

Text, Body, and Tools

Changing Mediations of Rural Masculinity

BERIT BRANDTH

MARIT S. HAUGEN

Norwegian University of Science and Technology

Centre for Rural Research

This article explores processes by which masculinities change, using examples from the Norwegian forestry industry. Forestry has traditionally been one of the most masculine rural work activities and an arena where hegemonic rural masculinity is expressed. The study is based on mediations of masculinity in a forestry magazine covering a period of twenty years. Using text, body, and tools as an analytic scheme, pictures of temporal variations of, and relations between, “traditional” and “new” types of masculinity are described. Even though practical, physical work in the forest is a basis for rural hegemonic masculinity, other types of work with new cultural influences (organizational and expert work) lead to “dialogical” masculinities, which open up for more flexible boundaries and cultural borrowing. This might be important to secure the future viability of rural industries and communities, especially if the recruitment of women is desirable.

Key words: gender; masculinity; media texts; forestry; rural

In gender research, men and masculinity have become a large field, but this research has, to a very small extent, considered differences between urban and rural space and therefore has been insensitive to the possible rural particularities. To understand the cultural diversity and transformations of rural life, however, it is important to identify and understand rural men as gendered persons and to unpack stereotypes. In the past years, research on masculinity has come on stronger in rural studies (see Campbell and Bell 2000b; Brandth 1995; Liepins 1998; Peter et al. 2000; Ni Laoire 2001; Little 2002a, 2002b; Saugeres 2002a, 2002b). These studies have produced insight into the processes by which farming and the land are constructed as masculine spheres of activity and how transformations of rural industries have consequences for men and masculinities.

In their article “The Question of Rural Masculinities,” Campbell and Bell (2000a) introduce the distinction between “the masculine in the rural” and

Authors' Note: The research has been financed by The Research Council of Norway. The authors would like to thank Professor Lawrence Busch and the anonymous referees of the journal for valuable input.

Men and Masculinities, Vol. 8 No. 2, October 2005 148-163

DOI: 10.1177/1097184X05277716

© 2005 Sage Publications

“the rural in the masculine.” By *the masculine in the rural*, they mean “the various ways in which masculinity is constructed within what rural social scientists would recognize as rural spaces and sites.” The *rural in the masculine* is “the way notions of rurality help constitute notions of masculinity” (p. 540). This is based on the recognition that rural themes are commonly used in notions of masculinity independent of a rural setting. The rural masculine therefore enables us to deal with masculinities in both rural and urban space (Campbell and Bell 2000a).

Our focus in this study is on masculinities in a rural industry. Primary industries such as agriculture and forestry have traditionally been closely associated to men and masculinity. As rural industries are going through processes of restructuring, the meanings of masculinities might also be influenced. The decline of these industries has been regarded as a problem especially for young men who cannot expect to practice their masculinity locally in the image of their fathers and grandfathers but need to find new ways of being rural men in a late modern age. On the other hand, these processes of change may open up for new influences and voices and produce less stereotypical masculinities in the rural.

Changes in work may influence gender constructions in different ways. That women have entered forestry to some extent leads us to expect a change in the representation of men and their practices. In a similar fashion, masculinity may be transformed as a result of challenges from other types of work-based masculinities. There exists a hierarchy of masculinities in which some types are hegemonic. The relation between subordinate and hegemonic masculinities might create possibilities for change (Connell 1987). Focusing on competition between masculinities in farming, one of the early studies on this topic used tractor advertisements as study material (Brandth 1995). The study showed how men and masculinities are associated with different tools and activities and how hegemonic masculinity possesses many qualities characteristic of farming’s most central tool—tractors—that of being strong, big, powerful, and controlling. It also pointed to the mutual construction of masculinity and technology and argued that hegemonic masculinity in farming may be altered as the technology changes and the tractor becomes more computerized and comfortable as a working place.

Studies have found that hegemonic masculinity in farming is challenged by the introduction of more business-related activities into farm work (Liepins 1998). New and more androgynous representations of men in farming such as the “the sensitive new age farmer” are only gradually emerging (Liepins 1998). In their study on the transition to sustainable agriculture, Peter et al. (2000) make a distinction between monologic and dialogic masculinities. Monologic masculinity is a conventional masculinity with rigid and polarized gender expectations, while dialogic masculinity is characterized by greater social openness and a broader understanding of what it means

to be a man. Dialogic masculinity facilitates the transition to sustainable agriculture, they argue.

