

7-11-2016

# Inequality, Position, and Perception: Understanding and Addressing Workplace Harassment in Oregon's Construction Trades

Sasha Mae Bassett  
*Portland State University*

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

Follow this and additional works at: [http://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/open\\_access\\_etds](http://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/open_access_etds)

 Part of the [Sociology Commons](#)

---

## Recommended Citation

Bassett, Sasha Mae, "Inequality, Position, and Perception: Understanding and Addressing Workplace Harassment in Oregon's Construction Trades" (2016). *Dissertations and Theses*. Paper 3044.

10.15760/etd.3038

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations and Theses by an authorized administrator of PDXScholar. For more information, please contact [pdxscholar@pdx.edu](mailto:pdxscholar@pdx.edu).

Inequality, Position, and Perception:  
Understanding and Addressing Workplace Harassment in Oregon's Construction Trades

by  
Sasha Mae Bassett

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the  
requirements for the degree of

Master of Science  
in  
Sociology

Thesis Committee:  
Maura Kelly, Chair  
Amy Lubitow  
Melissa Thompson

Portland State University  
2016

## Abstract

Does our status impact the way we interpret change? This study proposes that one's level of power within their workplace, as granted by their role within the organization, shapes the way in which people interpret adjustments to the norms of that organization. Drawing on qualitative focus groups with forty-four members of Oregon's construction trades, this study examines the relationship between participants' position within the industry's structure and their opinions about the changing jobsite norms brought on by recent waves of diversification in the workforce. Findings suggest that within Oregon's construction trades, hierarchical distribution of power via industry position serves to stratify and reorganize the attitudes and responses of participants. This is done through situating knowledge; different positions hold differential understandings of which issues generate harassment, present barriers to progress, and serve as potential solutions to the issue. Results show that participants who occupy positions of power within the trades tend to frame harassment as an interpersonal problem, which can be solved by interpersonal solutions. Thus, participants in positions of power saw change as an incremental process that was constantly happening. Conversely, participants who were not in positions of power within the trades tended to frame harassment as an institutional problem that required industry-wide changes to be fully addressed. As a result, participants with less power in the trades framed change as generational for the industry; something that could only be achieved after the current workforce. Ultimately, this study highlights the tension between interpersonal and institutional strategies for organizational change.

## Table of Contents

Abstract .....	i
List of Tables .....	iii
List of Figures .....	iv
1. Introduction.....	1
2. Theoretical Framework.....	11
3. Literature Review.....	16
4. Data and Method.....	24
5. Policies and Experiences .....	32
6. Addressing Harassment on Jobsites.....	42
7. Perceptions of Change .....	63
8. Discussion.....	76
References.....	85
Appendix A: Focus Group Questions.....	89

## List of Tables

Table 1: Participant Demographics .....	26
---	----

## List of Figures

Figure 1: Typical Jobsite Chain of Command.....	9
Figure 2: Participant Conceptualization of Harassment by Social Location.....	77
Figure 3: Participant Attitudes Regarding Changing Industry Norms.....	79

## 1. Introduction

The workplace has historically been home to many forms of harassment, hazing and violence. Across workplaces, broad cultural shifts in norms may or may not reduce conflict along lines of gender, race and sexual orientation, but it is clear that workplace desegregation (and the change in organizational norms and values that often accompanies desegregation efforts) happens at different rates for different types of workplaces (Cohen 2013). Blue color jobs, particularly jobs in the construction trades, are prone to forms of discrimination and harassment that impacts both formal and informal interactions between workers on jobsites (Kelly et al. 2015). While national studies on workplace desegregation within the construction industry are uncommon, and highly focused on gender as the primary axis of difference among workers, a recent analysis of the 2010 US Census found that men vastly outnumbered women in construction careers, resulting in a gender composition that is 97.6% men and 2.4% women (Cohen 2013). To address this, the state of Oregon has taken specific measures to alleviate employment disparities in its construction trades along lines of gender and racial/ethnic diversity (IWPR 2014). Recent demographic analysis of Oregon's construction apprentices shows that white men continue to make up an overwhelming majority of apprentices entering the trades in spite of the state's efforts (79%), followed by men of color (14%), white women (5%), and women of color (2%) (Kelly et al 2015). While Oregon's construction apprentices are statistically more diverse than the national sample due to these efforts, at least in terms of gender, these figures continue to paint a less-than optimistic portrait of diversity in this industry.

In many homogenous workforces, progressive shifts in workplace norms can be notoriously slow to occur, much to the detriment of women and people of color as well as lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) workers (Basford et al. 2013). In spite of great strides towards meaningful diversification in these workplaces, microaggressions and other covert indignities remain a persistent and pervasive part of the harassing culture present on many work sites (Basford et al. 2013). This is particularly significant when considering the ways in which these subtle, more innocuous forms of harassment result in hostile workplaces for marginalized populations in trade careers. Ultimately, this study seeks to show how the pervasive persistence of harassing behavior on trade jobsites impacts the ways in which various groups of tradespeople perceive the shifting jobsite norms around these behaviors, and thus, examine the ways in which social positioning within the structure of the trades affects the ways in which participants understand and seek to address the issue of harassment within the industry at large.

### *The Structure of Oregon's Trades*

The world of work within construction is composed of a constellation of occupations, all working together in synchronized harmony to build highways, bridges, and cities. Relying on the combined effort of carpenters, plumbers, iron workers, electricians, pipe fitters, rod busters, laborers, and many other types of skilled workers, construction careers are part of a notoriously fast-paced, hard-working industry. Due to this, new workers more than simply trainees on the jobsite; they are indentured into an apprenticeship through a union or open shop (non-union) program that typically lasts five to seven years for most construction occupations. During this time the new worker will

be expected to learn and perform their trade with the mentorship of an established professional (or journey level worker) in their chosen field. At the end of this apprenticeship, ideally, the worker will transition into the journey level, or “journey out” into the trades as an established professional. As a result, trade apprenticeships are highly competitive and workers often seek additional leverage into the industry through skill building (via pre-apprenticeship programs) and/or networking with established professionals.

In ideal conditions, workers in the trades can start off as an apprentice and work up the journey level with minimal issues. From this point, however, the worker has a variety of career options open to them: they can continue as a journey worker and take on apprentices of their own, they can take a supervisory position (e.g. foreman or trainer within a company), they can take an administrative position within their trade’s union or within a pre-apprenticeship program, or they can establish their own company and hire other tradespeople. In this sense, the skilled workers that the industry relies on to perform the work are only a piece of a larger hierarchy within the trades that includes a variety of administrative positions with varying degrees of authority and power over the general workforce. Since each individual trade is structured in this manner, with individual companies and jobsites acting as sites for trade-on-trade interaction, the larger trades industry relies on cooperation and professionalism to maintain efficiency on worksites.

Due to this, there are often multiple figures of authority available for workers to report to. The first level of authority is given to field supervisors (e.g. foremen or superintendents), who are present on jobsites and act as the day-to-day team leaders.

These are people who have achieved journey level standing in their field and typically have enough experience to warrant them running the operations of a jobsite for their companies. Generally, supervisors in the field are the company's first line of defense against abuses and policy breaches. Supervisors are also responsible for providing a majority of on-the-job training and giving policy refreshers to the workforce (commonly referred to as "toolbox talks").

Another level of authority is occupied by union representatives, who hold influence over the industry via their ability to hold companies as well as individuals accountable to a larger policy and procedural standard for the trade at large. While staff of workers organizations (e.g. unions) are typically powerful figures within their trade, they are not always present on jobsites and thus, do not hold direct power over individual workers in the same way that a field supervisor might. Similarly, the staff of pre-apprenticeship programs are often cited as authority figures within the trades due to their standing as industry trainers and instructors. However the staff of pre-apprenticeship programs are limited in their ability to act in comparison to their union counterparts. This causes pre-apprenticeship program staff to rely on connections to other authority figures within the company or union to achieve their goals.

In most cases, the highest degree of authority is granted to company employees who work in an office setting (human resources, engineers, or company owners). For most companies, these employees are not present during day-to-day functions of the jobsite and are seen as the most willing to cite or enforce company policy. Among office staff, owners hold the most power, even though they are not present on jobsites in the

way that supervisors are, as they set the policy and procedural expectations for their companies. Due to their enigmatic presence on most jobs, many workers may feel that the office staff are unapproachable in comparison to the supervisors on the field and thus, may never actually interact with them in a meaningful way. In this respect, the power held by the office staff distance them from the general workforce and set them apart as distinctly separate.

Since the trades are largely project-based, each job relies on different companies (often from different trades) to work in tandem. In most situations, a larger company will act as the prime contractor (or lead company on the project) and divvy out the rest of the work to smaller companies through sub-contracting. This provides structure and organization to the industry as a whole, by allowing general contractors to absorb the larger logistical costs and streamline tasks for sub-contractors. While this seems fairly straightforward at first, construction jobsites often have multiple crews from multiple trades working simultaneously. Under these circumstances, there are multiple figures of authority available for workers to report to, which may be a source of confusion for less-established trades workers. One white female workers' organization staff member summed this concern up succinctly:

[There is] complexity in the industry because you have a lot of different people that are involved in the worker... I imagine that workers sometimes find themselves a little uncertain: Do I go to the [general contractor's] person? Do I go to my [union]? Or do I go to the sub-contractor that's actually employing me on this job?

In spite of this ambiguity, there is a fairly clear chain of command within companies that links workers to their supervisors and office staff, and most tradespeople are aware that they can also express concerns to the union representatives within their

trade. Unfortunately, unions and pre-apprenticeship programs may not necessarily be informed of the most pertinent issues that occur on specific jobsites because they are somewhat removed from the field and often cannot speak to specific problems at the level of detail needed to sufficiently address them on jobsites. As a result, staff for these programs may seem ineffective to workers and thus, fail to provide an alternative outlet for grievances. Additionally, while these programs can provide an alternative method for reporting jobsite issues, they simply do not hold the same status within the industry as those from the formalized chain of command. This presents several barriers for the training staff of unions and pre-apprenticeship programs, the most common being inability to act when issues arise.

#### *Research Question*

This research seeks to examine how tradespeople characterize cultural changes in their industry around issues of harassment and hazing on jobsites. Specifically, this project seeks to answer the following question: *How does placement within the power structure of the trades affect participants' perception of changing norms around harassment and hazing on construction jobsites?*

Using data from qualitative focus groups with various stakeholders within the trades (workers, field supervisors, office staff, unions, and advocacy groups), I will investigate: 1. How individuals from various levels of the construction trades characterize the changing culture of their industry; 2. What types of barriers they perceive to change, and 3. What factors they perceive as necessary to address harassing norms and/or reduce the frequency of bullying, harassing, or hazing interactions in the trades. By assessing

these factors in tandem, I hope to highlight the ways in which individual standing within the trades workforce serves to influence participants' perception of the issue surrounding harassment, as well as overall attitude towards addressing harassment in a meaningful way on jobsites.

This study builds on existing literature that characterizes the nature of harassment and hazing behaviors against particular groups of workers on jobsites (Kelly et al 2015; Denissen 2010A; Denissen and Saguy 2014; Paap 2008) by moving beyond simply describing the nature of harassing incidents to analyze how people from differing positions within the trades construct this issue. Furthermore, by comparing participants' belief as to whether or not change around harassment on construction jobsites is possible to the types of knowledge they have about harassment (e.g. policy/procedure or experiential knowledge), this study assesses the ways in which a participant's employment position within the trade hierarchy informs their attitude about changing norms. This is additionally significant as it holds strong implications for any solutions that may be implemented to address the issue of harassment towards women, racial/ethnic minorities or LGBT workers on jobsites.

### *Context of Study*

The state of Oregon recently developed a comprehensive program to improve both gender and racial/ethnic diversity in its highway construction workforce with the passage of §184.866: *Highway Construction Workforce Development* in 2009 (IWPR 2014). This legislation specifically requires the state to utilize federal funding to increase the diversity of its construction workforce, making Oregon and Maryland the only two


states who have passed statutes to permanently dedicate a portion of their federal funding for the training and support of diverse workers in construction careers (IWPR 2014). While Maryland's program (BuildUp) has a more general emphasis on increasing diversity overall, Oregon's initiative (through ODOT and BOLI) has a more targeted focus on gender diversity within construction careers, setting an explicit target for women's employment in the industry at 24 percent (IWPR 2014).

To achieve this end, retention services offered in Oregon currently include funding for child care, fuel subsidies, on-site mentoring, work-readiness (purchasing tools, clothing, etc.) and per diems during training sessions (IWPR 2014). A portion of the funding also goes to pre-apprenticeship programs like Constructing Hope and Oregon Tradeswomen Inc. (OTI) to offer training and career counseling that helps individuals prepare and compete for apprenticeships in the construction industry (IWPR 2014). Additionally, various career fairs, orientations, summer camps and outreach activities for specific trades are funded by Oregon's initiative (IWPR 2014). While these tactics have increased the diversity of the workforce's composition in the construction trades to various degrees, they have also served to highlight and illuminate a major issue with the industry: its harassing culture among workers on jobsites.

Addressing this issue may prove problematic, as Oregon's construction industry can be broken into three hierarchical tiers of employment with varying levels of interaction among its members: office staff (contractors, engineers, human resources, etc.), field supervisors (foremen, superintendents, project managers, etc), and workers

(journeyworkers and apprentices). In addition to the formalized structure of the industry, Oregon's construction trades are supported by the rich network of affiliated

Figure 1: Typical Jobsite Chain of Command



organizations, generated through the various pre-apprenticeships, unions, and open-shop programs; each with its own sphere of influence within the industry. While not formally embedded into the chain of command, worker's organizations (e.g. unions, union apprenticeship groups) and advocacy groups (e.g. pre-apprenticeship programs) serve as a vital point of contact for workers – particularly apprentices – during their careers by providing enrollment and retention services in addition to the employment benefits offered by firms. However, these entities are not the only stakeholders in the industry. Formalized policy agenda for the trades often comes from the state or federal level, rather than from within the industry itself. The implementation and enforcement of these policies, however, is expected to be performed by individual firms under limited governmental supervision. In this respect, a major barrier to addressing the issue of harassment on jobsites could very well be the structure of the construction industry itself.

