



Lafferty, Scott (2015) *Sexed bodies, heterosexuality and Glasgow street-orientated youth*. [MRes].

Copyright © 2015 The Author

Copyright and moral rights for this work are retained by the author(s)

A copy can be downloaded for personal non-commercial research or study, without prior permission or charge

This work cannot be reproduced or quoted extensively from without first obtaining permission in writing from the author(s)

The content must not be changed in any way or sold commercially in any format or medium without the formal permission of the author

When referring to this work, full bibliographic details including the author, title, institution and date must be given.

<http://endeavour.gla.ac.uk/71/>

Deposited: 6 December 2016

Enlighten Dissertations
<http://endeavour.gla.ac.uk/>
deposit@lib.gla.ac.uk

Sexed Bodies, Heterosexuality
and
Glasgow Street-orientated Youth

Matriculation Number: 2098498L

Programme Name: MRes Criminology

Supervisor: Dr Susan Batchelor

Turnitin ID: 46682290

Word Count: 16, 432

Acknowledgements:

I am eternally grateful to all the young men who gave up their time and energy, and instilled their trust in me to talk openly about their lives in their communities. I would like to particularly thank ‘The Drumchapel Boys’ – Zack, Calvin, Paul, Charles, Robert, David and Frank – and James and Ryan, who are the core of this dissertation. Without you there would be no dissertation. Many thanks to the youth organisations who helped facilitate access to participants to ensure that young people’s voices were heard.

I would like to thank my family and friends for their patience and understanding for the numerous moments we have missed out on while I dedicated my time and energy to this academic endeavour. I am sure we will make up for lost time!

To Dr Susan Batchelor, I will be forever indebted to you, throughout my MRes Criminology course, not just this dissertation; you have provided insight, supervision and guidance. You have nurtured me academically, provided me with opportunities to flourish, and because of you, I am able to think critically, grow in confidence, and you have enhanced my confidence to express myself with conviction – and succinctly!

Most of all, to my partner Paul Traynor, your love, patience and understanding has no ends. Through the last two years this academic enterprise has become all-consuming, at times putting the rest of life on pause, and despite that you have stood by me and been my source of strength. Thank you for believing in me. Thank you for making me a better person.

Table of Contents

Abstract.....	4
Chapter 1: Introduction.....	5
Chapter 2: Youth Gangs and Gender.....	9
Chapter 3: Queer criminology and the ‘sexed bodies’ approach.....	20
Chapter 4: Methodology.....	28
Chapter 5: Findings and Analysis.....	35
Chapter 6: Conclusion.....	62
Bibliography.....	68
Appendix A.....	76
Appendix B.....	79
Appendix C.....	82

Abstract:

This dissertation demonstrates that existing malestream and feminist criminological research into youth gangs generally, and in Glasgow specifically, either portrays simplistic gender-congruent dualisms and/or remains heteronormative and de-sexed. Hence, this dissertation explored how gang-involved young men use discursive and social resources to construct 'intelligible' male and heterosexual subjects. It achieves this through the application of a 'sexed bodies' approach and qualitative postmodernist feminist-queer methodology drawing on oral-history interviews and a focus group across two comparable Glasgow research sites. The generated data from the resultant sample of 13 young men, aged between 18 to 30, generated rich insights into their sexed practices and discursive repertoires in the 'youth gang'. Through 'thick analysis' and the discourse analysis tools of 'interpretative repertoire' and 'subject positions and identity work' three emergent themes developed: valorised maleness in the youth gang, male gang affirmation of the 'heterosexual matrix', and sexed street habitus, which were critically explored utilising three case-studies from a 'sexed bodies' queer criminological framework. Thus the dissertation demonstrates that central to any analysis of young men's 'youth gang' lived experience and meaning-making requires a holistic account of the social and discursive significance of their sexed and sexualised bodies.

Chapter 1: Introduction

Background

Internationally youth ‘gangs’ are a prominent public issue, engendering fear and anxiety across communities and societies. In the Scottish context, interest occurs largely from media coverage and emotive political rhetoric, which conceptualise gangs as coherent spatially-bound social units engaged in rival group territorial violence (Bannister et al, 2010; Fraser, 2013). Most criminological enquiry and theoretical frameworks pertaining to youth gangs tend to focus on young men, and young men as perpetrators of violence, and girls and young women as victims (Batchelor, 2011). Feminist researchers have attempted to progress beyond these over-simplified stereotypes of dichotomous ‘gender difference’ to explore ‘how and when gender matters’ (Miller and Mullins, 2006), primarily through the application of the ‘gendered pathways’ and ‘gendered crimes’ approaches. Yet like most criminological enquiry, these feminist approaches remain de-sexed and heteronormative (Collier, 1998). Only limited criminological enquiry has adopted a ‘sexed bodies’ approach (Smart, 1990, 1995) and queer criminology is at an embryonic stage in the UK (Groombridge, 1999). Thus limitations of existing criminological research into ‘youth gangs’ embody: (i) a tendency to focus on masculinities/male violence through a negative prism, ignoring young women’s lived experiences and meaning-making; (ii) the assumption that the body has no social or cultural importance to understand or explain street-orientated young peoples lived experience or meaning-making; (iii) inadequate theorisation of sex, the body and sexuality; and (iv) a failure to conceptualise ‘youth gangs’ from a sexed and sexualised perspective.

The study

To address some of these gaps, this dissertation aimed to explore how gang-involved young men use discursive and socially situated resources to position themselves as 'intelligible' (Butler, 2004) male and heterosexual subjects. The following research objectives ensued:

1. To explore the discourses young men draw on to privilege or challenge bodies as heterosexual in the 'youth gang'.
2. To identify the social practices and positions young men adopt to reaffirm or destabilise the 'heterosexual matrix' of the 'youth gang'.
3. To examine how these discourses and social practices facilitate attitudes and practices towards violent engagement for young men.
4. To critically assess and map out the merits of a sexed bodies queer criminology interpretative framework to the 'youth gang' in comparison to other feminist criminological approaches.

