

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 **The construction of ‘tough’ masculinity:**
8 **Negotiation, alignment and rejection¹**
9

10
11 *Robert Lawson*
12
13

14 **Abstract**
15

16 *Drawing on narrative data collected during a three-year ethnography of a Scot-*
17 *tish high school, this article examines the construction of working-class ado-*
18 *lescent masculinities. More specifically, the analysis focuses on how adolescent*
19 *male speakers negotiate, reject and align themselves with the hegemonically*
20 *dominant ideology of ‘tough’ masculinity, the role socially low-risk discourses*
21 *of ‘tough’ masculinity play in interaction, and how speakers integrate a range of*
22 *discursive strategies which help maintain homosociality when ‘tough’ masculin-*
23 *ity is at stake. I argue that discourses which appear to be about ‘being tough’ do*
24 *a great deal more social work than might be expected.*

25 **KEYWORDS:** GLASGOW; GLASWEGIAN; ‘TOUGH’ MASCULINITY; CRITICAL DISCURSIVE
26 PSYCHOLOGY; URBAN ETHNOGRAPHY
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37

38 **Affiliation**
39

40 Birmingham City University, UK.
email: robert.lawson@bcu.ac.uk

1. Introduction

The city of Glasgow, Scotland has long been associated with criminality, violence and anti-social behaviour, with many representations of the city exploiting the image of Glasgow as Scotland's most violent city (Davies 2007). Such behaviour is strongly linked with working-class males and a specific form of 'tough' masculinity which is considered normative within Glasgow and post-industrial urban contexts more generally (Skelton 1997). 'Tough' masculinity has a long-standing social value in Glasgow, and in a city with a celebrated industrial history, 'being a man' has typically been identified with strength, toughness and physical skill. James Reid, a Scottish trade unionist involved in the River Clyde shipbuilding industry, even went so far as to say that 'we don't only build ships on the Clyde, we build men' (Johnston and McIvor 2007: 35).

The construction of 'tough' masculinity is perhaps best realised in the figure of the 'hard man', a working-class male who embodies toughness, a willingness to fight, a propensity towards physical violence, and a disregard for his own personal safety (Whyte 1998). Representations of the 'hard man' in Glasgow are wide ranging, from the razor gangs in McArthur and Kingsley Long's 1935 novel *No Mean City*, to the 'Big Man' from the Scottish television show *Chewin' the Fat*, who solves all his problems with violence. But as ubiquitous as the idea of the 'hard man' is in contemporary Glaswegian society, questions remain over how productive it is in discussing the lived reality of working-class men (both adult and adolescent) in Glasgow.

Indeed, despite the fact that the construction of identity among adolescents has been a central concern in recent sociolinguistic scholarship (e.g. Eckert 2000; Moore 2003; Bamberg 2004), how men in Glasgow discursively negotiate the 'hard man' ideology (and laterally the idea of 'tough' masculinity) has been almost entirely ignored. Moreover, while many studies of identity and masculinity have focused almost exclusively on middle-class speakers (Cameron 1997; Edley and Wetherell 1997; Bucholtz 1999; Kiesling 2004, although see Labov 1972, Cheshire 1982 and Milroy 1987 for some important exceptions), very little contemporary sociolinguistic research has focused on identity construction among working-class males, Scottish or otherwise. Lastly, there is an assumption within the sociolinguistic literature that doing 'tough' masculinity is a relatively straightforward endeavour which primarily involves explicit acts of violence (cf. Kiesling 1998; Coates 2003). One consequence of this is that 'tough' masculinity is viewed as a homogeneous construct expressed mainly through physical action. This offers a particularly limited picture of 'toughness' as it relates to adolescent masculinities, and with moral panics about adolescent

1 criminality and violence a pertinent issue in recent times, particularly fol-
 2 lowing the riots in Birmingham, London and Manchester in August 2011,
 3 it appears to be a fruitful time to critically discuss the relationship between
 4 urban masculinities and 'toughness' and how language is implicated in this
 5 relationship.

6 Adopting a social constructionist approach to identity, where identity is
 7 viewed as something which dynamically emerges in interaction (Bucholtz
 8 and Hall 2005), this article draws on narrative data and ethnographic obser-
 9 vations collected during three years of ethnographic fieldwork in a high
 10 school in Glasgow to address three main aims: first, to discuss the construc-
 11 tion of masculinities among a group of young working-class male speakers,
 12 and in particular, how they negotiate, reject and align themselves with the
 13 hegemonically dominant ideology of 'tough' masculinity; second, to argue
 14 that alongside discourses of 'tough' masculinity, young men use low-risk
 15 conversational strategies which help them preserve the principles of homø-
 16 sociality; and third, to show how discourses of 'tough' masculinity can stand
 17 in for the deployment of inter-personal violence to establish oneself as 'hard'.
 18 As such, this article is a potentially valuable contribution to our understand-
 19 ing of the discursive construction of masculinity among young men.

20 In the next section of the article, I discuss the concept of 'hegemonic
 21 masculinity', focusing on the concepts of the 'hard man' and 'tough' mascu-
 22 linity. In section three, I outline the methodology and fieldwork site before
 23 analysing three conversational narratives to examine how the speakers in
 24 these narratives construct and negotiate 'tough' masculinity. I conclude
 25 with some comments on the implications these findings have for language
 26 and masculinity research.

27

28 **2. Hegemonic masculinity in an urban context**

29

30 Working-class Glaswegian males have traditionally been accorded with a
 31 reputation of violence, aggression, and criminality (Patrick 1973; Davies
 32 2007; Kintrea *et al.* 2011), with one of the most persistent themes in the
 33 social history of Glasgow being the 'hard man' (Johnston and McIvor
 34 2007; Young 2007). Ubiquitous in post-industrial cities (Skelton 1997:
 35 352–353), the 'hard man' is an important touchstone and an embedded
 36 cultural theme for men in Glasgow. Scholarly treatment of the 'hard man'
 37 is, however, almost non-existent, despite its ideological centrality with
 38 Glaswegian society.

39 The status of being a 'hard man' relies a great deal on the intersection of
 40 several different practices, including physical strength, fearlessness, a will-
 41 ingness to engage in acts of violence (premeditated and reactive), aggression,
 toughness, social competitiveness, and (usually) violent reactions against

1 perceived insults. Drawing these elements together, we can offer a definition
 2 of the 'hard man' as someone whose configuration of social practices dem
 3 onstrates engagement with a culture of excessive aggression and violence.
 4 Indeed, for many people in Glasgow, the use of violence is a key component
 5 of being a 'hard man' and it is the case that violence is often considered to be
 6 a hallmark of masculinity (Kimmel 2001: 278), and a necessary part of being
 7 respected as a 'real man' (Quinn 2004: 111). As such, the 'hard man' is one
 8 substantiation of hegemonic masculinity within Glasgow since it '[embod
 9 ies] the currently most honored way of being a man [and requires] all other
 10 men to position themselves in relation to it' (Connell and Messerschmidt
 11 2005: 832). But like most forms of hegemonic masculinity, very few men
 12 are able to enact the practices required of being a 'hard man', including the
 13 threat of personal attack, the potential legal ramifications of violence, and
 14 individual physical and psychological limitations. Additionally, while being
 15 a 'hard man' can facilitate social hierarchies, structures of domination and
 16 peer-group status (Phoenix *et al.* 2003: 180; Kenway and Fitzclarence 2005:
 17 43–45), it can also result in a breakdown of social relations, peer marginali
 18 sation, peer rejection, and personal injury (Anderson 1997: 18–23; Hawley
 19 2007: 4). Thus, there is a tension between being a 'hard man' and developing
 20 and sustaining robust friendship networks.

21 While the 'hard man' is an acute embodiment of 'tough' masculinity,
 22 the role of 'tough' masculinity more generally has been a recent focus in
 23 contemporary language and masculinity research. For example, in their
 24 analysis of data collected from a group of men undertaking foundational
 25 degrees at the Open University, Wetherell and Edley (1999: 342) discuss
 26 how men take on three types of *imaginary positionings*: 'heroic' (the most
 27 closely aligned with hegemonic masculinity), 'ordinary' (where speakers
 28 emphasise themselves as normal, moderate or average) and 'rebellious'
 29 (where men describe themselves in terms of non-normative discourses of
 30 masculinity). One of their important findings was that many of the men
 31 adopted the imaginary positions of 'ordinary' and 'rebellious' masculin
 32 ity, rather than 'macho' or 'heroic', as a way of reinforcing other hege
 33 monic ideals such as individual autonomy and personal choice. This is
 34 also alluded to by Bucholtz (1999: 444) who argues that 'technically based'
 35 masculinities are becoming more normative for men and 'physically
 36 based' masculinity more subordinated. Such distancing from the hege
 37 monic ideals of 'macho' masculinity is surprising, especially given how far
 38 'toughness' is assumed to be a key orientating point for men. Indeed, in
 39 their study on adolescent masculinities, Phoenix and Frosh (2001) outline
 40 how 'hardness' is an important predictor in determining not only a boy's
 41 popularity, but also their sense of self worth as normatively 'masculine'.
 As I show in the analysis below, however, while 'toughness' might be an

1 important component of adolescent male life, it is certainly not the only,
2 or even the most predominant, component.

