

## Persistent norms and the #MeToo effect in Swedish forestry education

Ann Grubbström  and Stina Powell 

Department of Urban and Rural Development, Division of Environmental Communication, Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences, Uppsala, Sweden

### ABSTRACT

This study focuses on the persistence of gender inequality in Swedish forestry education. The many strategic documents stand in contrast to the experienced inequalities depicted in the forest sector's #MeToo movement. Both #slutavverkat and the open letter, written by female students, describe harassment and sexist behaviour. Theories about the culture of silence and bystander behaviour – are used to analyse the continuation of the norms that make harassment possible. Through an analysis of focus groups and interviews, we identify mechanisms that allow for the continuation of gender inequality. It is shown that strong traditions and hierarchical relations between students have contributed to the continuation of the culture of masculine domination. This culture has been allowed to flourish in hidden arenas such as the student union and social media, often in the form of sexist jokes that have been tolerated. Leadership at different levels has formulated measures to promote gender equality, but at the same time has failed to hear and react sufficiently to discrimination. This has in turn contributed to women's silence. #slutavverkat and the open letter have led to increased awareness, but remaining challenges include the barriers that prevent bystanders from acting in a more prosocial way.

### ARTICLE HISTORY

Received 11 March 2020  
Accepted 25 June 2020

### KEYWORDS

Forestry education; #MeToo; gender equality; masculine culture; bystanders

## Introduction



Despite a political agenda and plenty of measures for gender equality, inequality persists in forestry education at Swedish universities. This became evident in the forestry sector's own #MeToo call #slutavverkat<sup>1</sup> and in an open letter that was sent during the spring of 2018 to the Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences (SLU)<sup>2</sup> and to the forestry sector, from female students in the forest science programme (From Hashtag to Action 2018). They describe a culture permeated by sexism, harassment and discrimination, primarily against women. The open letter bears witness to sexist behaviour by older men in the forestry sector, but also to harassment from fellow students, making it clear that this is not a generational issue.

Sweden has strong national gender equality goals with a special equality strategy for the forestry sector (Government Offices of Sweden 2011). In this strategy, gender equality in forestry education is defined as men and women having the same opportunities and conditions when it comes to education, choice of study and individual development (Swedish Forest Agency 2019). A number of projects and strategies have been implemented so far, involving higher education institutions as well as the forestry sector, with the purpose of improving opportunities for a gender equal education (see e.g. Lidestav et al. 2011; Wickman et al. 2013; Andersson and Lidestav 2015). If assessed by the quantity of reports, strategies and measures, much has been done to promote gender equality, but according to the witnesses

from spring 2018, Swedish forestry education still faces severe challenges.

The first studies of the #MeToo movement in Sweden primarily analyse testimonies, for example in the military sector (Alvinus and Holmberg 2019) and the forestry sector (Johansson et al. 2018). In these studies, the testimonies are analysed to increase understanding about how resistance is expressed and articulated. Johansson et al. (2018), as well as the Swedish Forest Agency (2019), call for more research into the mechanisms that allow sexist behaviour and harassment in the forestry sector. The present study contributes with an analysis of interviews and focus groups with students, teachers and leadership representatives, to obtain a better understanding about why gender inequalities, harassment and sexism persist in forestry education. Vainio and Paloniemi (2013) claim in their study of Finnish forest owners that the masculine culture is so strong that both women and men prefer to support it rather than challenge it. Earlier studies have also shown that women adjust to the norms that men set in the forestry sector, and by not making gender an issue, it is possible to blend in to the culture (Vainio and Paloniemi 2013; Baublyte et al. 2019). The open letter is a powerful example of a departure from that strategy, being instead an act of contestation and making gender an issue.

In the aftermath of #slutavverkat and the open letter, there was a strong urge to “do something” about the situation within forestry education. Both SLU leadership and forest

**CONTACT** Ann Grubbström  [ann.grubbstrom@slu.se](mailto:ann.grubbstrom@slu.se)  Department of Urban and Rural Development, Division of Environmental Communication, Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences, Box 7012, Uppsala SE-750 07, Sweden

© 2020 The Author(s). Published by Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group  
This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>), which permits non-commercial re-use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited, and is not altered, transformed, or built upon in any way.

companies wanted to show that they took this seriously ([www.landskogsbruk.se](http://www.landskogsbruk.se)). They reacted by highlighting their already existing gender equality work, but also by additional initiatives. In the light of these efforts, it is crucial to discuss to what extent doors have been opened and what challenges remain.

The following research questions guide the analysis:

- What are the mechanisms that allow the continuation of discrimination and sexual harassment within forestry education?
- What are the possibilities and challenges for a more gender equal forestry education following #slutavverkat and the open letter?

### Gender and forestry

Previous research on gender in the forestry sector reveals a masculine culture. Even if the sector has, during recent decades, changed to more white collar work and an increase in the number of women working and studying in the sector (SFA 2014), the norm of hard physical work that is regarded as unsuitable for women, seems to stick (Brandth and Haugen 2005, p. 153; Andersson and Lidestav 2016; Johansson et al. 2019).

A special issue on Gender and Forestry in the Scandinavian Journal of Forest Research (2010) gives a global overview of how gender matters to the practices of forestry (e.g. policy, family). It finds that forestry is embedded in larger societal power structures, and argues that decisions on how forests are to be managed are fundamentally “political in character” rather than “scientific or technical” (Lidestav & Reed 2010:4). The forestry sector is changing along with the rest of society and needs to address, for example, climate change, biodiversity, and conservation, which in turn means that new skills and competences are needed. This process of change has led researchers to assume that women entering “modern forestry” may be able to challenge the “all-male structures” (Lidestav et al. 2011; Johansson et al. 2019). But, women’s place in forestry remains gendered, and studies show that women work in consultancy/ training, administration, environmental and conservation tasks while male foresters work with production and forestry science (Arora-Jonsson and Ågren 2019; Johansson et al. 2019). As Johansson et al. writes: “the notion of manual forestry labour as an embodied experience and as work that entails particular assumptions about the (male) bodies marked by such experience is still present in constructions of ‘real’ forestry workers” (2018, p. 4). In addition, Johansson et al. (2018) say that sexualised forms of male control and harassment (as reported in #slutavverkat) is a reminder that female foresters and students, are seen foremost as representations of women in the sector, rather than being true professionals.

