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ABSTRACT

At various periods throughout history women have worked at what are presently considered traditionally "male occupations". As recently as World War II, large numbers of women worked as a matter of course in forestry, construction, heavy industry, mining and transportation.

Since the war, however, these positions have reverted to being considered "men's jobs". What was considered normal and even socially admirable in the context of war has become exceptional.

Within the past few years, a small but increasing number of women are again joining the labour force in these occupations. They do what might be considered primary production in resource industries. They work almost entirely without female companionship in a work environment where the expectations, social relationships and patterns of behaviour are shaped by the men who have traditionally held these jobs.

It has been argued that patterns of social relationship and perception are partly shaped by one's participation in and relation to the work world (labour force and domestic) and by the work environment. It may further
be argued that one's approach and response to these patterns is largely affected by the social roles and expectations one has learned to hold within the shaping culture. This study attempts to isolate these issues as they arise when women work in what are traditionally known as "men's jobs".

The study was conducted within a methodological perspective developed by Canadian sociologist Dorothy Smith. The analysis is centred on an examination of the experiences of women as they perceive, understand and explain those experiences. It uses depth interviewing as the primary research technique. Twenty-two women who had worked in what are traditionally considered "male occupations" were interviewed. Interviews were conducted over several sessions and often lasted five hours. In addition, personnel from Canada Employment, from unions and employers, from women's centres and from other relevant groups in the community were interviewed.

It is argued that the social relations of the workplace, as these women experience them, force women into a position of facing a series of contradictions of expectations, both of themselves and from others. These contradictions generate conditions which sustain the marginality of women in the non-traditional workforce.
To my grandfather
the builder.
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I. INTRODUCTION

The naming of the world, through which men constantly re-create that world, cannot be an act of arrogance.

- Paulo Freire, 1972
  Pedagogy of the Oppressed

1. Methodology

if you know how the story ends why tell it

- Adrienne Rich, 1969
  Pierrot Le Fou

It can be argued that patterns of social relationship, interaction and perception are largely shaped by participation (or lack of it) in the work world, and by the work environment. As Marx noted, "Men, developing their material production and their material intercourse, alter, along with this their real existence, their thinking and the products of their thinking.\textsuperscript{1} The aim of this study is to illustrate the patterns of social relation, expectation and perception that develop in the workplace for women in non-traditional occupations in British Columbia and thereby to come to understand their social and work relationships within those occupations.

For the purposes of this study, non-traditional occupations are defined as any jobs performed by a woman
that are in or closely related to one of British Columbia's three primary resource extraction industries: mining, logging and fishing. Of all the non-traditional areas of employment that women are now entering, those of primary production are perhaps the furthest from women's traditional occupations associated with the home.

This study focuses entirely upon the social relations as they are revealed in interactions on the non-traditional workplace. This is therefore not an examination of the political economy of the workplace or its structures. The organization and the conditions of work are taken as a given. For this study, it is assumed that these women at least, have little control over either the structure or the conditions of their work. The social relations of the workplace as they are experienced by women, are explored.

An in-depth interview methodology was chosen as the best means to pursue this research only after careful consideration of alternatives. Smith,2 Glaser and Strauss3 and Schatzman and Strauss4 all argue that a conceptual framework must be grounded in the data that emerge from the field work itself, but there has been extremely little research done in the area of women in non-traditional occupations in Canada as here defined.5 These women's experience has not
yet been "spoken", publicly enunciated and defined, given a social framework and a conceptual outline and thereby a way of examining and affecting it. I lacked a frame of reference, a set of assumptions that were specifically derived from the experience of such women. Because I sought a theory that would emerge from the data, not data that could be cut to fit existing theories, this research demanded an exploratory approach.

As my aim was to find the particular in each woman's experience, it was decided that the questions and probing of a prolonged interview of from three to five hours with each woman would elicit both feelings and situations which would not have been possible in a shorter interview time.

This study began, not as a formal research project but as a series of incidents, observations and tensions that I noted in journal form during the course of two years as a lumber piler and carpenter's helper. These were eventually shared with other women doing similar work and the striking similarities of our experience as "only women" in our work encouraged further research.

The initial point of reference of the formal study was that every woman I interviewed would be able to read it,
see herself in it (that is, understand it from the basis of her own experience), agree with it generally and learn from it some perspective on her own experience she had never considered before. Further, that what she learned would make her work easier because it would help her to understand the larger forces working through and affecting her, in her work and her attitudes, as well as those of the people with whom she works. My work has been to draw concepts out of women's real experience so that the experiencer could read herself back into the concept, and have the meaning of her experience broadened.

Women in non-traditional jobs have read earlier products of this research, as an article (published in Branching Out, Volume VI, No. 4, 1979) and a paper (presented to the Canadian Sociology and Anthropology Association Learned Societies Meeting, June 1979) and in draft forms of the thesis. Depending on her own experience, every woman responded particularly to one or more sections of the work and unanimously agreed with the general "feel" of it. They identified particularly with the description of how women's sense of themselves changed in this work, and with the contradictions. One woman who expressed a great deal of concern throughout our talks at the
"insignificance" of the details of her work, later wrote me to explain that when next she worked at a non-traditional job, she began to "notice" the issues raised in our conversation. "I saw much more," she said.

One of their common concerns was that they wanted to know the women's names, to follow specific women through the narrative of the study. The reason for this concern is not clear. Perhaps it is in the tradition of a female mode which identifies through the specific, material detail. As a response to my abstraction, they were perhaps asking the practical equivalent of the academic question: "What, or who, is your source?" Or perhaps it is a function of the small number of women in this field that they wanted to know the names of other women they might be able to contact and with whom they could form some support network. I have decided that it is important to the goals of this study not to give the sources of specific comments, partly for ethical reasons, that in such a small field, comments associated with names, even disguised, would reveal identities, and partly because the study seeks to reveal the commonalities of women's experience, to provide a general yardstick against which to measure future change. I have chosen to focus on that which emerged as common from the particular,
sometimes unique, experiences of those spoken with. A comparative approach, one which analysed how different work situations affected women in non-traditional occupations, could also have been taken but it was beyond the scope of this study.

In general, it can be concluded that the responses of women in non-traditional fields, those interviewed and others, verify that this account is recognizable and reasonable as an exploration of the experience of this work.

The number of women interviewed, 22, represents the maximum I could handle within time, money and energy constraints. The criteria by which they were chosen were that they represent a cross-section of the resource extraction industries of logging, fishing and mining and of occupations within those industries; that they be white, Anglo-Saxons to assure that the relationships explored depended as much as possible upon sexual and not racial variables; and that each had worked for a minimum of two years in non-traditional occupations in British Columbia.

This two year time period seemed appropriate for a number of reasons. First, the most recent influx of women into the trades has occurred only since 1974, barely
four years from the date of the interviews.* Although, as it turned out, it would not have been difficult to find sufficient women who had worked for the entire four years, I settled on two as a more reasonable time demand. Second, women who had worked for at least two years had indicated commitment to their work and to resolving the dilemmas and problems that arose from it. Third, after two years I presumed there would be a certain realism in their understanding and perceptions of this particular work experience. After two years, much of the romance and adventure would have worn off and the grimmer facts of the work could not be avoided. Fourth, one of my interests in the study was in the social relations of the workplace and whether they underwent change. I arbitrarily granted two years as the minimum required before such changes would be observable.

There was no difficulty in finding suitable women who fit these criteria. They were contacted through unions, company personnel offices, women's centres, Canada

*The reason for the consistency in this date being the one when most women were hired and/or most companies initiated a conscious policy of hiring women, seems directly related to the fact that it is the year the revised Human Rights Code and its enforcement by the Human Rights Branch, went into effect.
Employment Centres and friends. Women interviewed also put me in touch with others they had heard of.

I chose broadly from the many possible occupations but within some industries I found that women had already become ghettoized. That is, certain jobs within resource industries have quickly become "traditional" for women and are dominated by them. They are avoided by men as "women's work". These jobs, in particular, women workers in the fish canneries and women whose only experience in non-traditional work was as flag"girl", were excluded from my study.

The basis of the interviews was an interview format here reproduced as Appendix A. The interview was pre-tested on three women and with minor changes, was found satisfactory. The responses of two of these three are here included. The third is not because her work was done in Ontario.

My approach to each woman was in the spirit of wanting to talk about her work. I stressed my background in non-traditional work rather than my university connection. The talks were conversational and informal within the parameters of the information I wanted to find. I therefore did not ask every question of every woman, though I made a major effort to do so. All conversations were tape recorded with the permission of the women.
Informal conversation was stressed, first, because I did not know any of these women before I approached them to talk to me. One woman had literally never seen nor heard of me until I walked into her small cabin off the road and introduced myself. We were therefore coming to know and trust each other throughout the course of the conversations. Second, and related to this, is the fact that a formal interview would be less likely to elicit the depth of response I sought. Apart from the fact that we were strangers, I was also from the "south" and had a university connection. These two factors traditionally arouse rightful distrust on the part of many people in B.C.'s northwest. I sought to minimize my know-it-all credentials by engaging in conversation, not locking in formal debate.

Most of the interviews were conducted in two sessions of approximately two hours each. Because of shift work demands, transportation difficulties, family responsibilities and the writer's time deadlines, a small number of interviews were necessarily carried out in one sitting. Unfortunately, this did not allow for as much thoroughness in covering all the aspects of the women's work.

As interviews progressed, certain questions underwent change. One in particular, "Where do you think women
have a better deal, in traditional or non-traditional work?" proved too vague and was answered, as a rule, with, "It depends on the woman." It was therefore changed to "If you were doing traditional and then non-traditional work and in each case you could choose instead to stay home with pay, would you? with which one and why?" This elicited more specific responses.

In the course of interviewing I travelled for six weeks in B.C.'s northwest sector to towns showing a variety of sizes and industries: to the Queen Charlotte Islands (population 3,000), Prince Rupert (population 15,000), Kitimat (population 12,000), Fraser Lake (population 1,500) and Prince George (population 60,000). I chose this part of B.C. for two reasons: because it has a high rate of industrial and resource extraction development and because of personal financial limitations. Here were most likely to be concentrated the kind of women I was looking for.

Jobs of the women spoken to included fishboat operator, deckhands, a blaster, a lumber grader, repair-women, several labourers, truckdrivers and forklift operators, carpenters, mill operators, a mechanic, an oil refinery worker and a maintenance engineer. Many women had done more than one of these jobs or did them
simultaneously, such as a blaster who worked at labouring when no blasting was going on.

Workplaces included fishboats, mills, smelters, refineries, mines, the forest and construction sites. Ages ranged from 23 to 45 and contrary to the myth that you must be a female gorilla to do this work, their heights averaged 5'7" and their weights, 130 pounds.

In each town visited, I also spoke to employers, personnel managers, union officials and Canada Employment Centre personnel in order to get a sense of the context of community attitude toward these women.

This work represents the first stages of a potentially very rich field for future study, the need for which has been indicated by Mitchell, Cohen, Hagerman and others. As a first step, it remains to test the hypotheses developed here by generalization to a larger field of non-traditional working women.
2. **History**

"Personally my experience with the office is that men can keep it. They can have the low wages that go with the dam job, too."

- Blaster, 1978

The purpose of this section is to briefly outline women's labour patterns in Canada and the context in which women are increasingly turning to non-traditional fields. It will also deal with the question of statistics, or lack thereof, in this area.

It is becoming a cliche, one that bears repeating, that women have always worked. And they have always worked at what we now commonly consider "non-traditional" jobs: on traplines and on fishing boats, as farm wives and as pioneers. As recently as World War II, women worked as a matter of course in large numbers in forestry, construction, heavy industry, mining and transportation. At one shipyard in Vancouver, for example, the Burrard Dry Dock, local records showed a workforce of 1500 women doing jobs ranging from shipwright to sheet metal worker to blacksmith helper. At the height of women's participation in the war time labour force, in 1944, there were 1,077,000 women active in full or part-time employment.
After the war, however, what was considered normal and even socially admirable in that context, again resumed the status of "exceptional" and women were strongly encouraged to return to their homes. Since the late 1950's, however, women have been entering the labour force in ever increasing numbers.

At present, the three factors that most distinguish the female labour force in Canada are: first, the dramatic increase in the percentage of married women; second, the fact of women's concentration into a small number of job areas; and third, a growing wage disparity between men and women in all job categories. These factors will be dealt with in turn.

1. Increase in the percentage of married women.

Mitchell observes that, "The overall increase in female participation rates is accounted for almost exclusively by the movement of married women into the labour force." In 1931 the labour force participation rate of married women was only 3.5%. By 1941 it was only slightly higher, 4.5%. This percentage more than doubled in 1951 to 11.2% and doubled again in 1961 to 22.0%. By 1971 the percentage of all married women participating in the Canadian labour force had risen to 37.0%. In other words, in 1971, 54.7% of Canadian working women were married and living with their
husbands and by 1978 this figure had reached over 60.0%. Those women most likely to work are those whose husbands earn the least. A 1955 study revealed that, counting the husband's income alone, only 14.0% of the families surveyed would have had at least $4,000 to live on. When the wife's income was also considered, 51.0% of the same families had incomes of $4,000 or more. In other words, these women did not work for "pin money" or extras, but for necessities because their husband's wage was no longer sufficient to buy what was necessary to maintain the family at a reasonable standard of living.

Among the non-monetary incentives for women's working, Mitchell suggests the steady decline in the fertility rate, easing social attitudes and general social benefits such as fraternizing with co-workers and acquiring new skills. Mitchell also mentions a trend towards increased labour force participation by women with children. It is interesting to note that of the 22 women interviewed for this study, eight were married and living with their husbands and seven had children.

In terms of anticipating future trends in women's labour force activity in British Columbia, Mitchell cites a number of reasons for believing that "it does not appear
logical to assume that the proportion of women in the labour force in BC has reached, or is approaching, any plateau."

2. Concentration in few job areas.

Many studies confirm that women in the labour force are focused in the tertiary or service sector of the economy on both the provincial and federal levels. Specifically, in B.C., a Ministry of Labour study shows that in 1978, "two-thirds of employed women in British Columbia were participating in two major industry groups - Trade and Community, and Business and Personal Services.... If Public Administration and Finance, Insurance and Real Estate are added, the tertiary sector of the economy accounts for a total of 82.9% of all female employment." This concentration is increasing. From 1971 to 1978, total female employment in the province increased by 52.0% and 86.0% of the increase in jobs had been among these four industries.

3. Growing wage disparity.

A recent study of women in B.C.'s labour market points out that "average weekly earnings in industries with high concentrations of women are approximately one-half to two-thirds to [sic] those with predominantly male workers." This discrepancy is documented on the national level by McDonald who concludes that "women who work
full-time in Canada earn on average about 60 per cent as much as male full-time workers." Even more depressing, she states that "the gap in wages and salaries between women and men is increasing - in all the provinces, and any way you look at it."  

Although many women specifically seek out non-traditional occupations for the high wages that usually accompany such work, they are not at all immune from the structural discrimination that assures lower wages for women. Hagerman's research makes devastatingly clear that "whether it is traditional or non-traditional work women will make approximately the same wage in either area and that wage will be significantly lower than males in similar occupations." The reasons, he suggests, have to do with inadequate training for women, the segregated labour market and general sexual discrimination. In his analysis of the nature of job discrimination, he details how the limits of the segregated labour market are "consistent, formidable and in many cases silent."

Parallel to women's lower wages is a higher rate of unemployment. Average unemployment rates for women in B.C. have been higher than those for men over the past 10 years with the exception of 1970, and the rate differential
has been particularly high from 1975-1978, especially among females over 25 years of age. 29

One of the secondary goals of this study was to determine the numbers of women who are working in non-traditional occupations in B.C. This proved to be a far more challenging task than at first imagined. Basically, there seems to be a dire lack of statistical information on the details of women's non-traditional employment in this province.

Not until the fall of 1979 did a government publication deal specifically and publicly with the issue of numbers of women in non-traditional work. In "Women in the Labour Market" in the Ministry of Labour's Labour Research Bulletin of August 1979, Patrick Stanton quotes a 1978 figure of 11,000 women in the primary occupations of forestry, fishing and mining in B.C., or 17.2% of the total labour force in the primary occupations.

However, this figure can not be assumed to represent the total number of women included in this study, as their occupations are those in and related to the primary industries. That is, their jobs included construction and truck driving, which would fall in the Construction Trades, Transportation and Related Occupations category.
(4,000 women), planer mill work, which would fall in the Processing category (21,000 women), and fork-lift driving which would fall under Material Handling and Other Crafts (7,000 women). 31

In total, this study classifies 43,000 women as being in the five major blue collar occupations in 1978.* This number still does not give a satisfactory figure however, as the source, the Labour Force Annual Averages, is a monthly survey based on just 5,000 households in all of B.C. and is, by Stanton's admission, "not very good on occupational data for purposes of women's non-traditional employment." 32

Another source of statistical data is Statistics Canada's monthly survey of large establishments (those with over 15 employees). In June 1979 this survey lists a figure of 3.9% participation by women in the large forestry industry and 8.6% in the mining industry. 34 The reliability of this

*This represents an increase of 70.6% over the 1971 census figure of 25,200 women in the same categories but Stanton suggests that it is still "not...a very significant change in the total numbers of women in these traditionally male occupational categories" in comparison to growth in the total numbers of women in the B.C. labour force in that time. 33
figure is limited by the fact that it includes only larger establishments, while many women with non-traditional skills hold jobs in small shops. Fishing is not included at all in the industries covered.

I decided that some personal inquiry might be more revealing, which in fact it was, though less of statistical data than of attitudes. The question, "How many women are presently working in hourly, non-clerical positions in your business?" called forth one of a variety of evasive and negative replies. These women seem to share a peculiar invisibility when it comes to being counted even by large, publicly accountable institutions such as schools, unions, employment centres and major industrial employers. "Perhaps," one secretary suggested, "they don't want to say because they're embarrassed."

During inquiries in 1978 and 1979, personnel in the Ministry of Labour and the Canada Employment Centre were unable or unwilling to suggest a total number of women in non-traditional occupations in the province. The Apprenticeship Branch at first denied having separate records of male and female apprentices (though application forms clearly call for the information) and they eventually agreed to handcull names of women from their computer list.
The most common response to my question was, "We don't keep such figures, that would be discrimination."

Upon inquiry to Kathleen Ruff, then Director of the B.C. Human Rights Branch, it was confirmed that the Branch encourages the keeping of statistical records on women and minorities, as important tools for measuring discrimination. It is only illegal to use this information to discriminate. It seems, however, that this distinction has not been clearly communicated to the public, which accounts for some of the apparent confusion around this issue.36

Listed in Appendix B are the fruits of those inquiries, outlining how many women there are and where they work in 21 of B.C.'s major mining operations and in three large forest companies. To summarize, as of summer, 1979, in the 21 mining companies surveyed (all operating members of the Mining Association of B.C. and performing by far the largest part of the mining operations in this province) there are a total of 471 women in non-traditional occupations out of a total hourly work force of 8,549. This represents 5.5% of that work force.

In the forest industry, MacMillan Bloedel employs 402 women (3.4% of their hourly labour force), B.C. Forest Products, 206 or 3.8% women, and Crown Zellerbach employs
113 or 2.8% women in non-traditional capacities. These figures average out to 721 women or 3.4% of the hourly, non-clerical labour force in these three companies being female.

Figures were not available for the fishing industry, either in the Labour Force Survey, from the Fisheries Association of B.C. nor from the industry's largest union, the United Fishermen and Allied Workers Union (UFAWU).

In summary, it can only be concluded that between 11,000 and 43,000 women in the B.C. labour force are included within the scope of this study. The lack of accurate data suggests a serious gap in the study of women in non-traditional occupations because it allows a lack of action in women's issues and matters of priority, such as employment, training and promotion, to pass unnoticed. To the best of my knowledge there is no provincial policy statement on the issue of women in the labour force. There is a federal commitment to an Affirmative Action policy but it is strictly voluntary and by all accounts, basically ineffective. Industry is not required to publicly provide a detailed breakdown of women's employment.

Until this situation is remedied, the lack of statistics enforces the invisibility that these women
already endure in the non-traditional work force.
FOOTNOTES: Chapter I


5 The lack of relevant Canadian material available on the subject of women in non-traditional occupations is confirmed by other women concerned with research in similar areas. "In terms of a bibliography...there isn't much and what there is isn't very exciting," observed Leah Cohen, author of The Secret Oppression: Sexual Harassment of Working Women and of the study, "Women's Participation in Apprenticeship Training." (Personal communication, February 1979.) The same idea was expressed by Olivia Jacobs, Director of the Women's Employment Division, Employment and Immigration Canada. "There is little information available," she said, "and not much sharing of these bits and pieces that do exist." (Personal communication, September 1979.)