3

4 **3. Methodology**

5

6 The ethnographic fieldwork on which this article is based began in 2005
7 after ethical approval from the high school, the University of Glasgow and
8 Glasgow City Council had been obtained. In this section of the article, I
9 outline the Communities of Practice encountered in the high school (CofP
10 hereafter), the data collection process, and the approaches used in the
11 analysis of the narrative data. I also briefly consider the notion of 'identity'
12 as emergent in discourse.

13

14 **3.1 Communities of Practice**

15

16 As previous research has demonstrated (e.g. Eckert 2000; Mendoza-Denton
17 2008), language is only one of a range of social practices through which
18 individuals signal their membership of a particular group and construct
19 their social identities. Consequently, in order to investigate the range of
20 practices which contribute towards the construction of identity, including
21 language, the Community of Practice framework was used, rather than the
22 speech community or social network approach. Eckert (2000: 35) defines
23 a CofP as:

24

25 an aggregate of people who come together around some enterprise. United by
26 this common enterprise, people come to develop and share ways of doing things,
27 ways of talking, beliefs, values – in short, practices – as a function of their joint
28 engagement in activity. Particular kinds of knowledge, expertise and forms of par-
ticipation become part of individuals' identities and places in the community.

29

30 Importantly, the use of the CofP framework allows us to go beyond 'top-
31 down' identity categories such as 'working-class adolescent male' towards
32 identities which emerge as socially relevant for the speakers (I discuss this
33 issue in more detail below). Membership of a particular CofP was decided
34 by a process of 'triangulation' (Mendoza-Denton 2008: 240), informed by
35 speakers' self-identification, other-identification, and ethnographic obser-
36 vations of shared social practices and mutual endeavours. Four CofPs
37 emerged during the fieldwork which I named the *Alternative*, *Sports*, *'Ned'*,
38 and *Schoolie* CofPs (although in the analysis section, I only discuss data
39 collected from the Sports, 'Ned' and Schoolie CofPs). These four CofPs
40 represented the broad social spectrum of the high school, with each group
41 occupying a distinct position by virtue of their differentiated social prac-
tices (see Lawson 2011 for more detail on these practices).

1 While the members of each of these CofPs knew of, and sometimes
 2 informally socialised with, one another, the ethnographic fieldwork
 3 uncovered significant polarisation between the groups, a finding con-
 4 sistent with previous 'school ethnographies' conducted in the UK (e.g.
 5 Willis 1977; Skelton 1997). The primary distinction was between the
 6 Schoolie and the 'Ned' groups who represented the extreme school and
 7 anti-school positions respectively. For example, the 'Ned' group were
 8 involved in the local subculture, including skipping school, participating
 9 in a range of age-restricted activities and low-level crime such as petty
 10 theft and minor vandalism. They also appeared to be well versed in the
 11 gang culture of Glasgow² and either knew of or informally socialised with
 12 individuals who were involved in gang-related violence (Lawson 2009:
 13 365–367). The Schoolie Group tended to reject such social practices and
 14 instead positioned themselves as pro-school by orientating positively
 15 towards the values promoted by the education system. By recognising
 16 (and accepting) the authority of the teachers, the members of this group
 17 were more fully aligned with the 'establishment'. The Alternative and
 18 Sports groups formed the 'grey area' between the Schoolie and 'Ned'
 19 groups, and although not as anti-school as the 'Ned' group, they were
 20 not as pro-school as the Schoolies. In terms of distinct social practices,
 21 the Alternative group listened to rock music and participated in non-
 22 traditional sports such as wrestling and BMX riding, while the Sports
 23 group participated in more mainstream activities such as football and
 24 rugby.

25 Over the course of the fieldwork, it became apparent that masculinity
 26 was constructed differently across the CofPs encountered. More specifi-
 27 cally, members of the 'Ned' and Sports CofPs appeared to construct more
 28 'tough' identities while the Schoolie CofP explicitly distanced themselves
 29 from such identities. Focusing on narrative data collected from members
 30 of these three CofPs, the analysis below suggests that, contrary to the posi-
 31 tions outlined above, 'toughness' is not only (or always) about 'being tough',
 32 and that conceptualising masculinity as static psychological categories of
 33 'ordinary', 'heroic' or 'rebellious' removes much of the complexity of the
 34 moment-by-moment unfolding of identity construction.

35

36 3.2 Data collection

37 Like many ethnographic studies in sociolinguistics, the main method of
 38 data collection was interviews. Participants were recorded (in conversa-
 39 tional dyads or triads with myself present) once they had returned a per-
 40 mission form signed by a parent or guardian, and to ensure confidentiality
 41 and anonymity, all participants were given pseudonyms.

1 Although there are a range of issues associated with the use of interviews
 2 in qualitative research (Potter and Hepburn 2005: 285), the difficulties of
 3 access and ethics associated with collecting 'naturalistic' data meant that
 4 interviews were the only possible method of data collection. Several steps
 5 were, however, taken in order to address some of the perceived weaknesses
 6 of interview approaches. First, the recordings were conducted after approx
 7 imately six months of fieldwork to allow the informants to become comfort
 8 able with speaking about their lives with someone with no predefined role
 9 in the school. This 'lag' also meant that I had background information about
 10 the participants' social lives and was better able to draw on this knowledge
 11 during the recordings. Second, the recording context was relatively informal
 12 to encourage informants to be less self-conscious of their talk. This meant
 13 that the first few recording sessions were facilitated with drinks, sweets,
 14 playing cards and so on to reduce participants' degree of 'active monitoring'
 15 of their speech (the Observer's Paradox, Labov 1972). Participants were also
 16 informed that the research focused on 'how people spoke in different groups'
 17 (cf. Potter and Hepburn 2005: 290), although the participants were generally
 18 uninterested in the aims of the research. Third, I was wary about the record
 19 ing sessions falling into a 'question and answer' session, so although it was
 20 necessary to ask direct questions of the participants to ensure that useful
 21 data was collected (for the purposes of the quantitative sociolinguistic anal
 22 ysis presented in Lawson 2009, 2011), an attempt was made to have the par
 23 ticipants guide the conversations themselves, rather than the conversational
 24 agenda be established by me. Nevertheless, it is important to note that my
 25 presence during the recordings means that we should view the interviews as
 26 co-constructed speech events between the participants and myself, rather
 27 than simply co-constructed between the interviewees (Rapley 2001; Baker
 28 2004). Last, in order to mitigate the effects of any perceived association with
 29 the authority of the school, I did not observe classes or interact with teach
 30 ers (Eckert 2000: 72–73; Evaldsson 2002: 204).

31 By the end of the fieldwork, the dataset consisted of approximately 30
 32 hours of fully transcribed conversations (250,000 words), following the con
 33 ventions outlined in Atkinson and Heritage (1984). Although the speakers
 34 used Glaswegian Vernacular, the narratives I discuss have been rendered in
 35 Standard English. Distinct Scots lexical features have been retained where
 36 possible, and glosses have been provided. My turns are marked as 'RL'.

37

38 3.3 Analytical approach and 'emergent' identities

39 Following transcription, the data were coded for salient conversational
 40 themes,³ including fighting, arguing, friendship, life after school and so on.
 41 During this process, several narratives emerged as interesting in terms of

1 how the speakers seemed to enact ‘tough’ masculinity. Since narratives are
 2 the vehicles through which speakers perform their ‘identity’ work (Bamberg
 3 and Georgakopoulou 2008), it was decided that these data warranted
 4 further investigation using critical discursive psychology, where ‘attention
 5 to micro-level detail is supplemented with a macro-level layer of analysis
 6 in order to focus on the historical, social and political contexts of identity
 7 construction’ (Benwell and Stokoe 2006: 9). Importantly, within critical dis-
 8 cursive psychology, identity is viewed as something socially constructed;
 9 as something speakers *do* rather than something that speakers *have* (this
 10 framework draws heavily on Judith Butler’s theory of performativity).