This study is part of a larger effort on the part of the state of Oregon to address various issues facing its construction workforce through The Workforce Development Project. As such, PSU researchers worked with Oregon's Department of Transportation (ODOT), the Bureau of Labor and Industry (BOLI), Portland Community College (PCC), Oregon Tradeswomen Inc. (OTI), and Green Dot Inc. to conduct focus group interviews, where participants discussed a variety of topics related to the issue of harassment on jobsites including: company policy, personal experiences, various problems and solutions, and whether or not they saw change as possible for the industry. In addition to this, participants also described the structure of the trades as an industry; noting the role that both formalized power structures and informal power structures play on jobsites.

## 2. Theoretical Framework

### *Inequality Regimes*

Joan Acker (1990) represents the idea that organizations can be gendered in how people view and interact with them, with workplaces being no exception. This interactional component can function to segregate organizations along more lines than just gender. In fact, Acker's work has demonstrated that the workplace is highly segregated in ways that provide further definition to class, gender, and racial/ethnic categories – a process driven by the ways in which division of labor, cultural symbols, organizational logic and individual identities are configured in the workplace (Acker 1990; Acker 2004; Acker 2006; Williams et al. 2012). This configuration process functions to informally stratify workers into the categories of “desirable” and “undesirable”, with those workers who conform more closely to the cultural symbols and logics of the workplace tending to be framed as more desirable than other types of workers. While Acker describes this “ideal worker” phenomenon operating primarily along the axis of gender (due to men typically possessing fewer familial obligations than women, and thus being perceived as more able or more willing to work), the pursuit of the most “desirable” worker within the trades results in the elevation of an ideal worker within the industry that is not only able to perform traditionally masculine activities, but of a specified gender, racial identity, ability status, and/or sexual identity (2004).

For the trades, this frequently results in straight, white, male workers entering and advancing in trade careers. Furthermore, this ideology results in a rationalized hierarchy within the organization that is legitimized through systems like work rules, job

descriptions, pay scales, and other types of evaluations that are embedded into most bureaucratic organizations (Acker 2006; Williams, et al. 2012). Acker refers to these hierarchies as being “inequality regimes”: organizations that institutionalize high levels of stratification among workers through an intricate system of practices, policies and procedures that are interwoven, rigid and unchanging over time (2006). In this sense, Weber’s definition of power (the ability of an individual or group to achieve their goals in spite of opposition) as an avenue to fulfill a myriad of interests (e.g. influence, money, privilege, prestige, etc.) is particularly relevant to the discussion of inequality regimes (Llanque 488, 490). Since Weber sees belief in the way power is structured within organizations to reflect a “rational” set of shared ideals as a source of legitimacy, the strength and stability of inequality regimes can be attributed to faith that unequal distribution of power or access within an organization is serving a rational purpose (Llanque 489). In this sense, belief that the organization is acting for a greater organizational good may actually function support systems of inequality within that organization.

Essentially, the notion of an inequality regime illuminates how bureaucratic work practices have the potential to perpetuate class inequality between its members, but it also has strong implications for workers along lines of gender, race, and sexual identity (Acker 2006). For organizations that function as inequality regimes, unequal practices between workers can become accepted as a natural and normal byproduct of class competition; in many cases, the full complexity of inequality within an organization may be invisible between its various levels of employment and is accepted as status quo

(Acker 2006). Thus, the complex inequalities embedded into the structure of these institutions (workplaces included) serve to reproduce inequality between workers through both overt and covert means (Acker 2006). As a result of the direct and indirect social controls implemented through policies and procedures, these workplaces also become embedded with norms and expectations that operate along multiple lines of identity for its members (Acker 2006). In this respect, it is important to recognize how this lens may also function to downplay the role of personal agency in issues of discrimination in the workplace. While inequality regimes are marked by their rigidity in structure and function, they have the potential to change if a great deal of concerted effort were made by a large proportion of the people who occupy the regime (Acker 2006). However, before any organization can attempt to overcome its inequality regime, Acker says that any inequality present in the system must first be made visible and identified as illegitimate to everyone involved (2006).

### *Positionality and Situated Knowledge*

The way an organization is structured (in terms of demographic composition or policy) is only a half of the issue when addressing workplace discrimination or harassment, as the agency of individuals can function to uphold problematic social structures within organizations. By adopting a positional approach, is possible to articulate how one's social location shapes their understanding of the world and where they stand in relation to others (Sensoy and DiAngelo, 2012). In this sense, acknowledging the ways in which one's identity might differentially inform their motivations from those of others allows for the assessment of how the differential

interpretation of an issue between individuals or groups of individuals can result in vastly different responses to it (Sensoy and DiAngelo, 2012). Due to this, Haraway's (1988) framework of situated knowledge is appropriate to apply to the study of inequality regimes as it requires that the object of study be pictured as an actor and agent, not as a resource or as a final authority whose agency should be disregarded as a factor in creating "objective" knowledge. This is pivotal to address in qualitative research as the agency of the people studied itself can transform the outcomes of projects by way of what information they choose to emphasize or omit during the interview process (Warren and Karner 2015).

Haraway (1988) articulates this concern succinctly by stating that "knowledge" itself (any information presented as "fact" or "truth") can function as a route to a desired form of very objective power. In this respect, persuasion must be taken into account within the context of how facts and knowledge are presented and contextualized (Haraway 1988). Since the experiences of tradespeople are situated within a larger context of an inequality regime, this approach dictates that we cannot simply take their word at face-value. This is particularly important to consider as certain participants, particularly those in positions of power, may be more inclined to omit or modify some of their responses rather than share the full breadth of their experiences. Thus, Haraway's framework is necessary to implement when coming to terms with the agency of research participants, since it assists in deterring the creation and dissemination of false knowledge (Haraway, 1988). Combined, the positional approach and lens of situated knowledge are extremely useful to apply to the study of inequality regimes – the

construction trades in particular – as these frameworks build upon and compliment structural analyses of inequality regimes to incorporate the ways in which an individual’s action (or inaction) can serve to reinforce the functional rigidity of oppressive organizations. Specifically, this provides an opportunity to critique the dynamics of power embedded into the structure of Oregon’s construction trades and how power itself can shape the actions of individuals in ways which extend beyond the limits of the organization’s structure.

### 3. Literature Review

#### *Harassment and Discrimination in Construction Trades*

In many ways, Oregon's construction trades are a prime example of Acker's "inequality regimes" in practice. A vast spectrum of discrimination occurs in the construction trades at every point of contact in one's work, including its hiring practices, formation of work groups and informal interactions between workers (Kelly et al. 2015). Within the context of white male-dominated work culture, this is legitimated through a success-driven discourse around work (Kelly et al. 2015). Basford et al (2013) describe this as occurring when personnel decisions are based on ascribed characteristics rather than an individual's qualifications or job performance. In many circumstances, the result is a workplace where persistent microaggression – everyday behaviors (whether intentional or unintentional) that exclude, demean, insult, oppress, or otherwise express hostility or indifference towards a group (or groups) – becomes acceptable as normal interaction on jobsites (Basford et al. 2013).

While harassment towards apprentices is pervasive throughout the construction trades, research suggests that in Oregon women and racial minorities face negative treatment at disproportionate rates in comparison to their white male counterparts while working (Berik et al. 2011; Kelly et al. 2015). This may take the form of overt sexism, racism or homophobia that persists through indirect behavior and language – particularly through use of competitive humor that undermines another worker (Cohen and Braid 2000). However, these trends are not limited to Oregon, or even the U.S.; a strong gendered division of labor persists throughout the trades internationally as well.

Characterization of construction work as high-risk and profit driven results in women being funneled into administrative roles, while men perform manual labor tasks in Australia's construction industry (Lingard and Francis 2004). In fact, a great breadth of international research on discrimination and harassment in construction trades is focused specifically on gender and the treatment of women in trade careers (Lingard and Francis 2004; Denissen 2010A; Denissen 2010B).

Frequently the focus of study, women in the construction trades tend to face differential treatment in the form of insufficient training or being assigned less physically demanding tasks at work than males (Berik et al. 2011; Greed 2000; Denissen 2010B), exclusion from networking, promotion and other job opportunities (Byrd 1999; Greed 2000; Denissen 2010B), and facing stereotypes that they are not really there to work (Byrd 1999) or that they only intend to be there until they have children (Greed 2000). Additionally, research suggests that men's and women's definitions of sexual harassment differ (Denissen 2010A) and in many cases women may be structurally or situationally forced between expressing discomfort with persistent sexual harassment (or other forms of sexist behavior) and being perceived as "part of the team" and worthy of continued employment in ways that men may not (Watts 2007; Denissen 2010B). While many women adapt and perform aggressive or masculine behavior to fit in with the dominant culture of construction (Denissen 2010B), this option is not available to all women. As a result, there is a frequent loss of female workers within the construction industry (Kelly et al. 2015). Similarly, those who fail to confront instances of gender-based discrimination or harm may unwittingly participate in its continuation on the jobsite

(Denissen 2010A), leaving most construction jobsites as hostile environments with respect to women (Paap 2008).

Paralleling the experiences of white women, racial minorities are often excluded from vital social networks that provide work. Historically, racial minorities (African Americans in particular) have been underrepresented in the construction trades regardless of their amount of education or training (Waldinger and Bailey 1991). Since the industry relies on informal networks (often based around family ties) for hiring purposes, racial minorities are frequently excluded from notifications of upcoming work and at times they're even excluded from events held by trade unions or similar worker organizations (Waldinger and Bailey 1991). Additionally, racial minorities are often mismatched with work tasks that do not suit their skills and are labeled accordingly as "bad workers" (Waldinger and Bailey 1991; Paap 2008). Being perceived as an inferior worker allows racial minorities to become acceptable targets of jokes and verbal harassing (Paap 2008). Also like white women, racial minorities may face stereotypes that they are only present in jobsites to meet a diversity quota and can be perceived as unfairly benefitting from affirmative action policies (Paap 2008). For many racial minorities in construction trades, the combined stigma of having their work constantly scrutinized and being persistently written off as an inferior worker results in mistreatment, a lack of mentoring, and in some cases, a forced exit from the trades altogether (Paap 2008).

Much like other marginalized groups, LGBT workers face differential treatment within construction trades that varies between groups of sexual minorities in complex ways. Studies show that gay men are less accepted on jobsites than lesbians due to the

hyper-masculine culture of construction trades, which is in line with the treatment of white women within the trades more broadly; where adopting a “butch” identity makes being a woman more acceptable on jobsites than being a man that is perceived as homosexual or “feminine” (Denissen and Saguy 2014). However, the relative acceptance of lesbians on jobsites stands in contrast to norms of heteronormativity, and in many cases, this provisional acceptance of women’s sexual deviance in the trades tends to be counter-balanced by objectification of those women by their male counterparts (Denissen and Saguy 2014). Due to this, openly lesbian-identified tradespeople are expected to simultaneously partake in hyper-masculine activities (such as story-telling or inappropriate jokes) and accept the sexual advances of her coworkers as part of her job. Others may simply choose to remain “stealth” or closeted in terms of sexual identity (Denissen and Saguy 2014). Both strategies reflect a need for sexual minorities to be accepted by the dominant, straight male culture while involved in construction work – if only for their own safety.

In many circumstances, the lack of a critical mass of diverse workers continues to stand as a major barrier to achieving more just practices in construction trades (Cohen 2013). This has strong implications along multiple lines of identity and while societal trends indicate that there are many more women and racial minorities with college degrees for employers to choose from, there is simply too little pressure to hire them in traditionally blue-collar jobs – construction included – to shift its composition in a meaningful way (Cohen 2013). Complicating things further, workplaces with greater task segregation appear less likely to place diverse workers in management roles, suggesting

that increased access to higher-level employment for may be a prerequisite for a more diverse workforce (Cohen 2013). While shifting cultural attitudes among workers and state intervention might provide some grounds for expediting workforce desegregation, current evidence does not clearly show how to reduce workplace harassment and segregation among workers along lines of identity in construction trade careers (Cohen 2013).

### *Mechanisms of Change*

There are a number of federal programs and initiatives targeted at increasing the number of diverse workers in the construction workforce, and individual states may also receive support in the form of allocated funds from the larger US Department of Transportation (USDOT) budget for a broad range of purposes (IWPR 2014). This may include university or community college support, employee training, or outreach efforts to promote careers in construction (IWPR 2014). While federally-funded programs are a more substantial and reliable way for states to improve pathways for marginalized workers to enter construction jobs, Oregon has designated a section of the budget specifically for this end (IWPR 2014). As part of the 2009 ODOT/BOLI initiative to improve diversity in the construction workforce, a clear target was set with regards to gender diversity, and as of 2013 women only made up 6.25 percent of the construction workforce, falling quite short of the initial goal of having women compose 24 percent (IWPR 2014). While the combined influence of retention services and pre-apprenticeship program enrollment has seemingly helped ease women's entry into the construction trades, it may be negatively impacted by a lack of emphasis on sexuality, race, or

ethnicity as additional barriers to employment and retention for some workers (IWPR 2014). This suggests that diversifying the construction workforce may not be as simple as training diverse employees for the work – it may also require shifting the culture of the industry itself to be more hospitable for workers with marginalized identities.

As a result, most bottom-up change strategies are typically initiated from outside of mainstream construction culture (Greed 2000). In this circumstance, change is most often instigated by union organizations or apprenticeship programs outside or beyond the jurisdiction of official trade organizations and companies (Greed 2000). Additionally, community programs for apprenticeships actively outreach towards marginalized groups for recruitment into trade careers (Waldinger and Bailey 1991). These programs may also provide retention services like mentoring or peer support groups that provide much-needed social or emotional support throughout the process (Waldinger and Bailey 1991). However, bottom-up change is hindered by a deniable plausibility of inequality in an organization, since those who are positioned to benefit from unequal practices on jobsites are usually able to ignore both the effects of inequality for their workers as well as their participation in the creation of inequality (Paap 2008).

Conversely, state-level regulators are positioned to and often charged with increasing participation in construction apprenticeships among marginalized groups from the top-down. In many instances, regulators possess the tools to enforce diverse hiring practices but fail to act on this in meaningful ways within the industry (Waldinger and Bailey 1991). Instances of state-level intervention which set goals for recruitment and retention of marginalized populations have proved successful in improving conditions for

those workers, however union strategies to address the homogenous workforce of the construction trades often result in affirmative action policies and equal employment opportunity (EEO) programs implemented at face-value only (Waldinger and Bailey 1991; Paap 2008). Additionally, those in charge of enforcing EEO policy are often positioned in such a way that they are able to simply ignore their responsibilities without much consequence (Paap 2008). In this respect, unions and other safeguards within firms can function to obfuscate issues of discrimination and make harassing cultural norms invisible, even though they are vital in providing positive effort and oversight on jobsites with regards to diversity (Price 2002).