It could be argued that in a forestry sector that is changing, with greater consideration of environmental issues and increased administrative work, there would be more opportunities for women. However, Johansson et al. (2019) concludes that this space is conditioned and that the burden of changing the sector lies with women themselves. Few studies

have addressed the young generation and how these outlined aspects of continuity and change within forestry influence students and the gendered culture in forest education.

### Policies and strategies as attempts to change the gendered culture

The gender equality strategy of the forestry sector, established in 2011, states that forestry education should be attractive for both women and men (Government Offices of Sweden 2011). Examples of measures initiated by projects that followed the strategy include increasing the gender equality competence among leadership and teachers (Andersson and Lidestav 2015), and producing information for forest companies and other actors where students have study visits (Wickman et al. 2013). Other planned measures at that time were, for instance, to integrate gender perspectives in student education (Lidestav et al. 2011), a course for teachers, and a seminar series for those in leadership positions (Wickman et al. 2013). Measures like these are built on the assumption that inequalities are a matter of ignorance, and with increased knowledge things will change (Powell 2016). In Wickman et al. (2013), it is further emphasised that the most important thing for establishing a gender equal education is that the leadership shows that they are serious about their engagement. Gender equality work is often regarded as a long and slow process. Wickman et al. (2013, p. 4) depict the work as *being at the beginning of a journey* and LRF (Federation of Swedish Farmers) describe it as a marathon (Holmqvist 2017).

After #MeToo, this focus on a slow change seems to be less prominent. One example is LRF, who in relation to the #MeToo call in the green sectors, urges both leadership and individuals to act, giving concrete examples of how to do this (LRF 2018). It is also clear that the events of spring 2018 influenced policy. One example of this is the Government Offices of Sweden (2018), who explicitly request the Swedish Forest Agency to take into account #slutavverkat and the open letter when proposing gender equality actions.

On the one hand, the many projects and strategies that express the need for gender equality in forestry education can be interpreted as a strong commitment to gender equality from the forest sector and the university. On the other, the measures implemented seem to have failed to change the prevalent gender culture that affects forestry education and student relations.

### The continuation of the masculine culture

In this section, we introduce and define key terms for this article: sexual harassment and discrimination, cultures of silence, and bystander behaviour. We have an abductive approach where the conceptual framework and theory have been part of a pre-understanding, as well as emerging during the analytic process. For example, the focus on bystander behaviour emerged as a result from the focus groups and interviews.

### Sexual harassment and discrimination

The #MeToo movement of the forest sector highlights different forms of sexual harassment. It has been argued that it is not necessarily desirable to find a common and simple definition of sexual harassment since the concept involves contradictions and ambiguities (McDonald 2012). Our understanding of the concept here includes unwelcome physical, verbal and non-verbal acts with sexual allusion (Fnais et al. 2014; Henning et al. 2017) and, as such, sexual harassment is one form of discrimination. It includes behaviours that put someone in an uncomfortable and sometimes hostile situation (Fnais et al. 2014; Henning et al. 2017). Here, discrimination is used to describe being disadvantaged or offended, with the focus on the experience of the person who is exposed. In our study we specifically look at discrimination and sexual harassment against women but we are more interested in analyzing what makes these acts possible than in the actual testimonies. The ambiguity of the term (McDonald 2012) is discussed in our study, where different individuals appear to have different views about whether something is sexual harassment or not, for example in the context of making jokes.

When trying to explain why sexual harassment and discrimination occur in an organisation, there is often reference to a specific culture that has developed over time. A culture consists of values, beliefs, norms and behaviours (De Welde and Stepnick 2015; Nardone 2018). Research has shown that women in forestry adapt to and accept the masculine culture and existing norms (Follo 2002; Baublyte et al. 2019). The open letter highlights that the culture is also something that men who do not fit into the norm feel that they need to adapt to and accept (From Hashtag to Action 2018). However, we see norms as dynamic, contradictory and changing (Connel and Pearse 2015), and therefore possible to change. The culture and norms also exist in, and are influenced by, a certain place. For example, previous studies on the academic culture of SLU (Powell 2016) displayed a male-dominated environment where ideas of what suits women and men carry stereotypical ideas, such as how family and care roles circumscribe the possibilities for women to stay in academia. McDowell (1999) describes a culture as sets of social relations and connections that tie people and places together, and that certain practices are maintained by social relations of power and exclusion. We argue that practices forming the masculine culture within forestry education are maintained by different mechanisms. Important contributors to these are silence and bystander behaviours, which themselves illustrate how power relations are manifested.

### The culture of silence

It is crucial to discuss how harassments are noticed and tolerated when trying to explain their continued existence. Research shows that women who experience high levels of harassment also see their organisation as tolerant of sexual harassment, meaning that: *... complaints are not taken seriously, it is risky to complain, and perpetrators are unlikely*

*to be punished.* (Fitzgerald et al. 1997, p. 586). In other words, these women have little hope of support, nor any trust that things will change, if they speak up. Instead, they fear being questioned or disregarded (Morrisson and Milliken 2000). To be silent could therefore be a strategy to protect yourself, but at the same time, it allows harassment and injustice to continue (De Welde and Stepnick 2015). Alvinus and Holmberg (2019, p. 1262) define a norm of silence as *a behaviour of a group of people that by unspoken consensus does not mention, discuss, or acknowledge the experience of women.* This silence does not just concern the exposed individuals but involves a whole group where individuals could have different reasons for being silent.

A culture of silence can be seen at three different levels: cultural, organisational and individual (Bird 1996). Cultural factors include how the organisation is coloured by the predominant discourses of, for example, a strong loyalty-culture where speaking up is not possible. Organisational factors include blocking dissent, questioning and criticising, and barriers to horizontal discussions of conflict and to organisational learning. Individual factors include fear, vulnerability or feeling inarticulate (Bird 1996). In this article we focus mainly on individual factors, even though we recognise that all three levels affect each other.

### Bystanders' role

A culture of silence is closely related to what literature calls "bystander behaviour". A bystander is not directly involved as a victim or a perpetrator; while witnessing an act of harassment the bystander typically passively ignores the event and waits for others to act (Fenton et al. 2016). Recently, bystander training has been recognised as a promising tool for changing bystander behaviour towards more prosocial actions (Fenton and Mott 2018; Hennelly et al. 2019; Paull et al. 2019). A more prosocial bystander is a person witnessing an event and intervening in a positive way. This in turn shows the person who is harassing, and other bystanders, that the harassment is socially unacceptable (Fenton and Mott 2017). These ideas could be linked to theories of normative social behaviour, where perceptions of what others do and what I am expected to do influence behaviour. The bystander training aims to change the perception that behaviours, such as sexual harassment, are socially acceptable (Mabry and Turner 2016).