To address these research objectives oral-history interviews were undertaken with six young men aged between 18 to 30 across two comparable research sites in Glasgow, alongside one focus group with 7 young men, aged 18 to 21, from one of the research sites. Whilst the research is small scale and exploratory, it generated rich insights into young men's sexed practices and discursive repertoires.

Contribution

My goal for this dissertation is to provide analytical insight that takes the social and cultural significance of young men's bodies, sex and sexuality seriously, acknowledging their centrality to 'youth gang' lived experience and meaning-making. I engage a number of insights from feminist criminology and queer-feminism, as well as being reflexive about my own politics and subjectivity, paying attention to the consistencies and divergences of the meaning-making that the young men account for their sexed and sexualised experiences. Hence I hope to contribute to criminological knowledge production and 'youth gang' enquiry, and by extension unsettle the heteronormative boundary of the field and its subjects by making it queerer.

Layout

In chapter 2 I critically examine the empirical landscape of the 'youth gang', taking note of its American heritage and illustrating how, in the UK, it is highly contentious and a shifting idea. An idea dominated by research conducted in Glasgow due to the city's historical links and reputation as a 'gang city'. However much of the UK research, as Batchelor's (2011) analysis demonstrates, draws on dichotomous understandings of gender difference. Further, I claim that the empirical data continues to be heteronormative and de-sexed.

In chapter 3 I put forward the merits of queer criminology, drawing specifically on the conceptual insights of the 'sexed bodies' approach. I critically assess the boundaries of criminology as a field, drawing insight to the contribution that feminist criminology has made to the field in terms of identifying the significance of gender (as an empirical focus and

conceptual tool) – and in advancing post-positivist epistemologies. I contend that the utility of the ‘sexed-bodies’ approach lies in its ability to elucidate the significance of bodies for young men in ways that enables them to actively affirm their maleness and heterosexuality in the context of the ‘youth gang’. In doing so, I set out key conceptual tools.

Chapter 4 outlines the qualitative methodological approach for this dissertation, as an explorative study, assessing the merits of the qualitative interview methods with a non-representative sample, followed by a pen portrait of the young men whose generated data is utilised. I also introduce two key discourse analysis tools - ‘interpretative repertoire’ and ‘subject positions and identity work’ - used to analyse the generated data.

Chapter 5 presents the data from the qualitative interviews. I commence with an explanation of the adopted case-study approach. Here I build up a picture through ‘thick analysis’, of the core themes derived from the generated data, comparing and contrasting the case-studies. The three themes discussed are: (i) valorised maleness in the youth gang; (ii) male affirmation of the ‘heterosexual matrix’; and (iii) sexing street habitus; engaging these themes to answer the dissertation questions set out.

Finally, Chapter 6 concludes the dissertation by returning to the research questions and discussing the significance of the findings for criminological enquiry and knowledge production relating to youth gangs. I also make suggestions for further research in this area.

Chapter 2: Youth Gangs and Gender

This chapter seeks to interrogate criminological literature relating to ‘youth gangs’ and gender, particularly in the context of Glasgow. I will argue that despite feminist contributions mitigating empirical and analytical shortcomings of malestream criminological research on gangs in terms of girls and gender; ‘youth gang’ criminological literature generally - and Glasgow specifically - continues to conceptualise heterosexuality as anything other than an effect of gender, and fails to make problematic the heteronormative sex/gender distinction it imbues. Thus, the ‘gang’ in Glasgow requires a sexed and sexualised analysis.

Definitions of the Youth Gang

The concept ‘gang’ is contentious in terms of definition, composition, and typology (Sanders, 1994:8). Contemporary media and political rhetoric have contributed to the notion that there is a youth crisis in the UK (Goldson, 2011: 4). This has led to a preoccupation on how and where delinquent youth spend their leisure time (Groves et al, 2011: 2), taking shape in the form of the ‘war on gangs’ (Goldson, 2011:5; Alexander, 2008: 3). This focus, on gangs as the source of all social problems, is void of robust empirical evidence about young people’s lived experiences and meaning-making, unlike the American context (Fraser, 2013: 971).

Sociological research into gangs can be traced back to Thrasher’s (1927) Chicago study. According to Thrasher, the gang as a social configuration is subjective in its composition (p. 5), with its key features being the solution for young men to address their family and community dislocation and marginalisation. In particular the gang is the solution

for lower working-class young men due to unemployment, poverty and lack of education attainment. The 'youth gang' consists of young males who live in the same community engaged in social bonding; fostering loyalty, collectiveness and defined sense of fixed spatiality, with an implicit structure that binds them together; all played out through inter-gang disputes. For Thrasher the gang is male-orientated phenomenon as young men possess the 'gang instinct' (ibid: 228); whereas young women who engage in gangs do so by embodying an unnatural masculine role. Thus the 'gang instinct' facilitates young men's sense of masculinity due to their social disorganisation (ibid: 332).

According to Cohen (1955) the 'youth gang' is a male phenomenon, manifested in working-class delinquency and frustration (p. 44) due to a rejection of capitalist values in industrialised societies, and lower standards of living and life chances (ibid: 97). Young men learn from older male peers the merits of gang involvement to ascertain their dreams and ambitions. The gang provides the context to enact violence and acceptable innate masculinity even if these equate to marginalisation and criminalisation. Fundamentally, the defining dynamics of the 'youth gang' are delinquency and criminality. In contrast Thrasher does not assign criminality as key to gang conceptualisation.

Criminality holds conceptual weight in contemporary 'youth gang' understandings. The Eurogang definition, which is dominant in contemporary discourses, stresses three defining features: (i) sustainability – although not predetermined – across time and space; (ii) their ownership belongs to young people; and (iii) criminality is the social lubricant that bonds members and facilitates gang subjectivities (Weerman et al, 2009: 20). This mirrors the definition of gangs utilised by Sharp et al (2006: 2) in their UK research study. While criminality is a dominant defining conceptual characteristic in British and North American contexts another set of attributes increasingly utilised in the Scottish context are: territoriality, identity formation, social bonding and social capital (Kintrea et al, 2008:12).