Trade unions can serve as bulwarks for workers in their struggles with employers, serving the dual purpose of halting competition among workers and assisting with negotiations with owners and firms (Draper 1979). However since workers are ultimately replaceable, their relationship with the owners of firms is often one of asymmetrical interdependence: where each of the workers must be more concerned with the wellbeing of the company than the company is about the wellbeing of its individual workers (Offe and Weisenthal 1980). While workers organizations and unions attempt to counterbalance organizational power, most unions are embedded into a system where they must first serve the interests of capital before they can serve the interests of their members (Offe and Weisenthal 1980). Additionally, while unions have procedures in place and relative power to promote diversity in the workforce, their concern with representing the majority of their members (usually white men) stands at odds with diversification efforts (Paap 2008).

While ideally, unions could benefit marginalized groups (especially white women), this goal becomes deprioritized in reality as a result of utilitarian views of what the majority needs: the “greatest good” for the “greatest number” of its members (Byrd 1999; Mellor and Golay 2014). This holds strong implications for the U.S., where recent growth rates for women, racial or ethnic minorities, and new immigrants in various trades have pressed unions to reconsider what they mean by “greatest number” (Mellor and Golay 2014). However, research suggests that when workers perceive unions as supportive of progressive policies that aid marginalized workers, there are increases in union membership and participation among those groups (Mellor and Golay 2014). Given that union apprenticeship programs are generally better at attracting and retaining female apprentices, there has been an increase in pressure on union groups to promote diversity in the workforce (Byrd 1999; Paap 2008). This pressure tends to have a negative response within the union, as diversification is typically perceived by white male members as the union being overly protective of women and people of color, while marginalized workers perceive inaction from the union as those with power continuing to act in favor of an all-white majority (Paap 2008). Due to this tension between membership pools, some scholars are skeptical of trade unions’ ability to promote any agenda that addresses gender or racial/ethnic discrimination (Bradley and Healy 2008; Paap 2008; Waldinger and Bailey 1991).

#### 4. Data and Method

This study was conducted in partnership with the staff of Oregon Tradeswomen (OTI), Portland Community College (PCC), and Green Dot Et Cetera, Inc (Green Dot), with funding from the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT), Bureau of Labor and Industry (BOLI), and Community Builders Association (CBA). PSU researchers worked closely with Green Dot staff to develop the focus group guide, as well as recruit focus group facilitators and note-takers. PCC staff were responsible for securing the location for focus groups to take place and coordinating participant RSVPs, while OTI was primarily responsible for locating and inviting individuals who met inclusion criteria for the study to participate in focus groups; they targeted workers in the construction trades as well as supervisors, contractors and employers, community-based organizations and other relevant stakeholders. To ensure safe spaces for the workers to share experiences related to gender or race, OTI specifically recruited white men, white women, men of color, and women of color to participate in race/gender matched groups. Recruitment was done via email, phone calls, and face-to-face conversations with contractors, employers and other known stakeholders from coalition groups as well as workers and representatives from relevant companies and unions. Participation was voluntary; all individuals who were available, met the criteria for inclusion, and demonstrated interest in participating were included in the study. The recruitment process was performed primarily by OTI with input from Green Dot staff and researchers from Portland State University (PSU). Note-taking and facilitation of focus groups were performed by the staff of Green Dot and PSU researchers.

Ten qualitative focus groups were held to over a two-day period in February 2015 in Northeast Portland. Focus group sessions took place in a private meeting space at a local community college's satellite facility. Upon arrival, participants' completed short survey as part of the written consent process that collected basic demographic information and asked several attitudinal questions about harassment towards specific groups in the trades. This information was de-identified and digitally coded for descriptive statistical analysis. Once all participants had arrived and gave consent, the focus group interview began.

In general, focus groups lasted between 90 and 120 minutes and had an average of 4 participants per group. The facilitator would introduce discussion topics covering issues of worker well-being, causes of workplace harassment, hazing, violence or aggression, and resources available to workers who experience a hostile workplace among others (see Appendix B for the complete list of interview questions). Additionally, the facilitator provided working definitions for harassment and hazing, sexual harassment, and violence during each focus groups' consent process. For the purposes of this study, harassment and hazing was defined as "any unwanted or undesirable conduct that puts down or shows hostility or an aversion toward another person at work"; sexual harassment was defined as "sexual conduct that's persistent, hostile, or personal and unwanted"; violence was defined as "any behavior initiated by a worker or group of workers intended to harm another person or group of people at work." A total of 44 individuals participated in focus groups for this study; their demographics are described in Table 1. All ten focus groups

were audiotaped and transcribed; transcripts were then de-identified to protect the identity of respondents.

All transcripts were stored on a password-protected computer while being reviewed for accuracy. Once reviewed, they were uploaded into Dedoose, a cloud-based qualitative coding software, for analysis. Analysis of the transcripts began with the general inductive approach; transcripts were closely read in search of emergent themes, which would be arranged into codes that reflect broader categories of information found

Table 1: Participant Demographics

Category		Number
<i>Race/Ethnicity</i>	White	30
	Black/African American	8
	American Indian/Alaska Native	1
	Latino/Hispanic/Spanish	1
	Other	2
	No Response	2
<i>Gender</i>	Male	17
	Female	25
	Transgender	0
	No Response	2
<i>Sexual Identity</i>	Straight	34
	GLBQ	7
	No Response	3
<i>Age</i>	Age range	25-45

in the data (Thomas 2006). After the initial themes were documented, transcripts were reviewed for a secondary round of focused coding, as directed by the emergent themes (Warren and Karner 2015). In the second round of coding, each transcript was re-read in search of thematic elements such as various constructions of “change” in the trades, barriers to progress, and suggestions for improvements; thus allowing for a focused coding process which refined the relevant thematic categories, and ensured similarity in meaning among the coded excerpts (Thomas 2006).

### *Limitations*

This study is limited in that participation is elective and fully voluntary. Given the nature of tradespeople, recruiting people to participate in anything work-related outside of work hours is difficult to do – especially when it is located outside of their jobsites. Due to this, participants in this study overwhelmingly consist of people who may be particularly interested in assisting or promoting cultural change within the trades. People who are diametrically opposed to shifting norms in the trades tended to lack interest in participating in these focus groups, and their perspective is duly lacking in the data because of this. In most cases, willingness to be interviewed tended to be more indicative of some level of support for a changing culture in construction trades than other possible motives.

Furthermore, the research sample consisted largely of participants who identified as female. While this does not appear to reflect the larger demographic composition of Oregon’s trade jobsites, the oversampling of women in this study is highly indicative of

Oregon's proactive recruitment efforts towards women apprentices. Due to these efforts, participants from advocacy groups were overwhelmingly women. This reflects not only individual interests, but the state of industry, as many experienced women trades workers end up working in support positions (e.g. pre-apprenticeship program staff) rather than on a jobsite itself. Among focus groups conducted with workers, white women participated in the highest number, which is highly reflective of the state's efforts to recruit more women workers. Taking this into consideration, this study relies on intersubjectivity, or a commonality of ideas and perceptions between respondents, to garner understanding over searching for an objective "truth" in the data (Warren and Karner 2015). Furthermore, this study is limited through its use of the general inductive approach as the evaluation and coding of raw data relies on assumptions made about the data's relevancy to the objective of study (Thomas 2006). Due to this, different evaluators may provide findings that are not identical to those presented in this study (Thomas 2006).

As a result of the unique historical legacy of Oregon's construction trades, the findings of this study may not necessarily be generalizable to other areas of the U.S. or world. They can, however, serve as a broader guidepost for potential ways in which worker relations in the construction trades could play out in other geographical contexts; its approach to sampling and theoretical framework allow this study to be replicated in many urban contexts. Reliance on intersubjectivity of response allows for an additional degree of reliability to be given to the thematic findings of this study (Warren and Karner 2015). Since this research emphasizes the role of one's social location on perception and construction of the issue of changing norms on jobsites, intersubjective agreement will

allow reliable conclusions to be drawn from the data in ways that weighing responses against each other in pursuit of an objective “truth” cannot (Warren and Karner 2015). Relying on intersubjective agreement to draw conclusions allows for responses of various groups to be compared in various meaningful ways.

Additionally, this study may be limited by the presence of multiple members of the research team during focus group sessions. Perceived class or gender differences between the researchers (mostly white, middle class, educated women) and the participants (diverse, working class, tradespeople) may have influenced participants to omit or alter stories in ways which cannot be accounted for. Participants may have also been limited in their ability to speak as freely as they could have in individual interviews since they were not only surrounded by peers in their field, but being audio recorded on multiple devices during focus group sessions. As a result, this study functions more as an analysis of how one’s position within an organization can function as a potential barrier to change in and of itself. By assessing respondent’s understanding of the shifts in construction culture in tandem with the barriers they perceive to be hindering change and the solutions they pose to assist change, this paper serves to address how the various levels of organization function to either challenge or perpetuate cultural norms.

### *Significance*

This study recognizes several areas of concern in addressing the harassing culture of Oregon’s construction trades: potential for differential interpretation of the issue, potential for institutional barriers to changing jobsite norms, and potential for individual (or collective) action to reinforce norms and other institutionalized issues. By placing the

focus of this analysis on the context of change, this research contributes to existing knowledge in several ways. First, this project builds on previous studies to assess hostile workplace issues in the construction trades (e.g. Kelly et al 2015; Denissen 2010A; Denissen and Saguy 2014) by examining how participants construct solutions to the issue from a particular position within their trade in contrast to their perception of the institutional, interactional or individual barriers to those changes, I hope to provide context to the discrepancies that exist between the way in which broad cultural shifts in construction trades are characterized and whether or not participants are able to embody or promote these changes at their own jobsites.

The data used in this research were collected as part of a larger project broadly assessing the nature of harassment in Oregon's construction trades. However, this study moves beyond characterizing harassment on jobsites to focus specifically on how participants' contextualize the changing nature of the trades' jobsite culture. This is significant because it allows for understanding how different levels within this particular type of occupation interpret and present their understanding of the issue of harassment on jobsites, informing the ways in which power serves to illuminate or obfuscate an issue that everyone agrees is a problem. Drawing on focus group interviews with 42 people associated with the construction trades in Oregon, I will compare perceptions of changing norms on construction job sites among workers from several tiers of employment in the trades (*e.g. apprentice, journeyworker, union staff, contractor staff, and external advocacy groups*) based upon two major criteria: their broad characterization of cultural change within the trades, and how they frame the issue of harassment on trade jobsites.

Recognizing that differing perspectives within an organization may influence their knowledge or understanding of an issue (Sensoy and DiAngelo 2012), this study assesses the ways in which knowledge of harassment on jobsites is situated in context by participants' position within the hierarchy of the trades. Specifically, this study is seeking to demonstrate the role of situated knowledge by assessing how occupying a relative position within the trades acts as a moderating force in constructing how individuals perceive (or at least present their perceptions of) cultural or normative shifts in the industry (Haraway 1988). By contrasting the factors which participants' frame as a barrier to change (as well as solutions to expedite change) with their overall assessments of whether or not broad changes are even possible in the trades, this research contributes to sociological knowledge by shedding light on the ways in which the amount of power held by position within an organization may function to restrict as well as enable individuals to act against inequality within that organization.

## 5. Policies and Experiences

### Company Policy and Training

While all participants in this study could recount some form of behavior guideline practiced on their jobsite, the level of detail they could recall was highly stratified along the power hierarchy. Workers, who typically receive the least amount of training on the jobsite, typically described learning about company policy on their first day of work. This usually entailed reading and signing off on their employee handbook, but could also include attending a more formalized process that included classes and homework. Similarly, the groups responsible for training workers tended to describe similar training processes. The most typical training seemed to be performed by union programs, whose process was described best by one white female workers' organization staff member:

We do a verbal training with everybody who comes to our program after orientation and they come in and it's a whole section of information that we talk about and refer to. We also give them a handbook so they have a copy of it and once they start classes, all of our instructors, they go through the handbook again and talk about our policies on harassment, that kind of stuff.

For unions, this level of training is seen as more than sufficient to prime workers to these issues as they assume that most workers would feel comfortable coming forward with grievances. However, some jobsites supplement the orientation process with additional promotional material and awareness campaigns, which often include signage around the jobsite as reminders for workers. One white male field supervisor describes the additional measures his company takes, stating: "They gave us posters to post about harassment any type of harassment or violence or anything like that... if you suspect, or you're seeing that or want to talk to somebody about that there's a big number that you call. And that has to be posted at the job site." Similarly, pre-apprenticeship programs often supplement

the anti-harassment orientation program with material of their own. Drawing from state-level documents, pre-apprenticeships often utilize an “apprenticeship survival guide” developed by BOLI to discuss the difference between jobsite culture and harassment.

Some participants who were responsible for the training of workers recounted complaints about the way policy is disbursed and enforced within companies. This was particularly true for field supervisors, who often are charged with training a rotating workforce. For many of these participants, the method of disbursing the anti-harassment curriculum on jobsites can create tension between the policy of a company and the culture of its jobsites. While many companies have some type of acknowledgement that they do not promote harassment built into their policy, norms within the workplace demonstrate that those values are not necessarily present on the jobsite. As a result, many participants from union apprenticeship programs described actively working to fill gaps in the training modules with additional trainings on diversity. Others work to address this by internally defining harassment under culturally competent terms within their own organizations.

Interestingly, the majority of participants who could explicitly describe the behavior guidelines expected within their companies were in “head office” positions: general contractors and their human resources staff. As a consequence, the participants who work in the head office tended to describe protocols and training processes in much more detail than other groups could. Furthermore, they were the only group who described the more advanced trainings available to salaried professionals within the

trades. One white male office staff member describes a fairly typical training for salaried tradespeople:

Salaried professionals get in-person training; yearly compliance training. We have our phone employee personnel who go through enforcing policy and reporting incidents, and we give them a number to dial toll-free, kinda like a hotline, and then they have the policies and sign off on the policies. Then we have the other contractors who are onsite and we go through what the site rules are in [our] workplace and they sign off on it

In this respect, staff from the office have increased familiarity with the guidelines of any given company for multiple reasons: they create and enforce policies, but they also spend the most time in trainings themselves and are significantly more exposed to the material than any other group within the trades. As a result, policy changes tend to have a slow trickle-down effect throughout the management, as described by one white female office staff member:

In 2015 we added on bullying as one of the components of [harassment training] and we're about 60 percent through the management side because training the office side is the easier than getting out into the field. We have to pretty much get a new personnel list to see who's switched to a foreman role.