Until 1978, all relevant data seems to have dealt exclusively with women in mining. The following three references represent almost the entire research field up until that time:


Key American material is published by two main sources: the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, and by Wider Opportunities for Women (WOW) Inc.. See particularly:


7Leah Cohen, "Women's Participation in Apprenticeship Training," Women's Employment Division, Canada Employment and Immigration, 1978, p.15. (Mimeograph)

8Dave Hageman, "Women in Non-Traditional Jobs: A Review of Manpower Policies and Programs," Women's Employment Division, Canada Employment and Immigration, 1979, p.31. (Mimeograph)


11 Ibid., p.144-145.


18 Ibid., p.25.

19 See p.63 of this study.


23 Ibid., p.15.
24 Ibid., p.16.
26 Ibid., p.4. Also Hagerman, "Women in Non-Traditional Jobs," p.29.
28 Ibid., p.23.
29 Mitchell, "Recent Trends," p.27.
33 Stanton, "Women in the Labour Market," p.17.
34 Statistics Canada Catalogue #72-002.
37 These are the three largest forest companies in British Columbia. The extent to which these figures can be generalized to the entire forest industry is not clear.
38 Margaret H. Davidson, Canada Employment Counsellor, Canada Employment and Immigration, Vancouver. Personal communication, October 1979.
II. THE THEORY

To record
in order to control

- Adrienne Rich, 1969

Pierrot Le Fou

The purpose of this chapter is to suggest some of the theoretical factors in an awareness of the interaction of individuals and social-historical forces, particularly as they relate to social roles on the work place. It seeks to clarify the bases of how we come to define ourselves, how we become "selves", in a social context and how that context changes in the interactions of the individuals that constitute it. Certain aspects of the works of Karl Marx, George Herbert Mead, Georg Simmel, Ernest Becker and Dorothy E. Smith will be considered insofar as each is helpful in clarifying issues that emerge in this study, and points out directions for an adequate methodological approach.

Karl Marx's work will be critically considered insofar as it focuses on the way in which material conditions of work are reflected in the thought, perceptions and experience of working people. George Herbert Mead's analysis of the social construction of the self will be examined. Georg Simmel's work will be considered for its
illustration of the nature and complexity of social interaction and some of the critical factors that shape it. The implications of Ernest Becker's analysis of role conflict will be reviewed. Finally, some aspects of Dorothy Smith's work will be explored as a means of coming to terms with how this society is symbolically ordered by men to the exclusion of women.

Karl Marx established a valuable framework for the observation and criticism of social structures and social change with his technique of social analysis called historical materialism, which is based on a systematic attempt to analyse human conditions in the context of history. Historical (or dialectical) materialism represented an important break from the Hegelian tradition of thought in that it accepted that human nature is neither biologically fixed nor changeable according to some spiritual essence. Marx, and his early collaborator, Frederick Engels, demystified the process of the social construction of reality and human nature by emphasizing that that which makes us human is our material, sensuous relation to the world and each other. He hoped that people would use this methodology for themselves and in a practical manner to analyse their lives and pursue alternatives. The point is not to
understand society, he urged, but to change it.

Marx and Engels begin by identifying three empirical, simultaneous facts of history. First, humans distinguish themselves from animals when they begin to produce their own means of subsistence. The way in which they do this, the technology and tools employed, the use to which the technology and tools are put and the social relations of work, were called the "mode of production". Second, they argued that satisfying the material needs and means of life leads to new needs. Third, they focused on the fact that people reproduce. The family, they argued, is the original social relationship. As Marx put it, "By social, we understand the cooperation of several individuals, no matter under what conditions, in what manner and to what end." ¹

A mode of production is thus always combined with a certain mode of cooperation. Both are termed "productive forces". The variety and relation of these productive forces will determine the nature of society and the form of all the relations which compose it. "As individuals express their life, so they are," declared Marx and Engels. "What they are, therefore, coincides with their production, both with what they produce and with how they produce."
The nature of individuals thus depends on the material conditions determining their production. In other words, social relations and a social self will be determined by the worker's relation to the means of production, that is, by their work.

Unfortunately, by defining the workplace as exclusively outside the home, Marx and Engels evolved a class analysis which neglected the division of paid and unpaid labour in the labour force and in the domestic economy, and thus entirely omitted the social reality of an increasing number of women who worked in the home. It was a vital omission if one is interested in understanding the position of women in capitalist society.

The importance of understanding people's relation to their labour and to the products of their labour as objects against which to measure their being, led Marx to a theory of alienation. Within capitalism, Marx argued, the means of production, the mill, factory or whatever, is not owned by those who work in it but by another, the capitalist. The worker does not control her/his actual labouring activity because s/he does not control what product will be produced and how, under what working conditions, etc. Workers thus are estranged
from their own activity and from the product of that ac-

Class, defined as cultural/social fellowship

based on economic status, is another relevant concept of

Marxist economic analysis. Class comes into being, Marx

said, when one group of individuals develop similar inter-

ests in antagonism to another. Further, the class in

its turn "achieves an independent existence over against

the individuals" that compose it so that they become sub-

sumed under it. In this sense circumstances make people.

Marx stressed that individuals exercise their power within

given historical conditions and relationships and that the

essence of humanity is this creative activity. But he

emphasized that a definite part of every personality is

submerged by and through enforced class relationships.

Marx pointed out that one of the basic means of

domination of one class over another was intellectual. That

is, the class which controls material production also

controls mental production. The ruling ideas are thus

"Nothing more than the ideal expression of the dominant
material relationships" and are therefore represented as the only "rational, universally valid" ones. Smith would later elaborate extensively on this idea in its relation to women.

Marx identified private property within capitalism as the division of labour into material and mental labour and with it, the unequal distribution of its products. Engels located the first private property as the family, wife and children, who were property of the husband. Private property thus made possible and then necessary, the exploitation of the biological difference between women and men. This line of analysis is not pursued in either Marx' or Engels' further work. They used the term "class" only in an economic and not in a sexual sense. They do refer, in their analysis of private property, to the sexual division of labour whereby women, limited by the care and carrying of children, presumably have no choice but to work around home and fields while men are freer to separate themselves from the home. It could be argued, however, that in speaking of this division of labour as "natural", that Marx and Engels were making the same mistake for which they criticize other philosophers, of accepting a historical fact developed out of
material conditions, as a mystical absolute. Some of the important implications of this division of labour within a capitalist economy are discussed by Margaret Benston in "The Political Economy of Women's Liberation".  

Marxists have sometimes taken this major omission by Marx and Engels as licence to subsume the whole "woman question" within the superstructure of capitalist society and to predict that the question of women's relation to capitalist society will "disappear" when the communist state is evolved. Recently this has been challenged and is the subject of extensive feminist and Marxist debate. It is explored particularly by Annette Kuhn and Ann Marie Walpe (Eds.) in Feminism and Materialism: Women and Modes of Production and by Roberta Hamilton in The Liberation of Women: A Study of Patriarchy and Capitalism.

Marx and Engels have set out a useful framework for understanding that human nature and human relations are the product of real, material historical conditions and not metaphysical or biological absolutes. However, their analysis focuses primarily on economic class almost to the exclusion of individual members, and almost entirely on the public, economic bases and conditions of society and social change to the exclusion of private psychological
and sexual ones. The work of George Herbert Mead speaks to this absence in Marx in that Mead focuses on the individual within, but also regardless of, class constraints, to explore how individuals are socially created and sustained within the broad social context.

The most valuable theoretical contribution of the American pragmatist, G.H. Mead within the context of this study, was his analysis of how meaning is derived in a social context through the individual's learning to see themselves as reflected from the other's position. Consciousness, Mead affirmed, arises through communication in a social context. Our sense of our "selves" is generated by and thus dependent on, the perceptions of others.

Mead was a behaviorist. He believed the world could be understood in behaviorist (non-mentalistic) terms. He focused, as did Marx, on the material sensual conditions of human lives, but insofar as Mead recognized the individual act within a social setting, he gave depth to an understanding of the individual members of an economic class.

In agreement with his close friend and co-worker, John Dewey, who stated, "Human beings can best be investigated as 'natural' within a natural world," and following on Marx's assertion of the importance of human activity,
Mead affirmed that doing is more fundamental than knowing and the individual act was accepted as the basic unit of existence and the basis for his observations.

His primary contributions to our understanding of social interaction and human behaviour centered on his analysis of the "self". The two aspects of the self, he argued, are the "I", which corresponds to the active, needing, impulsive process of cognition, and the "me", which is reactive and which gradually, over time, emerges as the assimilation of social perceptions brought into dialogue with the "I". The "me" provides for social control; the "I" asserts itself within the limits of the community and makes for novelty and change. Together they constitute a personality. One of the vital elements of selfhood, Mead argued, is this reactive ability to take the attitude or play the role of the other, and thus to become object to one's self, to act toward one's self as the object (other) acts toward you.

Meaning, he suggested, can not be derived within any individual consciousness but arises in a relationship by which one organism's response to another's gesture is the (interpreted, social) meaning of it. The response of the second organism gives meaning to the perceptions and
actions of the first. The mind, or consciousness, is not first individual and then social. Mind arises through communication in a social context. Mind itself is socially derived. Mead (and the pragmatists) have thus pioneered an approach in which the nature of language is essentially communication, as opposed to being the expression of "inherent thoughts".

A community of meaning or community consensus (such as on a worksite) arises when what is said or done or observed by one individual is understood and accepted as true by the other individuals in the group. Otherwise there would be no communication. This is the "generalized other" against which the individual judges her/his own private experience and conduct. Likewise, the "self" arises in a social context as experiencing itself not directly but indirectly, by the reflected viewpoints of other members of the social group.

Each act, perspective, or individual has their own value and standpoint. To retain its identity, each must carry on a continuous and changing relationship with nature and within the environment as a whole. Out of individual perspectives also arise individual protests and conflict. "Conflict and uncertainty are ultimate
traits," Dewey observed. 9 Social control is attained by the individual's carrying within themselves the attitudes of society as the "generalized other", but if it is not to stagnate and grow rigid, society must accept the changes which the rebellious "I" introduces or forces onto it. This is Mead's agency for social change. Against the "objective" world of common meanings, the individual sets her/his private experience and meanings and becomes the agent of social change. "We are not simply bound by the community," Mead stressed. "We are engaged in a conversation in which what we say is listened to be the community and its response is one which is affected by what we have to say." 10

In his work, however, Mead fails to deal with the organization of political, economic and social power and its impact on the social individual in society. When he predicts that the agents of protest and change will be individuals of "exceptional genius", he illustrates how his analysis omits any major consideration of the impact of economic and material context upon human (individual and social) behaviour. And of course, he deals not at all with the differing social experience of women and of men. The "human" lives he considers are masculine.
Mead's work provides considerable understanding of the interactions by which human beings become selves, and assume social roles, but it is the work of Georg Simmel that offers insight into the characteristics of interaction. Simmel views human interaction as occurring within and being differentiated by, its context. The locus of his concern, however, is in the dynamics of the interaction itself. Simmel focuses on the micro-level of the qualities of the individual characters who infuse social life with meaning. His analyses contribute to our understanding of social "roles" in that they focus with great delicacy and precision on the individual threads within the social fabric which, he affirmed, give texture, character, content and forward impulse to social life.

Simmel focussed not on the function of social organization nor even on how individuals evolve in the process of social interaction, but primarily on the qualities that characterize individual types and on how individual needs lead to the establishment of forms of sociality (social forms) as a result of spontaneous interaction. Simmel did not advocate social change, although he recognized it. Instead, he upheld the validity of intelligent analysis for its own sake. "It is our task not to complain or to condone,"
he said, "but only to understand."\textsuperscript{11}

Nonetheless, his individuals have a clearly social context and content. "The individual is determined by the way in which the totality that surrounds him \textit{[sic]} acts toward him."\textsuperscript{12} Simmel speaks of "the autonomous life of sociological forms" separate from the individuals who fill or even create them.\textsuperscript{13} Social forms, social roles, are social creations. This may partly explain the fact that, in Simmel's view, individuals never experience wholeness but always fragmentation based upon the fact that they circulate over a number of different "planes" from each of which "our life takes only a fragment along at any given time."\textsuperscript{14}

An example of the social creation of a role would be the fact that the role of the "poor person" only becomes such when society provides an individual with social assistance. No one is socially "poor" until s/he has been assisted.\textsuperscript{15} Thus too, he goes on, "frequently, the concept of personality is not defined by an inner characteristic but, on the contrary, those elements of society that perform a specific role are called personalities."\textsuperscript{16}

Simmel recognized that in the interaction of any individual with the group (or groups) of which they are a
part (including working groups or crews), there is a dual relation in that all elements of a group are both outside, confronting the group as a social whole, and also inside, as a member. Every individual is thus at once subject, as part of a whole, and object, treated differently insofar as they are an individual.

Two of the assumptions underlying Simmel's analyses are of particular interest here. These are the concepts of reciprocity and of dualism.

Reciprocity is the principle that no thing or event (including the discipline of "history") has a fixed, intrinsic meaning. Meaning emerges only in interaction with other things or events. By means of this principle Simmel avoids the "either/or" categorization of the controversy as to whether "society" has properties as an entity unto itself or whether it is merely the sum of individual actions. Rather, he proposes, society corresponds to the reality of reciprocal influence. Reciprocity is of the essence in distinguishing social forms. When it disappears from a social relationship the relationship no longer exists as a social fact.

Secondly, Simmel uses the fundamental concept of dualism, opposed qualities or tendencies, as the basic
condition for the existence of any aspect of life. This corresponds to elements of Marx's theory of contradiction. Tension and a tendency to conflict are inherent in all social forms and social interactions. But Simmel by no means saw the conflicts that characterize human experience as entirely negative. Among individuals, he thought, conflict gives society texture and resilience. Perfect social harmony is therefore not only impossible but undesirable. Between individuals and the cultural and social forms their own lives had helped generate, conflict was more painful but it could nonetheless lead to positive adjustment and replacement - to change.

"Tragic conflicts" he defined as those in which the destructive forces directed against some being are inherent in the being itself. In other words, Simmel sees as tragic, the threat to subjective individuality's existence by the very forms it has produced, objective culture and sociality. He observed that the extensive and intensive development of autonomous, objective culture in recent years had intensified this conflict and magnified the distance between subject and object. Human alienation, in this view, is human powerlessness in the face of the objects of human creation. They confront the individual
"independently". It includes the correspondingly magnified distance between the person as subject, and their creations as object, standing against them.

Simmel describes with gem-like clarity, many of the characteristics of the individuals who comprise the richness of the social texture. Each portrait, however, also lies in gem-like isolation beside its fellows. There is no setting.

Though he deals extensively with dyadic relationships, including marriage, he rarely specifically mentions women at all. Women's experience is subsumed in the "general" experience which is, of course, male. It is notable that he recognized this. Buried in the works of the psychoanalyst, Karen Horney, is her relatively unknown translation of a passage from Simmel in which he acknowledges his recognition that this is a masculine civilization.17 "Supposing," he says, "that we describe art, patriotism, morality in general and social ideas in particular, viewed as absolute ideas, by the single word 'objective', we then find that in the history of our race the equation objective = masculine, is a valid one." He goes on to point out that the reason it is difficult to recognize this fact is because our values are "not neutral, arising out of the differences of
the sexes, but in themselves essentially masculine."

Otherwise, Simmel's rare observations of women are fairly generalized, that is, stereotyped. For example he says, "Women are the less individualized sex; variation of individual women from the general class type is less great than is true, in general, of men." Anyone who would totally ignore their particular material conditions and speak of women as suffering from "a lack of variation" is as guilty as one who accuses all Chinese of looking alike.

Georg Simmel contributes to our understanding of the individual threads that comprise the social fabric but Ernest Becker's work brings this into the present context of social disintegration and introduces psychoanalytic concepts that elaborate, among other phenomena, on the individual experience of role conflict. By integrating the personality theories first articulated by Freud, with the ideas of Marx, Mead, Simmel and others, Becker sought to indicate the "social burden of individual failure." 

Becker accepted the postulates of Simmel and the pragmatists that the self comes into being over time as it transacts with the social world around it; that each individual is both social creator and social creature and that identity is achieved by virtue of reflection through social
encounter. He felt, however, that an accurate understanding of the human personality must integrate psychiatric insights. For example, a fuller understanding of human personality, he felt, would demand that we recognize the importance of the nature of early childhood socialization and in particular, the acute anxiety evoked by the utter "life-dependence" of the human infant. Anxiety, he stated, is the most basic fact to an understanding of human motivation. Further, individuals will do anything to avoid and allay it, by assuring to the fullest extent possible, the predictable functioning of their environment. This has immediate implications for the highly untraditional and thus unpredictable situation of women working in a non-traditional job.

Becker's elaboration of the concepts of status and role are particularly useful in explaining how an individual gets their cues to know what s/he should do in any particular situation and how s/he should feel about her/himself as s/he does it. Our use of status and role, Becker suggested, (including by implication, masculinity and femininity) allay anxiety by making behaviour predictable so that the meanings in everyday life become dependable.

Becker takes Mead's term "role" as a metaphor and expands it to explain social life as the staging of a
performance in which it is important to the smooth running of the "play" that everyone know their lines (their "role"). "Man [sic] uses physiology," Becker asserted, "for his most direct cues for action." Thus, based on occupation, family and other associations and most particularly, visible differences such as age and sex, we each assume our "parts to play." One's identity, Becker stressed, is inseparable from the role one is assigned. 22

Role conflict, in Becker's analysis, refers to the difficulty a performer has in playing several unrelated parts, in a culture which does not support their integrity in a single individual. Role conflict represents a major dilemma in our complex, industrialized society and the lives of non-traditionally working women are no exception. The unity of the various identities of one woman as dirt bike enthusiast, classical music fan, reader of spy novels, lover, gourmet cook and motorcycle mechanic, occurring in widely different contexts of time and space and seen from the many contradictory perspectives of the people who know her, is not sustained by society. Without this support, social performance becomes difficult and mechanical. The individual may have great difficulty maintaining a consistent, satisfying self-perception.
Everyone has a status in sociological terms. Status, declares Becker, is a "formalized cue, that makes it possible to predict how one will act in a certain situation." A status is ascribed to an individual on the basis of age, sex, marriage or membership in a particular group but it can also be earned, by virtue of one's own efforts to achieve a more preferable part in the performance. In either case, an individual must first learn the proper role behaviour before they are worthy to occupy a certain status. Convincing role-status performance thus creates and enhances cultural meaning within the social whole and serves to cement shared values. To the extent that we uphold our part well, we are rewarded with social affirmation of our identity. To the extent that we do not, we suffer role conflict. The import and relevance of such "convincing" performance will become clearer in the context of the shared community of the workplace.

Mental illness, it follows, is "the failure of the individual to fashion a self that is transactable in social ceremonial." It is noteworthy for women that the "mentally ill" epithet can follow not only from failure but from unwillingness to perform according to social roles.

Becker draws a striking parallel between Marx's
definition of alienation, and depression and schizophrenia as the modern crystallizations of the same phenomenon.

In *The Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844* Marx wrote how the organism must relate to an object outside itself in order to have a nature, to be. His definition of alienation was the loss of self-power by the overshadowing of the organism by the object whose process of production s/he no longer controls. Similarly, Becker shows, depression and schizophrenia result when the individual can not carry through self-satisfying action and ceases to socially function in any kind of satisfactory manner.

In other words, Becker says, "People break down when they are not 'doing' - when the world about them does not reflect the active involvement of their own creative powers." And to lose self power is to lose community.

It will be seen that this presents a particularly powerful conflict for women in non-traditional occupations who take on a more active and higher status function and involvement in the labour force but at the cost of challenging their acceptable social role as feminine women.

The successful social performer, then, learns to put forward a self (defined as "an attitude of self-regard inculcated into the child during his socialization,") that
is dependable and that can interact with others without threatening people's mutually "fragile self-esteem".\textsuperscript{27}

The fragility of this self-esteem, Becker suggests, stems from the fact that human meaning is arbitrary, a "purely symbolic creation."\textsuperscript{28}

Becker's analysis of role conflict and mental illness illuminate much of our understanding of the modern personality in conflict. It is, however, a personality out of the context of the organization of power. He focuses on the psychological to the exclusion of consideration of the impact of social, racial and sexual position on the psyche. For instance, his example of the various contradictory identities of a woman, clearly reveal some of his class, race and sex role assumptions. He describes a presumably "typical" woman as having the following qualities: "romantic lover, career, wealth, clever children with good heredity, winter house in Key West, appreciation of Bach."\textsuperscript{29}

Becker's analysis, and that of the others discussed so far in this chapter, offers some valuable insight which we can apply, indirectly, to women's situation. However, these men rarely or never submit themselves to a full analysis or even recognition of the unique circumstances of half the population they presume to talk about - the women.
Their vision is skewed from a woman's reality. They speak as white, middle class men. This brings us full circle to the sociology of Dorothy Smith.