Within the agricultural context, discourse analysis has disclosed two main narratives or practices of hegemonic masculinity: what has been termed “tough men farm” and “powerful men lead” (Liepins 1998). The differences between the “tough” and the “powerful” narrative of masculinity in forestry have been explored in a previous article of ours (Brandth and Haugen 2000). The tough man is constructed in practical logging activities, while the powerful man is based on managerial and organizational work. Building on this previous work, in this article, we are concerned with how masculinities are linked, contested, and mutually constructed.

Our study is based on a reading of the magazine *The Forest Owner*, covering three volumes over a period of twenty years. Our focus of interest is on how masculinity is changing within a traditionally strong rural sector, bearing in mind that this sector has faced radical change in recent years. We are concerned to see how masculinities are (re)positioned in line with the changes and new challenges facing this sector. To what extent do conventional rural masculinities remain stable or change? Are there new types of masculinity emerging in today’s forest industry? What is the relationship between conventional and emerging types? Is masculinity in the rural picking up elements from masculinities usually associated with the urban as a symbolic entity?

MASCULINITY—TEXT, BODY, AND TOOLS

Research examining changing definitions of masculinities has shown how meanings of masculinity are enmeshed in institutions and economic structures. The concept of “multiple masculinities” (Carrigan, Connell, and Lee 1985) has been developed to avoid charges of essentialism and also to convey how specific and various forms of masculine subjectivity are constructed in relation to femininity, to other forms of masculinity, and to the multiple social sites where people are engaged. Thus, that there may be a variety of masculinities in the forest industry does not mean that men choose from the available forms more or less at will. As Morgan (1993) has pointed out, Connell’s (1987) concept of hegemonic masculinity offers a sociologically appealing model as it introduces a kind of structural constraint. In pointing to the existence of hierarchies of masculinities, the model of hegemonic masculinity states that within any particular society, or sector of society, certain masculinities are more dominant and idealized than others.

Forestry consists of several sites at which men do masculinity. There are different types of work and occupations (machine operators, lumberjacks, administrators), and there are different social classes (farm-forest owners, self-employed entrepreneurs, and employed workers). Accordingly, there

are various forms of masculinity that we suppose have been affected differently by structural changes. For instance, general changes in the labor market in Western societies have included a decline in blue-collar jobs and an increase in white-collar jobs. Along with this, it has been argued that the representations of working-class masculinity are disappearing and giving way to other, more upwardly mobile, middle-class occupations (Aronowitz 1989). White-collar professionals and managers define masculinities differently from manual workers. Thus, gender shifts connect with changes in social class.

To address the question of how masculinities are constituted in forestry, we will apply an analytic scheme consisting of three elements: text, body, and tools. The magazine *texts* are men's "talk" to men. This talk is important in the processes that define masculine identity and work pride and in the processes that constantly affirm and reaffirm what men find central and important. The texts show the processes by which men are positioned and position themselves in relation to the community of men within the industry.

In interpreting the text, we have found the concept of "storyline" particularly useful. Storyline is a condensed cultural story, which exposes the positions of specific actors and becomes available as a framework for identification (Davies 1993). "Storylines are collective. But they are realized and created/changed in the more or less fragmented ways they are taken up by subjects as they develop their own narratives" (Søndergaard 1999, 14). In the sense that storylines focus on both their discursive or structural effect and the way in which subjects use storylines to speak and write themselves into existence, storylines correspond to some extent to narratives. Newer interpretations of the narrative approach, which go beyond the meaning of narratives as a representational form, claim that it is through narratives that we constitute our social identities. Giddens (1991, 54), for instance, posits that it is by means of narratives—specifically the "capacity to keep a particular narrative going"—that identity is created and recreated. As Somers says, "[We] come to be who we *are* (however ephemeral, multiple, and changing) by being located or locating ourselves (usually unconsciously) in social narratives *rarely of our own making*" (Somers 1994, 606). Thus, in each volume of the magazine, we are looking for the main storyline of masculinity in forest work.

"Acting people are acting bodies" (Shilling 1993, 9). Forest work is embodied and gendered as it is primarily the male body that performs this work in Norwegian forestry. From a phenomenological perspective, one may see the body as the very basis of human subjectivity (Parkins 2000, 60). It is the body that relates us to the world and locates us in a specific material, historical, and cultural situation. All social situations put demands on the display of the body, which means that the body needs to be consistent with the expectations of time and place.

Bodily differences are taken as major signifiers of difference between men and women. They also make us able to differentiate between men as there are young and old bodies, strong and weak, small and large, and so on.

Bodies are constraining as well as facilitating. In agriculture as well as in other areas of working life, work makes an impact on the body. The physicality of work demands bodily exertion and endurance and creates bodily fatigue and sometimes poor health (Casey 1995, 86).