In this sense, it can be quite common for the office staff of companies to be uniformly trained and highly competent around issues of harassment, but that consistency does not always carry through to lower tiers of management. Due to this, managers and supervisors who are the most active on jobsites are also less likely to have received up-to-date training due to their presence on the jobsite.

However, workers from marginalized identity groups often described their company policies around behavior (harassing behaviors in particular) as existing mostly

at face-value. One white female worker explains how this perspective is largely influenced by a perceived lack of understanding on the part of instructors:

We had a guest facilitator come into our class [with] a slideshow and it was very much like ‘this is how you will get in trouble’ and ‘this is why it’s a bad choice to say or do these things that could be perceived as offensive’... They don’t talk about people making fun of you or the repercussions for sticking up for someone else... They say all this stuff, but they don’t actually approach any of the social stuff that’s happening, like the actual social dynamics on the jobsite. They’re not even in the same universe.

In this respect, failure to fully articulate the social impact of reporting harassment on a jobsite is seen as fundamental lack of understanding around how harassment operates within the industry on the part of trainers and instructors within the trades. Due to this, many marginalized workers saw the training process as inadequate and unaligned with the policies or procedures observed within firms. Thus, marginalized workers tended to frame the broader trades workforce as highly under-equipped to adequately address harassment when it occurs on the jobsite. Ultimately, this implies that the lower an individual ranks within the power structure, the less likely they will have the tools they need to understand and address harassment on a jobsite.

### Experiences of Harassment

In spite of training procedures and existing policies against harassment on jobsites, all groups could recall experiencing or witnessing harassing or bullying behavior occurring in the trades. This frequently took several forms presented in previous research, often entailing overtly harassing behavior and as the use of derogatory remarks (i.e. racist, sexist, or homophobic comments) and/or inappropriate joking (Cohen and Braid 2000) between workers on jobsites. These overt forms of harassment were usually

described as experiences of physical intimidation, name-calling, or challenges to a worker's integrity; all of which were commonly experienced throughout the trades.

Most participants framed inappropriate joking behaviors as a pervasive force within the industry that impacts nearly all workers within the trades, particularly during the apprenticeship stage of their careers. While faced by all apprentices at some point, these harassing behaviors can (and often do) target marginalized workers at a disproportionate rate when compared to their white male counterparts. In this respect, while white male apprentices do regularly find themselves on the receiving end of harassment, it is more frequently women, people of color, and LGBT workers that are the target of harassment due to their increased visibility on the jobsite (Denissen 2010A; Denissen and Saguy 2014; Paap 2008). This was articulated best by one male worker of color as an issue of accepted norms within the trades:

There's two things that I notice: One, they think it is okay to talk inappropriately about homosexuals. They just think it is okay to make jokes and laugh... Number two, when it comes down to it, they call [the union] the brotherhood, but when they see somebody they don't like or is different... then they let them struggle. That's just what they do.

In this sense, marginalized workers are acceptable targets for harassment on trade jobsites due to their perceived differences from the ideal worker of the trades (Acker 2004).

Similarly, the pervasive notion that all workers should expect a degree of harassment as a normal part of their training allows for these behaviors to continue relatively unchecked (Bradley and Healy 2008). Complicating the issue further were subtle forms of harassment present on the jobsite – the most commonly acknowledged being high levels of microaggression between co-workers (Basford et al 2013). In many cases,

microaggression was presented as a “step in the right direction” when compared to other forms of harassment and bullying on jobsites, regardless of whether or not it was framed as an issue in and of itself.

While the most common source of harassment or bullying is often an unchecked worker, the field supervisors themselves were also framed as problematic for a variety of reasons. While physical violence is increasingly uncommon in the trades, some participants described negative interactions with field supervisors that neared the threshold of physical violence. These experiences frequently highlighted the use of intimidation tactics such as the worker being yelled at from an extremely close physical proximity, being pushed or shoved, or receiving constant belittling criticism. This is particularly worrisome, as those in supervisory positions are expected to be competent not only in the skills of the trade, but with other people; supervisors are supposed to serve as the rational overseer of the jobsite, not as a tyrant or oppressor. Theoretically, this could happen for two reasons: either the company owners or trade union isn't aware of the issue, or they allow the issue to persist because it serves a function for the company or trade (Bradley and Healy 2008; Byrd 1999). In this respect, the ends justify the means and abuses on the part of some supervisors can be overlooked or dismissed entirely if their workers remain productive as an overall team. Unfortunately for many marginalized workers, the increased productivity often comes with high-stress environments accompanies the heightened potential to be on the receiving end of negative treatment.

The most commonly described types of harassment, however, was the social exclusion and isolation of marginalized workers throughout the trades. Many articulated

this as individual exclusion from social activities based upon a worker's race, gender, or sexual identity, but isolation within the trades is not limited to this. Between a pervasive ingroup/outgroup clique process among workers and an industry-wide tendency to place workers from marginalized identity groups on redundant career tasks, isolation on the jobsite can lead to the stagnation of a worker's development within their company – and thus, their career in the trades overall. One white female worker articulates how this presents a major barrier to progress for women, stating: “I think that's one of the biggest issues... the social isolation. Being sent off to work by yourself or being disenfranchised from the networks... [which can] make it extremely difficult for women to integrate into the old boys club.” However, women are not the only group facing social exclusion on trade jobsites. Racial or ethnic minorities, LGBT workers, religious minorities, and many other groups face exclusion due to their difference from the trades' preferred, or ideal worker (Acker 2004). The profound lack of peer support and jobsite mentoring for marginalized workers within the trades

Ultimately, the informal divisions among workers, as indicated by the nature of harassment on jobsites, suggest that Acker's conceptualization of the ideal worker is very present and sought after in the trades (2004). The differential rate of occurrence with regards to harassment between straight, white, able-bodied, males and others on the jobsite suggests the presence and power of an informal power structure operating on the jobsite which supports Acker's ideal worker at the expense of many other types of workers (2004). Furthermore, the presence of such an ideology serves to provide additional structure to the trades as an inequality regime (Acker 2006). Due to this,

marginalized workers often report having to work twice, or even three times as hard as their white male counterparts while on the job just to maintain their standing as employed trade workers. Even those who prove their ability to perform the work in such a manner note feeling like an outsider due to the pervasiveness of ideal worker ideology.

In explaining why harassment persists on the jobsite, many participants indicated that this ideal worker ideology frequently translates into institutional action (or lack thereof), with their coworkers, firm leadership, and even unions resisting the recruitment of workers they viewed as “non-traditional” or “undesirable”. Under these circumstances, staff of workers organizations, field supervisors, and/or office personnel were frequently framed as gatekeepers for the “good old boys club”, often blaming affirmative action policy as unfairly promoting diversity over skill among the workforce. For women and people of color in particular, this manifests itself as resentment or confusion as to why a “diverse” candidate may be more acceptable than a “traditional” candidate. Consequently, when “diverse” candidates are accepted into a trade apprenticeship, it is often assumed that they have a personal agenda to change the industry at large.

In this sense, nepotism is often a driving force behind the harassment of women and people of color in the trades, with existing cliques are often cited as preferring friends or family members to their “diverse” new coworkers. One white male field supervisor describes this as a byproduct of changing customs:

For us, it's more of a family situation. We have to watch out for each other, and typically the guys we hire, you know... we call each other from time to time and I'll bring them on a job when were somewhere else... There's also a lot of tradition of becoming part of a trade with someone else in the family who is a trade member and so there is some resentment of that [changing].

Tradition, frankly, serves as the rationale behind a majority of the harassing behavior described within the trades. Rarely cited as a negative quality for the industry, tradition itself functions to fuel industry resentments towards workers from marginalized identity groups. The industry's historical legacy of recruiting from workers' families rather than from apprenticeships and pre-apprenticeship programs is in direct tension with the state of Oregon's intentions for the industry. The results of this tension manifests itself in real shifts in the how traditional workers interact with workers that they view as atypical or inappropriate for the job.

In many ways, these shifts hold negative consequences for marginalized workers. One female worker of color described how this can generate confrontational relations on the job, stating: “[There’s] an ownership there that you’re taking something from my cousin, my brother, my somebody else who can do this job and you’re taking something from us.” Complicating this further is the simple fact that many members of the “traditional” workforce did not enter the trades through an apprenticeship or pre-apprenticeship program. This is especially true among older cohorts of trades workers, who could rely on social connections to enter the industry at the journey level instead of serving as an apprentice. Due to this, participants identified an entire generation of tradespeople as problematic due to their lack of perspective. In this sense, tradespeople who are “grandfathered” into the trade instead of completing an apprenticeship are often viewed as the most detrimental for marginalized workers on jobsites because they do not understand the apprentice experience.

Ultimately, the industry's predisposition towards traditional practices, combined with a persistent and pervasive ideal worker ideology generate extreme pressure for workers to conform to industry expectations with little tolerance for exception. While it is obvious that apprentices hold the lowest rank on any given worksite, it is difficult to tease out the informal pecking order among workers that is generated by racism, sexism, and/or homophobia within the trades. Due to this, my analysis will simply distinguish responses from "ideal" workers from those of marginalized workers, stratifying ideal workers slightly higher than marginalized workers within an informal power structure in the trades due to the ways in which the culture of the trades uplifts the ideal worker at the expense of others' success in the trades.

## 6. Addressing Harassment on Jobsites

When it came to describing the issue of pervasive harassment on jobsites, participants articulated a variety of on-the-job problems with seemingly clear solutions. This included (but was not limited to): addressing the persistence of problematic norms, reinforcing or restructuring outdated reporting procedures, and closing loopholes in policies or practices. Participants frequently framed these problems which exacerbate the occurrence of harassment within the trades. These problems largely tended to be described in terms of conflict between individuals and/or industry-wide blind spots, and framing the issue under these terms suggests that the harassment may be a consequence of the trades' interpersonal and institutional norms alike. Consequently, the solutions suggested by various participants to address harassing behavior on the jobsite echo these distinctions. As a result, the ways in which different groups of participants qualified the problem and the remedies necessary to address the problem reflect the various positions within the trades that participants occupy. Thus, participants' construction of the issue of harassment on jobsites (in terms of perceived problems and solutions) is highlighted below.

### Problems

In discussing their experiences with harassment on the jobsite, participants identified a variety of problems and issues within the industry which were perceived as either instigating or perpetuating harassment within the trades. Numerous problems were identified, which fell into two general categories: interpersonal problems and institutional problems. Surprisingly, every group identified a combination of interpersonal and

institutional problems, with most groups discussing similar types of problems within the industry. Due to this, a majority of the distinctions between groups were largely a result of emphasis. While most groups tended to cite the same types of issues on the jobsite, certain groups emphasized particular issues over others as a potential cause of harassment.

Many of the participants who cited interpersonal issues as encouraging harassment saw the culture of the trades itself as the primary problem. Union staff and white male workers identified a pervasive work culture within construction work where a degree of hazing is viewed as normal. For these participants, the norms on the jobsite result in harassing behavior on a peer-to-peer scale. Framing the culture of construction work as heavily reliant on jokes and “playful ribbing” to diffuse high-stress working conditions, these participants tended to view harassment as unpleasant, yet unintentional – a byproduct of “taking the joke too far”. One white male union representative described how might be linked to the demographics of the workforce itself:

We got a whole new generation of war veterans coming back into society that... the only way they're going to know how to deal with things, is you joke it off... It's a bad situation, you make jokes about it and so that's going to be derogatory cause that's how they're going to act.

In this case, veterans (or other workers with traumatic backgrounds) may not necessarily have the best social tools to cope with uncomfortable situations. This response indicates that the everyday joking, teasing, even bullying, could possibly be a response to working conditions. According to one white female union representative, veterans aren't the only social group to watch out for - there are multiple types of workers that are seen as “problematic”:

You know the greatest generation ... they're the guys set in their ways, they don't have any emotion... so understanding generational differences I think is really key [with them], and dealing with these millennials... I think it's that we're bringing up people, we're trying to get them – I don't know – to see things like we do and they will never do that.

In this respect, generational differences between workers may also be fueling conflict on jobsites. This quote highlights how different age cohorts of workers have entered the trades with different mindsets. For this union representative, older workers can be problematic for their lack of sensitivity and younger workers can be problematic due to their standards of acceptability. Put simply: millennials will not tolerate the social norms that the Greatest Generation find acceptable for a variety of reasons.

Others cited rites of passage within the industry as a major source of harassing behavior. These participants identified apprentices as the most vulnerable group with regards to harassment, with the transition into the journey level as the point where most harassment stops for a worker. One female worker of color describes this phenomenon:

Well think about it as fraternity or sorority – how they go through initiation, their little hazing before they come out, so when you guys become journeymen... you're not necessarily this evil person that just wants to inflict that on somebody, but the next person that's coming in, fresh meat, you're going to want to kick them a little.

Since it is common practice to give the newest members of the crew a hard time, this passage demonstrates that it may not necessarily anything about the apprentice that draws negative attention, the simple fact that a person *is* an apprentice can give enough for the rest of the crew to accept (and perpetuate) their mistreatment. This passage is also significant in that it describes a predictable cut-off, a point in their career progression where a majority of negative jobsite interactions would (presumably) end. However, this

particular articulation of this phenomenon is also important because it sheds light on a known cycle of violence within the industry. Once an apprentice reaches journey level, they are given enough freedom to become harassers themselves.

This is not always viewed as a negative cycle, as demonstrated by one white male union representative, when he compared the mentality of the trades to that of a wolf pack:

It's the wolf pack mentality – You are in an elite group... [and] I think every tradesperson that finishes a program feels very proud of what they've done... and so when you get in that group and you got someone [else] trying to get into that group... they feel that you need to make them rise up to your standard, and so you're gonna treat them a certain way until you feel they've earned that privilege.