It is significant that Dorothy E. Smith is the only woman in this gallery and the reasons for this are, indirectly, the theme of much of her work, that theme being how this society is symbolically ordered by men to the exclusion of women. Her relevance to this study lies in her pointing out the assumptions by which we delegitimize and deny the authority of female experience. She puts women and their unique social experience into the picture of the interplay of social and individual interests, which has been drawn so far by Marx, Mead, Simmel and Becker, and she points out the importance of women's beginning, in a necessarily exploratory manner, to reclaim their own voice.

Her inquiry begins in her own experience, with the realization of a "point of rupture" between her/our experience as women within the social forms of consciousness (the culture or ideology of our society, defined as "those ideas and images through which the class which rules the society...orders, organizes and sanctions...social relations") and the world as directly sensed prior to its social expression. Smith's work generally seeks to explore
this "line of fault" between women's experience and its organization as "knowledge" and asks how it is organized, how determined, and what are the social relations that generate it. 32

She acknowledges that society is organized symbolically - on paper, in mathematical, financial and other forms. What she emphasizes is that these symbolic forms are integral to the practice of power and they are wielded almost entirely by men.

Traditional sociology assumes that the knowers are "objective" and the knowns have the quality of "neutral truths." Smith stresses, to the contrary, that knowledge, including methods of thinking and inquiry, the decision as to what is legitimate as the object of inquiry and the symbols by which it is expressed, is socially acquired. Conceptual practices are not merely "tools" to be mechanically picked up and laid down. They are those practices which actually bring into being "the phenomena as such" in the knower's relation to the known as object. Methods of inquiry and of thinking, she emphasizes, spring from

* A notable exception, of course, is Georg Simmel. See p. 42-43 of this study.
"a determinate social relation among knowers and the human objects of their knowledge." The "knowers", far from being neutral abstractions, are members of a "definite social category occupying definite positions in the society." Their social category is male. Their position in society is dominant. The male pronoun does indeed locate a male subject. Because women do not share in the construction of social reality, Smith adopts Simone de Beauvoir's distinction, as elaborated on in *The Second Sex*, of men as subject and women as the Other, as object to men.

Inasmuch as the symbolic forms by which society is organized, are produced by men as the reflection of the male experience and position in society, they ignore, exclude and belittle the experience and issues that relate to women. This is reflected in the products of a wide array of ideological institutions including television, newspapers, religious institutions and academia. Because women are not in control of the symbolic means of organizing ("naming") and thus of even recognizing our experience, the modes of imaging our experience are produced for us by others who do not share that experience.*

---

*I here use the first person plural, making overt and visible the fact of my position in the social category of "women" in this society."
Women are not simply absent from the locations of the symbolic creation of meaning, we are denied positions in the social organization, production and transmission of ideas and images. We are literally silent because we do not own or operate the means to think or image, and the dominant (male) class assumes and relies upon that silence.

Smith explains this phenomenon very clearly by adapting Hegel's master/slave analogy to point out that the perspective of woman as slave or servant is essential to understanding the traditional social relations of men and women. If a man is to participate fully in the abstract mode of action, she points out, it is essential that someone else (namely woman/servant) focus her activities and interest upon his bodily existence, and the means by which concrete form is given to conceptual activities. This includes secretaries (who prepare in final form the letters he dictates), nurses (who administer the care he prescribes), and waitresses (who serve the food he cooks) as well as wives, who at almost every point "mediate for men the relation between the conceptual mode of action... and the actual material conditions upon which it depends." That is, woman/servant's service work, from the standpoint of the man/master is invisible because it is the job of the
efficient servant to make it so. This is a form of Marxist alienation, in that the harder and the better the woman works, the more she strengthens the order which oppresses her.

The separation of practical activity and the conceptual mode of organizing it leads to what Smith calls a "bifurcation of consciousness", a disjunction between the conceptual/abstract and the material/social aspects of consciousness for both women and men.

Smith stresses that these two modes, the (dominantly male) world of the conceptual and the (dominantly female) world of the material, are not by any means in an equal relation. The world as constituted by men stands in authority over that of women. Using the example of female academics, Smith points out that the few women who do enter these locations find themselves at the centre of a contradiction. They suffer not only a bifurcation of consciousness between their conceptual (professional) and practical (domestic) activity but further, they do not enter the discipline on the same terms as men in the first place. They do not fully appropriate its authority because men treat as significant only what other men say and what women say only as it is sanctioned by men.
This study will illustrate that women in non-traditional occupations suffer similar contradictions in that the structures of organization of their workplace have been established by men and within those structures women hold little authority. What they do does not count, they are invisible, because, as Bernard put it in a different but comparable context, "the image of the profession does not include them."

It could be argued that the world of the primary production worker and the tradesperson is a dominantly material one as well. That is, it is similar to the dominantly material world of the women/servant in relation to the man/master. In this sense, the blue collar worker stands in a feminine, subordinate relation to the white collar conceptual worker. This is reflected in the public status accorded to each kind of work. At the same time, however, the male blue collar worker stands in a superordinate position to women, particularly the women of his economic class. Men hold their authority, states Smith, not as individuals but by virtue of their belonging to the dominant sexual class, "because as men they appear as representatives of the power and authority of the institutionalized structures which govern the society."41 By
virtue of being men, working class men participate in the authority associated with this phenomenon.

The fact that women have no means to formulate or to express our experience is not a conspiracy nor a conscious manipulation by dominant men. Rather, Smith describes it as a class phenomenon of oppression. There is a class, men, occupying a set of positions in relation to a structure of power which reinforces the domination of that class.42 Within the existing system of social relations, then, women's lack of authority is clearly not biological but is socially constructed.43 To illustrate, Smith cites the violence done toward women throughout history who have dared to speak out authoritatively as women, particularly in religious and political contexts.

Making conscious the organization of our consciousness and seeking a mode of speaking our own women's experience, Smith observes, women begin "from nowhere. In opposing women's oppression we have had to resort to women's experience as yet unformulated and unformed, lacking means of expression, lacking symbolic forms, images, concepts...methods of analysis...lacking information and knowledge about ourselves and about other women."44 When Smith speaks of a method and style of research which
"begins from women's perspective" she refers to this essential return to women's direct experience in their everyday worlds. The first results of such research are works such as the *Northern British Columbia Women's Task Force on Single Industry Resource Communities*, the submission of the Fort Nelson and Whitehorse women to the gas pipeline inquiry, *Beyond the Pipeline*, Rolf Knight's, *A Very Ordinary Life*, Louise Howe's, *Pink Collar Workers*, *The Women's Press* publication, *Women at Work 1850-1930* and Terry Wetherby's, *Conversations*.

Smith acknowledges that women's lives at work in the labour force are as much determined as men's "by direct subordination to a managerial hierarchy" on the workplace. In other words, a standard conceptual sociological framework will work to explain a part of women's experience because essentially the same processes are in focus in this case for both women and men. The uniqueness of her contribution lies in the fact that she illustrates how women are also subject to a different relation to the world. Women in the labour force, Smith points out, must adapt to a man's framework of relations as well as, or within, or without, our own, unacknowledged one.

2 Ibid., p. 42.

3 This is the writer's modification of Marx's language. He and all other theorists in this section with the exception of Dorothy Smith, use the masculine pronoun as generic exclusively throughout their work.
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III. THE WORK

1. Relation to the Job

a. Background:

What we need to do is to begin to talk about women's work, to create a framework for making it visible, to take seriously the task of describing it.

- Helga Jacobson, 1978

When someone does exceptional or unusual work, it is traditional to seek some explanation of motivation in their background. Not to abandon tradition entirely, then, the matter of women's history was considered relevant to this study. There were some fairly striking consistencies in the backgrounds of the 22 women interviewed that it would be interesting to pursue in a more systematic way in some further study.

The strongest pattern was that of a tradition of having working mothers. Sixteen of the women interviewed had mothers who had worked at least part-time when their daughters were growing up.

Not one of the women interviewed had been encouraged nor had the ambition to become a non-traditional worker as a child. Several had had the experience of helping their fathers do mechanical and construction work
during their youth, or were raised by mothers alone who needed their help in more ways than are usually expected of a girl. Many of these women fought and climbed trees and puttered with their fathers over cars as children. Almost to a woman they declared themselves tomboys ("but if you'd called me one, I would have beat you up") but they were unanimously forced to deal with the contradiction that though such behaviour was all right for them as girls, it must be suppressed and their interests redirected as grown up women. "I did all of the quote, 'male' jobs around the house," a carpenter explained. "But while I was doing all the heavy work I was always told that it wasn't really appropriate."

When they applied to take shop courses in high school several were denied entrance and only one woman took two such courses ("electronics and drafting, I did terrible").

They all grew up to parent's ambitions, which they duly tried to fulfill, along the traditional lines of secretary, teacher or nurse. In fact they became nursing aides, mothers, waitresses, secretaries, barmaids, salesclerks, bank clerks, bookkeepers and chambermaids, a veritable who's who of traditional women's service oriented occupations.
The majority of the women were single (ten of them) or married and living with their husbands (eight). Five of the eight married women had children and two of the single ones. Four women were divorced or separated and three of these had children.

The other consistency in these women's lives was that of class background. Every father was involved in blue collar or trades work with the exception of one who owned new car dealerships in the United States. Among the rest were included an electrician, a heavy duty mechanic, engineers, a longshoreman, a fisherman and a telegrapher. Only two of the daughters were involved in the same line of work as their fathers (fishing and engineering) and one had tried and grew impatient of waiting for the pre-apprenticeship that would have placed her in the same trade as her father, an electrician.

The primary motivation toward seeking non-traditional work was the attraction of high wages for unskilled work. "I was after the money," "I just needed the money and I had no training for any of the nice jobs," "I just needed the money - I was broke," were common responses, or as one put it more forcefully after switching from office to
labouring work, "Why in the hell should we have to take low paying jobs?"

In summary then, the backgrounds of the women interviewed showed several trends in common. That is, they were predominantly the daughters of working mothers, and fathers who were blue collar workers. Almost without exception they were childhood tomboys and several attempted (unsuccessfully) to take shop courses in high school. When they "grew up", however, every one was expected to and did follow traditional female patterns of employment. Most were either single and self-supporting or married and living with their husbands.

The balance of this study will comprise an analysis and description of the outstanding characteristics and relations of the non-traditional workplace for women as defined in Chapter 1.
b. **Getting Hired: "No Room!"**

"They like to hire men."

- Female truckdriver, 1978

Once past the hurdle of simply accepting the idea of non-traditional work as a feasible one for them, the first major difficulty women faced in non-traditional jobs was that of getting hired. Men, of course, deal with this problem as well. "If you want a job in a trade," a tradeswoman said, "don't think that it's easy for a guy either, because it's not necessarily." Nonetheless, women face particular difficulties in getting hired that include minimum height/weight requirements, the lack of women's facilities and generally biased attitudes and assumptions about women's strength, capabilities and ambitions.

Obviously, employers in resource industries want to be as confident as possible within reasonable limits that every person they hire is capable of handling the job required of them. In the course of interviewing candidates, certain "objective" criteria and others less objective, are used to attain this end. For example, people with industrial experience have a higher likelihood of adjusting quickly to the job with fewer accidents and a higher probability of staying for some time. They offer a better
risk than those who have no such experience. Likewise, management tends to accept generalizations as to the work performances of sex or racial groups, as a kind of "short-hand" rather than judging each individual on their particular merits. In the case of women, Becker has pointed out that sex (along with age) is "the most direct cue for action" in indicating to people how they should respond to others in the role behaviour that goes along, in this case, with their sex. In other words, management's most immediate and common response to a job applicant is to attach to that person the assumption of role behaviours that, as a result of historical, social and economic conditions, have come to be associated with them. For women, the traditional feminine role in the face of heavy physical demands is one of physical weakness, mechanical incompetence and a primary commitment to the domestic sphere rather than the paid labour force. This assumption was obvious in management comments such as, "Women are more emotional," "Women don't look into the future in terms of a career," "Women work conscientiously and they find routine work less boring," "Women are not physically successful," and "Women prefer seasonal work so they can be home more, have babies and things like that." Traditional responses to non-traditional behaviours therefore
lead to the assumption not just by (male) management but also by male peers, that women will fail at industrial work. It is presumably for the same reason (of role expectations) that it is assumed that men will succeed.

In the face of Becker's work which emphasizes the importance of proper and predictable role behaviour to people's sense of shared values and social security, "assume" may be read as "hope". It is the assertion of this study that all of the "reasons" given for not hiring women are basically smoke screens for the fact that most men hope, doubtless often unconsciously, that women will fail. For the mere presence of women on the non-traditional worksite offers a major challenge and threat of disruption to the social order. If it be acknowledged that women can do this job, there must needs be a major readjustment to many of our deepest expectations of the behaviour associated with sex. Many men hope that women will fail. They therefore assume it.

In the face of this assumption, numerous "reasons" are given for not hiring women, including lack of facilities, height/weight restrictions and women's inadequate strength. Each will be dealt with briefly within the context of the assumptions explained above, and keeping in mind that all
of these jobs have been successfully performed by women as recently as World War II.

One common reason given for not hiring women, particularly in camps, is the lack of facilities. By law, employers must provide separate washrooms for male and female employees "except where the maximum number of employees on any shift is less than six, when one water closet is required." There is no provision in the law for separate living quarters in isolated working locations.

The rationale given for not hiring women is not that the company will not provide such facilities but that because the facilities do not exist, the women cannot work there. This situation is particularly acute in isolated camps.* Women who are finally hired as "firsts" on any work site must often put up with the inconvenience and discomfort of shared, jerry-rigged, distant or occasionally, no washroom.

*It is one of the little known legends of the early days of the women's movement in Vancouver that the Vancouver Status of Women purchased its own Johnny-on-the-Spot for just such situations. At least one woman who applied for a logging job in an isolated camp when met with the usual, "We would hire you but we have no facilities," rejoined, "Oh, but I have my own" and sallied into the true north armed with the borrowed toilet. (Personal communication, Rosemary Brown, Member of the Legislative Assembly of B.C., September 1979.)
at all. Until women and their separate needs become "normal" on the non-traditional work site, this issue will continue to be a source of awkwardness and an excuse for the exclusion of women.

Several British Columbia companies have instituted minimum height and weight limits that require non-clerical female staff to be a minimum of 5'6" in height and weigh 140 pounds. The rationale is usually that this assures a high probability that any woman hired can handle any job demands for strength, as height and weight have been shown to have a direct correlation with strength.

This requirement presents many contradictions. First, as one employment officer rationalized it, "If a woman fails at these jobs she leaves a negative work record for all women in the eyes of the foremen, her peers and management." Minimum height/weight requirements, she concluded, would help to assure that women would succeed at these jobs and thus maintain the "authenticity" of women working.

Such an approach assumes that women are not "authentic" at such work, that they have no inherent right to do it. It also accepts the assumption that women as a whole are less physically competent than men. Like the
assumption that "all blacks have rhythm", it generalizes from a few that "all women are weak".

This issue of women's strength as a measure of their suitability for non-traditional work is generally considered by kinanthropometric specialists and the women themselves, as a red herring.

In terms of actual strength, Dr. W. Ross, a Kinanthropometrist at Simon Fraser University, points out that although men tend to have larger cross sectional areas of muscle, "per square centimetre of muscle, strength is a constant between men and women." In other words, men and women with the same amount of muscle mass, are equal in strength. Further, whereas most men will generally outperform most women in gross strength activities (because of more muscle mass), most women in turn outperform most men in other physical respects such as endurance, including endurance to heat stress. Ross points out that women are very prone to improvement in physical performance with training, particularly when they are highly committed to improving that performance. Research by Sally Luce ("Women's Athletic Potential") and Ann George ("Occupational Health Hazards to Women") support the same conclusions.
Recent studies such as Chaffin's on preemployment strength testing, bear out that "intragender variability in the strength of males and females is very large. Gender thus appears to become secondary to strength per se."

In addition, variables such as endurance and commitment must be taken into account in each individual case.

As far as the women were concerned, they stressed that "there are other ways to handle weight apart from pure muscle." Women spoke of learning how to handle weight not with brute strength but using balance, coordination and knowhow. "I taught the women who were new on the job how to tip the dolly first with their foot. After that, handling it was a cinch." "When I shovelled I used my hip and arm for leverage." "I carried things from my waist down as much as possible." "It's a question of the right balance," they said. Mechanization has eliminated many of the jobs that once required brute force. A male millwright remembered how "25 years ago a hydraulic lift for 5000 pounds weighed 60 pounds by itself. Now, a spreader that can lift 10,000 pounds weighs 15 pounds." Women took advantage of mechanization and they learned skills on the job by which they could increase their strength. "Put a longer handle on anything so I can improve my leverage," said a labourer, "and I can
handle anything." Women observed that their strength and endurance markedly increased with time spent on the job and they stressed that some of their domestic experience was directly useful to them in terms of strength. "I had good shoulders," pointed out a labourer, "because I packed my daughter on my back for two years." They also commented on their physical socialization, that if, as girls, they had been encouraged to use their bodies more, they probably would have had less difficulty with physical adjustment to the job. "I had to learn that getting strong hurts!" a pulp and paper mill operator said.

There are other assumptions behind height/weight regulations for women that are clearly erroneous. One is that such regulation guarantees minimal capacities for handling the most physically demanding jobs. But one personnel officer admitted that smaller women have successfully handled extremely taxing jobs. "We had a woman who was only 5 feet tall," the officer reported, "but I knew she could handle the job so I told her to stand on her toes if she had to, to pass the test."

Further, again by company personnel's own admission not everyone has to work at every job. By virtue of the fact that you enter the job progression where there is an opening,
many employees never have to perform the most gruelling
jobs of any given industry. As one woman who had spent
several years in a sawmill and was presently employed in
management pointed out, "It's bullshit that anyone starting
has to go through an entire job progression. It depends on
who quits."

Recently the B.C. Human Rights Branch made a
ruling that the height/weight restriction as required in a
Vancouver Island sawmill, constituted discrimination. It
remains to be seen if this restriction will be likewise
challenged at other locations in the province.

It can be hypothesized that management's assumption
that women cannot succeed is partly self-fulfilling, for
women's job successes have a tendency to remain invisible.
Management personnel showed an outstanding memory for women
who had failed, and a correspondingly poor one for the women
who had unspectacularly proceeded to successfully do the job.
One manager who at that moment had 53 women employed in non-
traditional capacities in his mill, told the interviewer
that women are a bad bet because "one woman took two days
off every time she had a period. We soon got rid of her,"
he concluded. He failed to see any parallel to men who
regularly took time off for "benders", nor could he comment
on all the women who were successfully carrying out their jobs without this particular quirk of behaviour. The knowledge that not every woman had been successful (an unfair expectation under any criteria) was apparent justification for caution in hiring other individuals who were women.

Some of management's reasons for not hiring women seem to bear more justification. For example, management personnel argued that women's lack of industrial experience was a major reason for not hiring them. Here, women are caught in the old bind, "Come back when you have experience." This is a difficulty faced by anyone, male or female, seeking to enter a new field, but it appears that it is used more often as an excuse not to hire women, than for men.

Another reason for not hiring women that bears consideration is the fact that many women, particularly in isolated areas, apply for industrial jobs with no work experience outside the home whatsoever. The Personnel Manager of a northern mine pointed out that "roughly half our applicants are women and most of them have no experience working outside the home whatsoever. They aren't a very good employment risk."

When one woman active for six years in non-traditional work heard this comment she asserted angrily, "Any woman who can do a half-decent job of establishing work
patterns by which to run a home and a family has more valid experience than any kid fresh out of high school." She went on to point out that women handle weight around the house (moving furniture, carrying loads of wet laundry and heavy babies), use tools such as mixers and toasters and often do minor repairs to electrical fixtures. They do manual labour (shovelling snow and racking leaves), learn "eyeball" and measuring skills from sewing and cooking, and gain the invaluable experience of learning how to juggle several jobs at once. "You learn, as part of your training as a wife to be able to keep an eye on supper while you're picking up around the house and watching the child, all at the same time. A woman who has gone through that experience," she concluded, "is going to be able to handle multiple instructions from her foreman."