In contemporary research literature on subjectivity and identity, emphasis is not so much on the body as a hard fact of physical reality. There has instead been a growing emphasis on the body as a feature of a person's "identity project" where the surfaces of the body symbolize the self (Giddens 1991). Bodies have become the means for self-expression—for becoming who one would like to be. In traditional societies, bodies represented the person's place in the social order. In late modern societies, there are many more choices for self-expression, and our reflexive attitude toward the body concerns work, leisure, age, health, and so on. For instance, the representation of the body at work in the forest may not at all resemble the body when the same person is visiting town. Although bodies may be used to create many symbolic spaces, we do not expect men in the forest industry to deviate much from the culturally acceptable storylines of masculine appearance.

The third aspect we consider is the tools used by the men at work. Tools that are available at work also carry meaning beyond the instrumental and utilitarian functions. Like other material objects or possessions, their symbolic dimensions have important implications for the social identity of their users. As mechanical machinery in rural industries represents many qualities connected with men and masculinity, it is an important display of masculine identity. Machines are a part of the picture men show of themselves, and the machines tell us that the persons are in possession of qualities required of a "real man." Being capable operators of the machines establishes men's connection to other men and confirm their distance from women. Research has pointed out that the construction of gender and that of technology are comparable social processes, that they are mutually shaped (Brandth 1995). As tools and technologies of forest work changes, so will men and masculinities.

The way tools are used as a means of self-expression is quite parallel to the way technical artifacts are used to communicate identity. In the qualities of heavy machinery, one may recognize ideals of macho masculinity—what is "big, hard and powerful" (Brandth 1995; Lie 1995). Physical strength and mechanical skills are bodily qualities of men, and men demonstrate physical strength and technical skills by using machines. Media use these characteristics to manifest and communicate rural masculinity.

THE FORESTRY PRESS: A MASCULINE DISCOURSE

The article is based on textually mediated representations of masculinity. The study of texts might be a suitable entrance to study men and masculinity in an industry affected by structural, technical, and economic changes. Texts

are an entrance both to an understanding of history (the past, sudden changes, long-term developments) and to today's situation. Dorothy Smith has noted that textually mediated discourse has become a central aspect of contemporary society (Smith 1990, 160). Magazines, newspapers, and advertising contribute to the organization of social practices. Thus, on one hand, texts are based on actual practices and are expressions of the larger context within which they are produced. On the other hand, they have a structuring effect on social relations and so contribute to shaping the meaning and experience of men and women. In this case, they tell us about the actual practices of rural men and how rural men are being actively constituted through textual representation of themselves.

Media representations in general portray a wide variety of masculinities and femininities. We are interested in the ways men and masculinity are constructed through articles, pictures, and advertising. For this purpose, we chose the magazine *The Forest Owner* (in Norwegian, *Skogeieren*) as our study material. This is the largest forestry magazine in Norway, and it is distributed to all private forest owners and parties in the industry throughout the country. *The Forest Owner* is put out by the federation of private forest owners. It represents the federation and addresses its members. The magazine is an important source of information and a link between the members. As the articles are men talking to men, what has been called "identity talk" (Snow 2001), they function to define rural, masculine work identity. They are affirmations of how forestry men see themselves in relation to or contrast with some set of others.

The material consists of all issues from the three selected years, 1976, 1986, and 1996—a twenty-year period of great changes in society, not to mention in gender relations. One advantage with media texts, such as this magazine, is that they regularly cover lengthy periods of time. Thus, they permit longitudinal analysis and may be used to study how trends are established, shift, and disappear. Such explorations of temporal patterns are sometimes impossible to obtain by other means.

MEDIATIONS OF MEN AND MASCULINITY IN FORESTRY

Forestry work has gone through a considerable transition during the past forty years. The technical developments gaining speed in the 1960s and the changes in the organization of the forest industry have altered working conditions and led to a differentiation of roles for forest owners. In addition to technological developments, the forestry industry has met new claims regarding environmental considerations and international trade agreements. New types of knowledge and skills have become important. The forest workers have to acquire relevant education and new vocational skills.

One effect of the mechanization is that the forest owners or farmers, to a decreasing extent, cut the roundwood themselves. As machines are expensive, contractors are hired by forest owners and forestry cooperatives to do this work. To the forest owners themselves, managing property and finding ways to optimize resource use have become more important.