11 A key debate about constructionist approaches has, however, emerged in
 12 recent years, centring on the extent to which the researcher predetermines
 13 the categories speakers occupy. For example, Benwell and Stokoe (2006:
 14 56–57) argue that constructionist or ‘gender-as-performance’ studies ‘rely
 15 heavily on *analysts’* rather than *participants’* categories’, leading to a tau-
 16 tology where researchers start out already ‘knowing’ the identities of the
 17 speakers whose identity constructions they are supposed to be investi-
 18 gating (Stokoe and Smithson 2002: 81; Benwell and Stokoe 2006: 57). In
 19 qualitative research, then, it is important to outline under what categories
 20 speakers are recruited (Potter and Hepburn 2005: 290).

21 Since one of the aims of the research was to investigate quantitative pat-
 22 terns of linguistic variation among young working-class Glaswegian males
 23 (Lawson 2009, 2011), the ethnographic fieldwork focused on speakers who
 24 fit this profile (although only speakers who belonged to one of the four
 25 CofPs outlined above were interviewed). Importantly, however, the eth-
 26 nographic fieldwork (outlined above) uncovered socially meaningful and
 27 locally embedded ‘ways of being’ which went beyond the homogeneous
 28 category of ‘working-class adolescent male’, moving away from identity
 29 categories such as ‘working-class’ and ‘male’ towards identities which were
 30 informed through ‘bottom-up’ processes. This article, therefore, does not
 31 investigate how ‘working-class male’ identity is constructed through an
 32 analysis of ‘working-class male’ language, but instead, how salient cultural
 33 discourses such as ‘tough’ masculinity emerge in interaction and how these
 34 discourses function as part of a wider set of identity strategies (cf. Kiesling
 35 2006).

36 The (ir)relevance of ‘extra-discursive’ features has, however, also
 37 been disputed in discourse studies (Wetherell 1998). In her discussion
 38 of hegemonic masculinity, for example, Speer (2001a, 2001b) argues
 39 that extra-discursive issues which are not directly orientated to by par-
 40 ticipants should not form part of an analytical account. In response,
 41 Edley (2001b) notes that it is not enough to focus only on the data, and

1 although 'hegemonic masculinity' may not be explicitly named as such
 2 by speakers, 'it is a mistake to imagine that what it describes is entirely
 3 absent from everyday talk' (Edley 2001b: 137). Additionally, the use of
 4 ethnography helps us to develop 'detailed insight into the concepts and
 5 processes that underlie what people do – but that they are often unaware
 6 of' (Forsythe 1999: 129). Indeed, given the ideological centrality of the
 7 'hard man' identity within Glasgow, it would make little sense to suggest
 8 that this culturally valued way of 'being a man' in Glasgow would not be
 9 a relevant issue.

10

11 4. Narrative I: negotiating 'tough' masculinity

12

13 In the analysis of the first narrative, I discuss how Nathan and Phil (two
 14 members of the Sports CofP) collaboratively construct and negotiate
 15 social identities which align with 'tough' masculinity over the course of
 16 a co-constructed narrative. The two speakers discuss a key event in the
 17 collective memory of their social group (what Georgakopoulou 2007 calls
 18 a 'shared story'): a fight between Nathan and Mark (another Sports CofP
 19 member). Although Phil, Nathan and Mark were friends at the time of
 20 the fieldwork, there had been a fall out between Nathan and Mark which
 21 led to a fight between them. Phil attempted to intervene to protect Mark
 22 from injury, but was prevented by others from doing so. In the first part
 23 of the analysis, I present the opening excerpt of the transcript and discuss
 24 how the 'looking good principle' (Ochs *et al.* 1989) can help us illuminate
 25 the importance of self-presentation in the narrative. In the second part, I
 26 outline some of the ways in which 'tough' masculinity is constructed col-
 27 laboratively and negotiated by the speakers.

28 Excerpt 1

29

30 1 RL: Have you had any fights with anybody
 31 2 else in, like, your group that-
 32 3 Nathan: I had a fight with Mark in first year.
 33 4 RL: Right.
 34 5 Nathan: And I battered him.
 35 6 RL: Right=
 36 7 Nathan: =On-
 37 8 See that bridge out there?
 38 9 RL: (.)
 39 10 Uh-huh.
 40 11 Nathan: Top of that.
 41 12 There were-
 13 (1.0)
 14 like-

1 15 (1.0)
 2 16 Four-
 3 17 They were fourth years, weren't they?
 4 18 (.)
 5 19 Like, going into,
 6 20 [well third years-
 7 21 Phil: [I would've went for you
 8 22 that day man [if-
 9 24 Nathan: [What?
 10 25 Phil: I would've went for you that day if=-
 11 26 Nathan: =You di:d, you tried to hi-
 12 27 You tried to attack [me]=
 13 28 Phil: =I know, but everybody kept
 14 29 holding me back.
 15 30 Nathan: (.)
 16 31 Aye, no wonder but.
 17 32 Phil: (.)
 18 33 How?
 19 34 Nathan: (.)
 20 35 Cause it was [Mark] that caused that fight.
 21 36 (.)
 22 37 They all say I was calling his
 23 38 mum a boot (*insult term*) and that.
 24 39 RL: Right.
 25 40 Nathan: But I wasn't.
 26 41 (1.0)
 27 42 I try and keep myself to myself, don't I?
 28 43 (1.8)
 29 44 Phil: No:, you-
 30 45 sometimes you cause fights as well.
 31 46 [You-
 32 47 Nathan: [Aye but-
 33 48 No recent.
 34 49 I- I don't a:lways do it.
 35 50 (.)
 36 51 That time I didn't try and do it=
 37 52 RL: =Uh-huh.
 38 53 Nathan: All these people blocked us
 39 54 off one side of [the bridge],
 40 55 and him and Mark ra:n over the other side
 41 56 and went the other way,
 42 57 so the only way I could get
 43 58 by him was to fight him.
 44 59
 45 60
 46 61

1 The 'looking good principle' states that speakers 'present narrated events
 2 in a way that portrays themselves in the most complimentary light' (Ochs
 3 *et al.* 1989: 244). In following the 'looking good principle', speakers attempt
 4 to present a positive image of themselves to their interlocutors. In Excerpt
 5 1 of the conversation, Phil and Nathan observe the 'looking good principle'
 6 by downplaying the negative aspects of their character as being 'fighters'
 7 and position themselves as unwilling participants in the event (although
 8 as I argue below, both speakers use discursive means to demonstrate aligna-
 9 ment with 'tough' masculinity). Phil uses the conditional modal verb *would*
 10 (line 21 and line 26) to suggest that attacking Nathan is something he con-
 11 sidered but did not do (a claim immediately countered by Nathan), while
 12 Nathan argues that he 'keeps himself to himself' (line 42). His use of the
 13 tag question 'don't I' (line 42) is a way of seeking affirmation and agree-
 14 ment from Phil to bolster his claims. As Ochs and Capps (2001: 137) point
 15 out, however, 'there are risks... whenever recounting... a narrative to an
 16 intimate: the moral glow may be dashed when someone recalls a rather
 17 discrediting background detail' and after being invited to respond, Phil's
 18 dispreferred response is prefigured by an almost two second pause (line
 19 43) before he rejects Nathan's statement, pointing out that Nathan 'some-
 20 times causes fights as well' (line 44–45). Taken together, Phil undermines
 21 Nathan's attempt to justify his lack of culpability in and responsibility for
 22 the fight. Nathan then rejects the idea that he started the fight by claiming
 23 that he only fought Mark because he was forced to (line 57–58). There is a
 24 degree of similarity here with Andersson's (2008) study of narratives of vio-
 25 lence in which Salim, a young man who had been sent to a youth detention
 26 centre for assault, explains away his use of violence as 'self-defence'. Such
 27 techniques of neutralisation are often an attempt to justify one's behav-
 28 iour and place the blame on a second party, and we can see this technique
 29 deployed in Nathan's contribution to the narrative.

30 The opening sequence of the narrative is also important in that both
 31 speakers use this opportunity to initially construct their identities as
 32 'tough', albeit in slightly different ways. Phil's first contribution (line 25)
 33 positions himself as 'heroic' through his attempted intervention in the
 34 fight to protect Mark, while his second contribution (line 28–29) furthers
 35 an idea of 'tough' masculinity by virtue of the fact that he had to be held
 36 back by other people in the group, suggesting that if this had not happened,
 37 Phil would have caused serious harm to Nathan. Nathan's construction of
 38 'tough' identity is more straightforward in that he opens with the claim
 39 that he 'battered Mark' (line 5), and although the remainder of his con-
 40 tribution in Excerpt 1 is an attempt to explain his actions, in Excerpt 2,
 41 Nathan jettisons his attempt at 'looking good', which up until now has

1 been based largely on the rejection of violence. Instead, he states that the
 2 only possible solution to the situation in which he found himself was to
 3 resort to physical aggression. When the narrative arrives at its climax and
 4 culminates in physical blows, we revert to a presentation of ‘tough’ mas-
 5 culinity by Nathan which is not mitigated in any way.