For Bourdieu (1977) capital can be economic, social or cultural, and functions as a social relation of power as they are assets contested inside any given field or subfield of life (p. 73). Fraser (2013) utilises Bourdieu's framework of habitus and capital to advance existing UK gang research through the concept of 'street habitus' (Fraser, 2013: 972). Street habitus is a conceptual lens to interrogate the entrenched and implicit bonds between young people and place due to restricted spatial mobility (ibid: 974). As a conceptual tool it brings space and culture into the context of youth embodiment, subjectivities, memory, and social practices. Street habitus reconfigures territorialism into a socio-cultural context whereby sense of self and spatial attachment are interconnected and interwoven dynamically with socio-economic forces. Subsequently 'performance of "gang" identity represents a form of "practice" in which space *as self* is protected' (ibid, italics original), and as will be demonstrated in Chapter 5, 'street habitus' has potential from a 'sexed bodies' approach.

Given that the literature has explored dominant criminological understandings of 'youth gangs', the literature review will turn its attention to the context of this dissertations research site – Glasgow.

Youth Gangs in Glasgow

Glasgow has historically been linked to youth gangs, more so than any other city in the UK (Davies, 2007). Glasgow's notorious reputation for gangs, violence and antisocial behaviour is well engrained in dominant discourses (Fraser and Atkinson, 2014). This is despite the scarcity of academic enquiry into gangs (Bannister and Fraser, 2008), particularly young people's lived experiences and meaning-making. Nevertheless limited empirical data exists and it is to this research that the literature review will now address.

Davies (1998, 2013) social history research documents that gangs in Glasgow stretch back to the 1880s. Historically Glasgow 'gangs' were glorified as street-orientated, community-based groups that engaged in violence, but who did not harm non-gang members and could protect their local community (Davies, 2013: 406-407). This popular mythification stood in stark contrast to the incidents recorded in media and judicial reports (ibid: 421), as some male gang members had histories of committing gender-based violence towards female partners; while others had reputations for promiscuity or abandoning their families despite portraying themselves as 'honourable' family men (ibid: 249 and 265). Nevertheless Glasgow 'gangs' (of the 1920s and 1930s) need to be contextualised within Glasgow's housing slums, mass unemployment and entrenched sectarianism; as well as imported American gangster culture (1998: 252). Hence, Glasgow gangs predominantly involved young adult males engaged in violent territorial or sectarian disputes, using convenient and make-shift weapons (as opposed to the Chicago form portrayed by the British media) (ibid: 254). Furthermore, gangs provided the social context for young men to express a hard configuration of masculinity that enhanced their street cred. In other words, Glasgow's early gangs need to be contextualised within understandings of patriarchy and gender-based violence.

Jephcott's (1967) research focus was youth leisure rather than 'gangs' or violence across three research sites in Scotland, one of which was Drumchapel. Jephcott's Drumchapel research highlighted that despite geographical size and relative newness of the housing estate it lacked leisure amenities (p. 25), with much of young people's leisure time consumed by 'Trouble' with a capital 'T' (ibid: 95) i.e. brawls and drunkenness, as well as activity that contravened 'approved codes of society' (ibid: 92).

The most common form of 'Trouble' was fighting between loosely formed groups of young men, known across the community. Some of these groups were so fluid, Jephcott

claimed, that they did not merit the term 'gang'. Those gangs that did exist consisted of a handful of notable members with an established status who were feared for their willingness to do whatever to achieve their goals. However, according to the research, most young men eventually exit the gang, growing out of youthful misbehaviour. Those that did not were defined as 'hard men' (ibid: 97). Furthermore such gangs were based on defined locality, marked by a gang through graffiti, and group fights were ignited for no substantial reason other than to alleviate boredom, evoke excitement and create impulsiveness due to the lack of amenities. Despite this, young people expressed a sincere anxiety of potential violent victimisation; young men particularly felt unsafe to enter certain territories alone or back out of a fight once complicit. Subsequently it was 'common-sense' to carry a knife for protection and to move about in groups (ibid: 139); while other young people acknowledged that youth engaged in 'Trouble' co-facilitated negative youth stereotypes, and for Drumchapel - something they believed the media aggravated.

In contrast, Patrick's (1973) now infamous research modified a number of American studies into a Scottish context. For Patrick, Glasgow gangs were male-orientated and had a territorial facet, which consisted of congregating randomly on street corners to mitigate the boredom of everyday life (p. 24). Such 'gangs' formed through peer pressure and forced delinquent behaviour embodied in territorialism; namely entering other territories for conflict or to mark their gang-identified mantra or name. Also joining the gang for young males acted as a means to construct a '...self-assertion and rebellious independence against authority as a means of attaining masculinity' (ibid: 170).

More contemporary criminological enquiry develops the arguments outlined above by utilising social capital theory as discussed. A case in point is Fraser's (2013) empirical

research, which applies the concept of 'street habitus' (Fraser, 2013: 974). Fraser claims that to optimise finite space and social resources young people construct 'microgeographies' and 'microcultures' to develop their independence from adults, creating a sense of individual and collective identity (ibid: 976). This enables spatially-specific configurations of masculinity and street capital as part of the 'gang'. In other words, young people are able to use their street habitus to configure and reconfigure the territorial boundaries, and their identities. Gang identity becomes malleable and situationally specific rather than fixed, and violent and non-violent practices facilitate the fluidity of gang-identities as well as young people's sense of purpose, place and connectedness. Thus 'space becomes a resource for identity' (ibid: 982), and alignment with a localised 'gang' becomes interwoven with spatial identification (Bannister and Fraser, 2008: 102). Therefore 'street habitus' enables a nuanced criminological analysis regarding youth subjectivities and space. Having said this, empirical limitation of Fraser's study is the absence of any analysis of gender and heterosexuality. Masculinity is mentioned in passing, and depicted as a manifestation of the gang, depicting a coherent and universal masculinity full of negative attributes. Thus obscuring a critical assessment of the multifaceted dynamics of young men's social practices in the gang (Collier, 1998:22), which limits the concept of masculinity, as it locates peculiarities between the 'masculine' and 'feminine', and roots masculinity in notions of heterosexuality, configuring a false universalism and dualism (ibid 30/31).