This is particularly important to consider as it highlights the differences between intention and impact. The white male union representative and the female worker of color describe the same phenomenon, but not necessarily in the same way. He describes it in terms of industry self-regulation, while she describes it in terms of tradition and vindication. The differences between these two suggest that a variety of interpretations might be available at any given time for an interaction; one incident might be read entirely differently between the person perceived as a harasser and the one who perceives they are being harassed. Similarly, that same interaction could be externally perceived as normal behavior by an observer when it is perceived as harassment by the recipient. The difference in perception of these behaviors is fueled a lot by context; it is normal (to an extent) for an apprentice to be picked on at the jobsite, but when that apprentice happens to be different from the rest of the crew, complications can arise from those normalized behaviors.

Male workers of color also identified a pervasive negative mentality that specifically operates in Oregon's trades. This mentality sees non-traditional workers (e.g. women, people of color, LGBT) as fundamentally different from (and inferior to) their white male counterparts, and are thus treated as unwelcome on the job. One male worker of color describes its consequences:

They get away with things that are unacceptable other places where we have people of color in major numbers. They wouldn't get away with that in Seattle... And they can get away with it in Portland and in Boardman. And they can get away with it in Medford and in Salem. But they don't get away with it if you go up north [to Washington State] or down south [to California]. Because we have representation there.

For this worker, the norms of the construction trades in Oregon leave room for overtly racist behavior. This is likely a byproduct of Oregon's historical legacy of racist policy and ideology; people of color were openly banned from owning property within the state of Oregon until the 1940's. Given those circumstances, it is not particularly surprising for an industry so closely tied to that market to have similarly problematic practices and ideologies. In this sense, the frequent bullying or harassment of people of color in the trades operates as a method of deterring new people of color from entering the trades. This is highly reflective of the trades' status as an inequality regime (Acker 2006).

For female workers and advocacy group staff, however, the issue of harassment on the jobsite cannot be divorced from social isolation. These participants identified a profound lack of inclusion in the construction industry particularly for most women, due to their perceived lack of physical strength. For some of these women, social isolation not resulted in exclusion from lunchtime groups or social activities, but a significant lack of business connections (through which new work is often found). While being left out of

the trades' social network can be crippling during layoff season, it was considered to be one of the lighter consequences faced by women on the jobsite. Lack of skill development was generally framed as the most detrimental consequence of social isolation. One female worker of color describes her experience being stagnated on the crew:

[At journey level] I'm expected to go onto a job and work the job and be able to train someone behind me. But [I was] working in stagnated jobs... when I journeyed out, I was able to push a broom really well. I'm great, I'm very efficient... I didn't see that happening to anyone else. I was the only woman. I was the only minority.

For this worker, standing out as different on a jobsite stagnated her career, leaving very few useful skills that she could take with her to work in her trade. Her example, among several presented by female workers is typical of what most women can expect while working in the trades: being treated as if you simply would not be able to handle *real* work. One white male workers' organization staff member describes how job stagnation impacts more than just women in the trades:

I think if we gave them the opportunities that we have, they would perform just as well as any of us. So it's not just women, it's minorities, it's the attitudes towards both and you see it in the trades, cause we come from a lot of farm kids, redneck families, and that's where you see a ton of the trades people come from and they have that attitude and I think it's ridiculous.

This is likely the same mentality described by the male workers of color: the idea that only a certain type of worker should be in the trades (Acker 2004).

However, when it comes to actually reporting in the trades, many office staff perceived the strategies workers use to cope with harassment as part of the problem. In this respect, office staff saw the issue of harassment as largely an interpersonal issue; they see individuals as simply choosing not to come forward with their experiences of

harassment and/or intervene in the harassment of others. Due to this, office staff often verbalized that they felt workers were improperly utilizing company resources with regards to complaints of harassment. One white female office staff member described her frustration with workers who “keep it local” and try to address issues without informing the office of the issue:

I know that one of the things that occurs is a lot of times people in the field were told don't bring it into the office. You keep it local, you keep it right here. Don't go forward and let anybody in the office know about it... you don't go to HR... You stay here... [So] by the time it comes into HR, it's a fire... it's usually through EEOC, Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor. It's usually coming from somebody you don't wanna hear from.

This statement is significant because office staff are somewhat distanced from the work, which causes them to rely on workers willingness to report incidents to gauge the severity of jobsite issues. The fact that this office staff person could quickly identify a weak link in the reporting chain speaks volumes about the norms of the industry. Since office staff are typically the highest-ranking employees in their companies, they have a lot to lose by implicating their own shortcomings. Through her allusions that they *have* policy and procedure to address harassment, she suggests that things *could* get done if only workers would take the first step, she places the onus on the workers themselves. By recalibrating the problem to be a harassed individual's failure to report the incident, or use of improper channels to remedy it, she is relieving the blame she assumes by verbalizing that these same workers do not feel that they can report incidents to their supervisors, or to HR directly. Keeping Haraway in mind, this may also be an attempt to control the dialogue and remove themselves from implication – she may simply be managing how we perceive those in the office.

In addition to the issues that exist on an individual scale, many participants noted a lack of industry-wide precedent when it comes to anti-harassment policy and procedure throughout the trades. Field supervisors commonly reported that jobsites rules and norms vary drastically between companies within trades as well as across trades. This creates complications for workers who, due to the nature of construction work, may have a new jobsite with a new field supervisor every several days. Under these circumstances, norms that are acceptable at one job may not be viewed as such at others; workers are subjected to the rules of the site they work on that day rather than an industry-wide standard. One male worker of color described how this impacted experiences working within two different trades, stating: “Let me make something perfectly clear here... if you scream loud enough [the electricians union] will definitely do something about it. The carpenters, unless they have an attorney – a state attorney – knocking at their door are deaf, dumb and blind.” This statement highlights how some trades may be more proactive about providing an environment where all of their workers feel safe than others might be. It also highlights the importance of external pressure to ensure action: this particular worker believed that he would need litigation to get the carpenters to act against accusations of racism or harassment, whereas he would only need to approach the electrician’s union with the same issue to receive the same result.

In many ways, this distinguishes harassment from other safety concerns on a jobsite by the simple fact that there is no universal standard for addressing it like there is with physical safety. While the trades has made considerable efforts to introduce additional policies and procedures that address concerns around safety (e.g. accidents or

physical injury), industry standards regarding what is considered “safety” protocol typically do not include the issue of harassment. In this sense, companies which choose to implement an anti-harassment agenda (in addition to state-mandated procedures around safety) rely on the discretion of individual supervisors to identify what does and does not constitute harassment, hazing, or bullying on the jobsite. In this sense, the lack of policy standard generates a system-wide lack of safeguards against harassment, exacerbating any existing negative jobsite conditions for workers.

Furthermore, the discretion of field supervisors is often problematic. One white female workers’ organization staff member pinpoints a common reason why this is the case: “I think more often than not I hear from apprentices that it’s their supervisor or foremen that is harassing them or is complicit in the harassment at least.” Her statement is significant because it highlights that the formalized chain of command may in fact be a source of harassment, rather than a place harassed workers can go with their experiences. Due to this lack of industry-wide policy and procedure around harassment, there is a profound lack of safeguards for most reporters on the jobsite. Those who are perceived as odd man out (either through “ratting out” a crew member or bogging the company down with paperwork) by reporting experiences of harassment risk becoming the recipient of a “one man layoff”, where they would either be the only one terminated during a reduction of force or be excluded from working upcoming projects with that particular crew.

One male worker of color describes how trivial inclusion and exclusion from the crew’s social network can be, stating: “The biggest thing is that ‘you are not a company man’, ‘you don’t fit in here’, ‘you don’t meld with us’... they come up with a lot of

different things to give you that one man layoff.” In this respect, it becomes crucial for new workers to not only perform well on the job, but to be someone that is liked by the rest of the crew – or at least liked enough to maintain a steady flow of work. This notion was particularly salient for marginalized workers (white women and men of color) as well as union staff, who could recount multiple narratives about how the “one man layoff” had been used to silence those who came forward, rather than to weed out problematic or unfit employees.

All of this contributes to the most widely acknowledged problem with respect to harassment in the trades: a leaky pipeline for specific types of apprentices. Female workers of color, as well as some field supervisors, described the negative impacts of the tokenism, stereotyping, and career sabotage faced by apprentices who are women, people of color, LGBT (or any combination thereof). For these participants, the lack of industry-wide policy or protection fuels negative peer-to-peer interactions on the job and serves to exacerbate problematic norms about who should and should not be performing the work in the first place. Ultimately, the loss of diverse workers is seen as not only counterproductive, but preventable.

## Solutions

In addition to identifying the problems facing the trades, participants offered several potential solutions to address the issue of harassment in the trades during the focus group sessions. While a variety of problems were brought forward by participants, only three clear solutions were called for: interpersonal change in the form of adjusting the norms for peer-to-peer interaction on the jobsite, institutional change in the form of

adjusting the policy and procedure of individual companies, and institutional change in the form of imposing state-level mandates which target jobsite harassment throughout the entire industry.

### *Interpersonal Solutions*

Many participants verbalized a need for peer-to-peer solutions to address harassment on worksites. Office staff and union groups were particularly vocal about how they thought that shifting the norms, values, or behaviors of individual workers was the key to creating a new jobsite culture of tolerance. One white male office staff member describes his company's approach:

We spend a lot of time doing what we call trying to get them in the heart. We're trying to get people to want to work safely, to get people to want to be professional and treat others with respect because it's important to them... I mean, it doesn't happen all the time but that's certainly our goal to get people to want to be this way... we create those cultures.

This was a popular approach for many office staff; to try and forge a community-minded workplace based around respect. This is, perhaps due to the fact this this group had the most working knowledge of policy and procedure, and struggled to attribute the pervasiveness of harassment in the trades on individual inaction. Their position is one of power and privilege, and in suit, other groups who shared this viewpoint were not quite as optimistic as participants who were office staff.

Participants from union groups spoke bluntly about how they perceived the nature of tradespeople. According to one white female union representative:

Some of them are just jerks, and it doesn't matter who the recipient is... And I don't want to minimize at all, please, that the treatment doesn't happen to women and people of color substantially more, but it happens to all of the workers... But

I don't have as much contact with the foremen or supervisors so they don't typically come to me when they saw this or that or the other... I think that because of their position they may not want to feel like they can't handle the situation.

She places a strong emphasis on the perceived ability of the company to manage the behavior of individual employees on the jobsite, but this statement is significant because she acknowledges that the behaviors we would call harassment are probably far more pervasive than many give credit. By stating outright that all of the workers face negative treatment, she centers field supervisors and office staff as part of the problem and part of the solution simultaneously. However, this statement also stands out because she recognizes that the high-stress nature of working in the trades impacts more than just workers (i.e. apprentices, journey workers). In this context, problematic field supervisors may be improperly trained, or simply fear ridicule, scrutiny or failure. This suggests that on an individual scale, those field supervisors who choose not to intervene in harassment may not feel empowered to act, or may simply not be equipped to do so.

In many ways, the inconsistency of field supervisors with regards to harassment exacerbates existing problems caused by the underreporting behavior of workers. Regardless of whether or not they feel equipped to act, the position of the supervisor is largely an intermediary position between the company's owners and its contingent workforce. Within individual companies, supervisors are supposed to be the primary point of guidance for a worker; if the supervisor is actively generating or ignoring the issues of their jobsite, it makes it increasingly difficult for a harassed worker to say something without negative recourse when problems occur. Keeping in mind that the trades are an industry where the squeaky wheel can easily be silenced via one man layoff,

the contradictions that exist between company policies and practices on some jobsites forces many stakeholders to pursue institutional remedies for the issue of harassment on trade jobsites. In this sense, the seeking out of interpersonal solutions to address an issue as complicated as harassment within the trades may be indicative of a position of power within the industry. By suggesting that the problem can be addressed interpersonally, office staff and unions essentially omit the role that tradition and institutional rigidity have in limiting the recruitment, retention and progress of marginalized workers within the industry at large. Interestingly, neither groups that suggested interpersonal solutions are typically present on jobsites, suggesting that individuals who seek out this approach to address harassment may not necessarily be informed of the fuller dynamics of the jobsite and may not see the various barriers that could impact the ability of interpersonal change to succeed within the industry.

### *Institutional Solutions*

A majority of participants viewed structural changes to the industry as necessary to address harassment on jobsites, but this diverged into two main approaches: the restructuring of individual companies in ways which will provide safe reporting procedures, and introduction of federal or statewide policy that directly addresses hazing and harassment. Generally, participants who suggested an institutional solution to harassment would call for one or the other rather than both. For most, the type of institutional change called for was indicative of their status within the industry: company-level changes were sought after by participants with relative power in comparison to others (i.e. white male workers, field supervisors, or union staff), while state-level

changes were sought after by groups with a high degree of marginalization in the trades (i.e. workers of color, women workers, and advocacy group staff).

White male workers, in keeping with their standing as ideal workers within the trades, frequently framed change within the companies themselves as the most appropriate way to address harassment in the trades. This frequently entailed full enforcement of zero-tolerance policies with regards to worksite harassers, as articulated by one white male worker:

I think management need [to be] 100% behind having a system in place and then having a system where people can report. And then have those reports taken seriously and each one investigated. And then have consequences. Have real consequences for the bully no matter what level of management they are in. The company needs to take it really seriously.

For these workers, successful change is contingent upon enforcing the behavioral policies that already exist within most companies regarding bullying on the jobsite. In this context, they are calling for unilateral enforcement of policy, regardless of who the perpetrator is. This standpoint is seemingly appropriate, as it allows for perpetrators of harassment to be held accountable regardless of social positioning, and thus, enables companies to address issues among its management and supervisory personnel. However, in describing their ideal form of company-level institutional change, white male workers often stressed the importance of strengthening the existing channels through which reporting occurs within companies, and thus, strengthening the existing power structure of the jobsite. As a result, there was emphasis on company owners to be proactive about policy because there is still potential for abuses to occur in this scenario in spite of any

increased top-down pressure within companies to fully investigate and respond to reports of harassment.

Similarly, participants from union groups often felt it was the company's responsibility to draw a hard line regarding harassment policy. In an exchange between three white women from the union, they discuss an "ideal" strategy for addressing harassment in the trades:

W1: I think the best strategy is for the person getting harassed to build up some allies, you know, and get some protection around them. It's not always possible, but they can establish their own clique so to speak. I don't know, and that, it's difficult. And training is really important I think everything comes down to training...

W2: I would agree with that... but you can at least expose em to the education or information at some point at the beginning of the career. I think supervision is a huge part in it as well and citing and telling them what's okay.