6

7 Excerpt 2

8

1 Nathan: And I decked [Mark]
 2 and started kicking into him.
 3 and I was just about to leave,
 4 and I turned round,
 5 and I seen [Mark] ho:lding his back si-
 6 back e:nd greeting (*crying*),

13

14

7 RL: Uh-huh.

15

16

8 Nathan: And I turned round,
 9 and all you see is Phil
 10 just trying to fl:y for us,
 11 and all you see is big Peter
 12 just gra:bbing [Phil]
 13 and pu:shing him out the way.

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

Unlike earlier parts of the narrative where Nathan attempts to deflect responsibility for the fight, here he emphasises the agency of his actions. Syntactically, Mark occupies the object slot in the utterance (line 1 and line 2 in Excerpt 2) and is the one towards whom action is directed. Moreover, Mark’s position as ‘object’ is highlighted by the fact that in Nathan’s narrative, Mark does not attempt to fight back. From my observations during the ethnographic fieldwork, it is unlikely that Mark would have accepted being attacked by Nathan since doing so would have resulted in social censure and a potential loss of status. Nevertheless, by glossing over Mark’s participation in the fight in this narrative, Nathan attempts to cement his own position as ‘tough’, placing Mark in the undesirable position of being considered an ineffective and inept fighter. Nathan also takes up the earlier point from Excerpt 1 that Phil had to be restrained from intervening, adding the detail that it was ‘big Peter’ (line 11–13) who ultimately stopped Phil. The repetition of this point solidifies the co-construction of ‘tough’ masculinity for both speakers: Phil’s attempts to intervene and the fact that Nathan’s behaviour required intervention.

Following Nathan’s account of him fighting Mark, he questions Phil’s attempts to ‘look good’, and in Excerpt 3, offers an (implicit) moral evaluation of Phil’s actions.

1 Excerpt 3

2 1 Nathan: (Directed towards Phil)
 3 2 Honestly, I didn't see you
 4 3 greeting, right,
 5 4 but honestly see when we lo-
 6 5 see when we all looked back,
 7 6 (.)
 8 7 I did see tears of wa:ter
 9 8 dripping from your eyes.
 10 9 [Ask-
 11 10 Phil: [(inaudible)
 12 11 Nathan: See if you [ask-
 13 12 Phil: [(inaudible)
 14 13 Nathan: I [know but see if you ask-
 15 14 Phil: [See see because your
 16 15 face goes all red.
 17 16 Nathan: See if you ask,
 18 17 (1.0)
 19 18 Peter and Jack,
 20 19 they all say it did look
 21 20 like you were greeting.
 22 21 (.)
 23 22 Honestly, it did look like
 24 23 you were greeting.

25 Excerpt 3 includes features which would normally be indicative of a co-
 26 operative speech style, such as the repetition of the verb 'see' by both
 27 speakers and the presence of simultaneous speech (lines 11–14). In the case
 28 presented here, however, the conversation is anything but co-operative,
 29 with both speakers vying for control of the conversational floor to contest
 30 the issue of Phil crying. Nathan's claim is hedged by the fact that he says
 31 'looked like you were crying' as opposed to 'you were crying', but neverthe-
 32 less, Nathan calls into question Phil's claims to a 'tough' masculinity, since
 33 crying is often seen as an antithetical masculine quality. It is expected (if not
 34 demanded in certain communities) that men should not cry, since doing so
 35 belies emotional fragility (Migliaccio 2011: 229). Nathan's comments are
 36 an attempt to foreground Phil's breaking of social norms and function as a
 37 face-threatening attack on Phil's construction of a 'tough' masculinity.

38 What is interesting about this excerpt is that Nathan appears to con-
 39 tribute two very conflicting statements (lines 2–3 and lines 7–9). He ini-
 40 tially states he did not see Phil crying (lines 2–3), a claim strengthened by
 41 the adverb 'honestly'. In line 7–8, however, this statement is contradicted
 when he says 'I did see tears of water dripping from your eyes'. This claim

1 is boosted by an appeal to the external group of peers observing the fight
 2 (lines 13–15), a tactic Nathan attempts three times (lines 11, 13 and 16).
 3 The commentary on Phil’s supposed crying episode is further developed
 4 in Excerpt 4.

5

6 Excerpt 4

7 1 RL: I used to be like that as well.
 8 2 There’s just-
 9 3 There’s that much emotion,
 10 4 that even if you win you still like-
 11 5 Phil: I wasn’t actually fighting.
 12 6 I was going to go stick up for him, right,
 13 7 because I was just going to
 14 8 do what he done to him.
 15 9 RL: Uh-huh
 16 10 Phil: So I- I re:ally really wasn’t greeting,
 17 11 just because-
 18 12 (.)
 19 13 [S-
 20 14 Nathan: [Aye, but it did look like it.
 21 15 I- I- I wasn’t saying you were greeting,
 22 16 but it did look like you were greeting.
 23 17 Phil: (.)
 24 18 No, it’s think- it’s just cause my eyes,
 25 19 it looks like [I’m greeting.
 26 20 Nathan: [Ah but-
 27 21 Phil: Do I look as if I’m greeting now?
 28 22 Nathan: (.)
 29 23 N:o but-
 30 24 No but I did see something coming [out-
 31 25 Phil: [No, it’s
 32 26 because of the colour
 33 27 of my eyes are always [like all thingied.
 34 28 Nathan: [I know.
 35 29 Phil: Look as if I’m greeting now?
 36 30 Nathan: No, but I did see something.

35

36 At the start of Excerpt 4, I offer a supportive alignment with Phil (lines
 37 1–4), a comment which Phil rejects by pointing out that he was not fight-
 38 ing, the implication being that since he was not fighting, he had no need
 39 to cry. Phil also explicitly positions himself as ‘protector’ when he says
 40 that he was ‘just going to stick up for [Mark] (line 6). In line 10, Phil
 41 challenges Nathan’s claim, upgrading his position that he was not crying

1 through the repeated use of 'really', a fact that Nathan agrees with (line
 2 14). Nathan's agreement here is positioned as a co-operative speech act
 3 which shows alignment with Phil's own version of the event. Nathan then
 4 restates his two contradictory claims from Excerpt 3: the first, that it did
 5 not look as though Phil was crying (line 15), and the second, that it *did*
 6 look like Phil was crying (line 16). The contest between Nathan and Phil
 7 on who is 'right' becomes more apparent from line 19 onwards, during
 8 which both participants seek to convince the other of their version of
 9 events, highlighted through the use of disruptive overlap throughout the
 10 excerpt.

11 Ultimately, however, we have to ask why Nathan produces the contra-
 12 diction he does. I suggest that it happens because Nathan has to simul-
 13 taneously manage a critique of Phil's claim to 'tough' masculinity *and*
 14 maintain the relationship. If he had decided to not mitigate his claim that
 15 he saw Phil crying, then it is entirely possible that his comments would
 16 have been taken more seriously and with potentially dangerous repercus-
 17 sions. Both participants here are collaboratively defending their sense of
 18 'tough' masculinities and in the process, they use the conversation as a way
 19 to explore what constitutes 'tough' masculinity and what does not. Impor-
 20 tantly, Nathan's mitigating comments offer Phil a safe way of contesting the
 21 claims that he cried (thus to counter accusations that he is not a 'real man'),
 22 while allowing Nathan an opportunity to further his own sense of 'tough'
 23 masculinity, primarily by positioning himself as an arbiter of acceptable
 24 masculine behaviour.

25 What occurs in this conversation is slightly different to what Goodwin
 26 (1990: 248–256) and Evaldsson (2002: 218) find in their analyses of boys'
 27 story-telling. Both argue that counter-narratives offered by a boy who is
 28 under attack generate further counters from the peer-group. In the case
 29 of this data, however, the rejection of Nathan's claims by Phil does not
 30 entrench Nathan's viewpoint or generate stronger and more insistent
 31 claims. Instead, Nathan utilises strategies which mitigate the strength of
 32 his claim, even going so far as to contradict himself. The collaborative
 33 nature of the conversation becomes even more apparent when we consider
 34 Excerpt 5 where Nathan appears to offer a supportive comment that it too
 35 sometimes looks as though he is crying.