However, there are barriers to a more prosocial bystander behaviour. Research shows that sexist jargon and sexist behaviour among a group of male students encourage other male students to behave in the same way (Angelone et al. 2005). Berkowitz (2010) also emphasises that misperceptions about what other male peer norms look like prevent men from intervening. In other words, men might think that other men are ok with the masculine norm and sexism. Research also recognises that the reason bystanders within a group of university students do not intervene is fear: the perceived risks are higher than the incentive to act (Paull et al. 2019). Those risks are related to a feeling that the organisation accepts the behaviour. The feeling of being powerless, and that authority would not react even if the bystander were to say something, are important incentives to keep quiet. This

inclination to inaction is strengthened by observing that when other bystanders speak up, nothing or very little happens (ibid). It has been suggested that in a hierarchical situation, where for example someone in a leadership position is harassing an employee, bystanders are three times less likely to intervene (Chakroun and Soudre-Lécué 2014). Our study also involves harassment that takes place on social media. Myers and Cowie (2019) show how bystanders' behaviour is important in determining whether the bullying continues and whether posts are shared and go viral. They also underline the bystanders' fear of becoming victims themselves if they defend the person who is exposed. These different explanations of barriers for a prosocial bystander behaviour highlight that relations of power are important underlying mechanisms. In our study this relates to relations between leadership, teachers and students, as well as hierarchies and relations within the student group.

### Material and methods

To be able to discuss the mechanisms involved in discrimination we need insights into, and an understanding of, the experiences of students, teachers and leadership. With a combination of focus groups and individual interviews we have been able to analyse these groups' own explanations of why discrimination and sexual harassment is happening. Moreover, we have been able to discuss different kinds of behaviour and the feelings attached to these behaviours.

We recruited the participants for the focus groups and the interviews through reaching out to students in their classrooms, and through emails to teachers, students and leaders. In the initial contact, we presented the project and asked if they would want to participate. Once we made these connections, we were given the names of others who would possibly be interested in speaking to us. Initially, it was most challenging to find male students who wanted to participate, but through contacts with the student union, and with help from teachers, we succeeded. These contacts made it possible to also meet individuals who were not especially interested in gender issues.

### Focus groups and interviews with students

Four focus groups of students from the forest science programme were conducted. Two groups consisted of female students, with three participants in each group; one mixed group had three men and one women; and finally, one group contained four men. These smaller groups were good for discussing gender relations. That students already knew each other was seen as an advantage since it could make it easier to start a discussion. The decision to have some single-sex groups was based on two reasons. *Firstly*, since women at the programme have witnessed harassment it might be hard to talk about these kind of experiences in the presence of men. *Secondly*, that both men and women should feel as free as possible to reflect on experiences and thoughts about the other gender and about relations between men and women (see also Bosco and Herman 2010).

The discussion themes for the focus groups were: ideas about how a forester should be and act (culture and norms); relations between men and women in education; reactions to #slutavverkat and the open letter; explanations for why harassment continues; and finally, thoughts and ideas about the way forward. We encouraged participants to reflect on their own and other people's behaviours and what they thought were the reasons behind these. We were careful not to judge anyone based on what they said. Follow-up questions such as "why do you think it is hard to react when someone says something that is not ok?" were carefully framed to encourage participants to describe others more openly and to also feel it was less threatening to reflect upon their own behaviour. In this way, we deepened our understanding of the mechanisms behind, for example, bystander behaviour. However, the participants always spoke about the more severe sexual harassments being performed by others rather than by themselves.

The focus groups lasted from one to two and a half hours. We also had three individual interviews with women. One of them had recently graduated from the forestry science programme and talked more in retrospective about the education. In total, we met 17 students: ten women and seven men. We met students from different years of the programme, with a majority from the later years. Students came from different parts of Sweden and from both cities and countryside. Our impression is that students participated in the focus groups with great interest, which made our material rich with many different experiences, views and fruitful discussions.

### Interviews with teachers and leadership

We conducted four interviews with teachers and ten interviews with people in a position of leadership. In the latter group, most also had teaching experience. Two leaders were representatives from forest companies with experience of collaboration with forestry education. Only two of the interviewees were women, reflecting the male majority in forestry education. Themes covered in the interviews were teaching and relations to students, gender equality work, reactions to #slutavverkat and the open letter, and the way forward. The themes that we had talked about in the focus groups were also touched upon during the interviews.

### Analysis

As a first step of analysis we reflected on the focus groups and interviews immediately after performing them. These notes made it possible to identify interesting themes that emerged during the conversations and that we could dig deeper into during the following focus groups and interviews. The interviews were transcribed verbatim and thereafter we identified three overarching themes and coded the transcripts in associated sub-themes that emerged during the analysis. The three main themes, and their sub-themes in brackets, are: (1) Explanations for the continuation of the masculine culture (hierarchy and traditions, hidden arenas, bystander behaviour, culture of silence); (2) Possibilities for contestation

(new group of students, #Me-Too as inspiration); (3) Reactions to #slutavverket and the open letter (reflections, possibilities, resistance). We recognise that interviewees might not have been comfortable expressing critical views about feminist or gender equality work. As a result, we see that resistance is mostly apparent when interviewees talk about others.

In our presentation of findings, we have distinguished between male, female and mixed focus groups, but since the organisation is rather small, we do not spell out the gender of the interviewees in order to protect their anonymity. In the following text, focus groups have been shortened to FG.

## Results

In the first section we discuss the explanations for the continuation of the masculine culture that recurs in our focus groups and interviews. A culture that enables discrimination and sexual harassment to continue. We then move on to the possibilities for contestation. Finally, we discuss if there is a #MeToo effect in forest education and discuss the reactions to #slutavverket and the open letter to identify the challenges that persist.

### Explanations for the continuation of the masculine culture

The forest science programme has a long tradition, starting in the nineteenth century. The admission requirements of military service and experience of forest work almost guaranteed a masculine culture and male domination. The first woman to obtain an exemption from this regulation started her education in 1962 (Wickman et al. 2013). Recently, the proportion of women has increased and in 2019 constituted 31% of the students admitted to the forest science programme (Admission Office, SLU, 2020-01-22). Apart from the fact that men have always dominated the education programmes in terms of numbers, three other explanations for the prevailing masculine culture are revealed by our study: *firstly*, the close knit environment; *secondly*, a strong hierarchy within the student group; and *thirdly*, traditions within the student union.