W3: and reinforcement. I mean safety used to be a pssh, you know? Now it's we have weekly job talks, safety talks, you know, tool box talks, and if every week you tacked on a little... I don't know what you'd call it... to the safety talk, it kinda will keep it in their mind, you know? Just keep it fresh

In this respect, participants from union groups placed strong emphasis on the importance of support networks and counter-cliques to address harassment in the moment on jobsites. These support systems would ideally be supplemented by education and training – not only during apprenticeship, but throughout the career of all workers. Ideally, union groups see company owners taking the lead and instituting a similar system within their own ranks. This echoes the approach suggested by white male workers; that the owners of companies need more power within the industry to address harassment as it relates to their specific crew of workers.

Aligning with this were field supervisors, who also framed company leadership as needing to take a stronger role in identifying and eliminating harassment on jobsites. Many supervisors, however, discussed this not in terms of the company needing additional power to address harassment on jobsites, but in terms of the company needing to utilize their power more appropriately. In this sense, they saw the office staff of companies as already equipped and positioned to make change among their workers, but for whatever reason, choosing not to. According to one white female field supervisor, this lack of investment in can even be limiting the ability of workers to promote change among themselves:

[There is already] bottom up pressure to change culture, and I just don't think it's going to change until there's a top down. I don't mean federal, I mean business owners, not contractors... I think that until trade unions and construction organizations and contractors, until they embrace and expect, and role model, that behavior [won't] change.

Others echoed this viewpoint, claiming that instituting a strong internal compass within companies would get most “back on track”. One white male field supervisor elaborates on how this could create a trickle-down culture of change within companies:

Everything has to start at the top and work its way down... and if you don't have somebody that actually cares or is enforcing policies that are there, and makes it known, then it's never going to change. Because, we can sit there and blame the owner we can sit there and blame the IBW but they're not out there. You know, and yea they can set policies, but if you're physically not out there then nothing is going to change.

For field supervisors, strong leadership from the top down is necessary for establishing healthy working conditions and weeding out unsavory employees. In this circumstance, this means that personnel from every level of the company need to be on board for change; that companies are already equipped to address this issue but haven't devoted

their energy to it in ways which are meaningful. In this sense, all three groups are essentially arguing the same point: that the company can (and should be) powerful enough to address harassment as it occurs among its workers.

Consequently, calling for company-level change may be more indicative of groups with a relatively higher degree of power on the jobsite than others. All three groups who sought company-level institutional solutions do, in fact, hold various types of power on the jobsites themselves be it direct power granted from the chain of command (in the case of field supervisors), indirect or ideological power within the industry (as displayed by unions), or power granted from privilege as a worker (as held by white male workers). In this respect, the call for company-level change serves a dual purpose. It acknowledges institutional problems in a manner which doesn't address it unilaterally within the industry, and thus, allows white male workers, union staff, and various supervisors to displace harassment as a phenomenon that happens only in "bad" companies. By narrowing their scope regarding solutions to institutional change at the company level, they avoid implying need for an all-inclusive mandate that would, ultimately, impact their own companies and thus, impact their own mini-structures of privilege and power within the trades. In many ways, this type of solution can be considered a performance of allyship; these groups fully acknowledge harassment as an issue that is larger than a few bad apples, without necessarily accepting the degree of regulation necessary to affect meaningful change for the industry as a whole.

Diverging from these groups were pre-apprenticeship program staff, female workers and workers of color, who advocated strongly for institutional change at the level

of the state or federal government. These groups regularly cited the need for cross-cutting legal mandate that expounded on safety protocols to include regulation that addresses harassment or bullying within all trade career paths. In this sense it is the pre-apprenticeship program staff, who have increased contact with new apprentices during their most vulnerable stage of employment in the trades, and the most highly marginalized workers who call for the most transformation within the industry. This is relatively unsurprising, as workers of color and female-identified workers are common targets of harassment within Oregon's trades (Berik et al 2011; Cohen and Braid 2000; Kelly et al 2015; IWPR 2014).

Highly vocal about their skepticism regarding companies' willingness to change, workers of color frequently articulated internal change within individual companies as insufficient to fully address harassment within the industry as a whole. In many cases, this was linked to concerns about the "one man layoff" strategy used by most companies when faced with a worker they view as troublesome. Male workers of color suggested a variety of options that the state could implement which they believed would help alleviate harassment on the job including (but not limited to) creating special orientations for marginalized workers to equip them with resources in case negative experiences occur, rotating and retraining the workforce in cultural competency, and delegating a state representative or advocate from BOLI to exclusively investigate negative claims. While these suggestions varied in terms of cost and impact reach, all of the options sought out by male workers of color involved state-level personnel becoming intricately involved with day-to-day functions of jobsites. Female workers of color, however, felt

strongly that additional training was necessary to ensure cultural competency among all tradespeople. One female worker of color describes her ideal process:

You should have a training for foreman in harassment... a continuing education that [is] mandatory to take... because there are certain classes that I have to take to keep my license up, so if they made it mandatory statewide that you had to do these [competency] classes to keep your license going, then you've got everybody doing it.

She suggested this simply as a mandate that companies would have to meet on their own terms; an avenue for addressing harassment that was very similar to the way safety and concerns of physical harm are addressed in the trades. In this respect, female workers of color are perhaps suggesting the most practical solution to the issue: have a state-wide mandate with clear guidelines to follow, offer avenues to satisfy that mandate, and then revoke business licenses for those who fail to meet the state's standards within a reasonable period of time.

Advocacy group staff were similarly skeptical about successfully enacting state-level institutional change throughout the trades. While they often claimed that the only way to create a lasting solution to the issue of jobsite harassment is to treat it like safety and create a state-wide mandate with clear guidelines and procedures for all companies throughout the trades to follow, participants who worked for pre-apprenticeship programs were the most likely to express frustration with the discrepancies that exist between companies. Pre-apprentice program staff have a unique position to have access to many companies (via their students, who are apprentices in training) without the power and prestige of the union and thus, were more vocal about the injustices faced by their constituents. They saw a profound need for the state to place external pressure on the

industry unilaterally, as they are often the first to notice the discrepancies in policy that exist between jobsites. As a result, many pre-apprenticeship program staffmembers actively engage with BOLI and ODOT as advocates in efforts of enacting meaningful changes on a state-wide scale. One white male advocacy group staff member describes his own experiences working with BOLI to create additional trainings for the workforce:

We worked with Bureau of Labor in this to develop affirmative action strategies, and one of them was to incorporate in apprenticeship training cultural competency as a way to prepare current apprentices to be journey workers training apprentices without harassing them.

While the program they developed was thorough it was also over eight hours of training, a length that was deemed “overkill”. As a result, this particular effort to nip harassing culture in the bud never got traction within the trades. While most advocacy group staff could recall working to develop similar programs to varying degrees of success, they were also adamant that state-level intervention was necessary because they saw approaching individual companies as problematic. In this respect, while it is difficult to achieve meaningful state-level change for the industry, it is a worthwhile endeavor because it is seen as the only way to limit the will of the company itself; state-level mandates would force companies to comply, rather than simply hoping companies choose to implement anti-harassment policy or protocol on their own.

Ultimately, institutional solutions that rely on the state or federal government to implement changes are indicative of a low power status in the larger trades industry. These solutions were largely called for by marginalized workers and their largest advocates – the pre-apprenticeship program staff. In this respect, this position reflects an increased knowledge of how harassment occurs on jobsites. Additionally, participants

who sought state-level changes are often intimately familiar with the many ways in which individual agency can reinforce the structure of power on jobsites. For marginalized workers and advocacy group staff, a cross-cutting institutional policy for the trades is the only way to circumnavigate problematic power figures within companies, and thus, create a new standard for conduct independent of the industry's traditions.

## 7. Perceptions of Change

Overall, participants expressed varying degrees of optimism with regards to successfully addressing harassment in Oregon's construction trades. Their optimism, however, was frequently qualified. Participants tended to relay positive intentions (either on their own part or on the part of others) with regards to ending harassment in jobsites, but these sentiments were framed as only part of the formula for success. In this sense, while all participants in this study expressed feelings of optimism about changing the social norms of the trades, this came with conditions for nearly every participant. Generally, this diverged into two primary attitudes about change: "Things could change if..." or "Things could change, but...".

### "Things Could Change If..."

With respect to changing the trades, the groups who seemed most optimistic about changing jobsite norms were the office staff and staff of workers organizations. These two groups framed change as possible within a short timeframe if the right steps were taken to address harassment, often paralleling the issue of harassing behavior on jobsites to the issue of safety on jobsites. This was particularly true for participants who worked primarily in the office (either in HR positions, or as general contractors). These participants often saw workplace culture as malleable with the right guidance, and did not see harassment as an issue that needed institutionalized policy or procedure to be successfully addressed on trade jobsites. Frequently suggesting that workers simply needed to be more vocal about any negative conditions they face at work, office staff were also the most likely to frame change as an incremental process. One white female

office staff member summed up the sentiments of the group succinctly when she stated: “It is improving but I don’t think you’ll ever have it [be perfect for everybody] and that’s because humans are people and people are human.” In this respect, office staff saw change as not only possible, but in motion. Their attitude, however, was shaped to a large degree by the way they measure change: for office staff, even the smallest amount of progress was framed as more desirable than the current state of the trades. Change, in their opinion, was a means of achieving progress rather than the end result of progress.

Due to this, office staff held an interesting position that is largely indicative of their status as authority figures on the jobsite. Their optimism stems from faith in the institution to be functional when it comes to reporting procedure. For these participants, changing jobsite norms around harassment is a process that can never perfect due to the human element; they saw their existing protocols as sufficient to handle the problem of harassment on the job and called for workers to utilize existing mechanisms within the company when facing inhospitable conditions at work. As a result, office staff often framed change as a process that will likely never be complete in the trades, but they were also adamant that the trades is getting better with each attempt to level the playing field among its workers. This was best articulated by an exchange between two office staff, who believed that the effort of individuals was key to successfully shifting jobsite culture:

White male: “...this is a hard industry [with] a tendency to change very slowly. The way we build buildings and we build things is very different than the way they did 100 of years ago... and there is resistance in the culture [around the updated safety protocols] that didn’t change overnight. It’s still not where we want it to be and it’s been a long time...”

White female: “I think it’s evolving every day... It’s improving every day.”

White male: “...there’s a lot of people putting a lot of effort into trying to change it.”

In this sense, office staff saw improvement as the result of increased effort and attention to the issue on the part of individuals. Because they saw existing EEO policy as sufficient on paper, it was not necessarily the institutionalization of anti-harassment policy that would lead to decreasing harassment on jobsites. As a result, office staff place the weight of change on individuals. Since they generally have faith in the existing grievance processes to work, they viewed the issue of harassment as an issue of workers utilizing the resources available to them. In this sense, their framing of harassment as an interpersonal problem which needs to be addressed interpersonally allows participants who work in the office to de-emphasize the shortcomings of the system itself and shield themselves from responsibility in this situation. Their status as powerful figures on the jobsite grants them increased familiarity with procedure and protocol in comparison to the larger workforce and thus, their standing within the trade hierarchies can function to obscure office staff’s understanding of how their workplaces operate on a day-to-day basis. In many ways, their increased ability to cite existing policy or procedural processes that address harassment on jobsites allows them to blame workers for their own inaction, rather than address any structural flaws which may fuel harassment on jobsites.

When considering the staff of workers organizations, optimism also stems from belief that the forces that perpetuate harassment on trade jobsites exist on an interpersonal scale. For the unions, the major issue with respect to harassment is also one of inaction on the part of individuals, but where they differ from office staff is in their point of

emphasis: unions often placed the weight of change on the inappropriate conduct of individual policy enforcers rather than the tendency for workers to underutilize the chain of command for grievances. Due to this, unions often called for authority figures (such as office staff and field supervisors) to be held accountable for their inability to provide a safe working environment for workers. This was best expressed by one white male union representative:

...And I think that's our task that we're charged with, getting people to be more accepting. And are we going to change the attitudes on the job of some of these old guys? No. We're not, we never will... and what's the worst that happens? They harass someone... the employer finally says 'I've had enough of this', they terminate 'em, and those guys go right back to the books, take another call out somewhere else and continue that same attitude on another jobsite.

This is significant because many union representatives framed the company owner as insufficiently screening their employees for things like poor conduct on the jobsite. In this respect, industry allegiance to problematic members of the workforce and/or failure to sufficiently disqualify potential crewmembers with multiple cases of misconduct on their record functions to keep harassers employed and in work. As a result, many participants who worked primarily within the union saw change as very possible within the trades if company owners would shape up and do better. This was usually framed as company trainers, supervisors, and hiring committees needing to stick to a moral high-ground and refuse to employ workers with prior abuses on their records and in many ways, the unions used this as an opportunity to rebuke the informal power held by good old boy networks within the trades. Their fundamental argument, it seems, is optimistic and perhaps unrealistic: change is completely achievable *if only* managers would ignore the more traditional networks and hire less problematic workers.

White male workers, however, tended to internalize responsibility for changing the culture of the trades around issues of harassment. One white male worker even described how he planned to incorporate this responsibility into his duties once he reaches the management level of his company:

I believe I can play a pretty big role. Absolutely. I think the best way for me to play a role though is to step into a foreman's position where I am in a management position and actually be the change. Instead of sitting on the sidelines and barking at the wrong doers. In this positions, as a foreman, I can take things to the contractor because I am more in a trusted position than just a journeyman who got called off the books.

In this sense, many white male workers (either apprentices or journey level workers) internalized criticism of the current industry leaders and applied it towards their own goals. Ideally, as they move upward throughout the trades structure into positions of greater authority, they would carry this outlook with them, setting a higher standard than previous authority figures on the job. While admirable, this approach does very little to address the actions of others; it even subtly implies that the workers who should expect be promoted are the same demographic group as the trades' ideal worker: white male workers. In this respect, while male workers' willingness to implement changes when they become supervisors may be little more than lip service – it may even be their attempt to preserve existing power structures.

In all three cases, the optimism held by the group reflects their standing as powerful entities within the construction trades. As a consequence, office staff, union staff, and white male workers are proposing somewhat impractical solutions to addressing harassment. The extreme individuation of harassment as an issue for the trades causes office staff to invest relatively little in addressing it; they often frame

encouragement as enough to boost reporting behaviors among workers and tend to overlook any complications that may arise for workers who report. Unions place a similar faith in company administrators to act in the best interests of their employees, and thus, overlook the complications that arise due to a lack of universal standard for addressing harassment as an issue for the trades as an industry. Additionally, white male workers' preference to advance themselves into supervisory positions does relatively little to address issues across trades, and generates no change in the composition of the managerial tiers of the trades. Due to this, qualifying change for the trades as something that can happen if X, Y, or Z were completed is largely contained to the most powerful groups: office staff, unions, and ideal workers and indicative of their standing as agents of the inequality regime. All three groups benefit from the current state of affairs, and thus, their solutions and outlook call for the least dramatic changes for the industry.