In addition to practical forest work, organizational activity and politics have become important aspects of industrial activity. The Norwegian Forest Owners' Federation was established in 1913 to take care of forest owners' economic interests. A large part of the federation's activity is business politics directed toward issues such as increased international competition and new regulations of markets. These structural changes have created needs for a solid central office and for strong, professional management. Brought about by the structural changes in the industry, a need for a strong organization and competent political representatives has been expressed.

(FORESTRY) WORK DIGNIFIES THE MAN

Traditionally, hard work and being seen as a good "workman" have been a source of masculine status in farming societies (Johansson 1989; Kaldal 2000). Forest work may be characterized as hard, heavy, and dangerous and connected to dominant narratives of rural masculinity (Brandth 1995; Liepins 1998). The storyline of the 1976 forest worker is much in line with this and can be captured by the saying, "Work dignifies the man." In this storyline, logging is the primary work activity. It is "real" work, physically hard and demanding. All individual forest workers who are portrayed in the magazine this year are positioned as heroic workers in one way or another. The way these men and their work are described attributes to them qualities like being robust, hardy, and able to bear up against natural forces like rain, snow, storms, frost, and so on. Working in the forest implies participating in "battles" such as mastering nature and putting up with natural environments like steep slopes, marshy terrain, and in the winter, deep snow and frost. A journalist pinpoints the storyline when he writes, "A grey December day when one snowdrift replaced the other, we met A. L. who faced the weather and was working with lumbering" (*The Forest Owner* 1976, 1:6). Bad weather does not stop the forest worker from doing his job. One "drawback" of forestry, of which a point is made, is that it is a risky place to work, but then again, handling risk is an asset of masculinity (Morgan 1992). Masculinity is shaped in the performance and mastery of physically demanding forestry work.

In addition to descriptions of the rough conditions, the texts also communicate care and love for nature. It is the free and easy, autonomous work outdoors in fresh air and nature that is emphasized, often in contrast to clocking in and time pressure in industrial work. The independence and freedom of

working in the forests are important, but so is comradeship—belonging to a community of forest workers as in the old days and thus gaining confirmation from other men significant to them.

The working body is an instrument for performing a (man's) job. As an instrument of work, it seems to be a "taken-for-granted" and "naturalized" part of their masculinity. The forest workers themselves do not boast about their bodily strength or working capacity but appear calm, steady, and modest. More typically, it is the journalist who contrasts himself and his work, not claiming much physical efforts, with the forest workers and their work and lets the readers understand that it is harsh work, demanding the vigor of manhood. The body seems to become a metaphor for masculine virtues such as physical and mental bravery and rough individualism. The dominant narrative in the 1970s is that of the toiler combining forest work with small-scale farming. Men are represented with bodies marked by a long life in hard, outdoor work, and their outfits are modest: flannel shirts, knitted sweaters, and caps, which might mean that masculinity is more closely linked to the accomplishment of work rather than to body surfaces.

The main tools mediating masculinity in the 1970s are the power saw and the axe. The toilers are pictured working with these tools. Traditionally, such tools have been seen as men's tools, demanding physical strength (axe) and technical skills (power saw). As Follo (2002) has pointed out, using a power saw is considered a male competence, and the initial trial for a woman who wants to enter into forestry work is to get it started. One advertisement for chain saws shows the forest worker having his lunch break, sitting among the felling with his lunch box and thermos bottle. The result of his work, a big pile of logs, is making an illustrative background, telling about his working capacity. It is the ideal of the Protestant work ethic that is communicated, linking the result of the work with prevailing ideals of masculinity.

THE YOUNG, EFFECTIVE MACHINE OPERATOR

By the 1980s, technical changes in the industry had become very noticeable in the magazine's visualization of forestry work. The foresters are represented as active and competent machine operators, not only of chain saws but of harvesting machines, forwarders, skidders, loaders, trucks, and lorries. While men's struggling with nature was a central theme in 1976, in 1986, the main storyline deals with mastering machinery. Judging from the number of articles picturing men at work with machines and additional equipment, being active and competent in technical matters are at the core of the story. Front pages picture men as young and dynamic.

A macho image of the forest worker is strongly expressed this year. In no other year do we see so many images where strong, vigorous men are posing with their power saws and machines fit for fight and ready to bring down the

forest. And in no other year do we find so many features of men in action in the forests, conquering new land by building roads through the virgin land to facilitate the use of big machinery.

On the cover pages in 1986, younger men with power saws and heavy machinery have replaced the quiet-mannered old workmen with weathered, furrowed faces. Their bodies are less marked by hard work and years of toil outdoors. Rather, machines are seen as extensions of their bodies. Furthermore, they are described as “lads with muscles and snuff” (*The Forest Owner* 1986, 4:41), smelling of resin and sweat and having “icicles in their beards” (*The Forest Owner* 1986, 1:22). Body display such as felt hats and knitted caps has been replaced with hardhats and ear muffs, and the knitted sweaters and flannel shirts with professional outfits. This makes them more distinct as professional forest workers and entrepreneurs. Their appearance is powerful, signaling virility and bodily strength.