#### *Hierarchy and traditions in the "SLU bubble"*

The male students describe a close knit environment at SLU:

- 2: And we are quite a few students at SLU as well, when compared to other universities
- 3: ... and there are no others, some others sit and eat lunch but it is like nothing, so it is difficult to get outside the SLU bubble (FG men).

The class becomes very important for their social life. One student said that the student group could be described as a large family (interview student). The forest science programme involves long study trips, which are described as positive for creating a sense of belonging, but also an arena where the male norm has been cultivated and expressed (interview teacher).

It is emphasised that younger students have great respect for older students, which creates a hierarchy that is mentioned in several interviews (interview student; FG men; FG mixed; FG women 1). This respect seems to originate from the nulling (fresher activities), and from the student union where the older students are in charge of the different activities. As one student in the mixed focus group said: *If there are older students there, you stand like a lamb*. Women students emphasise how older students, fitting the masculine forestry norm (which has also included harassment of women), recruit new students to their group (FG women 1; FG women 2).

Traditions connected to student union activities are described as important for the identity as a forester. These traditions are considered to be positive and something that many look forward to participating in (interview student). However, some of the traditions, for example song texts, enhance the gendered culture and support the male norms of forestry. A normative culture in the student union is seen as something that shapes students and their relations with each other (interview leadership), and traditions and rituals are mentioned as a way in which norms are conserved and reproduced. As one teacher expressed it:

I think there are still a lot of behaviour patterns that are quite 'male'; it's not that anyone consciously, how to put it, tries to marginalise female students – but indirectly they do it somehow, definitely.

The focus groups reveal that when changes that affected the party traditions were suggested during student union meetings, there was an emotional response (FG men). Hence, efforts to change these traditions have met with resistance.

In line with the study by Alvinus and Holmberg (2019) of the military sector, the forestry students develop into a cohesive group through spending time together and sharing experiences, and this promotes the creation and maintenance of masculine norms. The strong hierarchy reveals a power structure where older students are more influential in the formation of the existing norms and the way traditions are maintained. This seems to encourage younger students to behave in the same way as older students and make it hard for those who do not conform to challenge the existing order.

### Exposure in hidden arenas – examples from student union and social media

Exposure to gender-related harassment exists in all arenas of education. Here we focus on the student union and social media, arenas that are largely hidden for teachers and university leadership. We regard these arenas as important for shaping relations between students and thus for affecting the gendered culture at the forest science programme.

Sexist jokes and misogynous songs are described as part of the party culture at the student union. When alcohol is involved, more invidious opinions are expressed (FG men; FG women 1). Even after revisions of the songbook, some men have used these old sexist songs as provocation. The interviewees expose the existence of physical sexual harassment, unwelcome compliments and jokes during student

union gatherings (FG women 1; FG women 2). One interviewed student describes how she thinks that women have adapted to this party culture: *Maybe we have subconsciously just put a lid on it and, almost that we have accepted it* (interview student). She thinks that women accept behaviour in this milieu that they would have reacted to somewhere else. Earlier research (Follo 2002) shows a normalisation process, where women have accepted and avoided reacting to prevailing masculine norms.

In our study, bystanders are described as a *middle group*, between those strongly associated with the masculine norm and those outside it. Referred to as coat-turners, bystanders could turn against those outside the norm if someone within the norm group requested it. The passive behaviour of bystanders and their unpredictable loyalties were highlighted as important factors supporting the continuation of harassment (FG women 1).

Women students told us about how fellow men students have created accounts on social media, open for all students to join. In these accounts, posts were uploaded in which women were humiliated, as well as posts expressing both homophobia and racism. Moreover, in the same accounts, interest in nature conservation, as well as being a vegetarian or vegan, were ridiculed. Social media accounts have also been used to deride posts from women. As #MeToo, and #slutavverkat started, posts were uploaded that had the aim of dismissing the stories (FG women 1; FG women 2; interview student). Other examples are chat forums where men discuss the appearance of women students, and when some of the men questioned the ethics of this, they were also ridiculed (FG women 1). In the focus groups, we were told by both women and men, how some of the chat conversations also spread beyond the initial group, and how this generated difficulties in student relations. Social media comes across in our study as an arena where derogative comments towards women have flourished. As such, it maintained the masculine norm and defined what was possible for a forestry student to express or not. When posts on social platforms were challenged, the authors defended them as being jokes and satires (FG women 1).

The women who were exposed or who challenged derogative posts rarely got any open support visible on the social media platforms. The support was instead given in person and in private (FG women 2; interview student). This is in line with the results from Bastiaensens et al. (2015), who says that, in general, bystanders are more inclined to show support to the harassed person privately, rather than in public. The explanations for this are the imagined risk for the bystanders to be exposed themselves, and the uncertainty over whether public support would actually help the harassed individual. Everyone who is a member in the group can see harassment on social media. If no support is given, it becomes evident and visible to everyone. Women who were exposed therefore felt lonely and experienced severe negative feelings (FG women 2; interview student). There were disagreements among women students about whether it was worth taking up the fight and whether this was something that should be discussed, or even whether it was a problem or not (interview student). The events on

social media, and the negative effect these had on exposed students, probably had a deterrent effect on the bystanders' willingness to act.

The student union and social media are examples of arenas that have become protected zones where harassment could continue. However, things that have happened at the student union and on social media affect the student environment in the classroom, and the other way around: events at lectures could have effects in the union building (FG women 1). Some students have avoided certain courses and in some cases considered quitting their education. These repercussions bring attention to whether the university is responsible for student activities outside the education room or not.

### *The mechanism of the culture of silence*

Focus groups and interviews reveal a great complexity in the culture of silence involving teachers, students and the leadership. One crucial aspect of the silence lies in the reaction (or lack of reaction) from teachers when subtle or open discrimination and harassment take place. In focus groups and interviews, students said that teachers seldom reacted when male students behaved in an inappropriate way and if they did, the teachers received a hostile response. As one woman explains: *They [teachers] come in for an occasional lecture and hear an inappropriate joke among the students, they don't want to be dragged in to this* (FG women 1). Students also give examples of future employers, who they have met during fieldtrips, making sexist jokes and how no one reacts, not in the actual situation and not afterwards (FG women 1; FG women 2; interview student).