“Things Could Change, But...”

A majority of participants saw change as something that could happen, but would likely not progress as hoped due to a variety of reasons. Many who shared this viewpoint were clear that they had seen progress around safety on jobsites, but that this progress was limited and uneven across the trades as a whole. In this respect, many of the participants who were more skeptical about changing the trades saw policy or procedure as insufficient to address harassment throughout the trades in a meaningful way. These groups frequently cited ‘old boy’ networks as a major barrier to progress, meaning that nearly all workers, field supervisors, and advocacy group staff were inclined to frame change as a generational process for the trades. Many suggested that change would

naturally occur over the course of the next ten or twenty years as older generations of workers exited the trades, and in many ways, these participants tended to see the workplace culture of the trades as somewhat rigid and unchanging – especially with its current workforce – but it did not necessarily mean that these groups weren’t optimistic about changing the industry. Many marginalized workers and advocacy group staff members were adamant that change was inevitable, and that there would be meaningful cultural change for the trades after the “good old boys” left the industry. For many, their feelings of optimism about change were dampened by increased awareness of how pervasive harassment can be on contemporary jobsites, and resulted in workers of color, women workers, supervisors, and advocacy group staff calling for change on an institutional scale rather than an interpersonal one.

Workers of color were particularly vocal with their belief that things would not simply change on their own in the trades, frequently claiming that there needed to be a strong top-down institutional policy that is heavily enforced to achieve any type of meaningful progress. Calling for introduction of policy or invention of a new organization within the state, workers from marginalized racial or ethnic groups felt the need for the trades to attain a critical mass of diverse workers in order to be able to successfully address harassment on jobsites. Furthermore, obtaining a critical mass of diverse workers was frequently described as process that was neither instantaneous nor rapidly building within the industry under its current conditions. In this sense, workers of color are hopeful about generational turn-over among workers acting as an agent of change for the trades. In this sense, as the older generations of workers continually age

out of the construction workforce, room is created for incoming apprentices to be trained under new guidelines. The opportunity presented by rotation of the workforce, however, simultaneously makes many workers of color feel optimistic and weary about the prospect of changing industry norms. Unfortunately, this is because any opportunity presented by generational turn-over is limited by two factors: the workers turning over and when they choose to exit the trades, and institutional biases towards an ideal worker within hiring and promotional procedures for the trades. Tradition, in this case, is framed as a negative quality that holds the trades back. As a result, many workers of color were “playing the waiting game” because they felt strongly that the industry’s values couldn’t be altered in a meaningful way while their biggest proponents were still active members of the trades.

Female-identified workers identified a similar pattern of improvement between workers as generational turnover occurs within the workforce, and was best described in an exchange between three white women:

Woman 4: I think things are changing. I think as time has gone by there are fewer people who are hard to deal with. There are more people in the trade that are different than they used to be – 30 years ago, 20 years ago.

Woman 2: The more women that go into the trades, it will equal it out.

Woman 4: Even men, you know the younger guys I think are a little more open minded.

Woman 2: Yeah, a lot of the younger guys are actually getting along better.

Woman 6: One guy was really excited I was gay... [So] I think that is totally true. I think there are a lot of younger people who are coming in who are different, who may be young white guys, but they’ve been exposed to more stuff.

In this sense, women workers tend to frame millennials (regardless of gender) as more understanding and/or compassionate than their older counterparts since they come to the job prepared to work with sexual minorities, women, and people of color. In spite of recognizing younger cohorts of workers as allies on the jobsite, many women workers still expressed doubts regarding the ability of the new cohorts of tradespeople to be able to impact the trades in a meaningful way without institutional support (such as updated policy). In this sense, even though newer cohorts are generally identified as progressive, women workers often felt that those progressive individuals would be unable to assist in anti-harassment work on their jobsites without an institutional framework to support them. Due to this, women workers frequently agreed with workers of color that an external standard needed to be imposed onto the trades by state-level policymakers. Similarly, both groups of marginalized workers expressed fairly high levels of skepticism with regards to whether or not companies actually wanted to address harassment on their jobsites.

In articulating concerns about whether or not firms would actually enforce anti-harassment policies and procedures on the jobsite one female worker of color recounted an experience she had with her field supervisor regarding recently updated safety protocols:

My foreman now, who is a really great guy, has said “If I don’t see you get hurt, I’m not reporting it.” Compared to the first two foreman I had, he’s amazing! So it’s kind of like... it’s a head in the sand – with safety and with this. So if they don’t, or pretend not to see it, or pretend not to hear it, then they don’t have to do anything about it.

Another white female worker piggybacked off this, stating that “appearances sometimes are more important than the reality”. This is significant because the issue of harassment was frequently compared to the jobsite issue of jobsite safety. This woman recognizes that policy is only really as useful as the person enforcing it; while there are currently state-level mandates around physical safety and harm on jobsites, there isn’t really a hard policy for harassment on that scale yet. By acknowledging that there are field supervisors currently responsible for enforcing safety policy who choose not to do so (regardless of their rationale), she highlights that even *if* state-level mandates around harassment were to be passed, it would still be up to individuals to enforce them.

Marginalized workers were not the only group to question the intentions of companies. Pre-apprenticeship program staff frequently articulated a lack of will to change on the part of office staff, with many expressing concerns that the owners themselves may not actually care that much about addressing jobsite harassment among their workers. One male pre-apprenticeship program staffmember of color describes how the cultural rigidity of the trades might just be a byproduct of disinterest at the top of its power structure:

I think there’s really a lack of will to change... and I would argue that the trades themselves, the organized trades could within a year could see change... And I think there’s a fundamental desire to placate but not necessarily move the internal mechanisms and I don’t know if that’s [actually] about the money involved and all that.

Under these assumptions the problem with harassment continuing to be an issue on jobsites isn’t one of resources or funding, it is simply one of disinterest and inaction. In this sense, advocacy group staff see the culture of the trades as more malleable than

marginalized workers do – perhaps due to their position as industry trainers. Due to this, advocacy group staff frame the industry’s rigidity and tendency towards traditional practices as a byproduct of industry leader choices: they see it largely as an issue of poor leadership. Poor leadership, however, is not simply framed as an issue of poorly performing individuals. One white male advocacy group staff member describes this as being a symptom of larger institutional complications surrounding cultural norms for the trades:

It’s really complicated because you’ve got apprenticeship leadership, you’ve got union leadership, and then you have all these companies who are signatories and they have different cultures in each of the companies... so if the companies have their feet, you know, stuck in the ground...they’d have to make major waves, they would [be] really challenging a power structure.

In this sense, the industry tends to hold onto the problematic norms which originate from poor leadership. While generational turn-over is framed as a large driver for bottom-up cultural change in the trades by advocacy group staff, they also see each generation’s system of values as a rigid regime to be overcome by the next generation of workers.

Field supervisors were, by far, the least optimistic group when it came to discussing change on trade jobsites. This is largely due to their standing as middlemen within companies: Field supervisors are charged with enforcing protocols on the worksite, yet they often have little say in what types of protocols are implemented within the companies. In this sense, while many companies may actually have policies that address bullying or harassing behavior on jobsites, they may not be being implemented or observed because the field supervisor simply doesn’t want to do so. As a result, many field supervisors felt that the cultural change necessary to address harassment throughout

the trades would be impossible to achieve without additional effort being made on the part of office staff – particularly the owners of companies themselves. This was best articulated by one white female field supervisor, in describing the barriers she saw impeding cultural change for the trades:

I don't really feel like there's a lot of investment in the contractors that I've worked for to monitor any of this behavior. It's much easier for contractor to just lay off the person who is making the complaint than to actually try to change behavior on the job. And I don't know if [other trades] work this way, but under our union management, management has the absolute right to lay off people at any time without explanation.

Her statement encapsulates the outlook of most field supervisors: while many believed that change could occur within the industry, they clearly pointed out that “one man layoffs” made it significantly easier for most supervisors to make cases of harassment go away by firing the complainant rather than actually addressing the issue of harassing behavior on the jobsite. Consequently, this was seen as a major barrier to change for most field supervisors in this study and since they perceived lack of investment on the part of most company owners, the general attitude among participants in supervisory positions was that they had too much power for their position in the industry. Due to this, many field supervisors saw change within the industry as an issue of poor leadership; the reason normative change is so slow within the industry was because company owners did not care enough to make sure it was properly addressed on their jobsites. In this respect, it is not entirely the fault of a problematic field supervisor if harassment continues on their jobsites – company owners are seen as equally responsible as they have authority over policy-setting as well as final say regarding acceptable employee conduct.

As a result, field supervisors echo the concerns of many groups in positions of limited power within the trades: that without strong top-down leadership, unacceptable norms on the jobsite would continue to impact workers negatively. In this respect, they are criticizing the tendency of office staff to place the blame elsewhere. This criticism was best summed up by one white male field supervisor as he described why he thought normative change around harassment was somewhat unlikely for the trades:

Whoever is the boss on the job, it starts there... Everything has to start at the top and work its way down... and if you don't have somebody that actually cares or is enforcing policies that are there, and makes it known, then it's never going to change. Because, we can sit there and blame the owner we can sit there and blame the IBW but they're not out there. You know, and yea they can set policies, but if you're physically not out there then nothing is going to change.

What he is describing is essentially scapegoating processes on the part of office staff. That owners, union staff, and other entities with the power to actually influence the industry's norms don't make the effort to be present on the jobsite and monitor employee conduct. In this respect, leaving sole enforcement of the rules of conduct to a limited number of field supervisors is problematic because it not only leaves fewer authority figures informed of dynamics on the jobsite, but it informally sends the message that those authority figures don't really care. In this sense, a field supervisor's view that change is unlikely for the trades is the direct result of being the only position of power and authority present on the jobsite. Because they do not see other authority figures making a measurable effort to address harassment, they do not see it as something that can be addressed meaningfully under these conditions.


## 8. Discussion

In sum, this study finds that social positioning plays a strong role in informing participants' perceptions of harassment and change within the trades, and that one's social position within their company (or trade) is not determined solely by their rank or level of expertise. Gender identity, race or ethnicity, and/or sexual orientation function as influential factors in determining a tradesperson's social standing within the trades; these axes of identity were highly influential in stratifying the responses of workers. The effect of identity, however, was less influential in other positions within the power structure of the trades. This is largely due to institutional biases towards an ideal worker within the trades, and as such, a majority of participants who were office staff, union staff, field supervisors were of the ideal worker demographic: straight, white males between thirty and forty years of age. Since Oregon has been somewhat active about increasing the enrollment and retention of women in the trades, it is not particularly surprising to see many women present in these groups, but since the state has not invested equal effort in increasing the enrollment and retention of LGBT workers or workers of color, it is also not particularly surprising that these identity groups had exceedingly little presence in these groups. Due to this, identity is highly influential in shaping the experiences and responses of workers, but this is not the case for other positions within the trades. For positions with moderate or high degrees of power, the most influential factor in determining attitude about change was whether or not they had a presence or direct connection to the jobsite. Position then stratifies responses in the sense that increased power for an individual within the trades generally functions to remove them from the jobsite, and thus, disconnects them from the experience of harassment. As a result, office

staff and union staff (both generally acknowledged as the most powerful groups in the industry) appear to construct a systemic issue as the result of problematic individuals, rather than institutional practices. The impact of social location, then, becomes most visible in the way various groups conceptualize and approach addressing the problem of harassment. In this sense, the power granted by position or social location within the trades, functions to stratify participants' responses into either an institutional or interpersonal approach to addressing harassment (see figure 2). As a result, groups whose power distances them from the work (office staff and workers' organizations in particular) generally see harassment as an issue that can be solved by individuals in the moment; they do not have familiarity or personalized experiences with the many ways in which harassment or discrimination can manifest itself on a jobsite, and thus, do not recognize it as a byproduct of the institutional regime itself.

Furthermore, there is a trend for those in positions of greater power have more faith in the system to be functional as-is. Citing protocols as sufficient and placing the


*Figure 2: Participant Conceptualization of Harassment by Social Location*



emphasis on problematic individuals, groups with larger degrees of legitimated power within the company (e.g. office staff or field supervisors) or with larger degrees of informal power within the industry (e.g. ideal workers) tended to seek the smallest changes because they saw the fewest issues with the system itself. In this sense, people in positions of power are less inclined to imply that the system granting such power may be flawed. Conversely, participants located in positions with less power (e.g. marginalized workers or advocacy group staff) tended to hold more reservations about shifting problematic norms without systemic policy changes. These groups generally had more frequent contact with the issue of harassment through personalized experiences, and saw the industry as lacking a universal standard of conduct. In this sense, their increased exposure to harassment fuels skepticism about the industry's ability to produce meaningful change within a reasonable timeline.

While participants' framing of change was largely tied to social location, there were some exceptions to the larger patterns associated with power. Field supervisors, who arguably hold a moderate degree of power within the trades, saw change as unlikely

Figure 3: Participant Attitudes Regarding Changing Industry Norms



because they identified the same barriers to progress as marginalized workers. While the institutional criticisms made by field supervisors betray their organizational position, their claims were often framed as being a problem for “other” companies. In this sense, it is difficult to discern whether or not they are being protective of their firms or speaking to a more objective truth; while they corroborate the perspective of marginalized workers, they do so in a way that seems to lack the same gravitas or conviction. Similarly, ideal workers shared the highly interpersonal framing of harassment held by office staff. While both groups see harassment as an issue of individuals (rather than the industry), ideal workers do not hold the same level of power as office staff, and thus have less to lose by implying industry shortcomings. Due to this, the perspective shared by ideal workers is likely to reflect their decreased personal exposure to harassment on the jobsite rather than any form of self-presentation.