A somewhat more feasible reason for management's hesitation to hire women was the awareness that most women carry two jobs - one in the paid labour force and one in the unpaid domestic sphere as manager of the home and family.*

*The old argument that women's bodies could not stand up to the same work as men is now being questioned by some theorists who believe that the women's fatigue may be due not so much to sex differences as such as to the fact that they often have two full time jobs. See Ann George, "Occupational Health Hazards to Women," p.67.
The fear and the assumption that every woman's first commitment would be to her home and family was another subtle deterrent to hiring women. All these factors together reinforce the traditional assumption associated with the female role that "women are trouble". It is easier not to hire them.

The almost total lack of statistics in regard to women's applications, hiring and promotion and training, make it difficult to challenge the fact of management bias with anything other than contrary opinion. However, one study available at the time of this research suggests some interesting bases for further research. It was conducted as a follow up study at Kitimat's Alcan smelter one year after women were first hired. Briefly, for the 24 women hired and a control group of 24 men hired at about the same time, figures indicated that "total absentee rates for men and women were not significantly different." There was "no difference in absence rates due to injury," the total number of Worker's Compensation Board claims for men and women were similar and "no differences between termination rates for men and women was recorded."

One further deterrent to the hiring of women lies in an apparent confusion between union and management.
Women applying to industry are often told, "You must go through the union before we can hire you." When they approach the union they are told they can only join it after they are hired by the company. Caught in the apparent Catch-22, many women give up.

Finally, on the issue of hiring women into non-traditional areas of work, it is important to remember that the basic decisions as to which characteristics are desirable in an employee, have been established by men, over time, with other men's specific qualities and lifestyle in mind. In other words, the present basis of decision making based on strength and industrial experience rather than, say, endurance, commitment and initiative, or the assumption that families will be cared for by "someone else" at home, are themselves major controlling factors in assuring that it is difficult for women to be hired for non-traditional jobs.

The question then arises, with such bias against her in the first stage of hiring, how does a woman go about getting a non-traditional job? With some support from the women's movement, the Human Rights Branch and pressures on industrial management to find a stable workforce, most women got their jobs by dint of stubborn persistence, good timing and luck.
Tenacity was vital among women successful at finding non-traditional work. "You have to have the ambition and just bug somebody until you get the chance." One woman reported how, when she applied, "they said they didn't have any work. All I had was enough money to pay my next month's rent so I bugged them. For a few days I drove out there, 10 miles on my 10 speed bike. Then I phoned every day, I was persistent. After two weeks I got on." Another woman described how "all summer I spent the mornings going out hassling other people for a job and the afternoons working for someone for free just to get the experience."

Women were also hired because they were at the right place at the right time and "they couldn't get anyone else i.e. a man, to do it." Some were willing to do jobs and work for employers that nobody else would. They also had to be willing, for the sake of experience, to accept the lower rates that often went with such work. "One guy had the reputation for being the absolute worst to work for. Nobody lasted there more than a month or two and I thought, 'Damn it! I've tried everybody else!' I went down there and he hired me, at less than minimum wage because I wanted that job so bad."
Applying at small, non-unionized family shops was another accessible opening for several women, but again at the cost of lower wages and less job security. "The experience you're getting," as one woman who had done it attested, "is a direct tradeoff with the fact that you are cheap!"

The recent resurgence of the women's movement has been a boon to women looking for work in non-traditional areas. As of 1978 there were 68 women's centres outside the Lower Mainland area of B.C., one of their functions being to encourage women to examine their options and give them the confidence to tackle new challenges. Only three of the women interviewed identified themselves as Feminist, but several others were willing to acknowledge that, as a mine mill operator put it, "It has made women a lot freer to do what they want."

A major factor in women's favour and one which helps contribute to an understanding of why so many women began non-traditional work in B.C. in 1973-4, is the fact of a major labour shortage confronted by industry at that time. A study on hourly employee turnover by Alcan of Canada's Kitimat smelter, noted that the company's turnover in 1972 and 1973 was higher than in each of the previous five years.
In 1967 the turnover rate had been 38%. The study goes on to cite pulp mill turnover levels in Kitimat and Prince Rupert of 45% and 70% respectively in 1973. Logging operations in the Kitimat-Terrace area and on Vancouver Island are quoted as having turnover rates of 100-225% and the mining industry is reported to have turnover rates ranging to 120% and 200% in 1973. One of industries' chief responses was a willingness to hire women "in order to take advantage of a readily available stable labour pool," that is, the wives and daughters of men already working.

This willingness to hire women was not without some relation to the reorganization of the Human Rights Branch. Perhaps the single most important factor in the continuing presence of a number of women in non-traditional work in British Columbia today is the existence of the B.C. Human Rights Branch. In 1974 a revised Human Rights Code went into effect to be administered by the Human Rights Branch. The Branch, reorganized under the NDP government, was given considerable staff and the power to investigate and settle complaints of discrimination around the province, if necessary by calling formal hearings under the Ministry of Labour. From a situation of few complaints and fewer hearings, there are now in excess of 600 complaints per year.
to the Branch and approximately 10 hearings. The Branch was instrumental to several women spoken to during the course of this research in getting their jobs, in achieving equal pay to men doing the same work and in one case, assuring that a woman would be the first female to attend B.C.'s only mining school.

The simple existence of the Human Rights Branch with the enforcement powers it carries, seems to act as a major deterrent to sex discrimination in employment. Several employers mentioned among their reasons for hiring women, their awareness of penalties imposed by the Branch for unfair hiring practices.
c. Where Are All the Journeywomen?

They found themselves without a tradition, without experience, without confidence, and without knowhow.

- Philip Wylie, 1951
The Disappearance

It is traditional in resource related industries that employees without skill (as is the case with most women) enter at the labourer or unskilled level and progress via on-the-job training through a series of jobs offering them increasing degrees of responsibility and challenge. In addition, employees who choose to become specialized in some particular aspect of the work, may choose a trade, as mechanic, electrician, millwright or whatever, and ask their employer for special training, called an apprenticeship that will lead within three to five years to certification as a journeyman or "master" of that trade.

It is understood when an employer signs an apprenticeship agreement with an employee that they will ensure that that employee receives on-the-job training and that they are released for from four to eight weeks of theoretical training in each year of the apprenticeship. Study sessions take place at schools scattered throughout the province. Tuition is free. Each student receives a
subsidization allowance from Canada Employment and a travel allowance for one return trip between home and school.

Under certain collective agreements, where the employee is unionized, employers must compensate the apprentice for the difference between regular wages and the subsistence allowance. Other employers may pay apprentices a stipend during study periods and if eligible, apprentices may, in addition, receive Unemployment Insurance benefits during their technical training, or in-school, periods. Upon successful completion of the indenture period, both on-the-job and technical training, the apprentice is granted an apprenticeship certificate. S/he is now a journeyman.

As preparation for formal apprenticeship training, people may take a non-compulsory pre-apprenticeship. A student sponsored by Canada Employment or the Ministry of Labour receives free tuition, a travel allowance and a subsistence allowance. (Those sponsored by the Ministry of Labour receive a lower training allowance at present.) There are the same possibilities for Unemployment Insurance benefits, where eligible, as during apprenticeship study periods. Depending on the employer, pre-apprenticeship training may count as time worked toward the apprenticeship. It is the responsibility of the pre-apprentice and apprentice, to find
an employer willing to apprentice them.

As women clearly pointed out, it is hard for anyone, man or woman, to get a trade. Also, it is becoming less rewarding by virtue of declining rates of subsistence pay during training periods and a narrowing wage gap between tradesmen and non-tradesmen in most union jobs.

Nonetheless, the advantages of "having a trade" for women are outstanding. They include higher wages, more interesting and responsible work, more pleasant working conditions, greater access to jobs and greater security within them. "A tradesperson can pick and choose where they want to work," as a union official, himself a journeyman, put it. Further, a skilled trade would grant women a higher status which would perhaps serve to enforce acceptance on the non-traditional workplace where there is respect for skill.

However, as Leah Cohen in her recent study of apprenticeship training for women points out, "It is our contention that women are the victims of pervasive discrimination which effectively bars their entry or poisons their work environment to such an extent, that significant participation is not possible." The factors working against successful trades training for women are at least
fourfold. They are:

1. A general lack of adequate financing and clear information about trades training.

2. Women's responsibility for two jobs, domestic and labour force, with no provisions for support services such as day care that would make taking on a prolonged training program feasible.

3. General hostility or at best, inertia, among those responsible for the trades training programs, including at the high school level.*

4. Women's lack of industrial experience and their lack of confidence in seeking out that experience and demanding training.

Women are not being trained. As of April 1979 out of a total of 12,938 apprentices indentured in B.C., 975 or 7.5% were women. When the large numbers of female hairdressing and barbering apprentices are removed from

---

*The Vancouver School Board has experimented in three high schools with a compulsory Grade 8 course that combines Home Economics and Industrial Arts, for both boys and girls. There are no plans to extend this program and it is the opinion of both the Vancouver Coordinator of Industrial Education, Ralph Ralston, and the B.C. Ministry of Education's Program Superintendent, D.L. Hartwig, that girls do not participate in optional Industrial Education programs to any significant degree, "out of lack of interest". (Personal communication, Ralph Ralston, August 1979 and D.L. Hartwig, October 1979.)
the 1979 total, the remaining 251 apprentices represent only 2.0% of those in all apprenticeship programs. Pitifully, this compares favourably to a national average of 1.0%.

In pre-apprenticeship programs designed to familiarize students with skills required for apprenticeable trades, the picture is not much better. In April 1979 there were 29 women out of 497 pre-apprenticeship students, or 5.8% of the total. This suggests there will be no reason to expect "significant increases" in the numbers of women entering non-traditional occupations in the skilled areas.

Theoretically, Canada Employment has an Affirmative Action Program in force by which one seat in each pre-apprenticeship program is reserved for a woman until two weeks before the program begins, at which point it is given to the next comer. But this action is still irregularly enforced.

And so it goes. Apart from almost insignificant training allowances, training arrangements are particularly unsatisfactory for married women and single parents. They do not allow for the fact that a woman must often travel away from home for her course when there is no allowance for housekeeping or child care, and for only one
return trip fare. The structure of these training programs assumes that where there is a family, the wife will do the housekeeping and child care in the husband's absence, while he is being trained. No such parallel assumption can be made for husbands. Considering women's usual degree of responsibility for the home, the organization of training programs further fail to take into account the strain of a woman's being absent from family for from 4 to 20 weeks for each year of the apprenticeship for technical training.

One response to the specific difficulty of lack of industrial experience is a trades training program, a sort of pre-pre-apprenticeship, geared specifically to women. Called the Women's Experimental Apprenticeship Training (W.E.A.T.) Program, it was initiated as a pilot project in 1976 by Christine Waddell of the Ministry of Labour to give women hands-on experience in as wide a number of trades in as supportive an atmosphere as possible. The program was initiated specifically as an attempt to counter the problem of a serious lack of women in official apprenticeship programs but it suffers similar difficulties to other training programs in regard to insufficient allowances and no job carry through.
On the job, there are further obstacles to women's being trained. Many foremen showed lack of concern for women's gaining skills on the job. "The guys all had five days' training on the trucks. I had three days and then was told to go drive," a driver reported. "I trained for three weeks and my boyfriend trained for a month when he started the same job," remarked a Power Plant operator, "so I know I didn't get any extra training." One woman applied twice for different apprenticeships, both times with the express disapproval of her foreman. The second time she got second highest marks on a qualifying exam. The man who came first withdrew, leaving her eligible for the position, but when she went to claim it she was told it had been withdrawn. Another woman seeking an apprenticeship in carpentry commented, "They have no apprentices in carpentry at all, and I really think they're not putting it through because I'm next in line for the apprentice program. I don't know if they think I'm a bad risk or it's the principle. They've never had a woman in an apprentice program here."

Only one woman reported extra concern over her training that went to near bizarre extremes in an effort to prove beyond any shadow of a doubt that a woman could handle any job in the mill. "Until I could do every job
perfect," she said, "they wouldn't move me on. If there was a raise in pay for the next job I was supposed to move up to because of a vacancy, they usually kept me at the lower job but at the higher rate of pay."

Considering the difficulties here very briefly outlined, the number of skills among the women interviewed are striking. Only one woman was a certified journeyperson but six others had "tickets" indicating some level of specialized skill. These included a blasting ticket, three people with Class 3 tickets as repairwomen, an air brake ticket and a lumber grading ticket. In addition, several women held Industrial First Aid tickets and one was in the process of earning a Trades Qualification Certificate. The Trades Qualification Certificate appears to be a practical way for women to gain certification because it consists entirely of on-the-job training (with a final exam) and does not demand away-from-home study. Unfortunately, the Ministry of Labour requires that "persons just starting in a designated trade [one of 26 major trades] in B.C. are required to enter into an apprenticeship with an employer." In other words, the more convenient trades qualification is not an option for women within these 26 trades.

It should be noted that every woman who achieved
some level of skilled training did so with the strong support of a boss, her crew, her family and not infrequently, the Human Rights Branch. The woman who held a lumber grading ticket had originally piled lumber. "The owner of the planer mill," she said, "was the one who really encouraged me to go for my grading ticket. 'I'd really like to see you girls go for it,' he said." For another woman it was her supervisor who supported her. "The very day he hired me as a labourer he said, 'You'll have to study for your course.' And he was on my back all the time so I couldn't very well slack off." She laughed. "He really wanted to see women do different things." Still another woman had encouragement from her crew. "I might not have got my ticket," she remarked, "but the four guys I was working with really wanted me to get it. I wouldn't have done it without their sympathy and support."

Employers who didn't want to train women claimed "women aren't motivated" and "women are more career minded in an office structure than in the industrial structure." This is consistent with social role expectation but it is belied by studies that indicate that job commitment and interest are directly related to the degree of job control.
There is one further explanation to the argument that women "don't want" trades training. It has to do with the fact that success of this nature on the non-traditional workplace undoubtedly increases a woman's already significant conspicuousness. That is, "fear of success" may be fear of visibility. Women's avoidance or failure to pursue specialized training in the face of opposition may be a reasonable response to already excessive visibility on the job.
d. **Working Conditions**

Females and children may be counted upon to work for small wages, to submit to petty exasperating exactions and to work uncomplainingly for long hours.

- Royal Commission on Relations of Labour and Capital, 1888

The romance of doing physical labour for a living, the excitement of being a pioneer in a man's field, the challenge and the novelty, are fairly quickly dispelled in the course of performing difficult, often routine and monotonous physical labour.

In general, working conditions, with the exception of physical facilities in some cases, are roughly equivalent for both men and women. But they are conditions that women, often accustomed to the cleanliness and order of an office or restaurant or home often find "really appalling" to adjust to.

Depending on the industry and specific conditions of each workplace, women must adapt to dirt, air and chemical pollutants, physically strenuous work in every kind of weather, and the general industrial dangers of heights and holes, falling objects, molten metals, high temperatures, heavy machinery and dangerous tools.
One of the major dangers was human carelessness. One labourer told of working beside a friend who was responsible for filling a bucket full of cement that was then lifted to a second story. "I guess they hadn't checked the rope and it broke," she said. "The full bucket just missed her and splatted all over her. She didn't cry but she sat there and shook."

"Minor" chemical irritants were common. One woman working in the Bleach Plant of a pulp and paper mill "always had flakes coming off my skin. They also always told us to drink beer after work because it would help us burp up the gases we inhaled."

Perhaps working conditions are best described by women's own accounts of what they did at work. For example, a deckhand: "The skipper would come down and shake my leg in the morning. 'Time to get to work.' I would stagger out of bed, no tea or coffee, nothing like that, put on my work clothes and at 5 o'clock in the morning I would be out there chopping up frozen herring, putting it on the hooks, making bundles of hooks. It would take almost two hours to set four skeins and then I would make breakfast. After breakfast we would start picking up the lines. You were lucky if you got a half hour to yourself in a day."
Another woman described her first job in a planner mill: "I only did one job when I started. I cut little sticks into smaller sticks. She laughed at the memory. "I stood out in the rain and the weather, that's all. My hands got all wet and cold and frozen and I dug that stuff out of the snow and the mud and cut it up."

Still another told of how "the way they burn stuff inside the Recovery Boiler is they spray it in and it runs down the walls of the boiler. There are 150 holes, maybe more, around the base of the boiler where the air goes in and keeps the stuff from splatting out. The stuff hardens, it's black like lava, and my job was to go round with a rod, bent over at a 95° angle, banging the black stuff out of the holes. They called it 'punching the bitch'. It was hard. Four times a night you'd have to do a round and it took me 50 minutes a round. It took the guys 45. At first your hands sweat. You're wearing gloves and it rubs so you get really bad blisters. Until they go into calluses it's really sore."

One woman's most physically taxing job was sacking in a mine mill. "Lead ore was rolling off this belt in a powder and I had to pack it down in a box that was about 6' x 4'. First you had to make the boxes. They were hard
to make. You had to put a big square steel frame down on the pallet and then take the sides and put them on. The frames were metal and the sides were wooden with metal corners and you had to balance the sides so that they wouldn't fall in, then you had to put another frame on top, and keep them up and that would make the box. But if you didn't put the frame right square on top, the whole thing would collapse and your box would be filling up.

"You couldn't stop the lead coming down. Sometimes it would go slow but other times it would go really fast and you would be just burning around. While one box is filling up you make another one and keep packing down the first one because if you don't pack it down while it's wet it wouldn't weigh enough. It's easier to pack down while it's wet.

"Sometimes I got behind but then you get caught up again and you keep packing it down and just shovel to get it up off the floor and fill the box up. You could let it pile up on the floor for maybe two or three minutes but that would be it. Then you wouldn't have anywhere to move your box and you'd be in trouble.

"After it was full you'd cover it up and wrap it with metal strapping, put a card on each end with the number and date and the weight and then write the number on the list."
Then you'd use the crane to move the box because it weighs 12,000 pounds. How long would the whole process take? Sometimes it was coming as fast as 15 minutes for a complete box and sometimes it would take 45 minutes."

Perhaps because, being new to industrial work, women have not yet become oblivious to the dangers of industrial work, they were conscientious in wearing standard safety gear. "I wouldn't even try to go in without steel toed boots," a mill worker stressed. They were highly active on Safety Committees and many held Industrial First Aid certificates. ("At least if something happens I won't have to stand there feeling helpless," was how one labourer explained her motivation.)

Safety programs on the job were generally limited to a few signs scattered around the workplace and non-unionized sites tended to be even more minimal in their safety standards. "Training?" one woman said. "You walk out and the foreman says, 'Work here.' Then you watch the guy beside you until you figure out what he's doing and then you do the same. That's your training. And if somebody happens to be polite enough to say, 'Watch out for the forklift,' well, that's your safety training."
Those aspects of their working conditions which women found most difficult were shiftwork and their dual workload.

Shift work is the organization of labour whereby workers are divided into a number of "crews", each with all the experience and skills to run the "shift" or working time. If an industry runs for more than eight hours in a day, each crew is put on a rotating schedule of hours so that the mill or industry can work continuously, usually 16 or 24 hours a day. There are three shifts that are most often divided as follows: Days, 8 a.m. to 4 p.m.; afternoons, 4 p.m. to midnight; nights or graveyard, midnight to 8 a.m.. Crews take turns on each shift on a rotating schedule that varies with the demands of the industry and the desires of management, foremen and occasionally, workers themselves.

Shift work, as opposed to working "steady days" has always posed physical, social and psychological problems for the people working on this schedule. It is physiologically and emotionally difficult to adapt to relatively rapid and extreme changes in the work/sleep/leisure schedule as well as being socially disruptive.

Women are in a unique position in regard to shift work if they have a family. The shift work schedule is based around the premise that someone i.e. the wife, will
be at home 24 hours a day to look after the reproductive labour of the home. When women, especially single mothers, go on shiftwork, no such similar expectation can be made. This bears on the fact that women working in the labour force carry a dual work load which consists of one job in the labour force and one job at home as being primarily responsible for family care. Canadian time studies indicate that women in full time jobs "have the heaviest work load and the least amount of time for leisure, averaging at least 63 hours a week in...paid and unpaid activities."

Women may assume a "man's" job but they are not thereby released from their material, bodily responsibilities. In their peculiar dual role as homemakers and as workers within an otherwise masculine frame of reference, they straddle two consciousnesses. Their two identities as wife/mother and as craftsperson have no social bases of integration (they are still "exceptional" on the job) and therefore no individual one. The effect is one of extensive strain. When someone pointed out that men seemed to handle shift work better than women, a labourer and single mother of two snapped back, "Well, I guess! I could handle it too if somebody washed my clothes and did my cooking!"