Interviewed teachers explain this by saying that teachers generally might feel uncomfortable about drawing the line at something they feel is not okay. The teachers also explain the lack of reaction by saying that many teachers probably think that students are grown-ups and if inappropriate behaviour happens, the students need to sort this out by themselves (interview teacher). One teacher explains:

You always risk a conflict when you speak up. You have no idea how contradictory the other person is, if you will achieve a change or if it creates a bad atmosphere that will hang on the rest of the time you spend together.

This shows the kind of risks teachers consider before they intervene. The absence of confirmation from a teacher that a behaviour is not acceptable, in turn leads to women's silence and a hesitation to take their problems further, to teachers and the leadership. We were told about situations where students did turn to the teachers and the leadership but that these attempts gave little or no effect. In many cases, female students instead kept their experiences to themselves or only told some of their closest friends. The women told us about being worried that it would backfire if they spoke up. For example, that it would negatively influence their social life or their career possibilities (FG women 1; FG women 2; interview student). Women who have expressed their views to those who have harassed them have been further intimidated. This reveals that the young women have surveyed

the possibilities for support and been convinced that this is not strong enough and therefore made the decision to not take it further.

Interviews and focus groups also reveal another aspect of silence, that young men are silent during discussions about gender equality. They describe how they might feel uncomfortable when gender comes up on the agenda:

- 4: It is so with all sensitive subjects that you don't talk too much about it, because it feels like you have to think a lot, so that you really don't hurt anyone.
- 3: So that you are not called hostile against women.
- 4: So that you not say something inappropriate or lousy, that's where the problem is maybe (FG mixed).

These young men are afraid of being labelled as someone who is hostile against women if they engage in a discussion about gender equality and it turns out that their views on it differ. They also feel provoked by those who *go too far* and are overreacting (FG mixed). One teacher also emphasises that students are concerned that they must *think the right way* and are expected to say certain things when discussing gender equality.

In summary, the culture of silence involves a complex web of interactions, communication, interpretations and relations between students, teachers and the leadership. This leadership includes the student union and teachers, as well as formal leaders at the university. It is evident that the non-reaction from leadership on different levels plays a crucial role in explaining why women become silent about their experiences of harassment, sexism and discrimination. When women have reacted and through that attempted to challenge norms, they have experiences of not being taken seriously. According to earlier research, this leads to a feeling of being powerless. A presumption that the leadership would probably not react to a complaint leads to the exposed individual, as well as bystanders, keeping quiet (Paull et al. 2019). In line with our study, Morrisson and Milliken (2000) show that there is a danger in speaking up. It could risk relations and start conflicts. This is an important explanation for the silence witnessed in forestry education. However, despite this culture of silence, a space of contestation became possible after the #MeToo movement in early spring 2018.

### Possibilities for contestation

The open letter from the female students to the university and the forestry sector described the situation experienced by a few graduating year groups, but our interviews show that this experience was not unique to these classes. What was described in the open letter has been a part of the forestry sector for a long time.

### New group of students

It has been a change in the share of the kind of people that starts the school... in the old days were all foresters interested in hunting... today it might not be that they are here because they like forest machines and production, but for that they like ecology and biology... (FG mixed)

This description of the shift in the student group towards an increased number of students interested in environmental

and green questions recurs in interviews with both students, teachers and the leadership. This change is a part of the explanation of why a polarisation has occurred in some groups. In some groups, the values of the productive forest, being interested in hunting and eating meat, contrast with, for example, being interested in sustainability, nature conservation and being a vegetarian. Since there are more women in the environmental track of the education programme and more men in the production track (FG mixed), this polarisation has to some extent been gendered and arguments between the groups have sometimes been expressed as harassment towards women.

A broader recruitment of students, in combination with the increased importance of forest values other than production, seems to have improved the opportunities for students interested in green issues to have their values heard and understood. Consequently, women also got more space since a larger share of women choose the environmental track of the education programme.

### #MeToo as inspiration

As previously mentioned, female students experienced that it was hard to get any reaction from the leadership, other than from a few women who were engaged. However, after the #MeToo movement they also started to get reactions from men (FG women 1; FG women 2). Women who wrote the open letter received support from teachers and people in leadership positions. Compared to the situation before #slutavverkat, it seems that women now had more reason to believe that their voice might be listened to. However, interviews with both students, teachers and leadership with insight into the process indicate that the perceived risk of writing the letter was high, with worries that it would affect the career as well as the social situation of those who spoke up. The #MeToo movement made discussions possible and it became feasible to create supportive relations between women, to describe the situation and provide a language of description (Hill et al. 2015). When norms are made visible, it is easier to de-legitimise them (Carvalho et al. 2019). In the next section, we will discuss the opportunities for change that this visibility created.

### Reactions to #slutavverkat and the open letter – what about a #MeToo effect in forestry education?

The open letter has attracted attention up to the highest governmental level and both SLU and forest companies have expressed both the will and the urgency of acting. One of the interviewed teachers also emphasised: *I think it was good that this came from the students themselves, that they started this push, because it is hard for us to do anything.* This indicates that students protesting together were more powerful than they had expected. It was no longer possible to ignore women's accounts.

### Only a joke? – A process of reflection

Young women describe two different forms of reaction to the forest sector's #MeToo movement. Some of the young men started to reflect on their own behaviour and wanted to talk

with the women about this. However, others behaved even more extremely and claimed that the witnesses in the open letter were exaggerated and accused women of not being able to take jokes (FG women 1; interview teacher).

The young men we spoke with say that they are surprised and shocked by #slutavverkat and the open letter. One of them emphasises: *I don't know if it is so that I have not noticed anything or if one is bad in seeing things or if I have said things myself* (FG mixed). The open letter became an eye opener that made men start thinking about their own behaviour and they express feeling unsure about whether they themselves have behaved in a proper way. Interviewed men say that it can be hard to talk about gender equality since it put the focus on one's own actions. As one of the teachers explains ... *you get the insight that you have not always behaved in a proper way, you can be ashamed sometimes* (interview teacher).

One of the interviewed women realised that she had herself contributed to the norm by, for example, laughing at inappropriate jokes (interview student). Others told us that they have heard comments/jokes that they thought were quite innocent at the time but now when they have heard so many stories from #slutavverkat and the open letter they are starting to reflect on it in a different way (FG men; FG mixed). They also emphasise that different student groups have different jargons and different ways of joking.