There is no space here to discuss the wider critiques regarding analyses of youth gangs – in Glasgow and beyond (for a summary see Fraser 2015). However, the most important criticism in the context of the current dissertation is that most contemporary accounts continue to depict the 'youth gang' as innately male-centric for the display of an essential, unified masculinity (Messerschmidt, 1993:25). Thus such criminological

knowledge and enquiry continues to be ‘alarmingly gender-blind’ (ibid: 1) and de-sexed/heteronormative (Collier, 1998), ignoring young women and LGBTQ populations (Miller, 2001; Batchelor, 2011; Panfil, 2014). It is to issues of gender, heterosexuality and the ‘youth gang’ that this literature review will now explore.

Gender, Heterosexuality and the Youth Gang

Our knowledge of young women’s experiences of gangs derives largely from North American generated data (Batchelor, 2011: 110). The breakthrough study of ‘girls in the gang’ is Campbell’s (1981) research, conducted in New York in the late 1970s/early 1980s, which depicts the gang as male-orientated with young women performing a supplementary role. This offers young women two dualistic positions: as conventionally feminine ‘good girls’ or masculinised and promiscuous ‘bad girls’. This dualism is attributed by young men and young women in the context of patriarchy (ibid: 28), as young women valorise intimate relationships with young men over female friendships due to perceived kudos attached through the male gaze. Accordingly girl’s agency is only illuminated in violent encounters between young men for claiming ownership of them, or due to a young woman engaging in promiscuity to discover information from an enemy gang (ibid: 8). Moreover, Campbell’s ‘girls in the gang’ accept subordination as they define their aspirations and goals to the power and privilege imbued in male gang members. Consequentially ‘the emerging pattern ... [is] ... one of the heterosexual gang’ (ibid: 89); whereby young women’s routes into the gang involve obtaining a boyfriend. Girls who contravene heterosexuality or avoid the male gaze are punished for being lesbians (Campbell 1984). Thus the gang is a microcosm of wider

patriarchal society but does provide a means for girls to reject the oppressive expectations of wider society (Campbell, 1987: 463).

A key limitation of Campbell's (1981) research is its proclamation that the gang is a site of empowerment rather than a paradoxical context of self-actualisation and oppression (Joe and Chesney-Lind, 1998: 106). Messerschmidt (1993, 2002) and Miller (2001, 2002, 2004), both develop a more nuanced feminist approach to the girls, gangs and gender. Messerschmidt (1993) conceptualises the gang as male-centric (p. 89). The gang nonetheless equips girls to constitute situational 'bad-girl femininity', which can be inferred as masculinity (1995: 184). Hence, young women may engage their agency and use violence as a tool to create normative femininity in novel and insightful ways, which sustain, subvert or reconfigure gender. This enables girls to achieve a contextualised femininity, without breaching their gender-identity (ibid: 464-468), as normative femininity and masculinity are accountable to others in the 'youth gang'. Gender accomplishment exists for girls in an interpersonal and associative manner to boys (1997: 82), stressing the specific social context and how 'youth gang' involvement may be enacted to accomplish gender (2002: 464-466).

In contrast, Miller (2002) argues that 'bad girl femininity' diminishes gender to practices facilitated by normative expectations and structural context. This reduces girls' agency as femininity is regarded as the aetiology and effect of gang involvement; ineffectively conceptualising how girls utilise their agency to reconfigure, reject or challenge gender. 'Bad-girl femininity' affirms a reiterative gender dualism as it limits how gender accomplishment and gender-identity are negotiated through power-relations and inequalities. Thus understanding of girls' agency is required, and how their gang involvement is paradoxical in gendered ways.

According to Miller's (2001) research, young women face social control and gendered risks of accountability through gendered categorisations as a result of their gang engagement in ways that contravene normative femininity despite their enactment on the grounds of agentic self-preservation or resistance. Moreover young women face social punishment by non-gang young men due to their gang membership and the gendered embodiment this denotes (ibid: 108). This may lead to androcentric notions of female respectability (Laidler and Hunt, 2001: 672), which requires the negotiation of contradictory sexual standards, gendered practices and identities (Miller, 2004: 109). In contrast, young men's sexual conquests become lionised (ibid: 108); toughness is valorised through heterosexual penetrative sex, which is valued by other male peers (Cannan, 1998: 177-179). Young men in the 'gang' who do not participate - or resist peer pressure to do so - are signified as 'gay'; linking hardness with heterosexuality. The bodies of young women therefore become salient for young men in the 'gang' to accomplish masculinity and masculine-identity (ibid: 181-184).

Having said this, Miller (2002b) notes that young women utilise incongruous gendered strategies to mitigate their oppression while simultaneously embodying male-centric values and attitudes to obtain value as 'one of the guys'. Such valuation is often at the expense of other girls, and wider gender equality. Thus gender can be crossed as a strategy, which facilitates dynamical contextualised power relations between gang members so that girls can be identified as 'one of the guys', subverting gender dualisms (Miller, 2002: 442-444). This illustrates how girls utilise gendered agency and discourses to achieve or mitigate 'youth gang' involvement.

To date two British criminological studies discuss the lived experience and meaning-making of girls' in the gang: Young (2009 and 2011) and Batchelor (2011). Young's (2009, 2011) research 'brings the voices of young women to the centre of theoretical and methodical

debates' (Batchelor, 2005: 361). Empirically, it paints a different picture of girls' experiences to that offered by malestream criminological research (Batchelor, 2011: 115). A limitation of Young's (2009) research is that it does not elucidate *why* girls participate in the 'gang', nor indeed the role played by gender - a critique made by Batchelor, (2011: 115) in her review of the literature. According to Batchelor if it is to advance a better understanding of the causes and consequences of gang involvement for girls, criminological enquiry ought to interrogate the dynamics and significance of gender in ways that transgress simplistic gender-congruent dualisms (ibid: 116). In short, it must engage with the wider context of (and theoretical literature on) gender inequality.