Magazine articles and advertisements put much emphasis on machinery, and these tools are presented as important signs of rural masculine status and self-esteem. The ads usually contain a description of the item’s advantages and qualities like power, efficiency, security, and low running costs. Pictures of, for instance, power saws are often against a background of trees, rocks, thunder, and lightening to create effects of action and drama. When metaphors are used, they overwhelmingly relate to qualities important to working men: strength, power, and control. One power saw is described as “king of the woods,” another as “a great, strong hulk of a fellow without weight problems.” A hoisting apparatus is called “the power packet.” A belt-driven transport vehicle with a winch is characterized as the “iron horse,” and a pickup truck is “a rough and rugged working truck with real power to pull.” The qualities of the machines and of the men operating them merge.

The forest worker is clearly positioned as a macho with heavy machinery. There are, however, signs of destabilization this year. Throughout the volume, we notice signs that the image of the tough machine operator might be gradually challenged as new skills have become needed in forest work. Machine operators represent a specialization of tasks, but possessing only such specialized knowledge is no longer sufficient to handle the complexity of modern forestry. For instance, another type of technology, computers, is becoming more important as a tool in forestry planning. An advertisement for a personal computer pictures a forester (man with a helmet) saying, “Practicians should be listened to. There are too many wiseacres in agriculture” (*The Forest Owner* 1986, 4:4). Although this is a gesture to the practical forest worker, we might read it to indicate that manual and machine-operator skills, important in the dominant storyline, are somewhat on the defensive. The message is that mastering new technology cannot be dismissed, probably as being in command of the very latest technology signifies being involved in the future. However, the use of this new technology needs to be combined with the knowledge of the practical forestry work.

Men who display masculinity at both the sites of forestry work and organization seem to be much respected. These are men for whom both the power saw and the “time manager” are important tools. The president of the federation, for instance, was portrayed with a lumberman’s gear, and the accompanying text reads, “G. R. is not only an organisational man. He also knows the practical work” (*The Forest Owner* 1986, 11:8). We interpret this to mean that compared to organizational work, the masculinity of the forest worker still has hegemony, indicating a traditional skepticism against white-collar work in a rural context. Such skepticism may be seen as “cultural self-defence” (Skogen 1999, 53). The new ways of doing masculinity need to gain legitimacy from the old.

Still another new phenomenon introduced this year is women’s entry into the scene of practical forestry work. As the organization Women in Forestry was founded in 1986 with the objective of having more women enter forestry, the magazine paid some attention to women’s participation and presented women in forest activities (such as felling and transporting) not seen in the previous volume. Although there is no explicit indication of its influence, it is interesting to note that the macho-man flare-up coincides with the entry of women this year.

POWER AND KNOWLEDGE—CHANGES IN HEGEMONIC MASCULINITY

By 1996, masculinity tied to outdoor work, to nature, and to machinery is becoming less important, and organizational and expert masculinities are coming on much stronger. This suggests that forestry work has opened up to other and new discourses and masculinities. An increasing diversity in representations of men in the 1996 volume makes it difficult to identify one main storyline. Rather, there are parallel narratives reflecting the restructuring of the forest industry. Subjectivities such as the environmentalist, the businessman, the expert, the representative of the organization, even the female forester, are making their marks on the magazine’s pages.

The most dominant storyline is about the organization man as read out from the many texts devoted to discussions about organizational work and politics. We read about men who disseminate knowledge, discuss policy, negotiate, comment on actual issues, and give statements. Titles indicate high-level positions like director, chief executive, and chairman. They represent men with status and authority in superior positions who are acting out their managerial decisiveness, assertiveness, authority, oratorical gifts, and negotiator skills at a site that is very competitive. Organizations are sites of competition between men, and these men are constructing themselves as very dynamic by actively pushing cases and trying to be at the core of the organizational and political debates. The texts present us with an internal

discourse in which organization men battle between themselves for recognition and power.

Research on organizations has pointed to the frequent use of military metaphors (Morgan 1997). Men in forestry politics are represented by metaphors that refer to fighting and battle. A proposal to restructure the organization has as its purpose to obtain “a modern, future directed, and hard-hitting organisation.” In one article, it was claimed that the members of the committees ought to behave more like “commanders of an army” than “weathercocks” (*The Forest Owner* 1996, 9:5). On one occasion, the top management of the federation was accused of acting like “castrated male cats” because they did not have enough power to fight and execute their tasks (*The Forest Owner* 1996, 9:13).