36

37 Excerpt 5

38

39

40

41

- | | | |
|---|-------|--------------------------------------|
| 1 | Phil: | The colour of my eyes look like |
| 2 | | they're all thingwied- |
| 3 | | look like they've got water in them. |
| 4 | RL: | Was it windy? |

1 5 Nathan: (.)
 2 6 No.
 3 7 RL: Right. You ever get like that-
 4 8 Nathan: It was like that-
 5 9 It was like that-
 6 10 See my- my eyes always wa:ter,
 7 11 and they always think I'm greeting, right?
 8 12 Don't know.
 9 13 It's something to do with cold air,
 10 14 cold air makes me- my eyes water,
 11 15 or if I keep, thingwy- my eyes,
 12 16 because- because I've got glasses,
 13 17 my eyes are always itchy.

14 Nathan's comments about crying (line 10–17) appear to be an attempt to
 15 validate Phil's earlier claim in the narrative and shows how judgements
 16 about apparent 'weak' emotionality can be reintegrated, refashioned and
 17 reinterpreted for the purposes of maintaining homosociality between inter
 18 locutors. Indeed, the negotiation of 'tough' masculinity in this narrative
 19 relies a great deal on indirection and delicacy between the two interlocu-
 20 tors. Both participants are aware that prototypical expressions of 'tough'
 21 masculinity (i.e. fighting) could potentially alienate them from their social
 22 group (as was the case in other examples where individuals in the high
 23 school had fought with one another). Without collaboratively negotiating
 24 in the 'game' of 'tough' masculinity, the narrative could have developed
 25 in a radically different direction, particularly if both speakers were truly
 26 committed to the notion of 'overt competition' and 'one-upsmanship'. For
 27 example, Farrington (1998: 19) suggests that many altercations between
 28 adolescent males begin with arguments or disputes. Nathan's contributions
 29 could have been interpreted by Phil as insulting, resulting in potentially
 30 more confrontational strategies which would have run the risk of threaten-
 31 ing the friendship. The way the conversation is framed, however, provides
 32 both parties with an opportunity to perform 'tough' masculinity without
 33 the 'game' going too far.

34 5. Narrative II: Personal histories of 'tough' masculinity

35 The next narrative was collected during a conversation with two members
 36 of the 'Ned' CofP, Danny and Will.⁴ As mentioned in section 3, of the four
 37 CofPs I encountered, the members of the 'Ned' CofP were the most inte-
 38 grated into the local subculture of Glasgow. Their social practices included
 39 a range of age-restricted activities such as smoking and drinking, illegal
 40 activities such as drug taking, and a knowledge of local gangs and gang-
 41

1 related activity (Lawson 2009: 152–162). As such, members of the 'Ned'
 2 CofP were seen by many as the 'hardest' in the school, while some actively
 3 avoided interacting with them.⁵ In particular, a knowledge of gangs and
 4 gang-related activity were important indices of group membership, even
 5 though I saw limited evidence that members I spoke to were actively
 6 involved in any of the gangs surrounding the local area. Nevertheless,
 7 gangs remained an important conversational point for a number of reasons.
 8 First, gangs in Glasgow are transient, mobile and changeable, so knowing
 9 the best fighters, what fights had happened, who the 'hardest' members
 10 were, and other demonstrations of 'gang knowledge' conferred a degree of
 11 insider status. Second, because knowledge claims about gangs and gang-
 12 violence were difficult to verify, status could be negotiated by claiming to
 13 'know the right things' without serious worry of other people showing this
 14 knowledge to be demonstrably false. And last, since gangs in Glasgow are
 15 generally organised around physical violence and other anti-social acts,
 16 members could vicariously attain 'hard man' status through claiming even
 17 peripheral membership.

18 The main speaker, Danny, was identified by many people as a pro-
 19 tototypical 'hard man', a status he maintained through outright rebellion
 20 against teachers, claims of 'running' with local gangs, and the retelling of
 21 a range of fight narratives (recorded both on and off-tape). Prompted by
 22 a discussion on Glasgow gang culture, Danny's narrative focuses on his
 23 participation in a gang fight. Throughout the narrative, Danny draws on
 24 dominant discourses of 'tough' masculinity, but whereas we might expect
 25 the narrative to display elements of 'heroic' masculinity (cf. Wetherell
 26 and Edley 1999) and to clearly foreground his skills and abilities as a
 27 fighter (cf. Coates 2003: 110), he uses the narrative as a way of distanc-
 28 ing himself from dominant expressions of 'tough' masculinity. I suggest,
 29 however, that he uses his historical involvement with gangs to also reify
 30 his identity as 'tough'.

31
 32 Excerpt 6

33 1 RL: Right, but you don't [fight] any of them?
 34 2 Danny: I used to but-
 35 3 I used to fight for the Steam
 36 4 but I don't any more.
 37 5 RL: When did you stop?
 38 6 Danny: Eh, I stopped-
 39 7 I only done it one night so I did.
 40 8 RL: Right.
 41 9 Danny: And then I fucking stopped.
 10 RL: How come?

1 11 Danny: Cause I didn't like it.
2 12 (.)
3 13 No, because I ended up fucking almost getting
4 14 hit on the head with a bottle.
5 15 But I took a fu:cking-
6 16 I smashed the bottle and fucking shoved it
7 17 right into some cunt there.
8 18 RL: Uh-huh.
9 19 Danny: I thought I almost killed him
10 20 so I didn't want to go back.
11 21 RL: Right.
12 22 Danny: I've been done for
13 23 attempted murder before aye,
14 24 but I never want to do it again.
15 25 Will: (inaudible)
16 26 Danny: Aye bu:t I don't want to get put
17 27 into jail at fucking fou:rteen Will.
18 28 Will: (1.7)
19 29 (inaudible)
20 30 RL: Well I don't know.
21 31 Like, I always thought it was just like,
22 32 because youse came from different schemes
23 33 and stuff like that,
24 34 [that's why youse fight.
25 35 Danny: [A- a- a- a lot of people-
26 36 That's what-
27 37 That's the reason a lot of cunts fight,
28 38 but I'm like that so I am.
29 39 RL: Uh-huh.
30 40 Danny: I only fight when I really need tae.
31 41 Most of the time I run,
32 42 you know what I mean?

31 Immediately, Danny distances himself from participation in gang-related
32 fighting, claiming that it was something that he 'used to' do (lines 2-4).
33 When asked about why he stopped, he initially does not complete his first
34 response (line 6). Instead, in the following line, he self-repairs to claim that
35 his involvement in gang violence was only restricted to one evening (line 7)
36 and that it was only after this that he stopped. When questioned about why
37 he stopped, we are faced with a complex interweaving of multi-faceted ori-
38 entations towards 'tough' masculinity. First, Danny states that the reason
39 he stopped fighting was because he 'didn't like it' (line 11), a claim which,
40 on the surface, appears to be a rejection of 'tough' masculinity since 'real
41 men' are expected to enjoy violence and fighting (Lewis 1983). This expla-

1 nation is then rejected for one where he stopped because he could have
 2 been seriously injured during the fight by someone wielding a bottle (line
 3 13–14). Danny appears to be searching for an 'acceptable' reason as to why
 4 his involvement in fighting ceased. Nevertheless, his two opening con-
 5 tributions suggest an apparent rejection of 'tough' masculinity along two
 6 potential axes; a lack of enjoyment and fear for one's own personal safety,
 7 both of which contradict the 'hard man' ideology. In line 16–17, however,
 8 a sense of 'tough' masculinity is re-established when he admits that during
 9 the fight, he 'smashed the bottle and fucking shoved it right into some cunt
 10 there'. Here, Danny presents a stark reframing of the situation in which
 11 he engages with a form of extreme 'tough' masculinity. The utterance also
 12 alters the dynamic of the event to place Danny in the dominant position
 13 and his foe to the subordinate position (acutely marked through his use of
 14 the insult term *cunt*). In lines 19–20, he comments that he did not go back
 15 to the scene because he thought he had 'almost killed' his opponent, relat-
 16 ing this back to a previous occasion where he had been 'done' (charged)
 17 with attempted murder.⁶ Finally, towards the end of the narrative, Danny
 18 alters his presentation of 'tough' masculinity again by admitting that he
 19 would run away from a fight (line 41), reverting back to his original stance
 20 of rejecting 'tough' masculinity.

