craft jobs. Yet many—possibly most—women in traditionally male blue-collar jobs cannot afford to be driven out of such economically rewarding jobs by unpleasant coworker interactions. Other researchers have found that relations on the job are only one consideration in the mental calculations women make about changing jobs, and that they do not necessarily override others (Deaux and Ullman 1983; McIlwee 1988; O'Farrell and Harlan 1982; Walshok 1981:235). In a sex-segregated job market where their alternative employment is unlikely to be as high-paying, the "push" factors—uncomfortable or unpleasant relationships on the job—decrease in importance. My experience is clearly not generalizable to all women. I could afford to be discouraged by men's behavior because the chief "pull" factor of these jobs—high pay—was not crucial to me. After all, my alternative employment was as a professor, not as a waitress or clerical worker.

These results also raise the question of men's motivation in re-creating gender, and masculinity in particular. Researchers who emphasize work culture in addressing men's motivation have written about how women's presence in men's jobs disrupts male bonding and the equation of masculine men with masculine work (Aga 1984; Astrachan 1986; Gray 1984:77), offering this as a reason for men's frequent unwillingness to accept women in blue-collar jobs. Yet the process I observed showed that the presence of a feminine-typed woman on the job was useful for *confirming* masculinity; an explanation of men's resistance that points only to their desire to maintain masculinity is not an adequate explanation. Researchers intending to understand men's interest in consistently re-creating gender in these jobs need to consider a more complex reality. Possibly more applicable is the real-politic explanation that men gain by maintaining these jobs as single-sex preserves, or at least by maintaining their moral and technical superiority at work. Further research on blue-collar men themselves would improve our understanding of these questions.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am grateful for the careful comments of Bruce Bellingham, Jim Orcutt, Barbara Reskin, Marc Steinberg, Steve Vallas, and Michael Yarrow.

## NOTES

1. Women's representation in skilled trades jobs was 8.7% in 1988, and they make up only 3.3 percent of mechanics and repairpersons, 2.1 percent of construction

workers, and 17.2 percent of handlers, equipment cleaners, helpers and laborers (U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, 1989:Table 22).

2. White-collar men as well may view their jobs as imbued with masculinity and similarly fear women's entry as both feminizing the job and threatening their personal claim to masculinity. While men in blue-collar jobs stress the physical aspects of masculinity (Willis 1977:147-52); Kanter (1977:22) noted the "masculine ethic" inherent in the tenets of rational management: "a tough-minded approach to problems; analytic abilities to abstract and plan; a capacity to set aside personal, emotional considerations in the interests of task accomplishment; and a cognitive superiority in problem-solving and decision-making."
3. Other responses are possible, and men resort to highlighting gender when the stronger response of resegregation is not available. Frequently integration is only nominal as supervisors or managers resegment women entrants into certain "men's" jobs deemed appropriate for women (see Deaux and Ullmann 1983, for the case of resegregation in response to a consent decree; Milkman 1987, for resegregation in response to a war; and Reskin and Padavic 1988, for resegregation in response to a strike).
4. The company contracted out many plant cleaning and laborer jobs to a national contractor. The fuel-supply employees and their supervisor at this plant never accorded the contract employees the status of unionized company employees.
5. My use of food-buying rituals is simply to establish the importance of work culture for creating meanings, particularly how men use it to mitigate status distinctions. Women's integration into this system was ambiguous. The lower-status "B" operators expected me to participate in the buying as well as the eating, but the "A" operators did not want me to contribute to the buying, preferring to treat me as a guest. I resolved my ambiguous status by eating their food, but contributing only food that was not part of any on-going buying ritual. The other woman did not participate at all, although it was unclear if this was her choice or her coworkers'.
6. This is not surprising. Men commonly stereotype women in work situations according to the categories with which they are familiar; usually as sex object or family member (Epstein 1983; Kanter 1977; O'Farrell 1980; Reskin 1979).
7. As one reviewer pointed out, some paternalistic treatment, as in this example, may have been due in part to my connection to management. To some extent this probably did figure into coworkers' treatment of me, although mitigated by the facts that (1) I had no on-going relationship with management; after assigning me to the job I never heard from them and (2) my supervisor (a management representative) undermined such a notion from the beginning by putting me in the dirtiest and hardest job and by announcing that I was not to get special treatment. Indeed, it is unlikely that they would have pretended to push me off the roof or told me how to steal supplies, for example, if they suspected I was close to management.
8. A norm exists in such workplaces against newcomers initiating jocular transactions until they have demonstrated their work competence, shown appreciation for oldtimers' jokes, and been granted tentative acceptance to the group (Seckman and Couch 1989). She may have violated this jocular rule, thus bringing on the opprobrium due any newcomer committing such an offense, as a reviewer noted. While possible in this particular instance, it probably does not account for coworkers' almost complete failure to warm to her at other times.