The organization men are pictured with a white collar and tie, which are clear displays of managerial authority. Almost without exception, articles about organizational and business activities are accompanied by pictures of men in business suits. While pictures of managers tended to be group pictures in 1976, there are mostly individual portraits in 1996, which may indicate a growing emphasis on individualism and assertiveness—characteristics that parallel the “new achiever” type of corporate men (Barthel 1992). Organizational men seem to have come a long way in the process of gaining legitimacy in the forest industry.

Board rooms, rostrums, and conference tables may be considered the main tools for managerial masculinity, and as such, they indicate new arenas for practicing masculinity in the forest industry. Mastery and control are important for both forest work and managerial work but in different ways. While mastering nature and machinery is important for the forest workers, mastering rostrums and negotiations is important for organization men. It is not muscles and sweat but brains and talk that matter.

Concerning the need for information and knowledge, an increasingly wide range of resource persons address the forest owners. The activities of the experts are quite different from men in both forest and organizational work as it is their expert knowledge that is in focus. They are the experts within research and development, consulting, education, and training, having special knowledge about biology, ecology, law, health, and work safety. Their position is dependent on their capital fund of knowledge and their possession of knowledge that others need. The experts’ know-how has an influential power on the industry, although the experts themselves are certainly “outsiders” regarding forest work.

The experts are often interviewed and pictured outdoors in the forest. They are virtually brought into the forestry arena from outside. The bodily displays of the experts are different from forest workers and organization men. Sometimes, when they are outdoors with the foresters, they might wear a helmet and light forestry gear, but normally, they have casual clothes.

Table 1:
Summary of Findings: The Dynamics of Masculinity

	1976	1986	1996
Text	The story of the sturdy farmer working in his forest, overcoming nature's forces	The story of the dynamic, professional forest worker mastering machinery and controlling nature	The story of the organization man competing for power, industrial markets, and increasing value
Body	The body as an instrument of work Work is inscribed on the old body Weather-beaten, bent Flannel shirt and cap	The younger energetic body Machinery as an extension of the body Forestry gear Coveralls and hardhats	Powerful bodily poses White collar Tie
Tools	Power saw Axe	Power saw Big machinery Safety equipment	Boardrooms Rostrums Computers Mobile telephones

For the experts, laboratory equipment, computers, and books are the visible tools, and this makes an interesting contrast to the rural ideology of real work as physically hard work. Women are sometimes seen in the position of experts although there were only a few represented in the magazine. The expert position requires education and professional skills—skills that might be seen as a necessary contribution to modern forestry but not as replacing physical forest work. The experts do not seem to challenge the main storylines of the strong and competitive or powerful men in the industry.

The emphasis on organization and expert masculinity does not mean that forest worker masculinities have disappeared by 1996, but they were given much less attention. As organizational work has increased in importance, it has become a more central locus for the demonstration of a dominant type of masculinity in the industry.

CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION

By analyzing three volumes of a forestry magazine covering a period of twenty years, we have shown how changes in the forest industry seem to be accompanied by changes in masculinity.

Our findings may be summarized as follows (see Table 1): from being strongest in focus in 1976, the sturdy working man is being replaced by the energetic, young man with efficient and powerful machinery in 1986. However, there are several signs of destabilization, and in 1996, masculinity based on practical forest work seems to be giving way to a stronger emphasis on

organizational and expert practices. These various forms of masculinities are different concerning storyline and display by means of bodies and tools. The masculine self-worth of the 1970s forest worker is based on the result of his work, an accomplishment that requires strength and endurance when battling the natural environment. In the 1980s, it is control and mastery over the heavy machinery that is the prime constituent of masculinity. The organization man of the 1990s is based on control over economic resources as he leads and manages other men's interests, displaying masculinity by means of the "power look" of business suits, conference tables, and rostrums. The experts seem to represent a softer kind of masculinity, in appearance, a blend between the forest workers and the organization men. Among the experts, there is a greater share of women than in the other occupations.

The dominant types of masculinity from the three volumes studied all may seem monologic in character: they are conventional, in line with strictly negotiated gendered performances within their contexts. When focusing on the relationship between them, the picture appears more complex and possibly more socially open for mixes between the various contexts and cultures.