**Policy Implications** Considering these findings, this study contributes to the sociological study of work and organizations by describing the ways in which power (as granted by one’s social positioning) shapes perceptions of the industry’s changing norms

around harassment. While certain aspects of this analysis may not necessarily be generalizable beyond the greater Portland metropolitan area, this study is significant because it articulates the ways in which various tradespeople frame and interpret change. Through careful examination of the ways in which the issue of jobsite harassment is approached by tradespeople from multiple social locations within Oregon's construction trades, this study highlights how industry structure impacts approaches to addressing problems. Furthermore, this study builds upon existing research by analyzing the ways in which inequality regimes shape the perspectives of the individuals occupying that regime. Through careful comparison of the various ways harassment and change are framed by tradespeople, this study highlights the ways that power (as granted through a formal position or status) influences tradespeoples' perspectives on the issue of pervasive and persistent harassment on construction jobsites.

The findings of this study hold strong implications for policy implementation, should the trades decide to address harassment within their industry. As an issue, tradespeople generally frame harassment as a minor issue for the industry, in spite of the existence of many accounts of how pervasive harassment can be on construction jobsites. This is consistent with trends in these data which indicate a consistent lack of accountability among those responsible for rule enforcement – particularly office staff – as well as the scapegoating of individuals to obfuscate systemic issues. As a result, there is a great degree of tension between the interpersonal and institutional approaches suggested by participants to address harassment on jobsites, as many cannot be implemented without a fuller acknowledgement of the industry's shortcomings. In this

respect, while tradespeople who are office staff might see a state-level intervention in the industry as intrusive or unnecessary, tradespeople who work primarily on the jobsite may find it insufficient to address such a widespread issue on an interpersonal, case-by-case basis.

Interestingly, many groups framed change as inevitable but saw differing driving forces behind this so-called inevitability. This is significant because there is a great deal of recognition among tradespeople that the demographics of the industry are changing, but not necessarily the same recognition that jobsite norms should adjust accordingly. While all participants in this study identified as pro-changing the industry's norms around harassment, there was still a great deal of dissention among participants as to whether or not harassing behavior could even be removed from the industry. In this sense, acceptance of any degree of harassing behavior as normal or "part of the process" can become detrimental to the success of any policy intended to address harassment on jobsites. Unfortunately for the trades, this perspective is largely held by those who are in positions of power (e.g. office staff or workers' organizations). Since these groups accept a degree of harassment construction jobsites as normal, they may not necessarily act in ways which challenge those behaviors. This only reinforces the trades standing as an inequality regime, as those in power effectively hinder the industry's efforts to address inequality.

This holds significant consequences for the trades' proposed course of action to address harassment on jobsites: the Green Dot initiative. Funded by BOLI's Healthy Workplaces Grant, the Green Dot initiative is a bystander prevention program intended to

provide individuals within companies with additional training to become peer advocates under a “see something, say something” ideology. While Green Dot has been successful in high school and college settings at improving relationships and reducing the occurrence of sexual harassment and microaggression, it is largely an interpersonal approach that will rely on companies to invest additional funding in training and other procedural costs. In this sense, it is relying on the owners of companies to choose to implement the Green Dot programming rather than relying on state-level mandate to enforce compliance with the program. Additionally, implementation of Green Dot does not necessarily require the company to change any of their policies. In this sense, firms maintain the liberty to implement Green Dot procedures at face-value only since it provides no safeguards against unjustified reductions of force like the “one-man layoff”.

Ultimately, the implementation of an initiative like Green Dot within the trades only addresses part of a larger systemic issue. While the additional training offered through Green Dot will undoubtedly benefit workers within firms that choose to implement it, it is not a requirement for all firms within the trades to adopt the Green Dot programming into their daily operations. Additionally, while the implementation of Green Dot on worksites would typically accompany a larger anti-harassment policy agenda for the company, it does extremely little to combat institutional issues that allow harassment to continue within the trades. In this sense, Green Dot encourages workers to speak up against harassment when it occurs on the jobsite (whether or not they are the target of that harassment), without additional protection against retaliation. Due to this, Green Dot has a large degree of potential to be adopted into the inequality regime present

within the trades as simply another measure that exists mostly in spirit, rather than in practice. Its reliance on workers (the least powerful stakeholder on the jobsite), rather than field supervisors to monitor harassment, allows for those in positions of authority to remain relatively inactive in engaging with the issue. Furthermore, it grants a plausible degree of deniability to the firm itself; by implementing a program like Green Dot, firms appear to be taking steps to address harassment regardless of the level of effort they contribute towards the program's implementation.

Due to this, Green Dot is a particularly problematic solution for the industry to endorse because it ignores many of the concerns presented in these data. It offers no additional safeguards for reporters beyond the word of employers, and thus, may functionally serve as a way for firms to expedite the removal of employees who do not engage with the established norms of the company. By failing to provide resources outside of the existing structure of the trades, and equal failure to modify the industry's shortcomings, implementation of Green Dot serves as a clear indication of Oregon's construction industry's status as an inequality regime. It places the burdens of effort and accountability on the shoulders of those with the least amount of power in the industry, and as such, has tremendous potential to fail at the task of addressing harassment – even worse, it has potential to effectively reinforce the very structures of inequality that it was intended to disrupt. This study concludes that the proposed solution (Green Dot) is insufficient to address harassment in a meaningful way for Oregon's trades. While introduction of an interpersonal toolkit for workers to deal with harassment when it occurs on the jobsite is a useful first step, asking workers to place themselves at risk of

receiving a “one man layoff” for speaking out against the norms of their company’s workplace without additional safeguards to prevent retaliation is an unreasonable expectation to make of most workers. Additionally, while Green Dot would be beneficial for the firms that adopt its practices, workers from those firms are highly likely to encounter and work with workers from other firms. In this sense, introduction of an industry-wide standard is still necessary to ensure that Green Dot’s norms and procedures do not conflict with the larger norms and procedures of the trades as a whole. Thus, this study suggests that Green Dot needs to be supplemented by state-level policies and the strong support of firms in order to impact meaningful changes within the trades.

## References

- Acker, Joan. 1990. "Hierarchies, Jobs, Bodies: A Theory of Gendered Organizations." *Gender and Society*. 4(2):139-158.
- Acker, Joan. 2004. "Gender, Capitalism and Globalization." *Critical Sociology*. 30(1): 17-41.
- Acker, Joan. 2006. "Inequality Regimes: Gender, Class and Race in Organizations." *Gender and Society*. 20(4): 441-464.
- Bastford, Tessa, Lynn Offerman and Tara Behrend. 2013. "Do you See What I See? Perceptions of Gender Microaggressions in the Workplace". *Psychology of Women Quarterly*. 38(3): 3410-349.
- Berik, Günseli, Cihan Bilginsoy, and Larry S. Williams. 2011. "Gender and Racial Training Gaps in Oregon Apprenticeship Programs." *Labor Studies Journal* 36:221-244.
- Bradley, Harriet and Geraldine Healy. 2008. *Ethnicity and Gender at Work: Inequalities, Careers and Employment Relations*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Byrd, Barbara. 1999. "Women in Carpentry Apprenticeship: A Case Study." *Labor Studies Journal* 24(3):3-22.
- Cohen, Marjorie and Kate Braid. 2000. "Training and Equity Initiatives on the British Columbia Vancouver Island Highway Project: A Model for Large-Scale Construction Projects." *Labor Studies Journal* 25(3):70-103
- Cohen, Phillip. 2013. "The Persistence of Workplace Gender Segregation in the US". *Sociology Compass*. 7(11): 889-899.

- Denissen, Amy M. 2010A. "Crossing the Line: How Women in the Building Trades Interpret and Respond to Sexual Conduct at Work." *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, 39(3):297-327.
- Denissen, Amy M. 2010B. "The Right Tools for the Job: Constructing Gender Meanings and Identities in the Male-Dominated Building Trades." *Human Relations* 63(7):1051-1069.
- Denissen, Amy M., and Abigail C. Saguy. 2014. "Gendered Homophobia and the Contradictions of Workplace Discrimination for Women in the Building Trades." *Gender & Society* 28(3): 381-403.
- Greed, Clara. 2000. "Women in the Construction Professions: Achieving Critical Mass." *Gender, Work and Organization* 7(3):181-196.
- Haraway, Donna. 1988. "Situated Knowledges: The Science Question in Feminism and the Privilege of Partial Perspective." *Feminist Studies* 14(3): 575-599.
- IWPR. 2013. *Untapped Resources, Untapped Labor Pool: Using Federal Highway Funds to Prepare Women for Careers in Construction*. Salem, OR: Institute for Women's Policy Research.
- Kelly, Maura, Lindsey Wilkinson, Maura Prisciotta, and Larry Williams. 2015. "When Working Hard is not Enough for Female and Racial/Ethnic Minority Apprentices in the Highway Trades". *Sociological Forum*.
- Lingard, Helen and Valerie Francis. 2004. "The Work-Life Experiences of Office and Site-Based Employees in the Australian Construction Industry." *Construction Management & Economics* 22(9):991-1002.

- Llanque, Marcus. 2007. "Weber on Power Politics and Political Ideals." *Constellations* 14(4): 483-496.
- Mellor, Steven and Leslie M. Golay. 2014. "The Conditional Indirect Effect Model of Women's Union Participation: The Moderating Effect of Perceived Union Tolerance for Sexual Harassment." *The Journal of Psychology: Interdisciplinary and Applied* 148(1): 73-91
- Offe, Claus and Helmut Weisenthal. 1980. "Two Logics of Collective Action: Theoretical Notes on Social Class and Organizational Form." *Political Power and Social Theory* 1:67-115
- Paap, Kris. 2006. *Working Construction: Why White Working-Class Men Put themselves – and the Labor Movement – in Harm's Way*. Ithaca, NY: ILR Press.
- Price, Vivian. 2002. "Race, Affirmative Action, and Women's Employment in US Highway Construction." *Feminist Economics* 8(2):87-113.
- Sensoy, Özlem and Robin DiAngelo. 2012. *Is Everyone Really Equal? An Introduction to Key Concepts in Social Justice Education*. New York, NY: Teacher's College Press.
- Thomas, David R. 2006. "A General Inductive Approach for Analyzing Qualitative Evaluation Data." *American Journal of Evaluation* 27(2): 237-246.
- Waldinger, Roger; Bailey, Thomas. 1991. "The Continuing Significance of Race: Racial Conflict and Racial Discrimination in Construction." *Politics and Society* 19(3): 291-323.
- Watts, Jacqueline. 2007. "Porn, Pride and Pessimism: Experiences of Women Working in Professional Construction Roles." *Work, Employment & Society* 21(2):299-316.

Warren, Carol A. B. and Tracy Xavia Karner. 2009. *Discovering Qualitative Methods*.  
Oxford University Press.

Williams, Christine L. Chandra Muller, and Kristine Kilanski. 2012. "Gendered  
Organizations in the New Economy." *Gender & Society* 26: 549-573.

## Appendix A: Focus Group Questions

1. What kinds of information do you currently receive at your work about harassment, hazing, violence or other negative or uncomfortable interactions? (Probe: This may come in the form of in-person or online training, meetings, printed literature, or other materials. The information might be about policies, prevention, resources, etc).
2. What kinds of interactions between people in the trades do you notice that affect worker well-being, social, emotional or physical? (Probe: What have you noticed as a bystander? This may come in the form of harassment, hazing, or violence).
  - a. How are these interactions harmful?
  - b. Thinking about these interactions, which behaviors most affect organizational or worksite productivity?
  - c. Thinking about the impact of these interactions and behaviors, what are the short-term effects on the target of the behavior?
    - i. How about for the person exhibiting the negative behavior?
    - ii. What about the short-term impact on the workplace or site as a whole?
  - d. Now, think about the longer-term impacts.
    - i. What are the long-term effects on the target of the behavior?
    - ii. How about for the person exhibiting the negative behavior? (Probe: What are the consequences of this behavior?)
    - iii. What about the long-term impact on the workplace or site as a whole when these types of behaviors are present?
  - e. What are the reactions of bystanders to these incidents?
3. In your opinion, what are the causes of workplace harassment, hazing, violence, or other forms of aggression?
4. Now, I'd like you to think about ways in which these types of behaviors are reinforced, sustained or even encouraged at a worksite. Why do you think these types of behaviors continue to be a problem at worksites?
  - a. What kind of verbal or non-verbal modeling or reactions help to sustain and perpetuate negative workplace interactions like harassment? (Probe: For example, eye rolls, threats, silence, laughing, cheering.)

5. Now thinking back to the negative behaviors we talked about, what are other ways workers respond to these behaviors when they see them happening? (Probe: What about when they hear about some of these things happening?)

a. How often do others intervene?

b. What do these interventions look like?

6. What might keep someone from intervening or what might make it difficult to intervene?

a. Are there social consequences? What does that look like?

b. Could there be work-related barriers? What are they? (Probe: for example, worried about losing job, not getting a promotion).

c. What kind of personal barriers might come up for people? (Probe: for example, fear, personal safety, shy, don't like confrontation).

d. What kind of cultural barriers might keep someone from acting? (Probe: for example, cultural differences, worried about backlash, that's a private matter, or barriers relating to race, class, gender or other differences)

7. If someone experiences violence, harassment or bullying at a worksite, how likely are they to report the behavior?

a. How much or how little are they supported if they do make a report?

b. What are the outcomes of reporting, positive or negative?

c. How do foremen or supervisors respond when they witness or hear about some of these behaviors? (Probe: How often are reports made? What are the consequences of these reports?)

8. When thinking about how someone might intervene in potentially high risk or uncomfortable situations, what do you think are good options? (Probe: What can you think of that isn't directly intervening or reporting?)

9. How much do you believe that things can change?

a. What would it take to create a safer work environment?

b. How much of a role do you believe you can play in helping to create change?

10. If we wanted to get more bystanders to intervene when they saw something concerning, we'd have to shift the social norms in the work environment. One thing we know is that norms can shift pretty quickly when socially influential people at a worksite, union, or community organization model ways to intervene. So, we may want to identify socially influential people in different trades groups. What do you think would be the best ways to identify who has social influence in the groups you're a part of?

a. How well do you think surveys would work to identify who carries social influence?

b. What if we asked some key informants? How well would that work? Who do you think we should ask?

c. What if someone at a worksite, union meeting, or some other gathering just watched how people interacted? How well do you think we could tell who the socially influential people are?

11. If someone provided training on harassment, hazing, and violence prevention, what are some important considerations about how training should be done?

a. When are the best times to provide training?

b. Where are the best places to provide training?

c. How long do you think people would be willing to spend in a training about these issues?

d. Would incentives would be needed to get people to a training like this? What do you think might work best?

12. Before we finish, is there anything else you want to say about the issues we discussed today?