Batchelor's (2011) own empirical research, based on interviews with young women, identifies the 'youth gang' as a male-dominated sphere embodying male/masculine privilege (ibid: 118). Batchelor's interviewees sought recognition as 'one of the guys' or 'wan o' the troops' through engagement in violence, masking expressions of vulnerability and managing actual or perceived promiscuity (2011: 119). Respect and esteem could be obtained by utilising masculinised practices or discourses, equipping them to align with young men and women in the 'gang' who had kudos due to violent participation; thereby differentiating from young women who lacked respect because of promiscuity. This masculinised backdrop acts as a resource for young women's violent engagement for reputation, safety and boredom mitigation; besides social connectedness, identity construction and 'gang' positionality (ibid: 120-121). Viewed in this manner young women's use of violence and gang involvement is a rational and instrumental survival strategy, rather than gender-congruent irrationality/emotion (Batchelor, 2005: 370).

The feminist literature outlined mitigates many of the empirical and analytical shortcomings of malestream criminological research on gangs in terms of its focus on girls and gender. Having said this, it only covers one side of the coin - i.e. gender and not sex

(Daly 2010). Thus the research fails to: (i) interrogate heterosexuality analytically (Collier, 1990); (ii) conceptualise heterosexuality not as an effect of gender (see Messerschmidt, 2012); and (iii) make problematic the heteronormative sex/gender distinction imbued in most criminological literature.

Chapter 3: Queer criminology and the ‘sexed bodies’ approach

The previous chapter established that malestream accounts of youth gangs tend to draw upon essentialist understandings of dichotomous gender difference. Although feminist criminologists have endeavoured to provide a more sophisticated exploration of ‘how and when gender matters’ (Miller and Mullins, 2006) in the context of ‘youth gangs’, this analysis is de-sexed and heteronormative (Collier, 1998). In this chapter I advocate the merits of queer criminology, highlighting the conceptual insights of the ‘sexed bodies’ approach. In doing so, I critically assess the limitations of criminology as a field, drawing attention to the contribution of feminist criminology in terms of epistemology.

Criminology as a De-sexed Field

Criminology is a contested body of knowledge, characterised by internal divisions and disputes. A multitude of epistemological claims compete with one another, often drawing from and/or depending on knowledge’s generated elsewhere. As a result, Chan (2013) argues that criminology is best conceptualised as a ‘field’ rather than as a discipline (Chan, 2013: 598). Given its configuration is impacted by wider knowledge, including socio-political debates (ibid: 599) it cannot be thought of as independent and self-regulating discipline immune from external influence (Garland and Sparks, 2000: 3).

Debates about what constitutes criminology raises questions of power regarding the privilege given to differing epistemological positions and ontological considerations, and how these shape constituted valid criminological knowledge (Loader and Sparks, 2012:9).

Feminist criminological perspectives share a concern with knowledge production, and with questions such as: who can know, what counts as knowledge and whose knowledge counts? (Mason and Stubbs, 2012: 487). These epistemological issues are salient in the context of the current dissertation, as they help explain why certain aspects of ‘youth gang’ members’ experiences and meaning-making remain unexplored (or silenced).

In the 1970s and 80s, a variety of feminist social scientists criticised criminological knowledge production and enquiry for being male-centric: typically involving male academics conducting analyses of male concerns (Gelsthorpe and Morrison, 1990; Heidensohn and Silvestri, 2012). A newly emerging feminist criminology sought to make problematic the gender-blind analysis of most criminological research and by extension the exclusion of women’s experiences of crime, social control and criminal justice (Miller and Mullins, 2006). This developed into a focus on men and masculinity, and a focus on crime as a means of ‘doing gender’. Drawing upon the insights of gender theory and feminist epistemologies, sought not only to challenge and reconstruct theories of crime but also the social scientific model that underpinned criminology (Mason and Stubbs, 2012).

Feminist thinking on epistemology can be grouped into three broad categories: feminist empiricism, standpoint feminism and postmodern feminism (Mason and Stubbs, 2012). Feminist empiricism centres on data generation regarding women in ways that are conventionally omitted from existing bodies of knowledge. Experiential or observational data derived from hypothesising seeks to ensure a more accurate form of empirical objectivity. Feminist empiricism for criminology seeks to enhance the scientific endeavour of criminology through the inclusion of women, without making problematic the positivism that underpins criminological knowledge production. It has subsequently made significant contributions to criminology.

Conversely standpoint feminist epistemology generates knowledge for women by women. Women's experiences and meaning-making are salient to feminist knowledge production due to women's disempowered position through patriarchy. Feminist standpoint challenges male-centric knowledge production by giving voice to women to produce a more holistic and accurate portrayal of women's lives (Harding, 1987: 184), generating a feminist consciousness and praxis to eradicate all manifestations of women's oppression (Harding, 2008). Feminist criminological knowledge from this epistemological position is centred on women's experiences and meaning-making of crime, social control and criminal justice from women's voices.

Post-modern feminist epistemology critiques standpoint feminism for depicting a universal womanly experience and position (Smart, 1995). Standpoint feminism is unable to deconstruct power-relations imbued in criminological knowledge, or difference such as sexuality. Postmodern feminist epistemology rejects positivist notions of universal truth and objectivity (Smart, 1995). Lived experience and meaning-making are not innate but constituted through discourse, and as an epistemological position, it makes problematic essentialist ideas of gender, sex and sexuality, and the binary systems they imbue. The deconstruction of binaries is core, ontologically, to post-modern feminist epistemology as it questions the essentialism packed in social categories such as 'women', 'man', 'heterosexual' and 'homosexual'.

Advocates of postmodern feminist epistemology, such as Judith Butler (1990), have utilised the deconstruction of binaries to make problematic the sex/gender distinction dominant in feminist empiricism and standpoint epistemologies, and have done so by drawing on postmodern philosophical literature of the body to configure a feminist 'sexed bodies' mode of enquiry (Daly, 1997: 33). It is this mode of enquiry and its postmodern feminist-queer epistemological position that is central to this dissertations methodology to

reconstruct theories of 'youth gangs', but also the social scientific model on which criminology is based in order to advance a post-positivist criminology. In light of this an exploration of the sexed bodies approach will now occur.