The lack of adequate childcare, including the difficulty of finding reliable babysitters who are willing
to work shifts, is a major difficulty in women's being able to easily handle their dual work load. A 1973 survey by the Ministry of Labour on the child care arrangements of working mothers indicated that "of those in B.C. who wished to work but were not doing so, 32% cited inability to make satisfactory childcare arrangements as their reason for not joining the labour force."

In this, women have no public support. When a Personnel Officer organizing for the introduction of women into her industry approached the local Human Resources office for 24 hour daycare, they told her they could not legitimately "condone" a woman dropping off her child at midnight for "someone else" to look after, even if shiftwork is a reality for mothers. This difficulty is not by any means limited to B.C. In Canada as a whole, only 7.0% of children are cared for in day-care centres or nurseries. Some 80% of child-care arrangements for pre-schoolers are paid care in the mother's or sitter's home or are unpaid care by relatives or neighbours. Despite lack of daycare, 1971 as compared to 1976 data show evidence of "a trend towards increased labour force participation by women with children."

It is difficult for women not to take on this general public attitude and it is reflected in their guilt
at leaving their children while they worked. "I've had lots of times when I felt really, really guilty because I wasn't home with my youngest," women said, and "I felt bad about going out to work but I had to." Another mused, "They make you feel guilty if you have kids and have to leave 'em to work, and guilty if you're too selfish and don't have 'em. Either way you can't win." This conflict is not unique to women in non-traditional work.
2. **Relation to Others**

a. **Conspicuousness**

When men look at a meeting of a board of trustees and see only men, they think they are observing a sexless world rather than a masculine world. For women are the bearers of sex.

- Marcia Millman & Rosabeth Kanter
  1975, *Another Voice*

Women experience two separate but interrelated kinds of discrimination on the non-traditional workplace. One is sexual. The other is the discrimination associated with the position of tokenism, which is experienced primarily as a sense of acute conspicuousness on the job.

Georg Simmel has done classic analyses of the significance of numbers for social life. But he dealt almost exclusively with the impact of absolute numbers as a determinant of group form and process. The life of women on non-traditional workplaces, as in the upper reaches of a corporation, is greatly influenced by the proportions in which men and women find themselves and which create a strikingly different interaction context for women than for men. As Rosabeth Moss Kanter points out in her ground-breaking study of women in minority positions in corporations, "We have no vocabulary for dealing with the effects of relative numbers, of proportional representation."
Kanter initiates the development of such a vocabulary by drawing out the three major tendencies she observed in the position of the women in her study of a major industrial corporation in the United States. These were: visibility, contrast and assimilation. These she discerns as the major characteristics of minorities in "skewed groups" which she defines as those in which "there is a large preponderance of one type over another, up to a ratio of perhaps 85:15" in which "the numerically dominant types also control the group and its culture in enough ways to be labelled 'dominants'." *

In this section, the three characteristics of Kanter's skewed group, visibility, contrast and assimilation, will be applied against the experience of women in non-traditional occupations in order to observe any similarity of patterns. If such similarity is marked, we may conclude that we have begun to move toward an understanding of the social effects of proportional representation. The applicability of the definition of the "skewed" group to women in

*Other group types she identifies are "uniform", which have only one significant social type; "tilted", which begin to move toward less extreme distribution with ratios of perhaps 65:35 in which dominants and tokens become simply "majority" and "minority"; and "balanced" groups at about 60:40 or 50:50.
non-traditional occupations is confirmed both by the ratio of their numbers on any work site, which can be generously averaged to a ratio of $95:5$ and by the fact that as this study will clearly show, the culture of this workplace is dominated by the dominant group, the men.

(i) Visibility:

Kanter defines visibility as the fact that "tokens get attention. One by one, they have higher visibility than dominants looked at alone."

This fact of visibility and conspicuousness was certainly relevant to non-traditional work. In fact, the awareness of being highly conspicuous, a "freak", is one of the first and most outstanding impressions of any woman who is new to non-traditional labour. "Everybody keeps an eye on what you're doing," they said. "You're conscious of the fact that people look at you," "I really felt that I was performing," were frequent comments. For women who were "firsts", this conspicuousness was near legendary. The first female labourer hired in a mine told this story.

"There's this railing up above my floor," she said. "I'm down on the bottom floor and I'm doing my work on the first day and I'm busy packing away, just working my butt off. And something makes me look up. And here
they are - about 12 guys on the railing, just watching me. Finally the boss comes along and says, 'All right, you guys, back to work.' So everyone goes back to their job and then all the others, carpenter shop and electrical shop and guys from the warehouse, they'd all have to come over and take a look at the new girl who's working in the mill. I was quite a sideshow for a while."

(ii) **Contrast:**

Contrast, says Kanter, is the effect by which the presence of a person bearing a different set of social characteristics, increases the self-consciousness of the dominant group. In contrast to the token, they become more aware of their commonalities and differences and to preserve that commonality they try to keep the token slightly outside, "to offer a boundary for the dominants."

Here also, the experience of women on non-traditional worksites closely parallels that of Kanter's corporation women. Women interviewed for this study never felt themselves secure in the position of being an "insider" to the community of meaning that the men had constructed and shared together. "We worked together really well," a labourer described one of the crews she worked on, "and the job went super smooth, but I always sort of felt on the
outside." They feared that this exclusion was due to some personal fault. "I feel on the outside but I never really know if it's because of the way I act or because the guys are really being unfair."

Women were excluded by the hostility and suspicion of the men, especially when they were new on the job. One man expressed his reaction thus: "It's an intrusion, and the women did it to themselves. After the war they went into their houses and we said, 'O.K., you stay there and do your job and we'll go to work and do our job.' So there the guys are, all comfortable in the mill or whatever, and in comes this woman!"

Before they began working, women were often discouraged by co-workers and sometimes by community members. "Before I started everyone said, 'Oh, you won't last. You'll hate it.'" "People told me I'd never make it." "My first day, the foreman told me he didn't like women on the job. He said, 'You shouldn't be here,'" were frequent comments.

Women clearly felt that they were unwanted, that they stood outside the boundaries of the masculine work world. "They couldn't piss in the U-drains anymore, they cut down their swearing - they just didn't like women around them. That's why they work there," one forklift
driver concluded, "to get away from women." "They really didn't like me around and in little ways made me feel it," said a labourer. "I wasn't really welcome."

Further, women stood apart from men by the biological fact of being a separate sexual class. Men defined themselves as "the boys". "The girls" (when there was more than one) were clearly not comprehended in this boundary, marked as it was by a certain back-slapping, arm-punching familiarity that, when it was extended to the women, began to take on sexual connotations. This leads to the third of Kanter's features.

(iii) **Assimilation:**

Assimilation is the tendency by which women in skewed groups, as tokens, are treated as symbols rather than as individuals. Individual characteristics, Kanter points out, tend to be distorted to fit the generalizations, or stereotypes about that person's social type.

This was overwhelmingly the case with women in non-traditional industrial and trades work, who were acutely aware that they were not "just another worker" but were regarded as representatives of their entire sex.

"You're not working as one of the guys, as an individual," a repairwoman stressed. "You're working there
as a woman and that's how you're going to be checked out."

This puts women into the position of "the stranger" as
described in some detail by Simmel. The stranger's posi-
tion in a group, as he describes it, "is fundamentally
affected by the fact that he [sic] does not belong in it
initially and that he brings qualities into it that are not,
and cannot be, indigenous to it."

Women are strangers on the traditionally male
worksites. They are within the group as subject, working
members, and simultaneously outside it as object, treated
differently and confronting it as being indigenously
different. The essence of their strangeness is their sexual
difference. The consciousness of women and men of having
"only the absolutely general in common" has the effect of
emphasizing that which is not in common i.e. that which the
stranger has in common with other strangers. It is thus
that strangers are not perceived as individuals but as
strangers of a certain type. "It was never direct," is
how a carpenter expressed it, "but I've always felt it, that
I'm some kind of symbol of Women."

For many women it was put very directly. "I
always got it from my boss," a maintenance engineer said,
"'Do a good job! Because if you don't they're never going
to hire another woman here again!" And another was treated as an impersonal laboratory experiment. "The boss said I was just a kind of guinea pig," she reported. "They just wanted to see how I worked out at all these jobs because if I worked well then maybe they'd find another woman."

One way in which this symbolic attitude to women was expressed was that foremen often "blamed" women for stereotypical attributes that all women are supposed to have, whether that particular woman had them or not. As a carpenter put it, "He needed a scapegoat and I was it." A driver gave an example: "While I was driving the truck," she explained, "the pump broke and the foreman was furious at me. 'That's what happens when women are on trucks!' he yelled, and the fact that I happened to be on that truck when it broke had nothing to do with its breaking."

One of the ways in which women were conspicuously marked as strangers, as outsiders, was by their language. Their most common response, therefore, was to learn the language of the workplace as quickly as possible. Women began to swear. "I grew up in quite a conservative Baptist family," observed a carpenter. "But after my first crew where everything was 'f---ing one thing or another,' it got to be an expression like anything else and the power was
taken out of it. If it seemed appropriate in a situation, I started using it." By coming to sound like the men, they seemed to seek to minimize their differences. In an effort to become less conspicuous ("just trying to avoid the damn flack" as a sawmill worker put it) women focused on minimizing their differences on the job, seeking invisibility. "You don't want to disrupt them," as a blaster put it. "When they swear around me and apologize," one labourer explained, "I tell them, 'I don't care what you say. Talk the way you want.'"

After several years of this kind of response, not to her individual self but to what she was considered to symbolize, a truck driver expressed her bitterness. "They don't know how to act toward you," she said. "They patronize you or want to screw you or they hate you. They figure you're either a mother or a whore."

Women's primary response to the presence of other women on the job, then, was relief that here was one who recognized and confirmed their individual self. As a deckhand explained, "I didn't like the isolation. You begin to doubt your own perceptions. That doesn't happen when there's another woman who shares the same set of values, a kindred spirit."
These women thus experience the contradiction of being highly visible on the job as different, yet being to a similar extent invisible in terms of their individual non-stereotypical characteristics.

It becomes clear that Kanter's observations of women in the corporate structure parallel the experience of women in non-traditional occupations in certain outstanding ways. It may be concluded that many of the peculiar experiences of women in non-traditional occupations (as in corporations) are due not to the fact of their sex alone, but to the structural organization of these institutions in which men form the dominant group and women hold only a token proportional representation. It may further be concluded that many of the difficulties women experience on the job, stemming from their token representation, increase the likelihood that women will not be successful at such work and thus contribute to their marginality and their continuing token status within the organization.
b. Male Territory

Womanland
Beware our small shadow
as it scuttles across your glories...
We are the ones who have never learned
to keep our hands off things
We are the creatures you have no pact with
come to betray you.

- Peter Trower, Logger, 1978
Northflight Over Wilderness

Any understanding of the social relations of the
non-traditional workplace for women must include some
perspective on the men they deal with in that particular
context.

For hundreds of years in resource extraction
industries men have worked together in a male companionship
that did not, or only rarely, included women. The only
notable exception is fishing, in which many wives and
daughters worked alongside the men. Paralleling this fact,
however, is the simultaneous and deep superstition of the
"bad luck" associated with women on the boats. Some men
fish with women. Others will not let even their wives step
on board for fear of her presence causing tangled nets,
broken traps and disappearing fish runs. Women, then, have
stayed home. The men went out to work, together.
Over time spent exclusively in male company, men in these industries have seemed to come to identify each other and themselves in a community of shared and reflected meaning by defining themselves in terms of what they all, regardless of race and other defining characteristics, were most conspicuously not—that is, female. Men in industry and the trades have generally come to characterize the workplace as feminine and have then assumed toward it an attitude of sexual superordination. The fact that this work is touted as "man's" work is a specifically sexual boast, and the non-traditional workplace is a specifically male sexual territory.

The outlines of this male community become most obvious when a woman joins it, or perhaps more accurately as a male millwright put it, "invades". The primary means, the clue, by which this sexualization of the workplace is revealed and is most directly experienced by women is in the language: the sexual terminology, the talk about women and the swearing.

Long before the most recent influx of women, the industrial and crafts workplace was humming with sexual terminology and sexual reference. For example, in most trades there are "male" and "female" connections; boards
in construction are "dressed" or "undressed"; something to be moved just a fraction goes "a cunt hair" to the left or right; and virtually every machine, tool and object is referred to in the feminine form as "she". "Lay 'er down!" one carpenter will call to another when a board is in position.*

One carpenter informed the writer that the slang term "cunt" was originally taken from the name of the hammer slit in a medieval carpenter's leather apron. (A search in the Oxford English Dictionary failed to verify this information. However, the O.E.D. discreetly fails to give any definition for "cunt" and refers the reader to "cunye", another slang reference to the female genitals whose original meaning is likewise rooted in the trades. It's 11th century use meant "cornerstone", perhaps a colloquial reference to the location of the "cunye" in the angle formed by a woman's legs. At any rate, the association of female sexuality with the trades, remains.)

*It is interesting to note that this feminine characterization also extends outside the traditional trades. A video technician pointed out that in her industry, connectors are not only male and female, they are also "lesbian", that is, female/female. She added in mock surprise, "There is no faggot connection." (Pat Findel, Personal communication, October 1979)
Men together also talk about women, often constructing an image in which no flesh and blood woman could recognize herself. "We talk about women 90 per cent of the time," a smelter worker said, "but women were never there before so it was pretty shocking when a woman came onto the site. It's a conflict between the way you usually talk about women and the woman who is actually standing there."

Men's discomfort about their language in general but their swearing in particular, was a conspicuous part of the experience of every woman interviewed, in every resource industry. Some reported that all conversation in their presence at first stopped entirely. "The lunchroom was quiet for two weeks, no one would talk or cuss or anything," a repairwoman remembered. "Fourteen guys having coffee and all conversation ceased when I walked in the room," reported a mine mill labourer.

After a few weeks the men might feel more at ease about talking but they remained uncomfortable about swearing. "They'd swear and then they'd slap their hand over their mouth. 'Oh no, we've got a woman in here now.' They'd make a big deal about it," a labourer said. "Every-time I came onto a new crew, I could tell that they changed their language for me by how they spoke to each other when
they didn't know I was around," added a carpenter.

The women were aware that they were intruders who were defined sexually as "ladies" and they generally sought to deal with this by denying the ladylike association. "They say they watch their language because I'm a woman. I wish they wouldn't." One woman made a point of making explicit that she did not want this tender treatment. "If someone said, 'Sorry' I'd say, 'Well, fuck man, if you're going to swear, do it properly. You want some lessons?' or something like that. I guess that was part of my defence, my machoness against theirs. If I was to say, 'Oh, that's all right' to his 'Sorry, lady,' that would be playing to his game of ladies and I don't want to do that. I'd rather swear back and he can either feel uncomfortable or comfortable with that."

But most women took a more conciliatory position. "It's a real buddy system on a crew," a mine-repairwoman emphasized, "and that's why, as much as you possibly can, you've really got to forget about the sex part, that it's a male and female relationship. Most of the men are not used to working with women, they've always worked with men and they'd like to be able to swear and say anything they want to. I can accept that."
In fact, during the course of their initiation and integration into the workplace, women usually took up swearing themselves, sometimes with gusto. It was an excellent and acceptable outlet for frustrations. "I used to get so damn mad that it was a release for my temper," a lumber piler said. "The louder and harder I could swear, the better it felt." And a mechanic explained that, "My biggest problem after I got into cussing was slowing it down. Someone was doing an interview of me at work and he said something about 'Do you mind the swearing?' and one of the other guys hollered over and said, 'We don't mind when she swears!' That's when I started slowing down. I probably swore more than anybody in that shop."

The contradiction of women's acceptance of the men swearing and usually adopting it themselves as part of their initiation and integration into the workplace, was that the men often felt that the women shouldn't swear.

Women were asked to "watch their language" and outright asked not to swear in the presence of certain men. "I heard the men talking to each other about a woman in a different shop," a carpenter reported, "saying that the worst thing she ever did was to let the guys swear around her. When I asked them, 'What's the difference? You use
that language, why shouldn't she?' they just said, 'Well, it doesn't sound nice."

It can be hypothesized that much of the men's discomfort with women's swearing stems from the disjuncture between their image of women generated in their own talk (no doubt fed by the media's and other institution's image of what a "lady" is, does, looks and smells like) and the actual woman herself. The Oxford International Dictionary (1958) defines "image" as "artificial imitation or representation of the external form of any object, especially of a person." What these men have in mind, their image of a woman, confronts the evidence of their senses when they watch and work with a woman doing non-traditional work.

The point being made here is that this "man's" language represents more than a shared code of meaning. It also represents a code of behaviour which has significance not just for women on non-traditional worksites but for all women who must relate to these men as mothers, sisters, wives and daughters. This requires some clarification.

Theorists recognize people's need for objects and people against which to reflect and upon which to act and thus become a self. Often those objects are the products
of one's labour, one's work. In the case of industry, men as a crew do not actually control the objects they produce. These are controlled by the owners of the means of production and hence the basis of human alienation in the industrial workplace. However, it could be argued that men have the illusion of dominating (by running) an industrial process - cutting down trees or producing paper or lumber or metal or oil or catching fish. Their need for domination over something reflects itself in a sense of domination over the industrial process itself. Industrial workers and craftsmen are experts in their field and often proud of the same. This is part of the satisfaction in the power of a union's strike.

It follows, then, that the "men's world" of authority over objects all day long is simply and rationally extended to women and children when he goes home at night. All day a man treats objects as women, literally cutting and bending them to his will. It is no surprise that he assumes to continue this act of control when he goes home and treats women as objects. We are dehumanized, objectified as women, by the fact that we are associated with the literal objects (trees, fish, ore) that men handle. Further, this shared sense of domination (over object/women) both on and
off the workplace, reciprocally designates men as "equals" and reinforces their sense of community, without specifically stressing with respect to what the equality exists. The fact that they are colleagues, supercedes the content of the relation.

Dorothy Smith's analysis of the exclusion of women from the institutions which produce the symbolic forms by which society is organized, here appears to be confirmed and extended. Working class men in the resource extraction workplace may be excluded from the production of ideas and abstract forms of social consciousness but the concrete, material organization of their work and work relations is conducive to the same ends of objectifying women. By the organization of the relationships therein, their workplace is eligible for inclusion among those social institutions which actively promote and enforce a socially acknowledged pattern, a stereotype, of acceptable masculine (and by implication, feminine) behaviour.

The romance of backslapping workers sharing sexual innuendoes is not available to women. It is our exclusion, the fact that we as a sexual class are its object, that helps define the camaraderie of the men's relationship as subject.
Not any conscious conspiracy but the material situation of their relationships, contributes to the reinforcement and continuation of this attitude on the part of men in industry and the trades. As Smith puts it, "We are locating a determinate set of positions in relation to a structure of power which constitute a common perspective ...and conditions of experience, interests and objectives." The occupants of these positions "view the world in particular ways and they experience common conditions with others similarly placed." She argues only in terms of an upper ("white collar") class who produce ideas and ideologies. Her argument now can be extended to a working class who produce objects of value, who likewise "take for granted the conditions of their experience" in their response to women who assume a similar but not the same position in the workforce - and doubtless to their wives and daughters as well.

The perpetuation of this attitude and response to women and women's needs and experience, relies upon the silence of the women. In traditional service work, the structures of the work are conducive to women's invisibility and the silence of their presence as well as of their voices in what Smith describes as a master-slave relationship to the men with whom they interact.
women in non-traditional work focus not on service (master-slave) but on production, as part of a crew (slave-slave). Insofar as she refuses to submit to the dominant ideology that holds that "A woman's place is in the home" and to be silent, a woman in a non-traditional occupation does not concede to male dominance and she threatens the balance by which the male community is kept intact. Any woman who enters the work community of the resource industries in question, therefore, physically by her mere presence and eventually by her spoken objections to being treated as a stereotype of "the lady", offers a threat and a challenge in that she forces the acknowledgement that existing concepts of women are inaccurate and inadequate.

Non-traditional work for women is carried on in the matrix of a male community of masculinized relationships. The illusion of neutral freedom of access to these non-traditional jobs and of a neutral community of non-traditional work, to the extent there ever was one, is thus dispersed.
c. Performance and Pace

"That's all we women have, is our work."

- Jeanne de Mol, 1978

In the face of such powerful factors of discrimination, how do women adjust and survive? First, they discover a proper pace of work.