21 Although there are similarities to the narrative discussed in section 4
 22 (i.e. self-defence against a perceived or actual threat), some crucial differ-
 23 ences emerge. Unlike Nathan's narrative, which segues into a negotiation
 24 of both his and Phil's claims to 'tough' masculinity, Danny's narrative is,
 25 I suggest, a sophisticated and dynamic negotiation of 'tough' masculinity
 26 which cannot be read as a straightforward substantiation of 'heroic', 'ordi-
 27 nary' or even 'rebellious' masculinity. Danny states that he never wants to
 28 be involved in a fight of that scale again (line 24), that he does not want
 29 to go to jail for murder or assault (line 26–27), and that he is more likely
 30 to run away from a fight than to confront an attacker (line 41), allowing
 31 him to distance himself from 'tough' masculinity. But his association with
 32 gang violence, as brief as it was, also allows him to claim a 'hard man'
 33 identity. Danny's story here is a complex personal narrative which shows
 34 that he is capable of being a 'hard man', and as such, it is an advertisement
 35 of his ability to embody an extreme 'tough' masculinity. The subsequent
 36 telling and retelling of the story serves as a 'pre-emptive strike' against
 37 anyone who might bother him, with the words standing in and removing
 38 the need for similar actions in the future (cf. Anderson 1997: 19). He is
 39 able to reject the hard man identity now because he has 'proven' himself
 40 in the past.

41

1 6. Narrative III: The construction of alternative 'tough' 2 masculinity

3
4 The last narrative shows how Victor, a member of the Schoolie CofP, rejects
5 'tough' masculinity while simultaneously orientating towards certain
6 aspects of it. The Schoolie CofP was by far the most integrated into the
7 educational system, recognising and acceding to the authority of the school
8 and the teachers (Lawson 2011: 249). None of them, to my knowledge,
9 engaged in any age-restricted activities and were more likely to meet up
10 with one another outside of school to play computer games or practise
11 guitar playing. As such, the members of the Schoolie CofP existed almost
12 completely outside the sub-cultural context of the high school and were
13 considered by many within the school to be 'model students'. While it was
14 certainly the case that many of the Schoolie CofP members rejected the
15 discourse of 'tough' masculinity, Victor's narrative shows a passing famil-
16 iarity with some of these discourses, and an implicit agreement with others.

17 The narrative was elicited through a conversation about gang activity in
18 the local area, during which Victor related how he had been involved in an
19 altercation with a group of young men while he was out with Gary, one of
20 his friends and another member of the Schoolie CofP. The previous narra-
21 tive (not presented here) focused on an event where Victor and his friends
22 were beaten up by a group of boys and Victor did not attempt to fight back.
23 Excerpt 7 follows on after Victor relates the first encounter.

24 Excerpt 7

25
26 1 Victor: I done that because
27 2 there was a previous time,
28 3 where three boys came down
29 4 and it was just me and Gary.
30 5 RL: Right.
31 6 Victor: (1.0)
32 7 Basically they kicked the crap out of Gary
33 8 and I done nothing because the boys were hel-
34 9 holding me back.
35 10 RL: Right.
36 11 Victor: There was that,
37 12 and I didn't want to get involved
38 13 and I didn't know what to do.
39 14 RL: Mhmmm.
40 15 Victor: And I haven't, like,
41 16 fought anyone before,
17 (1.7)
18 so: I was trying to make up for that,

1 19 so the second time they came down
 2 20 they started chasing Gary
 3 21 and started calling him names
 4 22 and they turned round
 5 23 and started kicking the crap out of me.
 6 24 (0.5)
 7 25 Wasn't that bad like my-
 8 26 my whole body went numb.
 9 27 RL: [Mhmmm.
 10 28 Victor: [((laughs))
 11 29 It didn't actually hurt.

12 Victor starts by stating that he was outnumbered in this encounter (line 3),
 13 emphasising that it was just him and Gary (line 4). This mitigation prefig-
 14 ures and excuses why he failed to prevent himself and Gary being beaten
 15 up (line 7, lines 22–23). Over the course of the narrative, Victor constructs
 16 both his and Gary's identities as 'victims', marked by the repetition of the
 17 formulaic phrase 'kicked the crap out of X'. Moreover, Victor states that
 18 he did not want to get involved (line 12), that he did not know what to
 19 do in that situation (line 13), and he had no experience in fighting (line
 20 15–16), all of which show limited engagement with the practices of 'tough'
 21 masculinity. Yet this positioning as 'victim' is also done in parallel with a
 22 partial engagement with ideologies of hegemonic 'tough' masculinity. For
 23 example, he states that he was 'trying to make up' for letting his friends be
 24 attacked (line 18), an implicit acknowledgement that he is lacking in some
 25 way and that he needs to prove himself. Towards the end of the narrative,
 26 Victor's negotiation of 'tough' masculinity is further developed when he
 27 states that although he was beaten up (line 23), it 'wasn't that bad' (line 25)
 28 and 'it didn't actually hurt' (line 29), a claim that is accompanied by laugh-
 29 ter (line 28), apparently trivialising the event. His defeat is reformulated in
 30 a positive light by a rejection of weakness and vulnerability, and his sub-
 31 sequent reworking of 'tough' masculinity is achieved through a discourse
 32 of being able to stand the pain, rather than deal it out. This aligns with
 33 previous research which shows that not only is the denial of pain a typical
 34 characteristic of 'tough' masculinity (Courtenay 2000: 1389), but also that
 35 being able to endure and withstand pain without complaint is reconfigured
 36 as a positive character trait (Zeeland 1997: 119).

37 7. Discussion and conclusions

39 My main point in the analysis of the preceding narratives has been that
 40 discourses which appear to be about 'being tough' do a great deal more
 41 social work than might be expected. More specifically, the article demon-

1 strates how the speakers' narratives do not focus on heroic, against-the-
 2 odds achievements, but instead contain a great deal of delicacy, nuance and
 3 indirection which allows them to maintain homosociality, distance them-
 4 selves from their past behaviour, or demonstrate an awareness of what it
 5 means to be 'tough'. We also have some evidence that 'tough' masculinity
 6 is at least partially rejected by some of the speakers. For example, Danny
 7 rejects 'tough' masculinity through a discourse of 'I was a hard man, but I'm
 8 not any more', while Victor does so through a discourse of 'I've never been
 9 a hard man'. In contrast, Nathan and Phil positively align themselves with
 10 'tough' masculinity in their narrative more explicitly. None of the speakers,
 11 however, offer a more general rejection of 'tough' masculinity (to wit, 'it's
 12 not good to be a hard man'), suggesting that such an identity is accepted as
 13 the hegemonic one for young men in the city.

14 In terms of the contribution this article makes to a more general under-
 15 standing of masculinities in Glasgow (and Scotland more broadly), I would
 16 suggest that while the 'hard man' is an important cultural concept within
 17 the city, it is of relatively limited power insofar as it encapsulates young
 18 men's articulations of masculine identities in the city. Indeed, the picture
 19 of the 'hard man' as established by the mainstream media appears to be
 20 at odds with the kinds of accounts presented in this article. Although the
 21 article focuses on a specific set of speakers in a particular location, it nev-
 22 ertheless provides some substance to how young men in the city construct
 23 their social identities as men against a backdrop of a hegemonically domi-
 24 nant ideology of 'tough' masculinity.

25 Moving beyond Glasgow, this article has several implications for how
 26 we approach the study of language and masculinity. First, we should
 27 reconsider the usefulness of static identity categories such as 'heroic' and
 28 'rebellious' masculinity, particularly since this implies that speakers deploy
 29 only one identity over the course of any given interaction (cf. Wetherell
 30 and Edley 1999). As the analysis above shows, identity is a dynamic entity
 31 which shifts on a moment-by-moment basis, and any analysis of language
 32 and masculinity should be sensitive to these shifts. It may be the case that
 33 speakers sometimes foreground certain facets of identity, but even in such
 34 cases, we should not focus on the foreground at the expense of the other
 35 identity work speakers undertake. Second, we have seen that the use of
 36 ethnography permits an additional layer of description in the narratives
 37 under analysis. Indeed, integrating insights garnered from ethnographic
 38 fieldwork means a more fully formed account of the social context the
 39 speakers inhabit can be developed. A third related point is that the use of
 40 ethnography also allows us to see the relevance of issues which might not
 41 be immediately retrievable from the conversational context (cf. Baker 2004:

1 163; Benwell and Stokoe 2010: 95). While extra-discursive features such
 2 as 'tough' masculinity and the 'hard man' ideology might not be named
 3 explicitly by speakers, they are nevertheless important in our account of
 4 what speakers do (cf. Kiesling 2006: 268).