9. Re-creating gender on the job is not the exclusive prerogative of men. Westwood (1984) noted how women affirm gender through rituals on the job that celebrate marriage and childbirth.

## REFERENCES

- Acker, Joan. 1990. "Hierarchies, Jobs, Bodies: A Theory of Gendered Organizations." *Gender and Society* 4:139–158.
- Aga, Synnova. 1984. "I'll Never Go Back to Women's Work Again!" *Women's Studies International Forum* 7:441–448.
- Astrachan, Anthony. 1986. *How Men Feel*. Garden City, NY: Anchor Press.
- Becker, Howard. 1972. "A School is a Lousy Place to Learn Anything In." *American Behavioral Scientist* 16:89–109.
- Burawoy, Michael. 1979. *Manufacturing Consent*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Cockburn, Cynthia. 1985. *Machinery of Dominance*. London: Pluto.
- Cockburn, Cynthia. 1983. *Brothers: Male Dominance and Technological Change*. London: Pluto.
- Deaux, Kay and Joseph Ullman. 1983. *Women of Steel*. New York: Praeger.
- DeMan, Henri. 1927. *The Psychology of Socialism*. New York: Henry Holt.
- Epstein, Cynthia Fuchs. 1983. *Women in Law*. New York: Doubleday.
- Epstein, Cynthia Fuchs. 1988. "Workplace Boundaries: Conceptions and Constraints." Paper presented at the Thematic Session "Alternative Work Futures," at the Annual Meeting of the Eastern Sociological Society, March 12, 1988, Philadelphia.
- Geertz, Clifford. 1988. *Works and Lives: The Anthropologist as Author*. California: Stanford University Press.
- Gerson, Judith and K. Peiss. 1985. "Boundaries, Negotiation, Consciousness: Reconceptualizing Gender Relations." *Social Problems* 32:317–331.
- Goffman, Erving. 1977. "The Arrangements Between the Sexes." *Theory and Society* 4:301–331.
- Goffman, Erving. 1976. *Gender Advertisements*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Goode, William J. 1957. "Community within a Community: The Professions." *American Sociological Review* 22:194–200.
- Gray, Stan. 1984. "Sharing the Shopfloor: Women and Men on the Assembly Line." *Radical America* 18:69–88.
- Gruber, James E. and Lars Bjorn. 1982. "Blue-Collar Blues: the Sexual Harassment of Women Autoworkers." *Work and Occupations* 4:271–298.
- Gurney, J.N. 1985. "Not One of the Guys: The Female Researcher in a Male Dominated Setting." *Qualitative Sociology* 8:42–62.
- Hall, Peter M. 1987. "Interactionism and the Study of Social Organization." *The Sociological Quarterly* 28:1–22.
- Halle, David. 1984. *America's Working Man: Work, Home and Politics among Blue-Collar Property Owners*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Hughes, Everett. 1958. *Men and Their Work*. Glencoe, IL: Free Press.
- Jacobs, Jerry. 1989. *Revolving Doors*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Kanter, Rosabeth Moss. 1977. *Men and Women of the Corporation*. New York: Basic Books.