The Sexed Bodies Approach

The 'sexed bodies' approach challenges the modernist sex/gender distinction present in much Western feminist epistemology that is shaped by phallogentrism (Smart, 1990: 198). It asserts that a new epistemological position challenges heterosexual normalcy and brings the body and human agency into social analysis (Gatens, 1996: 7). Three of its key proponents are: Butler (1990 and 2004), Grosz (1995) and Gatens (1996).

For Butler (1990), the sexed bodies approach questions the essentialism and continuity of the sex/gender distinction, for its continued discursive power conflates sex and gender into a sex-gender binary embodied through heterosexuality: the 'heterosexual matrix'; whereby masculinity and femininity are discursively configured as symbiotic but asymmetrical in power and privilege (p. 42). However sex is socially constructed and gender is not a construct that accentuates itself upon a predetermined sex, as this assumes bodies are subservient sites for cultural inscription; reinforcing the heteronormative dualisms of man-woman and male-female. There is nothing given about one's sex, rather sex is discursively utilised to constitute the legitimacy of bodies in the context of the 'heterosexual matrix' (ibid: 17). Sexual difference is temporally biological and socially determined configurations that are multidimensional, and as such, sexed bodies are important sites of epistemology, power, reflexivity, sexuality, and agency (Butler 2004: 186). Hence, the approach illustrates how bodies are humanised or dehumanised rendering bodies to the potential of conflicting stratifications of subordination and privilege based upon their 'intelligibility'; as bodies that

undermine the 'heterosexual matrix' are valorised as nonhuman. Heteronormativity denotes certain sexed bodies consequentially individuals use their agency and social action to configure meaningful and humanised sexed subjectivities.

Violence is one means of regulating and sustaining the 'heterosexual matrix' (Butler, 1990: 218), humanising those sexed subjects who embody the sex-gender binary. Violence signifies one aspect of the contention of the knowledge/power nexus of the 'heterosexual matrix' whereby the intelligibility of the subject becomes challenged or problematic. Experiencing violence is more than enduring domination; rather it is to undergo a process of dehumanisation of challenging ones ontology (Butler, 2004: 216-218). Some forms of violence may not be constituted as violence as it regulates unknowable and unliveable sexed and sexualised subjects contrary to the normalcy of the 'heterosexual matrix'. Violence therefore accentuates ontological and epistemological issues around personhood, sexuality and sex, how we understand violence and whose violent experiences count.

For Gatens (1996) sexed differentiation is pertinent to the sexed bodies approach as social practices are grounded in bodily subjects through the 'imaginary body' (ibid: 9). The 'imaginary body' is the collective discourse that elevates a synergetic body image, situated in a particular configuration of male and female 'sexed bodies' in a specific spatiality. Such an 'imaginary body' shapes the epistemological positioning, meaning-making and lived experience as sexed subjects (ibid: 70). Thus the 'imaginary body' is a relevant analytical tool for this dissertation to deconstruct and illuminate how gang bodies are constructed differentially as legitimate and privileged, and how this shapes their sexed subjectivities as lived out masculinities and femininities in particular social contexts.

The 'sexed bodies' approach not only mitigates limitations of the feminist criminological approaches outlined above, in so far as it: (i) illuminates how 'gender

categories neuter sexual difference' (Daly, 1997: 40), (ii) the social and cultural significance of bodies and; (iii) the importance of one's social and discursive constitution of sex and sexuality. It draws attention to sexual difference and its relationship to gender and sexuality. In doing so it makes problematic heterosexual naturalisation and the sex-gender binary imbued in much criminological knowledge and enquiry. But it equally provides important conceptual tools for this dissertation: 'heterosexual matrix', sexed differentiation, 'imaginary body', valorised bodies, 'intelligibility' and humanisation/dehumanisation.

Turning Criminology and its Subjects Queer

Queer criminology is at an embryonic stage in the UK (Groombridge, 1999: 532). In North America, by way of contrast, queer criminologies are varied in research areas, methodologies, outlooks and considerations, focussing on differing criminological aspects. Some bring LGBTQ subjectivities and experiences into the criminological fold, others challenge heteronormative assumptions, discourses and systems that shape LGBTQ subjectivities and experiences. Others draw attention to how queer populations experience criminal justice systems. Most critique and challenge the conventional knowledge production and enquiry of criminology (Ball, 2014a: 2). The following section illustrates those aspects of queer criminology that underpin this dissertation.

Queer criminology brings sexuality into the central analysis of criminology. Historically sexuality has been omitted and defined as unproblematic due to criminological discourses coding criminals as unquestionably male and heterosexual (Groombridge, 1999). Sexuality tends to be vaguely mentioned at the level of youth crime but only regarding sexualised remarks and violence. Equally criminological subject's sexuality's continue to be

assumed as heterosexual and not included in any meaningful analysis (ibid: 539). Queer criminology addresses this marginalisation by analysing implicit unproblematic heterosexuality (ibid: 543-545). This opens up ways of knowing the criminological subject, and the boundaries of the criminological field beyond victimology that have stereotypically and historically been assigned to sex and sexuality (Woods, 2014).

Application of queer criminology has potential utility to interrogate the essentialist assumptions dominant in heteronormative criminological ontologies and epistemologies (Ball, 2014b: 30). Hence, queer criminology can illuminate new sexed and sexualised ways of knowing youth gangs and youth subjectivities (ibid); forcing criminology to acknowledge the importance of sex differentiation, and the sexing of subjects engaged in criminological research (Collier, 1998: 49). This empowers an exploration of the sex-crime dynamic to rupture the neutralised 'heterosexual matrix' of the criminological field. Thus a 'sexed bodies' queer criminological approach to the 'youth gang' can empower an interrogation of heteronormative and de-sexed criminological knowledge and enquiry.