5 The research presented here has, of course, its limitations. Of particular
 6 concern, briefly alluded to above, is how far the analysis can be generalised
 7 to other men in Glasgow. Indeed, generalisation is an acute concern for most
 8 ethnographic work (O'Reilly 2009: 82–86), yet it is important to recognise
 9 that ethnography helps us bridge the gap between ideological constructs
 10 and how these might be embedded in everyday interaction. By investigat-
 11 ing the 'local', we can start to understand how speakers exploit more 'global'
 12 resources for interactional purposes and how the same resources might
 13 be deployed across different groups. The concomitant use of interviews
 14 to investigate the construction of social identity is also a potential area of
 15 weakness (cf. Potter and Hepburn 2005), but it is important to note that
 16 the interview data formed only one part of the study and that ethnography
 17 facilitated an investigation of the kinds of identities socially relevant to the
 18 speakers, going beyond the category of 'working-class adolescent male'.
 19 As such, the integration of ethnography with critical discursive psychol-
 20 ogy has helped to develop a more nuanced account of the role of 'tough'
 21 masculinity among adolescent male speakers and has shown how 'tough'
 22 masculinity is about much more than just being tough.

23

24 **About the author**

25 Robert Lawson is lecturer in linguistics at Birmingham City University.

26

27

28 **Transcription conventions**

29	[[Simultaneous utterances
30	[Overlapping speech which does not start simultaneously
31	=	Contiguous utterance
32	[info]	Contextual information added (e.g. names)
33	(<i>gloss</i>)	Gloss of lexical item
34	(())	Paralinguistic item
35	(.)	Pause less than one second
36	(sec)	Pause timed in seconds
37	-	Speech stops abruptly
38	:	Sound is prolonged
39	.	Terminal pitch intonation
40	,	Continuing pitch intonation
41	?	High rising pitch intonation

1 **Notes**

- 2 1 I would like to thank Paul Baker, Scott Kiesling, Ursula Lutzky, Ruth Page, Nicolai
3 Pharao, and Elizabeth Stokoe for their extensive feedback, friendly support and sagely
4 advice as this article moved from the germ of an idea to final publication. I am particu-
5 larly indebted to the anonymous reviewers who commented on several versions of this
6 article as it made its way through the peer-reviewing process. I would also like to thank
7 audiences at iClave, iGala, University of Lancaster, UC Santa Barbara, and Stanford Uni-
8 versity for their questions, suggestions and discussion, all of which have helped make
9 this article stronger. Lastly, this research would not have been possible without the co-
10 2 operation and involvement of the pupils who shared their stories. Thank you.
11 'Gangs' in Glasgow do not follow a hierarchical structure as that which characterises
12 many urban gangs in North America. Instead, 'gangs' tend to be horizontally distributed
13 and established around territorial areas, including local housing estates, parks, and other
14 important boundary markers (Kintrea *et al.* 2011).
15 3 The coding process involved, among other things, a close reading of the transcripts and
16 deciding what the topic of conversation was for each speaker turn.
17 4 Will's turns are all labelled 'inaudible' because his microphone was not properly attached.
18 5 They also advised me against trying to get to know anyone they considered a 'ned'.
19 6 Although I was never able to determine the veracity of this statement, it is a substan-
20 tiation of my point that it is difficult, if not impossible, to confirm or deny the kinds of
21 events Danny narrates here.

20 **References**

- 21 Anderson, E. (1997) Violence and the inner-city street code. In J. McCord (ed.) *Vio-*
22 *lence and Childhood in the Inner-City* 1–30. Cambridge: Cambridge University
23 Press.
24 Andersson, K. (2008) Constructing young masculinity: A case study of heroic dis-
25 course on violence. *Discourse and Society* 19(2): 139–161. [http://dx.doi.org/](http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0957926507085949)
26 [10.1177/0957926507085949](http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0957926507085949)
27 Atkinson, J. M. and Heritage, J. (1984). Transcript notation. In J. M. Atkinson and
28 J. Heritage (eds) *Structures of Social Action: Studies in Conversational Analysis* xi–
29 xvi. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
30 Baker, C. (2004) Membership categorization and interview accounts. In D. Silverman
31 (ed.) *Qualitative Research: Theory, Method and Practice* 162–176. London: Sage.
32 Bamberg, M. (2004) Form and functions of 'slut-bashing' in male identity construc-
33 tions in 15-year-olds. *Human Development* 47(6): 331–353. [http://dx.doi.org/](http://dx.doi.org/10.1159/000081036)
34 [10.1159/000081036](http://dx.doi.org/10.1159/000081036)
35 Bamberg, M. and Georgakopoulou, A. (2008) Small stories as a new perspective in
36 narrative and identity analysis. *Text and Talk* 28(3): 377–396. [http://dx.doi.org/](http://dx.doi.org/10.1515/TEXT.2008.018)
37 [10.1515/TEXT.2008.018](http://dx.doi.org/10.1515/TEXT.2008.018)
38 Benwell, B. and Stokoe, E. (2006) *Discourse and Identity*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh Uni-
39 versity Press.
40 Benwell, B. and Stokoe, E. (2010) Analysing identity in interaction: Contrasting dis-
41 course, genealogical, narrative and conversational analysis. In M. Wetherell and
C. Mohanty (eds) *The SAGE Handbook of Identities* 82–101. London: Sage.
Bucholtz, M. (1999) You da man: Narrating the racial other in the production of white
masculinity. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 3(4): 443–460. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/](http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/1467-9481.00090)
[1467-9481.00090](http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/1467-9481.00090)

- 1 Bucholtz, M. and Hall, K. (2005) Identity and interaction: A sociocultural linguistic
2 approach. *Discourse Studies* 7(4): 585–614. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/14614](http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1461445605054407)
3 [45605054407](http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1461445605054407)
- 4 Butler, J. (1990) *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. London:
5 Routledge.
- 6 Cameron, D. (1997) Performing gender identity: Young men's talk and the construc-
7 tion of heterosexual masculinity. In S. Johnston and U. Meinhof (eds) *Language and*
8 *Masculinity* 47–64. Oxford: Blackwell.
- 9 Cheshire, J. (1982) *Variation in an English Dialect: A Sociolinguistic Study*. Cambridge:
10 Cambridge University Press.
- 11 Coates, J. (2003) *Men Talk: Stories in the Making of Masculinities* Oxford: Blackwell.
- 12 Connell, R. (2005) *Masculinities*. 2nd edn. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- 13 Connell, R. and Messerschmidt, J. (2005) Hegemonic masculinity: Rethinking the con-
14 cept. *Gender and Society* 19(6): 829–859. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0891243205](http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0891243205278639)
15 [278639](http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0891243205278639)
- 16 Courtenay, W. (2000) Constructions of masculinity and their influence on men's well-
17 being: A theory of gender and health. *Social Science and Medicine* 50(10): 1385–
18 1401. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0277-9536\(99\)00390-1](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0277-9536(99)00390-1)
- 19 Davies, A. (2007) Glasgow's 'Reign of Terror': Street gangs, racketeering and intimidation
20 in the 1920s and 1930s. *Contemporary British History* 21(4): 405–427. [http://](http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13619460601060413)
21 dx.doi.org/10.1080/13619460601060413
- 22 Eckert, P. (2000) *Linguistic Variation as Social Practice: The Linguistic Construction of*
23 *Identity in Belten High*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- 24 Edley, N. (2001a) Analysing masculinity: Interpretative repertoires, ideological dilem-
25 mas and subject positions. In M. Wetherell, S. Taylor and S. Yates (eds) *Discourse*
26 *as Data: A Guide for Analysis* 189–228. London: Sage.
- 27 Edley, N. (2001b) Conversation analysis, discursive psychology and the study of ideol-
28 ogy: Response to Susan Speer. *Feminism and Psychology* 11(1): 136–140. [http://](http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0959353501011001007)
29 dx.doi.org/10.1177/0959353501011001007
- 30 Edley, N. and Wetherell, M. (1997) Jockeying for position: The construction of mascu-
31 line identities. *Discourse and Society* 8(2): 203–217. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/](http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0957926597008002004)
32 [0957926597008002004](http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0957926597008002004)
- 33 Evaldsson, A.-C. (2002) Boys' gossip telling: Staging identities and indexing (unaccept-
34 able) masculine behaviour. *Text and Talk* 22(2): 199–225.
- 35 Farrington, D. (1998) Predictors, causes, and correlates of male youth violence. *Crime*
36 *and Justice* 24: 421–454. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1086/449284>
- 37 Forsythe, D. (1999) 'It's just a matter of common sense': Ethnography as invisible work.
38 *Computer Supported Cooperative Work* 8(1): 127–144. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1023/](http://dx.doi.org/10.1023/A:1008692231284)
39 [A:1008692231284](http://dx.doi.org/10.1023/A:1008692231284)
- 40 Georgakopoulou, A. (2007) *Small Stories, Interaction and Identities*. London: John
41 Benjamins.
- 42 Goodwin, M. (1990) *He-Said-She-Said: Talk as Social Organization among Black Chil-*
43 *dren*. Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.
- 44 Hawley, P. (2007) Social dominance in childhood and adolescence: Why social compe-
45 tition and aggression may go hand in hand. In P. Hawley, T. Little and P. Rodkin
(eds) *Aggression and Adaptation: The Bright Side to Bad Behaviour* 1–30. Oxford:
46 Routledge.
- 47 Johnson, R. and McIvor, A. (2007) Narratives from the urban workplace: Oral testom-
48 onies and the reconstruction of men's work in the heavy industries in Glasgow. In