- Kessler, Suzanne J. and Wendy McKenna. 1978. *Gender: An Ethnomethodological Approach*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Leidner, Robin. 1991. "Serving Hambergers and Selling Insurance: Gender, Work and Identity in Interactive Service Jobs." *Gender & Society* 5:154–177.
- Margolis, Diane. 1985. "Redefining the Situation: Negotiations on the Meaning of 'Women'." *Social Problems* 32:332–347.
- McIlwee, Judith. 1988. "Reducing Occupational Sex Segregation: Explaining Failure and Success." *Sociological Focus* 21:35–51.
- Mead, George H. 1934. *Mind, Self, and Society*, ed. by Charles W. Morris. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Meyer, Herbert H. and Mary D. Lee. 1978. *Women in Traditionally Male Jobs: The Experiences of Ten Public Utility Companies*. U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Milkman, Ruth. 1987. *Gender at Work*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- O'Farrell, Brigid. 1980. "Women and Nontraditional Blue-collar Jobs: A Case Study of Local 1" Washington, DC: Employment and Training Administration, U.S. Department of Labor.
- O'Farrell, Brigid and Sharon Harlan. 1982. "Craftworkers and Clerks: The Effect of Male Coworker Hostility on Women's Satisfaction with Nontraditional Jobs." *Social Problems* 29:252–265.
- Reskin, Barbara F. 1979. "Sex Differentiation and the Social Organization of Science." *Sociological Inquiry* 48:6–36.
- Reskin, Barbara F. and Irene Padavic. 1988. "Supervisors as Gatekeepers: Male Supervisors' Response to Women's Integration in Plant Jobs." *Social Problems* 35:536–550.
- Roethlisberger, F.J., and William J. Dickson. 1975. "A Fair Day's Work," Pp. 85–94 in *Interaction in Small Groups*, edited by Paul V. Crosby. New York: Macmillan.
- Schroedel, Jean R. 1985. *Alone in a Crowd: Women in the Trades Tell Their Stories*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Seckman, Mark A. and Carl J. Couch. 1989. "Jocularly, Sarcasm, and Relationships." *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography* 18:327–344.
- Stone, Gregory P. 1962. "Appearance and the Self," Pp. 86–118 in *Human Behavior and Social Processes*, edited by Arnold Rose. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Strohmeyer, John. 1986. *Crisis in Bethlehem*. Bethesda, MD: Adler and Adler.
- Stryker, Sheldon. 1968. "Identity Saliency and Role Performance: The Relevance of Symbolic Interaction Theory for Family Research." *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, November:558–564.
- Swerdlow, Marian. 1989. "Men's Accommodations to Women Entering a Nontraditional Occupation: A Case of Rapid Transit Operatives." *Gender & Society* 3:373–387.
- Tolson, Andrew. 1977. *The Limits of Masculinity*. London: Tavistock Publications Ltd.
- U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. 1989. *Employment and Earnings*. January.
- Walskok, Mary L. 1981. *Blue-Collar Women: Pioneers on the Male Frontier*. New York: Anchor.
- Warren, Carol A.B. 1988. *Gender Issues in Field Research*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- West, Candace, and Don H. Zimmerman. 1987. "Doing Gender." *Gender and Society*, 1:125–151.
- Westwood, Sallie. 1985. *All Day, Every Day: Factory and Family in the Making of Women's Lives*. Urbana: University of Chicago Press.

- Willis, Paul. 1977. *Learning to Labour*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Yarrow, Michael. 1987. "Class and Gender in the Developing Consciousness of Appalachian Coal Miners." Paper presented at the Fifth Annual Conference on the Labour Process, University of Manchester Institute of Science and Technology, Great Britain.