An enthusiasm for working was unanimous among all the women interviewed for this study. Comments such as "I like to work hard," "I like to keep busy," "I feel lost without working," "There's never a happy woman who doesn't work," and "I enjoy working," were typical, though many added that their "ideal" work would involve fewer hours.

It is not surprising, then, that under the pressures of having to prove themselves on the job as individuals and as symbols of Womankind, the women interviewed, without exception, began non-traditional jobs by working as hard as possible.

The immediate effect was to alienate fellow crew by making it look as if they were trying to show them up. Women working hard, worked much harder than the men. One woman discovered this dilemma thus: "The very first day I went on the job they handed me a shovel and showed me a caterpillar whose track had so much mud and muskeg on it,
it was damn near solid, and they said, 'Clean those tracks out!'

"The operators just stood and watched me while I started and I thought, 'I've got to do this right.' It took an hour and a half and I was absolutely drenched from working so hard and I thought, 'Oh God, I'm probably slower than anybody else.'

"The next night when I was in the bar, the guy behind me was one of those operators and he said, 'You didn't have to sweat on that job. Most guys would have taken three or four hours to do that. You're trying to show everybody up.' But I wasn't! I thought I was being a terrible worker."

Women came to know, the hard way, the pace that the men had established as appropriate. "It took me a while to realize you weren't supposed to do things too fast," was how a refinery worker put it.

But in contradiction to their high visibility as tokens, and for other non-work related characteristics such as how "cheerful" they were, their actual individual achievements, apart from how they accomplished them, seemed strikingly invisible.

One woman was astonished to hear her foreman say when she quit, that he would hire another woman only because
"they don't seem to have the drive to become journeymen" i.e. they will not take the jobs away from the men. What made this painful, apart from the fact that she already was a journey"man" in another, related field, was the fact that while working for him she had assumed she was showing drive when she applied for the only apprenticeship that became available in her shop and had also sought to upgrade her Repairman status.

Women's invisibility on the job thus includes the invisibility of their achievements. Women captured attention for the "auxilliary traits" that gave them token status, such as their appearance and their good humour. But an achievement, a skill, implies aggressive action and such action is not within the stereotype of what we consider "feminine" in this culture. Achievements were invisible, then, partly because they were not expected.

What foremen saw, consistent with their expectations, were the traditionally female skills, particularly women's legendary prowess at cleaning. "When some cleaning job had to be done like hose down the floors, the boss would say, 'We'll let our woman do that because she does such a nice job.'" Women were exploited for their nimble fingers ("Most of the men assume I can handle small,
intricate fiddley work") and their sunny dispositions
("The guys thought this woman was great. She kept them amused.") Several supervisors were quoted as wanting to hire more women strictly for these traditional homemaking skills: "If there was a breakdown the guys would bugger off and the women would get the place spotless. If the boss had his way he would have all women," was a lumber grader's comment. "They hired all women in the lab because women work harder, they're cleaner and more conscientious," said a mine worker. And a labourer concurred: "The contractor I worked with said he'd rather have women than men because they were more meticulous."

Women may be valued for their homemaking skills but otherwise, the assumption is that they will fail. "Part of it is that physically they see a guy and until he proves that he's a sissy they say, 'We'll accept him,'" a mechanic explained. "But with a woman it's the other way around. 'We will presume she's going to be a sissy until she proves herself otherwise.' She may do just that but you as the next female would have to prove yourself all over again."

Even after long periods of time spent successfully on the job, women were regularly tested to see if they could "really" handle it. "When I was doing the hardest physical
job I ever had to do," reported a Repairwoman, "there was a kind of thing to see if I could do it or not, so they wouldn't help me, whereas they would help another guy. For physical things, for strength, I didn't get much help because I had to prove myself."

Another woman reported this as a "double conflict" with her foreman. After more than two years he still said to her with every job, "This is really a test, but I know you can do it!"

If their achievements were invisible, women's lack of them was quite the opposite. It seemed that bosses were quicker to criticize unsatisfactory work from women than they did from men. "They worked me a lot harder and they criticized me more," a mine mill labourer summarized her experience. She described a situation where two workers, a man and a woman, were both unable to handle the job required of them for similar reasons of strength. "The thing was," she observed, "there was talk of her being fired but there was no talk of the man being fired. They talked of transferring him to another job."

The contradictions of this situation are revealed in one industry's follow-up study of the first 24 women they hired. Although 22 of the 34 foremen surveyed said they saw
no obvious difference between the work performance of the women and a control group of men in certain categories, only 12 gave generally positive reactions to the fact of women working in their industry. Negative comments for the most part reflected opinion rather than specific criticism of work inadequacies. For example, "Women shouldn't work in the lines," "Don't really want women, men accept harsher treatment better," "Don't agree with women in the lines," and "Don't like to see women in the lines."

Where foremen do recognize women's work, they are not averse to fostering competition where it will increase production. The foreman of a woman who had a good set of tools constantly hazed his crew, "When are you guys going to update your tools so they're as good as hers?"

It makes economic sense from the foreman's point of view to goad workers to greater production. As it affects women, however, it appears to be direct competition between men and women, not simply between workers, and the men identify it as such.

Management does nothing to counteract this fear on the part of the men. "The guys are afraid they're going to lose their jobs," a mechanic observed. "They'll let women in and then a supervisor will say, 'We don't want more women
in here because the guys feel like we're being outnumbered.' And management never makes any strong statement. So you're dealing with a system where someone at the top says, 'Oh, you shouldn't say that,' but that's tacit support for the bias against women because they know it is being said."

One of the apparent effects is an informal quota system on the number of women "allowed" at any one time on many job sites. No management personnel would admit to such a fact but it was a common and irritating assumption to most of the women interviewed. "The word comes down the line, all word of mouth, 'No more chicks,'" as one woman put it. "They hire women like they have so many blacks and so many Hindus and so many women," added a lumber piler. "When one woman quits, the Personnel Manager hires one woman," explained a mine truck driver. "But when a man quits he doesn't hire a woman." "They just hire enough to say, 'We don't discriminate' but they keep it at a certain percentage," was a pulp and paper worker's observation.
d. **Ladies and Gentlemen: Special Treatment on the Job**

One way in which men can isolate women on the job and thus maintain the status quo of the masculine community, is by a tendency to put all women into jobs that are "suitable" for women by traditional social standards of the roles appropriate for women: in effect, ghettoizing them. Within the approximately four years since women's recent re-entry into the non-traditional work force, this has become apparent in jobs such as plywood mill workers ("It's light work," say employers and foremen, ignoring the women who pile green lumber and work in planer mills and sawmills), flaggirls ("It's a cleaner job and a guy will stop for a smiling chick rather than a grizzled old man"), pulp and paper testers ("They're more careful"), and truck drivers ("They don't try and hot rod the machines"). One woman who was the first to work in a mine mill recounted how within two years all the men were applying to go underground. When she asked a friend why, he replied, "All the guys think working in the mill is women's work."

It remains to be seen whether these jobs, following in the tradition of the feminization of bank clerks, teachers and clerical workers, will begin to lose status and be left behind in wage increase negotiations.
The effects of ghettoization, in the short run, are probably to ease women's accommodation to non-traditional work in that it places them in a position where they are more likely to be in the company of other women. However, it tends to increase their alienation from the men in the rest of the workplace. They are not working with, but apart from, the bulk of the men and this justifies the men's sense of community exclusive of the women. As one man commented, "That's the worst thing they can do, is group together apart from the men."

Another way in which the men defined themselves exclusively of the women and clarified the boundaries between them was to accord them special treatment. In some cases this was a question of the men being graciously aware and tolerant of a novice woman's lesser strength and lack of experience on the job. But it often rode a thin line with paternalism and a "protective" attitude that was inappropriate to the work to be done and was isolating of the women in the manner of Kanter's category of "contrast" as a characteristic of skewed group relationships.

It was inappropriate in that everyone on the crew must hold up their own end in order for the crew as a whole to produce. As one man explained, "If I was working..."
with a journeywoman, I'd be bending over backwards to help her and I would do the heavy work but I'd be getting burned up that I'm doing all the work."

He recognized the contradiction this would place them both into, for he continued, "And she'd be getting burned up that I wasn't letting her do the job. It's a vicious circle."

And why would he expect to do the lion's share of the work? "I learned to be a gentleman. Also, the other guys would give me a hard time. Maybe I'm all covered with grime and we're doing the same job, both tradesmen. But if she's all covered with grime the guys will say to me, 'What are you doing, working her to death?'"

Such gentlemanly behaviour was not at all an uncommon response to the first women on the job. "My foreman wouldn't let me go on midnight shift because, quote, 'There are certain types of men here, you know!' and that was all he'd say," a mechanic reported. "For the same reason he wouldn't send any guys out with me on an outside job. Most outside jobs, for safety reasons they'd send two guys out but they sent me by myself because of 'the men out there'."
And again, from a blaster, "When a guy gets hurt, the guys kind of expect it, but when a woman gets hurt, they feel really bad. They're very protective toward the women. They have been for a lot of years." A carpenter added, "Their attitude is, 'I'll look after the little lady.'"

Women rejected this behaviour but they had to do so carefully, so as not to humiliate the dominant group, the men, whose cooperation they required. "They figured I just wasn't capable of running the saw, of doing various things," a repairwoman said, "so they would do it for me all the time and they got me in a lot of trouble over it. I finally had to say, 'Get out of my life. If I want your help I'll ask for it!' But I had to be real nice about it because I didn't want to turn them right off. I still had to work with them."

"When I was on a framing crew," a carpenter described, "they would shift for me. They would do the heavy framing and assign me to do the lining out or measuring. In a sense they didn't do me any favour because I didn't learn the job that I really needed to do."

Occasionally, women were forced to acknowledge that they could not handle all the tasks that their jobs involved
and they had to ask for help, or let the men take the brunt of that job. "There is one thing that bothers me," a labourer in a pulp and paper mill explained this dilemma. "One of our jobs involves tipping 500 pound barrels. I can get them tipped. But then two guys go upstairs and lift that 500 pounds up by pulley. I can do it with a guy but it's hard on the guy because he has to take a bit more than his share. So they usually leave me downstairs for their own benefit, not to see me get the cushy job. But it kind of bugs me and it bugs them a little bit too."

One result is that any help that some women ask for, including that which is traditionally given on the job for particularly heavy or awkward loads, is regarded as the woman's inability to handle the job. "My boss got mad and said, 'You've got these guys helping you do your work,'" a carpenter remembered. "I said, 'How many of the guys don't help each other carrying timbers? And you expect me to carry them in myself and cut 'em? That's being stupid!'"

The only woman interviewed who held a journey-person's ticket pointed this out in her own experience. "I got along well with most people," she said. "Somebody would say, 'We're going to do a brake job, you do that side, I'll do this side.' That's fine. But if I'd have
been an apprentice there would have been more problems because I would have needed more help and then they would have pointed out, 'See? She can't do the work!' even though any apprentice would have needed the help."

Most people new at a job experience difficulties at first. But in general, when a woman has difficulty, or if she performs a job in any way differently from the accepted manner, it is assumed to be "proof" that she is incapable. Insofar as the self arises through the reflected viewpoints of the social group, this constitutes a continual strain on women's confidence in themselves and their real abilities.
e. Sexual Harassment

The women say, you are really a slave if ever there was one. Men have made what differentiates them from you the sign of domination and possession.

- Monique Wittig, 1969
Les Guérillères

One of the most universal ways in which women experience their isolation as subordinates (objects) to a dominant (subject) group, is in the experience of sexual harassment on the job. Sexual harassment has been defined as "any sexually oriented practice that endangers a woman's job" by the Alliance Against Sexual Coercion, and elsewhere as "any repeated and unwanted sexual comments, looks, suggestions or physical contact that you find objectionable or offensive and causes you discomfort on the job." Like rape, to which it is cousin, sexual harassment is an extension of sexual discrimination. It is not sexual, it is an assault whose effect is to establish a power relation in which the more physically powerful male asserts his superordination over the female.

The harassment which women encountered on the non-traditional workplace took the form of sexual remarks, jokes, teasing and gossip, staring, the display of nude
pictures in common rooms and women's washrooms and lockers and touching.

Women reported it as follows: from a pulp and paper mill labourer, "Some guys really bothered me. They'd sort of look at you like you've got nothing on. They'd go, 'Oh, and how are you?' and you'd say, 'Fine,' and they'd just keep staring." From a mine mill operator, "They'd say things like, 'Do your boobs move up and down when you're working? Must really exercise your boobs,' stuff like that. They got pretty gross." From a maintenance engineer, "Did they put posters up? In my locker, in my bathroom, when I was doing the rounds they'd come in the lab and put stuff up, just for jokes." From a deckhand, "I was so naive when I started. I didn't think the skipper of the fishing boat would automatically expect me to sleep with him. Now that I look back on it I think, 'Of course.'" From a labourer, "If I have a beer with a guy after work, holy shit! The next day it's, 'She's screwing that guy!' For a while when I was on shift work there's nobody to hang around with but shift workers on days off. Well, I had to go in with an eraser every time I went to the can."

Women's first responses were traditionally feminine ones. That is, they tried to avoid the issue.
"I would just laugh." "You just kind of avoid them," they said. They avoided demonstrativeness or any other behaviour that could be construed as sexual and as a rule avoided all but platonic relationships with co-workers. "I've only been sweet on one fellow on the job and I got fired for that," said a logger. "I've generally tried to avoid sexiness on the job since then." Another confirmed, "Sleeping with them would have made it more of a hassle."

Women in the non-traditional workplace are in a peculiar position around the issue of sexual harassment. They are aware that as women they are in a minority and that they have entered as strangers, a masculine world in which the jokes, pinups and many other sexual aspects of a male work relationship were there before the women were. These masculine forms of interaction constitute the established masculine role as it is confirmed in the "macho" generalizations of men in industry and the trades. It is a role which most men assume when they take on that job - whether they like the role or not.

Most women react to its aggressiveness in a "feminine" manner as subordinates to the superordinate male. That is, initially at least, they accept the traditional feminine role (passive, sexual object) and status
(subordinate) on the workplace as they did as a sexual class off it.

Their general desire to stay as inconspicuous as possible on the job was evidenced in this context by comments in which they sought to avoid criticism and that were therefore filled with contradiction. "Men don't like women on the jobs," exclaimed a blaster, and in the next breath added, "Some of the guys are really, really nice." Or on another occasion a woman described the "gross" sexual comments and jokes she endured and later, when asked in another context about ribbing, said, "It was all pretty light. They didn't tease me too much." "It doesn't bother me," they said, when the message was clearly that it did.

The outstanding characteristic of these women's situation is that they are socialized into a feminine role behaviour but because of and by way of their work they now seek an identity in a different role for which society has identified acceptable behaviour only for men. Women are thus in the position of what Ernest Becker would call "role conflict".

However, the same relations that induce this response also imply the means to challenge it. Women generally retain their subordinate relation on the
non-traditional workplace until the conditions and relations of that work lead them to realize that new behaviours are demanded.

Women ignored, avoided and endured sexual harassment until they could stand it no longer, at which point they asserted themselves to say "No!" "You just have to say it. They'll push you as far as you want to go. I put up with their jokes until they got pretty gross," a labourer said, "and then finally I let them know that I didn't go for that kind of thing and they stopped."

Women began to be assertive. A blaster told of a friend who "was having trouble with this guy patting her ass all the time and she said to him, 'If you were working with that guy over there, would you be patting his ass?' and he said, 'Of course not.' And she said, 'Well, leave mine alone. As far as you're concerned I'm that guy over there.' And she quit having trouble. He left her alone." Assertiveness is not the magical means to acceptance on non-traditional workplaces but it is one of the keys to women's survival.

One of the first major references on the subject of sexual harassment in Canada, The Secret Oppression: Sexual Harassment of Working Women by Constance Backhouse and Leah Cohen, affirms that "women in non-traditional areas
get more sexual harassment than other women"\textsuperscript{51} and that "the biggest obstacle such women will encounter is sexual harassment."\textsuperscript{52} It should be clear that there is danger of class bias in assuming that women in non-traditional jobs must suffer more harassment. Certainly, working class men in industry and the trades are often rougher in their language and in certain ways of relating to women, than are the men who usually inhabit professional seats and offices. \textit{This is not to automatically assume more harassment.}

Women in non-traditional occupations may at first find more seemingly intense harassment (which is often part of the initial testing that every new crew member, male and female, endures) but the nature of their work also presents them with some powerful tools and strategies by which to cope with it.

In many ways, harassment in the trades is less indirect (less "sophisticated") and women can deal with it directly by using the assertiveness that is fostered by the relations of the job itself. The confidence and competence that women gradually assume on the job are conducive to the development of a positive attitude which excludes the stance of victimization that goes along with much harassment.
Further, the distinctions between traditional, service-oriented women's work and non-traditional, primary production work performed by women, take on particular significance in terms of permitting and even encouraging non-traditional assertive responses. Male-female relationships in traditionally women's work are primarily those of superior-inferior (Smith's "master-servant"): doctor-nurse, boss-secretary, manager-waitress, etc. They are characterized by the fact that the woman is expected to maintain a clearly feminine appearance (neat and clean) and manner (polite and supportive). Women in service jobs work primarily in an isolated function. They perform their work alone, toward the end of personally pleasing the boss.

In contrast, women in non-traditional primary production fit into a working world whose relations emphasize a strong team cooperation in getting the job done. The camaraderie of a crew is a major component of the social relations of the workplace. Women's work in a crew focuses on cooperation with colleagues in accomplishing the task of production with a strong flavour of defiance toward management that is supported by existence of a strong union. A feminine appearance is irrelevant to that accomplishment and a feminine manner is often destructive. The point on the
non-traditional workplace is to be strong, competent, mechanically able - not prime characteristics in the feminine mystique.

A woman who gains a reputation as a "good worker" has strong respect from fellow workers which helps exempt her from harassment.

Finally, sexual harassment in an office or restaurant usually focuses on the employer-employee relationship. For a woman to say "no" in this context is often to threaten her job security. Harassment on the industrial workplace, where most interchange is between equals (crew members) and there is a union to support the worker against unjust treatment by employers, is much less likely to hold a threat to job security.

In summary, women in non-traditional occupations may at first experience what appears to be intense sexual harassment. This has two features. The first is that these women are entering a male territory where sexual comments, attitudes and images are a long-established tradition. "When I go into a lunchroom and it's all guys," a lumber grader said, "I feel like I've walked into the men's washroom." Women walking into the non-traditional workplace have caught the men with their pants down. The sexual
objectification of their workplace, imperceptible or at least accepted when there were no women there, becomes blatant. It exhibits a hostility mustered not against any one woman in particular. It is against women in general. When the first woman is hired on a site many men become self-conscious about this aspect of their workplace and will seek to erase at least its most conspicuous aspects. This element of sexual harassment requires a different attitude toward women in this society in general in addition to the presence of more women in non-traditional work, to erase it.

The second aspect of sexual harassment on the job is that that is personally directed against a woman at work. This requires immediate, effective personal strategies in defense. In contrast to traditional feminine service work, the social relations of the non-traditional workplace are conducive particularly to increased assertiveness and clear "no's" from the women in a refusal to be victimized. In the short term, then, the conditions of the workplace itself appear to be one of the most effective tools for countering harassment.
f. The Other Women

Man is estranged from that with which he is most familiar.

- Heraclitus

As a group, and consistent with the general phenomenon of role stereotyping within this culture and on the worksite, women in non-traditional occupations verbally affirmed their separateness from other women: "People who chatter and don't get on and do things," as one put it. As a group they spoke their scorn of women: "Women are petty." "Women can't be straightforward." "Women cry."

But the one factor that eased their awareness of being strangers on the workplace was the presence of other women. Breaking free from the tendency to generalize about all women (a trait largely shared with the men they worked with), they each expressed relief at the presence of specific others. "We could talk better." "It took the pressure off me." "I relaxed." There was a relief that someone else on the job could recognize their individual self.

Women are caught in being women, socialized to the "feminine" role, in a work environment in which being feminine is not appropriate. They cope by repressing
many of those characteristics that are commonly accepted as "feminine". Some they are happy to leave behind, such as nylon stockings and restrictive clothing and "sucky" behaviour, but others they find harder to deny, like spontaneous physical demonstrativeness ("I had to stop myself because it was always construed as being sexual"), makeup ("I felt that I would be ugly if I didn't wear it to work and I still wanted to be pretty"), and their general sense of identity as to what was feminine about them ("I thought I was going to lose it").