- 1 R. Rodger and J. Herbert (eds) *Testimonies of the City: Identity, Community and*
 2 *Change in a Contemporary Urban World* 23–44. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- 3 Johnston, S. and Meinhof, U. (1997) *Language and Masculinity*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- 4 Kenway, J. and Fitzclarence, L. (2005) Masculinity, violence and schooling: Challeng-
 5 ing 'poisonous pedagogies'. In C. Skelton and B. Francis (eds) *A Feminist Critique of*
 6 *Education: 15 Years of Gender Development* 38–54. Oxford: Routledge.
- 7 Kiesling, S. (1998) Men's identities and sociolinguistic variation: The case of fraternity
 8 men. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 2(1): 69–99. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/1467-](http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/1467-9481.00031)
 9 [9481.00031](http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/1467-9481.00031)
- 10 Kiesling, S. (2004) Dude. *American Speech* 79(3): 281–305. [http://dx.doi.org/10.](http://dx.doi.org/10.1215/00031283-79-3-281)
 11 [1215/00031283-79-3-281](http://dx.doi.org/10.1215/00031283-79-3-281)
- 12 Kiesling, S. (2005) Homosocial desire in men's talk: Balancing and re-creating cultural
 13 discourses of masculinity. *Language in Society* 34(5): 695–726. [http://dx.doi.org/](http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0047404505050268)
 14 [10.1017/S0047404505050268](http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0047404505050268)
- 15 Kiesling, S. (2006) Hegemonic identity-making in narrative. In A. De Fina, D. Schiffrin
 16 and M. Bamberg (eds) *Discourse and Identity* 261–287. Cambridge: Cambridge
 17 University Press.
- 18 Kimmel, M. (2001) Masculinity as homophobia: Fear, shame, and silence in the con-
 19 struction of gender identity. In S. M. Whitehead and F. J. Barrett (eds) *The Masculin-*
 20 *ities Reader* 266–287. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- 21 Kintrea, K., Bannister, J. and Pickering, J. (2011) 'It's just an area – everybody repre-
 22 sents it': Exploring young people's territorial behaviour in British cities. In B. Gold-
 23 son (ed.) *Youth in Crisis? 'Gangs', Territoriality and Violence* 55–71. Oxford:
 24 Routledge.
- 25 Labov, W. (1972) *Language in the Inner City: Studies in Black English Vernacular*. Phil-
 26 adelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- 27 Lawson, R. (2009) Constructions of social identity among adolescent males in
 28 Glasgow. Unpublished PhD thesis. University of Glasgow, UK.
- 29 Lawson, R. (2011) Patterns of linguistic variation among Glaswegian adolescent males.
 30 *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 15(2): 226–255. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-](http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9841.2011.00477.x)
 31 [9841.2011.00477.x](http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9841.2011.00477.x)
- 32 Lewis, G. (1983) *Real Men Like Violence: Australian Men, Media, and Violence* Ken-
 33 thurst, Australia: Kangaroo Press.
- 34 McArthur, A. and Long, H. K. (1935) *No Mean City*. London: Corgi Books.
- 35 Milroy, L. (1987) *Language and Social Networks*. 2nd edn. Oxford: Blackwell.
- 36 Mendoza-Denton, N. (2008) *Homegirls: Language and Cultural Practices among*
 37 *Latina Youth Gangs*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- 38 Migliaccio, T. (2011) Men's friendships: Performances of masculinity. *Journal of Men's*
 39 *Studies* 17(3): 226–241. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3149/jms.1703.226>
- 40 Moore, E. (2003) Learning style and identity: A sociolinguistic analysis of a Bolton
 41 high school. Unpublished PhD thesis. University of Manchester, UK.
- 42 Ochs, E. and Capps, L. (2001). *Living Narrative: Creating Lives in Everyday Storytell-*
 43 *ing*. Cambridge, M.A.: Harvard University Press.
- 44 Ochs, E., Smith, R. and Taylor, C. (1989) Detective stories at dinnertime: Problem-
 45 solving through co-narration. *Cultural Dynamics* 2(2): 238–257. [http://dx.doi.](http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/092137408900200206)
 46 [org/10.1177/092137408900200206](http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/092137408900200206)
- 47 O'Reilly, K. (2009) *Key Concepts in Ethnography*. London: Sage.
- 48 Patrick, J. (1973) *A Glasgow Gang Observed*. London: Methuen.

- 1 Phoenix, A. and Frosh, S. (2001) Positioned by hegemonic masculinities: A study on
2 London boys' narratives of identity. *Australian Psychologist* 36(1): 27–35. [http://](http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00050060108259628)
3 dx.doi.org/10.1080/00050060108259628
- 4 Phoenix, A., Frosh, S. and Pattman, R. (2003) Producing contradictory masculine sub-
5 ject positions: Narratives of threat, homophobia and bullying in 11–14-year-old
6 boys. *Journal of Social Issues* 59(1): 179–195. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/1540-4560.](http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/1540-4560.t01-1-00011)
7 [t01-1-00011](http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/1540-4560.t01-1-00011)
- 8 Potter, J. and Hepburn, A. (2005) Qualitative interviews in psychology: Problems and
9 possibilities. *Qualitative Research in Psychology* 2(4): 281–307. [http://dx.doi.org/](http://dx.doi.org/10.1191/1478088705qp045oa)
10 [10.1191/1478088705qp045oa](http://dx.doi.org/10.1191/1478088705qp045oa)
- 11 Quinn, P. (2004) Easterhouse 2004: An Ethnographic Account of Men's Experience,
12 Use and Refusal of Violence. Unpublished PhD dissertation, University of Glasgow,
13 UK.
- 14 Rapley, T. (2001) The art(fulness) of open-ended interviewing: Some considerations on
15 analysing interviews. *Qualitative Research* 1(3): 303–323. [http://dx.doi.org/10.](http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/146879410100100303)
16 [1177/146879410100100303](http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/146879410100100303)
- 17 Skelton, C. (1997) Primary boys and hegemonic masculinity. *British Journal of Sociol-*
18 *ogy of Education* 18(3): 349–369. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/0142569970180303>
- 19 Speer, S. (2001a) Reconsidering the concept of hegemonic masculinity: Discursive
20 psychology, conversation analysis and participants' orientations. *Feminism and*
21 *Psychology* 11(1): 107–135. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0959353501011001006>
- 22 Speer, S. (2001b) Participants' orientations, ideology and the ontological status of
23 hegemonic masculinity: A rejoinder to Nigel Edley. *Feminism and Psychology* 11(1):
24 141–144. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0959353501011001008>
- 25 Stokoe, E. and Smithson, J. (2002) Gender and sexuality in talk-in-interaction: Consid-
26 ering conversational analytic perspectives. In P. McIlvenny (ed.) *Talking Gender*
27 *and Sexuality* 79–110. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- 28 Wetherell, M. (1998) Positioning and interpretative repertoires: Conversation analysis
29 and post-structuralism in dialogue. *Discourse and Society* 9(3): 387–412. [http://dx.](http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0957926598009003005)
30 [doi.org/10.1177/0957926598009003005](http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0957926598009003005)
- 31 Wetherell, M. and Edley, N. (1999) Negotiating hegemonic masculinity: Imaginary
32 positions and psycho-discursive practices. *Feminism and Psychology* 9 (3): 335–356.
33 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0959353599009003012>
- 34 Whyte, C. (1998) Masculinities in contemporary Scottish fiction. *Forum for Modern*
35 *Language Studies* 34(3): 274–285. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/fmls/34.3.274>
- 36 Willis, P. (1977) *Learning to Labor: How Working-class Kids Get Working-class Jobs*.
37 Farnborough: Gower Publishing.
- 38 Wolfson, N. (1976) Speech events and natural speech: Some implications for sociolin-
39 guistic methodology. *Language in Society* 5(2): 189–209. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/](http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0047404500007028)
40 [S0047404500007028](http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0047404500007028)
- 41 Young, H. (2007) Hard man/new man: Re/composing masculinities in Glasgow
C.1950–2000. *Oral History* 35(1): 71–81.
- Zeeland, S. (1997) *Masculine Marine: Homoeroticism in the U.S. Marine Corps*. Binghamton: The Haworth Press.