Closing Remarks

This dissertation aims to interrogate the usefulness of a 'sexed bodies' queer criminological perspective for understanding Glasgow street-orientated young men's use of discursive and social resources to position themselves as 'intelligible' sexed subjects. The literature review has explored the masculinist criminological field regarding 'youth gangs'; analysing the limitations through contemporary feminist criminological epistemologies. It has equally

discussed the potential utility of a 'sexed bodies' queer criminology to 'youth gangs'.
Attention will now focus on the methodology chapter of this dissertation.

Chapter 4: Methodology

The empirical basis of this dissertation is two-fold: qualitative life-history interviews with a non-representative sample of 6 young men and a focus group session with 7 different young men. Participants ranged from 18 to 30 years old, and were accessed in 2 comparable Glasgow research sites (peripheral post-war council housing estates with reputations for gangs). What follows is a description of the research design and data collection.

Methodology

Qualitative methodology is an interdisciplinary framework to approach social inquiry, which positions the researcher in the social world and entails a set of interpretative practices that 'make the world visible' (Denzin and Lincoln, 2000: 3). Methodologically it is focussed on understanding and exploring contextualised cultural and social meaning-making and lived experiences, which equips it for researching historically marginalised groups such as 'youth gangs'. Such a methodological framework is accessible to a range of epistemological positions - for example feminist epistemologies - and can incorporate a range of research methods like oral history interviews and focus groups (ibid: 3-4). Thus the application of a qualitative methodology, from a feminist or queer perspective, illuminates the social world differently to other applied frameworks, and doing so makes notions of objectivity or universal claims problematic.

The qualitative methodology of this dissertation is a feminist-queer methodology, drawing on different qualitative methods and epistemological positions which fuses post-

modernist feminist epistemology discussed above, and queer theory – a gender/sexuality configuration of post-structuralism (Plummer, 2013). I do so to make visible, and give voice to, the sexed and sexualised dynamics omitted from much criminological enquiry regarding ‘youth gangs’ (Halberstam, 1998); rejecting positivist notions of ontological objectivity and universal ‘truths’ (Gamson, 2000). The discursive constitution of subjects as sexed and sexualised is salient to this methodology (Smart, 1995), as it seeks to destabilise essentialist assumptions of sex and sexuality (Seidman, 2003). From deconstructionist ontological consideration, this methodology illuminates the fluid and partial categorisation of youth subjectivities and bodies as sexualised and sexed (Hammers and Brown, 2004: 100). Thus making problematic the privileging and denaturalising binaries imbued in the gangs ‘heterosexual matrix’; I achieve this through qualitative interviewing.

Method

Queer research does not establish a new methodological paradigm, but rather ‘borrows, refashions and retells’ existing social methods (Plummer, 2013: 426). The approach that the current dissertation borrows and refashions is qualitative interviewing, specifically oral history interviews and focus groups. Qualitative interviewing is a dynamical research process, which includes the practical facilitation of interviews, transcription and analysis of those interviews (Abrams, 2010: 3). One key attribute is its orality and by definition language is central. It is not language per se that is important but how participants use language, utilising memory as an interpretive resource, to construct narratives, meaning and identity (ibid: 21-22). Subjectivity is central as it provides the forum for active critical

reflection and self-narration through time and space, illuminating aspects of identity continuity or ‘composure’, and contention of subject positioning.

Version of events recounted by any individual in any interview setting is rhetorically constituted; it cannot be read simply as a route to knowledge of social ‘reality’. The dynamic interplay of subjectivities influences memories recalled and their narration in a qualitative interview setting is therefore situationally specific and partial (ibid: 59). Memories are shaped by wider societal discourses, which influence and contextualise how narrators generate, communicate and give meaning to their experiences. In doing so they may utilise ‘collective memory’ to narrate experience and meaning-making (Portelli, 1997: 157). Within the context of the current dissertation, it is important to understand the wider discursive contexts of ‘youth gangs’ and ‘heteronormativity’ in order to disentangle analytically the alignment and ambivalence between narratives and wider discourses (Sangster, 2006: 10).

Research process

(i) Site selection:

The research was conducted in two research sites in Glasgow – Drumchapel and Castlemilk. Drumchapel is in the North-West of the city whereas Castlemilk is situated in the South-East. Both communities possess localities as part of the 5% most deprived areas as defined by the Scottish Index Multiple Deprivation. Both have similar social and economic composition. Furthermore, both communities have been identified as having an issue with ‘youth gangs’.

(ii) Access:

Participants were accessed via local youth work organisations - G15 in Drumchapel and Castlemilk Youth Complex. Recruitment involved engaging in both organisations and subsequently a wide composition of potential participants in a mutually safe context to promote access to the research directly; answering any questions regarding the study. Moreover it avoided methodological and ethical issues regarding youth workers identifying specific interviewees they saw fit for the purpose of the study, and it ensured consent was genuinely voluntary informed.

(iii) Sample:

The resultant sample comprised 13 young men, 9 from Drumchapel and 4 from Castlemilk. None of these young men identified as currently gang-involved, 10 reported prior involvement, and the remaining 3 identified as gang associated. For the 10 young men with prior gang involvement, this consisted of hanging around the streets seeking to mitigate boredom and inject excitement by playing football, attending the local youth club, drinking, graffiti, experimenting with drugs, and territorial disputes. Most stated gang desistance as they were getting too old for it. What the Drumchapel Boys wanted more than anything was 'a job, dosh, a hoose and burd'. For others, such as Ryan from Castlemilk and James from Drumchapel, they desisted from the gang due to consequences of violence.

Ryan (aged 22) had a scar and stated how he ended up in HMYOI Polmont due to gang-involvement but was now working full time and focussed on building his life with his girlfriend. Ryan expressed a passion for wanting to help other young men in his community away from gangs. Conversely James (aged 18) had not been incarcerated but stated he nearly

lost his eye due to being stabbed through a territorial dispute. This incident was James's key motivation for gang desistance, and he spoke of spending his time now with his girlfriend and focussing on developing a career in football or an apprenticeship. For the 3 gang-associated participants, their relationship to 'gang' members was older brothers/cousins. They broadly found gang fighting dangerous and stupid, and highlighted a benefit-cost dynamic of being gang associated. Violence or potential violence was something intertwined with their lives. They also spoke of losing friends or family due to gangs.