- 3: If I would hear it only once myself ... I would unfortunately not react on it.
- 4: I think one would react more, one would put one's foot down in another way today and say that it is not okay, if you compare to two years ago.
- 1: But then you really need to know that it is meant that way, I think that is the hard part.
- 4: But does it have to be meant in a special way? That is also something to think about if they say something that is not fair. But I am also a bit like you, afraid of conflicts ... (FG men)

In this discussion it becomes an issue whether the things said are meant to be a joke or not, and whether the observer can know the intention of the speaker. It is also evident that an important reason for the bystander not intervening is the risk of being involved in a conflict.

Sexist jokes have a function of strengthening group feeling among men (Thomae and Pina 2015). Alvinus and Holmberg (2019) highlight that gendered incidents are often neutralised and reduced, and one way of doing this is to say that "it was a joke". If the harassment is camouflaged as a joke and it is pretended that any offence given is unintentional, it is easier for both the speaker and the bystanders to neutralise the seriousness of what was said. The person exposed is depicted as a sensitive person who is easily violated. Women students were afraid to talk about their experiences through fear of being ridiculed and that someone would say: *But what? It's only a joke!*

Carvalho et al. (2019) label jokes as micro-aggressions, since they mediate stereotypical views, sexual hints and traditional roles of women and men. Pretending that a sexist statement is a joke could be a strategy for justifying harassing behaviour (Page et al. 2016). The culture in the forest science programme seems to have accepted these jokes and the fact

that bystanders have not reacted contributed to their continued use. Thomae and Pina (2015) point out that the focus on gender equality could be perceived as a threat to men's privileged position and jokes are one way of undermining women and holding on to power. However, students have noticed a difference since #slutavverkat and the open letter: *It feels as if there is a difference, all are more aware and it feels like the large group are striving in the same direction, so it becomes more and more ok to step forward* (FG mixed). This indicates that bystander behaviour might be starting to change from passive to more prosocial. However, hesitation in acting, motivated by concern about generating conflict, is an important barrier to a more prosocial behaviour that, according to Fenton and Mott (2017), could challenge the norms that make harassment possible.

### *A moment of possibility?*

It seems as if it was easier to gain support for gender equality measures when the open letter made it clear that it was needed (interview leadership). Suddenly, there was a space to lift these questions on the agenda. In the time of #slutavverkat, the SLU leadership spoke up, in blogs and in inviting the female students who wrote the letter to meetings. This gives an impression that the issues were taken seriously, both within the organisation and in the wider forestry sector.

Women said that they felt empowered by the #MeToo movement, #slutavverkat and the open letter. They express how they received strength from each other and describe that they could walk more upright than before. One woman explains the importance of the open letter:

If this letter had not happened I would have felt that it would be hard to walk out to the sector, I would have felt lost and lonely. I would have more accepted the role that I am a woman and that I can't seriously think that I could fit in to this norm. (FG women 2)

This suggests that things that have been accepted before could now be contradicted. Another effect of #slutavverkat was that women students started to see that it was possible to break the silence and to tell someone else about their experiences. Teachers, comparing their own education with the present, also conclude that the level of acceptance (of harassment) has been lowered (interview teachers). This indicates that the silence could be broken and that women have more hope of being listened to.

### *Resistance and priorities*

Our material reveals that there seems to be a large group agreeing with the ideals of gender equality, in principle, but who in practice have not prioritised it. In addition to this larger group, there is a small group that is critical of the #MeToo movement and the work for gender equality. This group is described as people with power, such as men with high academic positions who are of the opinion that gender equality work is unimportant and not necessary (interview leadership). Among students, those resisting are described as men with high positions in the student union, who openly criticise #MeToo and gender equality work (FG women 2).



One of the leadership interviewees explains what he believes are the thoughts behind the resistance:

We have a culture that we don't understand why we need to change and it has formed those who sits up there because they have walked the long way. Those who have survived the culture are those who are left ... Why should I go against it when it has taken me where I am?

Even though some men have engaged in gender equality work at the forestry science programme, it is mostly women who are involved. This is explained by the fact that men will lose power when women become more equal and therefore men have less incentive to work for change (interview teacher, interview leadership). In a context where men are in a privileged position compared to women, men have an interest in maintaining the system. Some groups of women who also benefit from the system of male dominance will also support the system (Ridgeway 2009). This condition is likely to persist even after #MeToo and is one of the overarching challenges identified for gender equality work in the future.

## Discussion

In this study we explore why discrimination and sexual harassment persist in forestry education, despite the many strategy documents, measures and the leadership's expressed willingness to work for gender equality. Through an analysis of interviews and focus groups with students, teachers and leadership representatives we have disentangled mechanisms that allow this discrimination to continue. Moreover, we discuss the possibilities and challenges for a more gender-equal forestry education following #slutavverkat and the open letter.

### *A complex culture of silence and a passive bystander behaviour*

This study shows how silence appears at different levels, from university leadership to teachers in the lecture room, as well as students leading the student union. Events that have involved harassment have led to no or very limited reaction in the organisation. According to Fitzgerald et al. (1997), this sends the message that the organisation is tolerant of harassment towards women.

The perceived tolerance of harassment against women is an important explanation for the culture of silence, described, for example, by Alvinus and Holmberg (2019) and Bird (1996). Our study adds to the understanding of the complexity of this concept by showing the multifaceted forms of silence that make up the culture in forestry education. Teachers are silent and do not react because they want to avoid conflicts that may threaten relations with colleagues and students. Women stay silent because they have learnt that complaints will not be taken seriously. In addition, they feel that they risk their social relations and future careers. These are also the reasons why bystanders stick to a non-acting, silent behaviour. Gender equality as a discussion theme in education can also end in silence. Men explain this with the feeling that they need to say the right thing. Another

explanation is that many men think that peer norms are tolerant of harassment against women (Berkowitz 2010) and therefore they do not want to oppose the norms and so risk a conflict.

### *Power relations, protected zones and tolerance*

The silence and the passive bystander behaviour that is a part of the gendered culture seems to have evolved due to formal and informal power and hierarchical structures. In forestry education, we have identified three aspects that are involved in maintaining this culture. *Firstly*, strong traditions, hierarchical relations between students and a close knit environment seem to have hampered change towards more gender equal relations between men and women and preserved the culture of masculine domination. *Secondly*, this culture has been allowed to flourish in hidden arenas such as the student union and social media. The development of these arenas into "protected zones" for harassment plays an important role in understanding relations between students. This result indicates that it is crucial to include behaviour on social media in bystander training. *Thirdly*, the tolerance of sexist jokes. Harassment in the form of inappropriate jokes seems to have been accepted and, as Page et al. (2016) argue, it seems to have been a way to justify harassing behaviour.