Women are thus forced to do violence to themselves to keep their non-traditional jobs. Kanter's description of individual women being "distorted" as they were assimilated into the narrow comprehension of stereotypes, was exactly echoed by one woman to describe how she had changed to adapt to her workplace: "I felt distorted," she said.

Women are thus "with the boys" but not "of the boys". Likewise, they are "of the girls" but not "with the girls". The isolation experienced on the job site extended off the job as well, as relations with other women underwent radical change. Old friends were often left behind because of marked differences in habits, interests and activities, and if you were working shifts, differences
in hours. "It definitely changes you," a labourer noticed.
"I wanted to save my money and the women who were still
waitressing wanted to buy clothes. My friends changed.
We didn't have the same things in common any more." "I
have one friend who tries to be feminine," a maintenance
engineer said. "She pretends she can't do this and she
can't do that. She *tries* to be incompetent. It bugs me!
I don't see her any more."

Wives of co-workers were often jealous and kept
a distance. They made the same assumptions as their men
did, that women on the job were primarily defined by their
sexuality and were therefore sexual threats. "It used to
be that your guy went off with the fellows all day. If he
was in an office some women would worry about all those real
fancy secretaries. Now I think some of them worry with
their men around ladies in construction," was a blaster's
comment. A pulp and paper mill worker reported, "One guy
told me at work, 'If I see you on the street, don't get mad
if I don't say hi when I'm with my wife.' I don't think he
even told her there was a woman on his crew."

Sometimes women are initially attracted by other
women working in non-traditional jobs. But often they then
back off. As one put it, "Maybe women become a little afraid
of you because you are stronger than most women and independent and I think some women really admire this but then when they feel themselves attracted to this more masculine part of you, they're afraid it's sexual. Maybe they're lesbian. Maybe you're lesbian. You get isolated," she concluded, "from men and from women."
g. Camaraderie

"What makes me feel best at work? Just getting along with the crew."
- Forklift driver, 1978

One of the most positive aspects of non-traditional work for women, is the pleasure of the strong camaraderie that can characterize a working crew. It is the main occasion on which women enter the community of the men and share the status of "subject". The pace and nature of physical work, the need to depend on each other for safety and the fact that work is often done in two's or three's rather than in isolation, lead to a trust and social familiarity that often give real closeness in the work relations.

The basic source of harmony in industrial and crafts work is that things are going smoothly, with good humour and at a comfortable speed of production. One of the blocks to this smooth flow is the presence of a novice whose ignorance disrupts it, a fact of which both novice and old hand are usually aware. The novice will usually try to close the knowledge gap as quickly as possible, that is, will try to become "one of the crew" and to lose the uncomfortably conspicuous position of
being the one who is "holding up the works". The novice must learn to do things - including learning how to learn, how to ask questions and observe in as unobstructive a manner as possible - so that the smooth pace of the job is restored, and along with it, the collegiality and camaraderie that make the job "feel good".

Women commented on how much they enjoyed working with men once they got past the novice stage. "I like joking with the fellows," a labourer said. "You socialize a lot," said another. "It's a good feeling to be part of a crew," commented a planer mill worker. "The camaraderie was a big part of the job," a repairwoman felt. "It was quite fun to work with them." "I really like guys." "When you work with them you get to know them. It's something like living with them," were other comments. One labourer observed that one of the few positive aspects of being conspicuous on the job was that, "Sometimes, with lots of guys around paying attention to me, I feel good!"

Another aspect of the camaraderie and support on the job was that, once the women had shown their willingness to work and that they wanted to learn, the men often gave them important teaching support. "My skipper was willing to teach me anything I showed an interest in," a
deckhand said. Another woman told how her crew "struggled to be helpful. One time a guy said, 'You're working too hard, you're hammering from your elbow.' That was a matter of encouraging me." And another added, "As far as learning things, they were more helpful than they would have been with a guy because I was new at it. They would take their time and really explain things." One foreman said that he preferred teaching women because "they don't pretend to know what they don't know." The absence of two competing male egos may be one of the positive aspects of being a woman on these jobs.
3. Relation to Self

a. Confidence:

"If you are raised to please someone else, you will always be a little insecure as to whether you are succeeding."

- Beth Hill, 1979

It will not be surprising to note that women found a considerable drawback to their success at non-traditional work lay in their lack of confidence. Primarily they traced it to their lack of experience, lack of mechanical opportunities as young people and to their awareness of being outsiders on the work site.

Women generally blamed themselves individually for their lack of knowledge and skill. "I used to think, 'You're not good enough,'" a carpenter said, "when I ran into something I couldn't nail or screw into. Now I know that most likely there's something back there, a knot or metal or really rough wood, that's hindering progress, and I have no compunction about pulling the nail out and starting someplace else. But at first I put myself down all the time. If I had any problems I felt it was because I wasn't good enough to do it."

They blamed their own socialization for their
difficulties in taking on a new way of thinking, a more mechanical mode. This mechanical way of thinking, along with the style of banter that goes on, are two of the chief characteristics of the industrial and crafts working communities. The mechanical way of thinking involves the right jargon, ("It doesn't matter so much how you do it as long as you say it properly," a foreman once counselled) and something more subtle which can only be described as "style". A woman who had worked for seven years in the trades recognized this when she had the chance to work with women. "I'm beginning to realize," she said, "that it's not so much that they don't know what to do as that they do it in a very different way than a guy would."

The women generally attributed their difficulties in learning the mechanical mode to the fact that their education was limited to learning the tools of the "woman's trade". "Ever since a boy was three years old his dad has been handing him screwdrivers and hammers while we got cookie cutters," one woman said angrily. "No wonder we're scared to plunge in."

This gap in their backgrounds was mentioned repeatedly. "Somehow the guys had this little extra bit of knowledge, of background to the trucks and tools, that I
had to learn," commented a driver. "I'm starting from zero," a maintenance engineer said. "Not every guy knows about engines but most have a mechanical sense. Like, most of them know you can't use an old gasket twice. I didn't know that until they told me. I was ready to use it again. Why not?"

They dealt with their lack of confidence by giving themselves pep talks, by using the model of another woman who had succeeded, or as a labourer stressed, "If she can do it, I thought, damn it, so can I!" and by asking questions. One carpenter declared, "My first boss told me he wasn't sure he'd last the first two weeks because I asked so blasted many questions."

Also, they relied on gut stubborness and determination. A truck driver described a turning point she had to cope with: "In 20° below weather, I had to crawl underneath this compressor and bleed the lines, using a very long and very heavy wrench, before I could take it to where it was needed. And I just couldn't get the torque to crack it anyway I tried. It's been thousands of years, you know, of "I can't do it, I can't do it!" I knew I could do it but I couldn't! Finally I started crying, all alone, I was going to freeze to death out there. I kept trying so hard, for so
long, and finally I did it. That was a highlight, a turning point for me. I could do it! You can do anything you want to."
b. Why Women Stay:

"Women can do any of these jobs."

- Labourer, 1978

In a sense, the basic relationships remain firmly traditional. The world (of work) as constituted by men, stands in authority over that of women. The men are the journeymen, foremen, supervisors and management. The women are primarily labourers and semi-skilled workers with little job seniority. The social community of men stands against the single isolation of the odd woman as forming the dominant means of interaction and source of "meaning" on the job.

Nonetheless, the women begin to take on characteristics that are not traditional within the context of the larger culture.

The most often mentioned of these was a sense of physical well being. They had never before had the opportunity to become familiar and comfortable with their own physical strength and capacities and limits. Women developed muscles. "Part of it is that you're developing your body and when women develop their muscles they don't look ugly. I have muscles, I'm really strong, and I think they look nice."

A labourer who eventually became a supervisor commented on how "My body changed an awful lot. I got stronger. I toned
up and I found that I felt better. It was good to feel hungry and tired after work. You don't feel frustrated. I'd rather be tired physically than uptight."

"It feels tremendous," "I felt a lot more healthy," "I loved feeling strong," "I like the physical part," "I like to see how my muscles work," was how they spoke of their physical experience on the job. Only one woman complained that it made her feel "not a woman." Her shoulders and arms got larger, she said, and "You have a horrible time getting blouses!"

Women liked working with men and the camaraderie of the crew. "You know the people at work better than you know the people you're living with because you see more of them and you do more things together." Partly due to this familiarity, women in non-traditional occupations began to be less intimidated by men's presence, to find general conversation easier and to be assertive and demanding with them, to be as straightforward as they observed the men being with each other. "I don't feel intimidated by guys any more," was how one woman put it.

Over time, having to stand up for their own rights in the relationships of the workplace, women began to notice in themselves a growing capacity to be assertive.
"I think my personality has strengthened a little bit because I can shoot off my mouth better," remarked an office worker turned forklift driver. "I had never yelled at people before, or had a good argument. When you're sitting in an office you've got to sit still while your boss tells you what to do. You can't talk back or express your feelings or tell him that he's wrong. But at this job you can. You can even make suggestions to your boss, so it changes you." "At first I was weaker and the guys used to get ahead," a labourer spoke. "But as you get stronger and more confident in yourself and you know what they're talking about, they can't bullshit you any more. Like, 'I'm so strong' and all this on the job and you know damn well they're candy asses."

Women's relations on the workplace elicited changes in their behaviour that extended off it as well. A deckhand described herself as "a quiet, gentle person, so I fit into that 'nice' role that a lot of women get trapped into. And I found when I was out fishing that I had to stand up and fight and draw the lines. I became a lot more assertive just in terms of defending myself, defending my space."
Marriages were affected. "Before I was working in the mill," a pulp and paper worker recalled, "when I was still in the office, I used to be really passive. 'Yes, dear. No, dear.' Then I'd listen to the guys at work tell each other where to get off and I started really shooting my mouth off. When I started working at the mill on shifts, my husband still expected everything done for him. He said, 'I didn't tell you to get a job.' So I left." Another woman credited the fact that her mate had stopped beating her, with the fact that she had learned to "stand up to him" after she started working in the local mill. "Also," she said, "I started telling people what he did to me. No one wants to be known as a wife beater."

"You have to be a little toughnosed," "You can't let them push you around," they said.

Over time, women gained confidence, began to relax at their jobs and to question somewhat their overinvestment in succeeding. Some of them began, in glimpses, to see that other factors such as their token position, their socialization as women and social attitudes to women in general, had a powerful effect on their experiences and struggles on the job. Perhaps they were not individually responsible for every success and failure. A carpenter
recounted the story of how this once happened for her.
"I had been under a lot of pressure as the boss's scape-goat at work. I could feel that everyone was expecting me to blow this job. So when I drove a nail right through a board and into the water pipe, I knew I'd blown it but I knew that the emotional resentment and confusion that had been part of that whole job were as much a contributing factor as I was.

"So the boss said, 'I'll have to let you go' and I said, 'I'll clean up the mess and then leave,' and I started mopping up, at that point feeling totally responsible for the whole situation. Then I stopped and said, 'Damn it! This isn't just my fault and I'm fired and I'm not going to clean up the mess. It's no longer my job.' And I stomped out of the house.

"That was a really significant turning point for me," she concluded. "Not until that day could I accept that I was only partly responsible for what happens to me on any job. That was a big step."

The concreteness of each day's achievements also contributed for women toward a sense of wellbeing about their jobs. There is a cleanliness, a sense of beginning and end and final product in non-traditional work that isn't found in
most traditionally women's jobs, and certainly not in the domestic sphere. As a labourer put it, "You wash the floor, tomorrow it's going to be washed again. It never shows, nothing ever shows! At work there's something there, you know? According to my son I built that road over there. I just flagged on it, but according to him that's my road because I worked on it. It's gratifying." And another explained, "I thought it was neat to dig somebody's basement. Years from now when I walk by I can say, 'I dug that basement.'"

Women's pleasure in their work included a growing sense of pride and self-sufficiency in their developing practical skills. "In construction you pick up things here and there," a labourer said. "If we ever build our house I'll be able to do a lot of things." Women enjoyed learning to think mechanically. "I thought more!" a mine mill labourer exclaimed. "And in terms of finding shortcuts that would make things easier. It made my housework easier too. No one ever taught me how to take shortcuts in my housework like they did in the mill." "It's easier to understand things now, it seems. And it carries over to my home," a maintenance engineer observed. "I did all the arborite on the kitchen counters because I had learned how to at work."
In contrast to the scathing comments about their previous, traditional employment, women spoke highly of the actual content of their jobs. A driver enthused, "I enjoy it so much. I can't leave a truck alone, I always have to try something." "I love being around the carefulness, the precision of the craftsmen," a refinery worker said. "When I threw some pipes down, they told me how easily metal bruises and to wrap each pipe in a rag. There's a near sexual excitement involved when you hear the guys talking about tools and working. I really like that."

Non-traditional work seems to have a radical effect on most women's sense of wellbeing of self. They began to feel competent and responsible. A deckhand experienced this in a particularly clear way. "On the boat I knew we had propane because I had ordered it and filled the tanks, I knew we had everything we needed because I put it there. It felt good." More simply, a mechanic said, "It comes down to feeling responsible for your own life."

Accompanying the sense of physical wellbeing and assertiveness came a new sense of responsibility and of confidence. They said: "Finding out that I reacted well in danger situations made me feel more confident." "It changed me in lots of ways. I learned how to deal with
people. It made me more confident with myself. "I never really expected too much of myself but I gained a hell of a lot of confidence in myself in construction, just the fact that I could hold down a job, do it, be there every day - I was getting more reliable. I felt good being able to make good money and support myself and my kids. I gained a lot of strength in myself."

This growing sense of power and confidence was confirmed by the respect that these jobs earned from their communities and their families. "I got encouragement from everyone for getting this job," a 35 year old planer mill worker and single mother of two, explained. "Because I got in and it's hard to get in. Because I stuck with it and because I was happy at the job. When people see somebody that can make a lot of money doing something that's tough, they really admire you." Another woman had the same experience. "If I tell people that I work at the mill they're really impressed." Families gave women more respect. Mother's became their kid's heros. "We went to get my son some shoes," a single mother explained. "And he said, 'Get me some workboots just like yours, Mom.'" "You feel more pride," one woman concluded.
This pride included that of being non-conventional, of breaking barriers for women, in being one of the first in a new field. "Being on the forefront of things really gave me a boost sometimes." "I really felt like a pioneer." One woman, the first hired at a mine, commented, "I felt like that saying when they stepped on the moon—it was one small step for woman and a giant step for womankind."

To another woman, a blaster, women were clearly re-breaking barriers. "Women have always worked hard," she said and pointed out the examples of women in the war and in pioneer days. "They helped their mates but we've gotten away from that." Observing the separation of women and men into public and domestic spheres, she described how, in her view, women simply want to "get back to what we're used to doing: working with our mates or alongside a man. We're just kind of breaking it in again."

Other aspects of non-traditional work which women spoke of included: the high pay ("The thing I like best is the money," said a mother of two. "People say they work for self-satisfaction but you're not satisfied unless you've got enough money.")

the fact that at night they could simply drop
everything and forget about it until the next morning
("You don't think about it after you're finished work
at night. That's it.")

the presence of a union for job security
("Other jobs I've had, if you make one mistake, you're out.
Without a union, you're completely at the mercy of the guy
you're working for.")

and the escape from children ("It's nice to have
a real coffee break and a lunch without kids crawling all
over you.")

Every woman had a strong feeling of her own inde-
pendence, no matter what her marital situation. "I've been
financially independent since I left home when I was 17," said one. "I don't believe in plunking myself here and
living off my dad," said another. "I think that's what
attracted my husband to me, is that I can work and I'm inde-
pendent," said a third.

They enjoyed their work and many of the ways in
which it affected them, but things were obviously not "just
fine" on the job. Primarily, women did not think it simply
a matter of time before they were buddies with the men.
They did not think, though they may often have wished it,
that they would ever be "one of the boys". "I don't think
women will ever adjust to that environment as it is now," they said. "You never adapt." "Because I'm female, I'll probably never be a buddy to any of them." The goal is not to fit in. It is to change the workplace in ways that will eliminate its bias. It must become a people's job rather than a man's job, before women will be at ease. "It's always going to be strange until they have equal amounts of men and women working in a place like that," a repairwoman observed. "You're still living in a man's world up there."

And in the meantime? "I figure it's better to laugh than cry so I always just laugh. They know I want to cry."
c. Off the Pedestal: Femininity:

If you want to know more about femininity, enquire from your own experiences of life.

- Sigmund Freud, 1933
"Femininity"

One of the sources of women's identity as women is the way they/we are taught to act as "feminine", performers of the female role, which even when they don't like it, gives them the cues as to how they should act and feel about themselves. They come to know themselves, as their surrounding culture knows them, as "feminine".

However, many of the women interviewed for this study are experiencing what Becker would call "role conflict" and Simmel, "formlessness" in that their socially defined parts do not suit them. As tomboys and then as grown women, their socialization has been incomplete. As individuals, they protest. "I always liked wearing jeans and a T-shirt," said one. "A lot of people don't consider me that feminine anyway."

To the extent that they prefer non-traditional work, they have exercised their power over their own self creation by choosing an environment in which other qualities are clearly going to be called for than those they have primarily learned.
They put themselves into a new social situation, a play in which they have not yet learned their lines, in which, in fact, there is no "part" for a woman.

The fact that women do not yet play "correctly" because there is as yet no socially evolved part for them to play, in turn threatens men in their self-esteem, in the convincing quality of their roles. In many cases it can probably be assumed that men don't so much resent the individual woman on the job as they resent the need to change. Women's challenge to their traditional role demands that men re-evaluate theirs.

How, in fact, is the feminine role being challenged?

When women began this work, they began it with the paraphernalia of their feminity still largely intact. "When I started working I wore eye makeup. I'd wash and curl my hair every night so I used to look fairly nice." "For the first couple of years I worried about what to wear to work." A labourer burst out laughing when asked what had changed for her at work. "Are you ready? I washed my raingear every night! I couldn't stand being dirty. Everybody said, 'You're not going to last like that,' and I thought, 'They're crazy. You think I'd come in that grubby raingear?' I'd
come out every day in my fresh rain gear, bright yellow like a canary."

And now? "Now I don't give a damn. Things like that become unimportant after a while."

Women specifically spoke of "losing their identity," assuming that not to be feminine was to be masculine. "In the beginning you tried to keep your identity, your 'being a woman', right?" asked a labourer, rhetorically. "I did anyway. I tried wearing shirts under my coveralls just so that I wouldn't become too masculine."

Some of the confusion arose over the meaning of "feminine" and contradictions that were arising as to how desirable and even how applicable the traits labelled "feminine" were to each woman. "At first I really enjoyed construction but after a while trying to be clean was a big problem. I had grease underneath everything and you get muscular. I feel like I'm not a woman anymore."

"Being feminine is when a guy can look after you," a labourer explained, and in the next breath protested, "Now I can look after myself. I don't feel I'm feminine in that I have to have someone help me open doors. They know bloody well I work like them. Why shouldn't I open my own door? I'll open the door for them!"
Others felt more at ease with their changes. "My idea of femininity is more amorphous now," a carpenter stated. "I'm not sure what being 'feminine' is, but it's not important to me as much any more. It's more important to me to find out who I really am, what sort of real strengths or weaknesses I have as a person."

Some women begin to recognize their identity as formed by their acts, not in their passivity (non-acts, such as having the door opened for you), nor in their physical appearance. "I'd say my idea of what is 'feminine' has changed," declared a mine mill operator. "In the beginning I fought to keep it, thinking I was going to lose it. Then I realized these were just physical things, so I slowly did away with them as I matured. I'm still a woman even though I don't buy slinky clothes and have my hair done like I did before. And I'm still a woman even though I'm doing what is considered a man's job." "Feminine is just the difference," said another.

These women are struggling to understand that difference in the context of what is appropriate, desirable and comfortable on the non-traditional worksite. "I wouldn't be working here if I was all that feminine," as a driver said, is exactly the point. Feminine behaviour
excludes confidence, assertiveness, physical strength, competence, responsibility for self and mechanical skill, all qualities which women in non-traditional jobs can begin to acquire.

Observation of the material, physical conditions of women, that is, their actions, as they participate in primary production and in a traditionally "male" relation to the means of production, leads us to observe that they take on what might be called masculine characteristics in their behaviour within that context. Their past so-called "inherent passivity" now takes on the perspective of having been an attempt to live within the limits of the seemingly inevitable. It begins to be clear that the structure of the work situation, not simply the personality of the women workers, has a major impact on behaviour.
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IV. CONTRADICTIONS

"Who are You?" said the Caterpillar.

"I - I hardly know, Sir, just at present - at least I know who I was when I got up this morning, but I think I must have been changed several times since then."