Hegemonic masculinity means that masculinities exist in complex power relations with each other. Concerning the relationship between forest-worker masculinity in the 1970s and that in the 1980s, the media representations demonstrate that one of them has lost hegemony to the other. This may be attributed to the transformation of forest work: although both draw on the manly world of hard work, the way logging is done has shifted character from manual, farm-based work to machine work done by professional entrepreneurs and loggers. What we see is that practical, work-based masculinity renews itself to maintain its hegemony in the rural.

The relationship between the tough and the powerful man—that is, the forest worker and the organization man—seems less straightforward. Organizational masculinity exemplifies how elements from outside (urban, private, business-management masculinities) have been adopted and made an aspect of masculinity in the forest industry. As the organization man is commonly associated with the urban, this relationship may, on one hand, be interpreted as a competition between rural and urban symbolic space, where the urban gains dominance. However, to be respected, it seems to be a great advantage for the organization man to demonstrate a background from forest work and knowledge of the practical. This spillover from the practical to the organizational site might mean that organizational masculinity gains legitimacy from the world of real, hard work in the forest. Historically, common sense and anti-intellectualism have found particular resonance in rural societies (Dunk 1991, 1994). To overcome the gap between manual and mental work, the organization man needs to base himself in the type of work that has traditionally given status to rural men. Adopting Campbell and Bell's (2000a) terminology, one might say that organizational masculinity needs to

be made acceptable in the rural by incorporating the rural in the (urban) masculine.

The cultural spillover between the two types is not as distinct the other way—that is, that white-collar, organizational masculinity influences rural, work-based masculinity. Essential to the definition of forest workers' identity is their difference from "white-collars." Working with heavy machines in the forest requires that forest workers convincingly show that they are the right men in the right place. They may not want to create uncertainty about their position by adopting what could be considered "effeminate" characteristics. A working man who lets go of the cultural repertoire connected to practical forest work may lose identity and status. In this way, the tough man appears much less open to influences from others—it is a more monologic masculinity. An increasing emphasis on the need for scientific knowledge and training among forest workers has created new challenges and tensions. The tough-man masculinity may be threatened as lay, tacit, and experience-based knowledge lose hegemony to expert knowledge. Nevertheless, masculinity based on hard, physical, and machine-based work still has an indisputable ideological position within the industry—as it has within the rural.

The relationship between tough and powerful masculinities may be interpreted as an antagonism between blue-collar and white-collar work. White-collar and professional masculine practices are conventionally thought to have more status than blue-collar practices. We have, however, found that in the rural setting in our study, categories are inverted. It is masculinity based on real, practical knowledge derived from direct experience that seems to have the highest status in the rural. At the same time, in a power perspective, it is the organizational man and the expert who have the power to influence the conditions of forestry. In this sense, the rural, hegemonic masculinity is subordinate to the white-collar and professional masculinities. Cultural hegemony does not correspond with power.

As discussed above, there is a mutual dependency between the two types of masculinity that may be interpreted as a struggle for hegemony. Our findings also indicate that they, to some extent, draw on parallel qualities. Both types of masculinity are, for instance, constructed through control and battle. Forest workers must battle against the natural elements and control the machines to conduct their work, while organization men must battle against markets, deregulations, and internal controversies.

Our analysis indicates that the restructuring processes in rural industries challenge the established masculine order and thus touch upon fundamental dilemmas and struggles of social identity. In this study, focusing on text, bodies, and tools as presented in the agricultural press gives material form to a particular story of social identity that is brought on as the hegemony of traditional male identity is challenged. At first sight, the new masculinities that come up seem to be quite remote from what used to supply rural men with

identity and self-worth. At a second glance, there are signs of flexible boundaries and cultural borrowing. A less polarized rural masculinity may be important to secure the future viability of rural industries and communities, especially if the recruitment of women is desired.