### *Towards a more gender equal forestry education*

#slutavverkat and the open letter provide examples of bottom-up initiatives that demonstrated the power of coming together for a common contestation. They disclosed the gendered culture, with its informal practices and behaviours. To make this visible has, according to our study, empowered women and shown that it is possible to break the silence. It has provided spaces for discussion and possible renegotiation of norms. Men say that #slutavverkat and the open letter have influenced them to reflect on their own and other's behaviour. Men have, moreover, indicated that it has helped them to see the whole picture. This study contributes by further highlighting how traditions, hierarchies, sexist jokes, and passive bystander behaviours together negatively influence the situation of women studying in the forest science programme.

Our study suggests that policy measures and strategies need to acknowledge the barriers to acting at an individual level. Moreover, the role of leadership at different levels (teachers, student representatives, university leadership, as well as informal leaders in social groups) needs to be recognised. Leadership has formulated measures to promote gender equality, but at the same time has failed to hear and react sufficiently to discrimination. Part of their mission is to act as role models, with strategies to deal with harassments and inequalities as well as what Fenton and Mott (2017) call prosocial bystander behaviour. To be able to implement this mission, leadership at different levels needs to have training, support, and clear and sufficient agendas about how discrimination should be dealt with. One important aspect is the creation of safe ways to report harassment and this must include consideration of

hidden arenas such as social media and the student union. These efforts could, in turn, reduce what Morrisson and Milliken (2000) refer to as the danger of acting and speaking up. However, more research is needed on how leadership at different levels perceive their role and possible ways to act.

Based on our study a suggestion for practice would be to design bystander training for the broader group of employees and students. A more prosocial bystander behaviour could also put more pressure for change on those who are still resisting gender equality. In our study, small groups, in which men and women could more unconditionally discuss their thoughts and feelings about gender equality and their relations with other men and women, was a well-functioning format. Within these small groups, discussion could identify similar thoughts (“I am not alone”) and start reflection about how behaviours are received (“this behaviour might hurt others”). This kind of discussion could be a part of bystander training, with the goal of a bystander behaviour that is more prosocial.

On the one hand, it could be argued that men are privileged and will continue to act to maintain a particular masculine culture. On the other hand, there are signs that #slutavverket and the open letter could hasten the process towards a more gender equal forestry sector – a process that we consider necessary in order to attract more students to the forest science programme and to ensure the re-growth of labour for the forest industry.

## Notes

1. The English translation of slutavverket is “clear-felled”.
2. SLU is a predominately natural science and interdisciplinary university in the green sectors of agriculture and forestry.

## Acknowledgements

The authors wish to thank The Swedish Forest Society Foundation for financial support of this research. We are also grateful to the students, teachers and leadership at the Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences that participated in the study.

## Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author(s).

## Funding

This work was supported by The Swedish Forest Society Foundation.

## ORCID

Ann Grubbström  <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-1602-9225>  
Stina Powell  <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-6898-1285>

## References

- Alvinus A, Holmberg A. 2019. Silence-breaking butterfly effect: resistance towards the military within #metoo. *Gender Work Org.* 26:1255–1270.
- Andersson E, Lidestav G. 2015. Gender equality as a joint forestry sector strategy. Umeå: Department of Forest Resource Management. Swedish university of Agricultural Sciences. Report: 4442015.
- Andersson E, Lidestav G. 2016. Creating alternative spaces and articulating needs: challenging gendered notions of forestry and forest ownership through women’s networks. *Forest Policy Econ.* 67(1):38–44.
- Angelone DJ, Hirschman R, Suniga S, Armeij M, Armelie A. 2005. The influence of peer interactions on sexually oriented joke telling. *Sex Roles.* 52:187–199.
- Arora-Jonsson S, Ågren M. 2019. Bringing diversity to nature: politicizing gender, race and class in environmental organizations? *Environ Plann Nat Space.* 2(4):874–898.
- Bastiaens S, Vandebosch H, Poels K, Van Cleemput K, DeSmet A, De Bourdeaudhuij I. 2015. ‘Can I afford to help?’ How affordances of communication modalities guide bystanders’ helping intentions towards harassment on social network sites. *Behav Inf Technol.* 4:425–435.
- Baublyte G, Korhonen D, D’Amato D, Toppinen A. 2019. “Being one of the boys”: perspectives from female forest industry leaders on gender diversity and the future of Nordic forest-based bioeconomy. *Scand J Forest Res.* 34(6):521–528.
- Berkowitz AD. 2010. Fostering healthy norms to prevent violence and abuse: the social norms approach. In Kaufman, editor, *The prevention of sexual violence: a practitioner’s sourcebook.* Holyoke: MA; NEARI Press; p. 147–171.
- Bird FB. 1996. *The muted conscience. Moral silence and the practice of ethics in business.* London: Quorum Books.
- Bosco FJ, Herman T. 2010. Focus groups and collaborative research performances. In: DeLyser D., Herbert S., Aitken S., Crang M., McDowell L, editors. *The Sage handbook of qualitative geography.* Los Angeles: SAGE; p. 193–207.
- Brandth B, Haugen MS. 2005. Doing rural masculinity – from logging to outfield tourism. *J Gend Stud.* 14(1):13–22.
- Carvalho I, Costa C, Lykke N, Torres A. 2019. Beyond the glass ceiling: gendered tourism management. *Ann Tour Res.* 75:79–91.
- Chakroun R, Soudre-Lécluc N. 2014. Identification of sexual harassment and legitimacy of employees to intervene: effects of provided information and hierarchical relationship. *Arch Malad Profess Environ.* 75:382–395.
- Connel R, Pearse R. 2015. Gender norms: are they the enemy of women’s rights? United Nations Research Institute for Social Development (UNRISD). <http://www.unrisd.org/beijing+20-connell-pearse>.
- De Welde K, Stepnick A. 2015. Introduction: from people to policies. Enduring inequalities and inequities for women academics. In: De Welde K., Stepnick A., Pasque A., Penny A, editors. *Disrupting the culture of silence. Confronting gender inequality and making change in higher education.* Sterling: Stylus Publishing, LLC; p. 1–27.
- Fenton RA, Mott HL. 2017. The bystander approach to violence prevention: considerations for implementation in Europe. *Psychol Violence.* 7(3):450–458.
- Fenton RA, Mott HL. 2018. Evaluation of the intervention initiative: a bystander intervention program to prevent violence against women in universities. *Violence Vict.* 33(4):645–662.
- Fenton RA, Mott HL, McCartan K, Rumney P. 2016. A review of evidence for bystander intervention to prevent sexual and domestic violence in universities. Public Health England. PHE publications gateway number: 2016011.
- Fitzgerald LF, Drasgow F, Hulin CL, Gelfand MJ, Magley VJ. 1997. Antecedents and consequences of sexual harassment in organizations: a test of an integrated model. *J Appl Psychol.* 82(4):578–589.
- Fnaiss N, Soobiah C, Chen MH, Lillie E, Perrier L, Tashkhandi M, Straus SE, Mamdani M, Al-Omran M, Tricco AC. 2014. Harassment and discrimination in medical training: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Acad Med.* 89:817–827.
- Follo G. 2002. A hero’s journey: young women among males in forestry education. *J Rural Stud.* 18:293–306.
- From hashtag to action. 2018. Open letter to SLU and the forest sector (Från hashtag till handling. Öppet brev till SLU och skogsnäringen).
- Government offices of Sweden. 2011. Competitiveness requires gender equality/Konkurrenskraft kräver jämställdhet. Gender equality strategy for the forestry sector/Jämställdhetsstrategi för skogsbrukssektorn. Linköping: LTAB.