- Lewis Carroll
  Alice's Adventures in Wonderland

"Can you imagine a guy in his first day as a secretary?"

- Repairwoman, 1978

The most striking phenomenon generated by the conditions of women's work in non-traditional areas, was a series of contradictions arising out of the social relationships of the workplace and played out in practice at almost every level of the work.

Their basic assumptions and expectations about their job, their fellow workers and themselves, seemed to propel women, at every level of the work, into a series of "no-win" situations. For example, in the pace of her work: when a woman is first hired she usually assumes (and is often told) that she must work hard to please the boss and to prove she can handle the job. Further, she knows that she is taken to be representative of her sex and therefore if she does not do well, no more women will be hired. Women therefore
work hard to prove themselves worthy and keep their job. But the harder they work and the more they please the boss, the more they arouse the resentment of the male workers for "showing them up."

Many of these contradictions could be referred to in popular parlance as "double binds". It should be noted that they are not true double binds, however, because they offer a choice between two alternatives of differing value. "A true double bind," as Anthony Wilden and Tim Wilson have pointed out, "is not simply an awkward situation...a contradiction...nor is a double bind equivalent to the 'horns of a dilemma'...A true double bind...is the result of the fact that one must choose, and moreover choose between incompatible alternatives."

Such contradictions are not merely an entry-level problem. They are the expression of the on-going difficulties and pressures which have been outlined in this study. One of the consequences is that several of the women interviewed were considering quitting.

In spite of the fact that they had got past the barriers of accepting the idea of such work as feasible, had successfully struggled to be hired and to some extent, trained, and had managed to stay on the job for at least
two years, that is, although they had managed to reach the brink of what many would call "success", they were ready to quit. They expressed this desire in terms of frustration ("I've tried twice for this apprenticeship and I know they're not giving it to me because I'm a woman. I'm thinking of doing something else, getting another job"), of boredom with unskilled, labouring work ("You get sick of shovelling after a while. You get sick of standing in the rain. You get sick of routine. You get the mucky, crappy jobs that nobody else wants, you wear out your body and most labourers drink too much. There has to be a stop somewhere where you stop thinking about the money"), and of simply being tired of the "hassle" ("It's a whirlpool. There are so many intricate little things happening around the edges yet there's no conspicuous core problem, no single thing that's happening.")

One reason why they had not yet quit was that they could not imagine an alternative now that they had tasted the advantages of non-traditional work. "What else would I do?" was the key question voiced for several others by a forklift driver. "Do I go back to the office," she asked, "to get runs in my pantyhose and butter up the boss all the time and get damned awful wages?"
Often women recognized many of the contradictions they dealt with daily on the worksite but they could find no acceptable explanation for them. When they did, it was in the vein of individual responsibility. "I'm contradicting myself, aren't I?" they would say, or "I didn't do that right." This feeling of personal responsibility, which was partly the result of isolation from each other, increased the tensions involved in trying to resolve, or avoid, the contradiction the next time. Most dealt with these situations with silence and mute frustration or they lived on an emotional teeter-totter, responding to each situation as it arose. They did not see their dilemma as common to all women in the same position—perhaps because they did not often, if ever, speak to other women in the same position.

One response was simply to try harder. But this not only did not resolve contradictions, it complicated them. "You work really hard and you know you're working as hard as the guys," a labourer said. "You're accomplishing as much and yet there's always going to be someone in the background saying, 'They always get the easier jobs.'" What this woman forgot, was that the men were generally assuming that "women are weak." Therefore she is caught in the contradiction that simply because she is a woman,
any job she does must be soft. And men resent that women get all the soft jobs.

Further, being "gentlemen" and feeling uncomfortable at the unfamiliar sight of female sweat and strain, they feel obliged to help her. They then resent that women don't hold up their end of the work. ("The guys will always figure a woman needs more help," a male labourer explained, "and then they get pissed off. She's not holding up her end.")

Sometimes, of course, men as well as women need help. When women ask for it in situations where a man would also ask, they can be accused of not being capable of handling the job. If they never ask for help they are considered unsociable and thinking themselves "too good" for the rest of the crew.

Another complication in this series of contradictions is that when men do the jobs for women, the women don't learn how to do them for themselves. Men then complain that women just don't catch on and don't deserve further training and promotion.

It has been said, over and over, that contradiction and conflict are inevitable. 2 Karl Marx evolved a clear analysis whereby he explained conflict and change in a dialectical process illustrated, for example, in the
conflict between the owners of private property and the wage labourer whereby the "inevitable" economic movement of private property was toward conflict with labour and its own dissolution with a resultant resolution into a new form of economic relation, communism.³

On a more individual level, in The German Ideology Marx and Engels elaborate on the fact that the social products of the individual, the fruits and the conditions of their "self-activity" (what Simmel calls the "forms of objective culture" - works of art, technology, science, religion, law, etc.) come eventually to be fetters upon it. And the result is change, to suit the new conditions. "In the place of an earlier form of intercourse, which has become a fetter," they assert, "a new one is put...which in its turn becomes a fetter and is then replaced by another." This set of contradictions they see as the origin of "all collusions in history."⁴

Likewise, Georg Simmel perceives that "the whole history of culture is the working out of...contradiction," for where our lives are goal-seeking and impulsive, the forms in which we embody them and which give them meaning are by nature fixed and rigid.⁵ "Life can express itself and realize its freedom only through forms, yet forms must
also necessarily suffocate life and obstruct freedom." \(^6\)

"Life" is thus, according to Simmel, thrown into struggle with its own fixed products and after a period of time will "inevitably" overthrow those forms and raise others in their place. \(^7\) "Life," he concludes, "is inseparably charged with contradiction." \(^8\) It is the key to change.

Implicit in this critique are Simmel's concepts of reciprocity and of dualism. Reciprocity is the principle by which no event or thing has a fixed meaning. Meaning emerges only in interaction with other things or events. Society is the locus of constantly shifting relationships and of constantly shifting meanings within those relationships.

This shift of meanings begins to become apparent, for example, in the situation of swearing on the non-traditional workplace. By established forms of appropriate behaviour between men and women, men "should not" swear in the presence of women. Based on this habitual assumption, men usually stop swearing when a woman comes on the job. But that behaviour (of not swearing in front of "ladies") is not longer appropriate in the context of the industrial workplace. The men are faced with the sudden melting together of two previously totally incompatible
situations - "ladies" and "the worksite". This is the situation of opposition or dualism. The form - no swearing in front of ladies - has become rigid and confining in the context of a new relationship. The form must break open. The inevitable outcome, according to Simmel, must be change.

In fact, this change is not yet generally apparent on the non-traditional workplace and may not be so until certain fundamental pressures are exerted, for example, to assure an increase in the numbers of women on the job. Women described the existing contradictions around swearing as follows: because you are female, men stop swearing in your presence. Then they resent that you made them change their language and become self-conscious. If you do not appear to mind their swearing, you are considered odd and unladylike. If you tell them you mind it, they isolate you as a prig. If you swear, they are offended.

Women experience many more of these contradictory circumstances on the job which are simultaneously "no win" situations and propulsions toward social change, toward the adapting of new expectations and behaviours. For example, women's extreme conspicuousness on the workplace leads to isolation and extra pressures to perform well. The contradiction in this ("the other side of the coin," as
one woman described it) is that "the woman" will be remembered out of a group and possibly as a result given a job.

A variant of this, in regard to their sexual availability, is particularly relevant to deckhands. For a long time women were not hired on boats because they were "bad luck". Soon after women began to be hired, some slept with their skippers and female deckhands are now in demand, the assumption being that even if the woman won't sleep with her skipper, she is a source of sexual status to him because others will assume that she does.

Another contradiction arises from women's enthusiasm to do these jobs well, which has to do with "nimble fingers" and dull jobs. When women are first hired at a non-traditional occupation they are generally given, as an unskilled man would be, routine and monotonous labouring jobs at which they generally work hard and with a minimum of complaint because they are glad for the job and assume they must work hard to keep it. Because women appear to accept dull work with enthusiasm, it is assumed they must find it less boring than men do. Because women find routine work less boring and do it generally so conscientiously and so well, they are maintained in positions of dull, routine
work. Because they accept the dull work, it is assumed they are not interested in the more complex and interesting jobs that come with training and promotion. Therefore it is assumed that women are not interested in promotion.

And of course, there is the contradiction of the words. The jobs at which women are now working, have men's names. A "journeyman" is a "master". The presence of a woman is not even assumed in these skill areas so we must specify her exceptional position, "female journeyman", or assume some awkward stop-gap, "journeyperson". Women's lack of names in this community contributes to their lack of identity.

A further contradiction has to do with the romance of physical work. Part of women's motivation for working hard was that they liked the actual work - astonishing as this was to many of the men - and they particularly liked some of the physical labour.

Labouring work is the dullest, most repetitious, dirtiest and physically demanding of jobs. "Manual shovel operators" as they are kindly referred to at one mine, require less skill and put up with harsher working conditions than almost any other employee in industry. But the
fact of labouring, of hard physical work, seems to hold some romance for women.

There are two aspects of the romantic. The dictionary defines them as: 1. to talk hyperbolically; a picturesque falsehood, and 2. suggestion of or association with the adventurous and chivalrous.

In many ways these women take on non-traditional work as the latter, in accord with Simmel's definition of the adventure as "something which occurs outside the usual continuity of this life...yet is nevertheless felt as a whole, as an integrated unit." The longer they stay in this work, of course, the less it occurs as "outside the usual continuity" and becomes central; the less it becomes an adventure.*

The romance of non-traditional work for women also stems from an aspect of the forbidden. There is an exhilaration that comes from such a public act of rebellion and defiance against what is "ladylike" behaviour. Getting

*Some women are closer to the "falsehood" than the adventurous aspects of the romance of their non-traditional work either because they are not forced by circumstances to take it seriously or because it is a part-time job, "an experience" in which they can afford to focus entirely on the enjoyable, adventurous aspects and ignore the rest.
dirty, swearing and clomping about in steel toed boots can be wickedly pleasurable.

Another romantic aspect of non-traditional work about which women were more reticent to speak is the exhilaration they experienced at using their bodies as never before. After some conversation they would confess that physical work could be "sensuous" and "a meditation."

"Once you got over the hurting part," a lumber piler said, "and set up a rhythm of work for yourself, it was almost peaceful and calming. Your body felt very graceful." They found themselves in the contradictory position of being more aware of their bodies but having to suppress it more so as to maintain their low profile as (sexual) females.

It also appeared that impersonalized industrial work, primary production as opposed to service work, offered women more personal dignity. "I didn't have to smile all the time," a smelter worker said. Working with the raw materials of lumber, minerals and fish, women had the pride of not only serving the fish for someone else's pleasure, but of catching it in return for cash. They are not only using the kitchen knives but refining the molybdenum for stainless steel, not only decorating the houses but processing the lumber and building them.
It follows that the romance of physical labour appears to have a further basis in class distinctions and the question of what we consider bona fide "work". It was clear that women felt that as secretaries and waitresses (and certainly as mothers and wives) they did not do productive work in the same way that they did when they dug a ditch. In the same vein, why do secretaries in the British Columbia Government Employees Union (B.C.G.E.U.) refuse to ask for wages equal to that of labourers in the same union - equal pay for work of equal value?  

The separation of mental and physical labour, said Marx in *The German Ideology*, was the first great division of labour. It could be argued that there lingers a historical memory, a suspicion and guilt among those who do mental labour, that the person who sweats mentally is not as much of a "worker" as one who sweats physically. This seems further inextricably linked to the sexual image of a "real man" as a burly type with hairy armpits and a labouring job from which he rises glistening with sweat: a slave but a noble one. Labouring, then, physical activity, has an aura of sensual vitality. In some sense, the person who works hard with her or his body has more "life" than one who does not.
Finally, the attitude that physical work is more genuinely "work" is reinforced by the fact that the universal measure of value in this culture, money, is being increasingly evenly distributed between the two types of labour. We limit the use of the term "professional" to the white collar occupations, but even a professional must have some respect for the tradesman, plumber or electrician, who charges $15 an hour for her skills.

The romance of non-traditional work for women is thus not without some basis in fact. It includes the following elements:

1. It is outside the usual continuity of most women's lives. It is an adventure, at least in its initial stages.

2. It allows a sense of greater personal freedom and dignity than traditional service work.*

3. It reveals the sensual pleasure of physical effort and experience.

4. It offers social recognition and acclaim for the fact that it is high paying and is respected as "good honest work".

*It is recognized that women are still totally within the framework of alienation experienced by all industrial labour in that they do not own their means of production and they have no control over the goods they produce.
The contradictions outlined above have not arisen on any single worksite, as the result of the peculiar and coincidental meeting of a particular group of individuals. They have been observed in striking consistency on every worksite, in every industry, in each of the areas of resource extraction. They do not appear to be simply an entry level problem, as they are consistently observed at every level of the women's skill development. In fact, as increasing numbers of women seek skilled training, they may become more intense. Despite individual and minor differences, these women, given a voice, speak of strikingly similar experiences which, it can only be assumed, are elicited by their similar relations to the resource extraction industries in which they work and by the nature of the organization of those industries themselves, as well as to their common roots in the social expectations of this culture.

Women and men on the non-traditional workplace are caught in the contradictions between the forms of traditional social expectations and new material conditions. In particular, the characteristics of the feminine role have become a "fetter" in the context of non-traditional work. Women in one frame of reference, that is, familiar with traditional service work and the socially accepted
definitions of what is "feminine" behaviour are put, or have put themselves, into a very different frame of reference on the non-traditional worksite. Within the disjunction that results, the feminine behaviours which were once largely unconsciously played out, become both conscious and conspicuous.

In the examples given, contradictions were precipitated by assumptions that women's behaviour could be assumed on the basis of what has come to be defined as the feminine role. If men did not assume women's feminine incapacity for a "man's job", they would have to observe the individual woman's capacities and attitudes on the job and proceed in their response to her from there. Women will handle the job, it would be observed, in as wide a variety of manners, skills and styles, as do men.

This conflict and contradiction in the social community where women have taken on non-traditional occupations, follows a pattern of historical development. It begins to become evident that the workplace has become the locus of social change. Men and women are challenged to release themselves from the "fetters" of their old behaviours and find new, more appropriate ones. In the meantime, the difficulties and pressures generated by the
social contradictions, in conjunction with the structural pressures generated by women's token representation on the job, contribute substantially to sustaining the marginality of women in the non-traditional labour force.
FOOTNOTES: Chapter IV


4 Marx and Engels, The German Ideology, p.89.

5 Simmel, "The Conflict in Modern Culture," p.375.

6 Ibid., p.391.

7 Ibid., p.376.

8 Ibid., p.392.


APPENDIX A

Interview Format

I. Background:

- What is your father's/mother's education, work experience, income?

- What is your family position (eldest, etc.)? How many brothers and sisters?

- Who did the work in your family, domestic and salaried? Who did chores and how were they divided?

- Place of origin? How long in B.C.?

- Own education?

- What was grandparent's work? education? income?

- Do you have a family hero?

II. Work:

- What jobs have you held and when? How has your income changed?

- How did you get into the non-traditional line of work? this job?

- How long have you worked at your present job? Describe the way you were hired.

- What did your friends say when you took this job? Do any friends do similar work?

- What exactly do you do in your job?

- Are other women working with you? Who are your closest friends at work?
- When you began working how did the men first respond to you? How did you feel? react?

- What did you do in your first few days at work that you don't do now?

- Did you get any special treatment because of your sex?

- What were your expectations when you started this work? Their's? How have you been surprised?

- What qualities of your work are most appreciated? Do people link these to your sex?

- What do you talk about in breaks?

- What makes you feel happiest at work? (When you feel best at work, what is happening?)

- How are your relations with your co-workers on the job? off it?

- Have your sexual relationships to men changed?

- What were the easiest/hardest things for you to handle when you started? what now?

- Have you changed since you started this job? Have you felt pressure from your co-workers to change?

- How do you feel differently about this work after working there for a while?

- Do you belong to a union? How did you join and why? Does it take very much of your personal and/or work time?

- Do women handle this job differently from men?
III. **Community/Home:**

- What was the response of your community to your taking this job? Did anyone try and persuade you to change your mind?

- Has anyone suggested you are taking away a man's job?

- What do your man/peers/children say about your work?

- Who did housework/childcare in your home before you took this job? Who does them now?

- Who stays home when the children are sick?

- How have your man's/peer's/children's attitudes changed over time? What do they say now about your work?

- Do you work as hard now as you used to?

- Do you think women have a better or worse deal working at home or in traditional jobs or in non-traditional jobs? If you could receive the same pay to do any of these, which would you choose?

- Do you feel any differently about being "feminine" than you did before you started this work?

- Anything not touched on? Advice? Favourite story?
APPENDIX B

Numbers of Women in Non-Traditional Work in Mining in British Columbia

**Summer 1979**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mine</th>
<th>OP/UG</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Total Hourly Work Force</th>
<th>Number Non-Trad. Female</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Afton</td>
<td>OP</td>
<td>Kamloops</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bethlehem</td>
<td>OP</td>
<td>Ashcroft</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bell Copper*</td>
<td>OP</td>
<td>Granisle</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boss Mountain*</td>
<td>OP</td>
<td>Hendrix Lake</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brenda*</td>
<td>OP</td>
<td>Peachland</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cassiar</td>
<td>OP</td>
<td>Cassiar</td>
<td>571</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cominco** (2 mines)</td>
<td>UG</td>
<td>Kimberley</td>
<td>923</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craigmont</td>
<td>UG</td>
<td>Merritt</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endako</td>
<td>OP</td>
<td>Fraser Lake</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Source: The Mining Association of British Columbia. "Non-traditional female" was defined as any female who worked in an hourly, non-clerical and full time position in the mine work force.

2 OP/UG: Open Pit/Underground

*Noranda Properties

**Sullivan Mine
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mine</th>
<th>OP/UG</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Total Hourly Work Force</th>
<th>Number Non-Trad. Force Female</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fording</td>
<td>OP</td>
<td>Elkford</td>
<td>851</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gibraltar</td>
<td>OP</td>
<td>McLeese Lake</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiser</td>
<td>OP &amp; UG</td>
<td>Sparwood</td>
<td>1,581</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2 mines)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lornex</td>
<td>OP</td>
<td>Logan Lake</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newmont***</td>
<td>OP</td>
<td>Princeton</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teck</td>
<td>OP</td>
<td>Beaverdell</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>OP</td>
<td>Port Hardy</td>
<td>696</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wesfrob</td>
<td>UG</td>
<td>Tasu</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western</td>
<td>UG</td>
<td>Campbell River</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zapata Granby</td>
<td>OP</td>
<td>Granisle</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>8,549</strong></td>
<td><strong>471</strong></td>
<td><strong>5.5</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

***Similkameen Division
### APPENDIX C

#### Numbers of Women in Non-Traditional Work in Forestry in British Columbia

**Summer 1979**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Total Hourly Work Force</th>
<th>Number Non-Trad. Female</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. MacMillan Bloedel Ltd.:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logging</td>
<td>3,348</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plywood</td>
<td>1,146*</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>11.0*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sawmills (Includes students)</td>
<td>3,450</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>2.0*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pulp and Paper:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alberni</td>
<td>1,243</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powell River</td>
<td>963</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarmac</td>
<td>1,313</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Island</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Packaging:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrugated Containers</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Personnel and Employee Relations Departments in each company. Note that these figures are those of the three largest forestry companies in British Columbia and it is not clear to what extent these proportions can be generalized to the industry at large.

*Approximate figure.*
## Total Number

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Hourly</th>
<th>Non-work</th>
<th>Trad.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MacMillan Bloedel Ltd. (cont'd):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Packaging:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bag</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11,858</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.C. Forest Products Ltd.:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logging</td>
<td>1,088</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plywood and Sawmills</td>
<td>3,161</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pulp and Paper</td>
<td>1,161</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5,410</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crown Zellerbach Canada Ltd.:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logging</td>
<td>860</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plywood</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pulp and Paper</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Packaging</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armstrong</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lumby</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. **Crown Zellerbach Canada Ltd. (cont'd):**

**Kelowna:**

- Sawmill: 168
- Plywood: 140, 14 (10.0%)
- Bin and Pallet: 20
- Timber: 13

**Campbell River:**

- Total: 863, 4 (0.5%)

**Total:** 4,061, 113 (2.8%)

---

**MacMillan Bloedel Ltd., B.C. Forest Products Ltd. and Crown Zellerbach Canada Ltd.**

**TOTAL:** 21,329, 721 (3.4%)
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