REFERENCES

- Aronowitz, Stanley. 1989. Working class culture in the electronic age. In *Cultural politics in contemporary America*, ed. I. Angus and S. Jhally. New York: Routledge.
- Barthel, Diane. 1992. When men put on appearance. In *Men, masculinity and the media*, ed. S. Craig. London: Sage.
- Brandth, Berit. 1995. Rural masculinity in transition: Gender images in tractor advertisements. *Journal of Rural Studies* 11 (2): 123-33.
- Brandth, Berit, and Marit S. Haugen. 2000. From lumberjack to business manager: Masculinity in the Norwegian forestry press. *Journal of Rural Studies* 16 (4): 343-55.
- Campbell, Hugh, and Michael M. Bell. 2000a. The question of rural masculinities. *Rural Sociology* 65 (4): 532-46.
- , eds. 2000b. Rural Masculinities. Special issue, *Rural Sociology* 65, no. 4.
- Carrigan, Tim, Bob Connell, and John Lee. 1985. Hard and heavy: Towards a new sociology of masculinity. *Theory and Society* 14:551-604.
- Casey, Catherine. 1995. *Work, self and society: After industrialism*. London: Routledge.
- Connell, Robert W. 1987. *Gender and power*. Cambridge, UK: Polity.
- Davies, Bronwyn. 1993. *Shards of glass: Children reading and writing beyond gendered identities*. St. Leonards, New South Wales, Australia: Allen and Unwin.
- Dunk, Thomas W. 1991. *It's a working man's town: Male working-class culture in Northwestern Ontario*. Montreal, Canada: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- . 1994. Talking about trees: Environment and society in forest workers' culture. *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology* 31:14-34.
- Follo, Gro. 2002. A hero's journey: Young women among males in forestry education. *Journal of Rural Studies* 18:293-306.
- Giddens, Anthony. 1991. *Modernity and self-identity: Self and society in the late modern age*. Cambridge, UK: Polity.
- Johansson, Ella. 1989. Beautiful men, fine women and good work people: Gender and skill in northern Sweden, 1850-1950. *Gender & History* 1 (2): 200-12.
- Kaldal, Ingar. 2000. Skog, arbeid og dagligliv i kvinners og menns fortellinger fra Trysil og Nord-Värmland etter 1930, in *Skogsliv. Kulturelle prosesser i nordiske skogsbygder*, ed. Ingar Kaldal et al. Lund, Sweden: Historiska Media.
- Lie, Merete. 1995. Technology and masculinity: The case of the computer. *The European Journal of Women's Studies* 2 (3): 379-94.
- Liepins, Ruth. 1998. The gendering of farming and agricultural politics: A matter of discourse and power. *Australian Geographer* 29 (3): 371-88.
- Little, Jo. 2002a. *Gender and rural geography*. Harlow, UK: Prentice Hall.
- . 2002b. Rural geography: Rural gender identity and the performance of masculinity and femininity in the countryside. *Progress in Human Geography* 26 (5): 665-70.
- Morgan, David H. J. 1992. *Discovering men*. London: Routledge.
- . 1993. You too can have a body like mine: Reflections on the male body and masculinities. In *Body matters*, ed. Sue Scott and David Morgan. London: Falmer Press.
- Morgan, Gareth. 1997. *Images of organizations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Ni Laoire, Caitriona. 2001. A matter of life and death? Men, masculinities and staying "behind" in rural Ireland. *Sociologia Ruralis* 41 (2): 220-36.

- Peter, Gregory, Michael M. Bell, Susan Jarnagin, and Donna Bauer. 2000. Coming back across the fence: Masculinity and the transition to sustainable agriculture. *Rural Sociology* 65 (2): 215-33.
- Parkins, Wendy. 2000. Protesting like a girl: Embodiment dissent and feminist agency. *Feminist Theory* 1 (1): 59-78.
- Saugeres, Lise. 2002a. Of tractors and men: Masculinity, technology and power in a French farming community. *Sociologia Ruralis* 42 (2): 143-59.
- . 2002b. The cultural representation of the farming landscape: Masculinity, power and nature. *Journal of Rural Studies* 18 (4): 373-84.
- Shilling, Chris. 1993. *The body and social theory*. London: Sage.
- Skogen, Ketil. 1999. Cultures and natures: Cultural patterns, environmental orientations and outdoor recreation practices among Norwegian youth. Nova Report 16/99, Norwegian Social Research, Oslo.
- Smith, Dorothy E. 1990. *Texts, facts, and femininity: Exploring the relations of ruling*. London: Routledge.
- Snow, David. 2001. Collective identity and expressive forms. Paper 01'07, University of California, Irvine, available at <http://repositories.cdlib.org/csd/o1-07>.
- Somers, M. 1994. The narrative constitution of identity: A relational and network approach. *Theory and Society* 23:605-49.
- Søndergaard, Dorte Marie. 1999. Destabilising discourse analysis: Approaches to poststructuralist empirical research. Working Paper No. 7, Køn i den akademiske organisasjon, University of Copenhagen, Denmark.

Berit Brandth is a professor of sociology at the Norwegian University of Science and Technology in Trondheim. She is also affiliated with the Centre for Rural Research. Her research focuses on gender, work, and care politics, including gender in agriculture and forestry.

Marit S. Haugen is a senior researcher at the Centre for Rural Research in Trondheim, Norway. She has mainly published on gender issues in farming and rural communities, currently focusing on changing ruralities and young people's images of the rural.