- Government offices of Sweden. 2018. Uppdrag att inom ramen för nationella skogsprogrammet, föreslå åtgärder för en jämställd skogssektor. Jönköping: Regeringsbeslut, Näringsdepartementet.
- Hennelly SE, Hussain S, Hale T, Cadle M, Brooke J, Davies E. 2019. University student attitudes to prosocial bystander behaviours. *Health Educ.* 119(5/6):408–424.
- Henning MA, Zhou C, Adams P, Moir F, Hobson J, Hallett C, Webster CS. 2017. Workplace harassment among staff in higher education: a systematic review. *Asia Pac Educ Rev.* 18:521–539.
- Hill E, Solomon Y, Dornan T, Stalmeijer R. 2015. 'You become a man in a man's world: is there discursive space for women in surgery?' *Med Educ.* 49:1207–1218.
- Holmqvist. 2017. Analys och efterord. I Jämställdhet ger tillväxt. Exempel från det gröna näringslivet. LRFs Jämställdhetsakademi. <https://www.lrf.se/om-lrf/uppdrag-vision-och-vardegrund/jamstalldhet/jamstalldhet-sakademin/jamstalldhet-ger-tillvaxt/>.
- Johansson K, Andersson E, Johansson M, Lidestav G. 2019. The discursive resistance of men to gender equality interventions: Negotiating 'unjustness' and 'unnecessity' in Swedish forestry. *Men Masc.* 22(2):177–196.
- Johansson M, Johansson K, Andersson E. 2018. #MeToo in the Swedish forest sector: testimonies from harassed women on sexualised forms of male control. *Scand J Forest Res.* 33(5):419–425.
- Lidestav G., & Reed, M. (2010) Preface: Gender and forestry. *Scandinavian Journal of Forest Research*, 25(sup9), 1–5.
- Lidestav G, Andersson E, Berg Lejon S, Johansson K. 2011. Jämställt arbetsliv i skogssektorn – underlag för åtgärder. Umeå: Department of Forest Resource Management. Swedish university of Agricultural Sciences. Report: 3452011.
- LRF. 2018. #metoo I det gröna näringslivet. LRFs Jämställdhetsakademi. <https://www.lrf.se/om-lrf/uppdrag-vision-och-vardegrund/jamstalldhet/jamstalldhet-sakademin/metoo/>.
- Mabry A, Turner MM. 2016. Do sexual assault and bystander interventions change men's intentions? Applying the theory of normative social behavior to predicting bystander outcomes. *J Health Commun.* 21(3):276–292.
- McDonald P. 2012. Workplace sexual harassment 30 years on: a review of the literature. *Int J Manag Rev.* 14(1):1–17.
- McDowell L. 1999. Gender, identity and place: understanding feminist geographies. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Morrisson EW, Milliken FJ. 2000. Organizational silence: a barrier to change and development in a pluralistic world. *Acad Manage Rev.* 25(4):706–725.
- Myers CA, Cowie H. 2019. Cyberbullying across the lifespan of education: issues and interventions from school to university. *Int J Environ Res Public Health.* 16(7):217.
- Nardone M. 2018. The powerful and covert role of culture in gender discrimination and inequality. *Contemp Psychoanal.* 54(4):747–762.
- Page T, Pina A, Giner-Sorolla R. 2016. "It was only harmless banter!" The development and preliminary validation of the moral disengagement in sexual harassment scale. *Aggr Behav.* 42:254–273.
- Paull M, Omari M, D'Cruz P, Güneri Çangarli B. 2019. Bystanders in workplace bullying: working university students' perspectives on action versus inaction. *Asia Pac J Human Resour.* 58:313–334.
- Powell S. 2016. Gender equality and meritocracy. Contradictory discourses in the Academy [PhD Thesis]. Uppsala: Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences.
- Ridgeway CL. 2009. Framed before we know it. How gender shapes social relations. *Gend Soc.* 23:145–160.
- Scandinavian Journal of Forest Research. 2010. Special issue: gender and forestry.
- SFA. 2014. Skogsstatistisk årsbok [Statistical yearbook of forestry]. Jönköping: Swedish Forest Agency.
- Swedish Forest Agency. 2019. Åtgärder för en jämställd skogssektor. Rapport 2019/4.
- Thomae M, Pina A. 2015. Sexist humour and social identity: the role of sexist humour in men's ingroup cohesion, sexual harassment, rape proclivity and victim blame. *Humour.* 28:187–204. <https://www.landskogsbruk.se/skog/samarbete-ska-gora-skogsbranschen-mer-jamstalld/>.
- Vainio A, Paloniemi R. 2013. Adapting to gender order: Voluntary conservation by forest owners in Finland. *Land Use Policy.* 35:247–256.
- Wickman K, Dolling A, Lidestav G, Rönnberg J. 2013. Genusintegrering och jämställdhetsarbete vid fakulteten för skogsvetenskap, Sveriges lantbruksuniversitet. Rapport 21.