(iii) Interview guide:

The interviews consisted of a thematic semi-structured format (Appendix A) with topics including: school and growing up, leisure time, hanging about the streets, and relationships with peers and family.

(iv) Conduct of the interview:

The research occurred June and July 2015 and the interviews were conducted in private but accessible group-work rooms in the stated youth organisations during evenings of youth work provision (6.30pm to 9pm) to ensure mutual safety and accessibility. Oral history interviews lasted from 1 hour 15 minutes to 1 hour 55 minutes, whereas the focus group lasted 50 minutes.

Analysis

All interviews were audio recorded and transcribed verbatim. Individual transcripts were summarised according to key themes and compared and contrasted, drawing on analytical insights of discourse analysis to critically explore the ‘heterosexual matrix’ and ‘sexed bodies’ discursive signification. Discourse analysis is relatively new to criminological enquiry but provides the means to illuminate hegemonic and subverted dynamics of criminological subjects (Meuser and Loschper, 2002). No formula for discourse analysis exists (Potter, 2004). Two analytical tools used in this dissertation were: ‘interpretive repertoires’ and ‘subject positions and identity work’ (Chamberlain, 2013: 149). ‘Interpretive repertoire’ involves familiarity with the narrations and searching for the meaning and messages imbued, with attention to “reoccurring expressions, thematic patterns of speech, imagery, metaphors and rhetorical stances” (ibid). This assists this dissertation to understand: (i) what heteronormativity does in ‘youth gangs’; (ii) how heteronormativity is constructed and; (iii) how social and discursive resources are used by subjects to affirm or subvert heteronormativity and ‘sexed bodies’ (Potter, 2004). The second analytical tool – ‘subject positions and identity work’ – equips an analysis of how ‘interpretive repertoire’ can be utilised or destroyed by subjects to codify identity positions through manifestations of speak and cultural assumptions (Chamberlain, 2013). This enables accentuation of the sex-crime dynamic, and aspects of ‘intelligibility’ and ‘(de)humanisation’ in Chapter 3.

Ethical Considerations

Prior to conducting the fieldwork ethical approval was obtained from the University of Glasgow's College of Social Sciences Ethics Committee (June 2015). As acknowledged in the statement of ethical 'risks' contained in my original ethics application (Appendix B), the primary issues were informed consent, confidentiality and anonymity. All potential participants were given an information sheet (Appendix C) detailing what participation involved, and I explained this face-to-face in interviews answering any questions raised. Importantly, the information sheet declared the limits of confidentiality and explained if they told me something that gives cause for concern, and raises the need for a breach of confidentiality, I would have a duty to act, but would talk this through with them first. In writing up the research all participants were anonymised with particular care to avoid identifying features.

Chapter 5: Findings and Analysis

The data in this chapter originates from 2 of the oral history interviews and the focus group session. Only 3 case-studies from the wider non-representative sample are utilised. This small number is in line with criminological enquiry using oral history/narrative interview methods to examine gender, sexuality and violence (c.f. Gadd 2000, 2002, 2003; Messerschmidt, 2000, 2012). These case-studies were selected as participants were ‘gang’ affiliated. The findings and analysis presented does not seek to portray a universal sexed or heteronormative ‘truth’ regarding young people, gangs or the localities in which they live, but portrays a ‘thick analysis’ (Clarke 2003) of how violence intersects with sex and sexuality in young people’s experiences of gang culture.

What follows are the analytical presentation of The Drumchapel Boys and the oral histories of James and Ryan, as they illuminate 3 themes: (i) the valorised and ‘intelligible’ male gang body; (ii) male affirmation of the ‘heterosexual matrix’ and; (iii) sexed street habitus. Thus, the case-studies are juxtaposed in each theme to draw out sexed and sexualised dynamics. What follows accentuates the utility of this explorative study and the ‘sexed bodies’ approach to critically explore lived experience and meaning-making of street orientated males. I begin with ‘The Valorised Male Gang Body’.

The Valorised and ‘Intelligible’ Male Gang Body

As demonstrated in Chapter 3, Butler (1990) outlines how the sex-gender binary is naturalised and how sex is discursively used to demonstrate the validity of certain

categorisations of appropriate maleness and femaleness, and in turn the extent of their humanisation, and the power and privilege they imbue. What follows is The Drumchapel Boys, Ryan and James's active creation of this sex/gender binary through sexual differentiation and sexed subjectivities by constituting particular bodies as legitimate or illegitimate in the 'youth gang'. Hence the empirical data addresses the following research questions: (i) how discourses young men draw on privileges or challenges bodies as heterosexual and; (ii) how these discourses and social practices facilitate violent engagement.

The Drumchapel Boys picture the legitimate male body as one materialised in notions of physical and emotional strength and toughness:

SL: Right guys, so what does in your opinion, what is your understanding of the word masculinity?

Zack: Solid!

Calvin: Guys!

David: Solid, fucking Solid

Robert: Flexing muscles

SL: Flexing what?

Robert: Your muscles

SL: Anything else?

Zack: I don't know, like not being heavy scared or something

Some of the young men valorised the concepts of power and control as materialisations of the male body, and freely exercising human agency was conceptualised as orientated in male bodies:

Robert: Power

SL: Are full of what?

Calvin: Power!

SL: So you would say that having power is quite a masculine thing?

Calvin: Definitely aye

Robert: Taking control

Zack: Like a man, taking control!

Ryan also stated the importance of money, power and sex to constitute privileged maleness:

Ryan: money, sex, drugs and power are the main things.

SL: And did you say that growing up as a young guy...would you say that those three things – money, power, sex – are three important things for guys?

Ryan: I do. Well I was going to say, it is, but it's seen as.

The signification of maleness also existed in what it should not be, discursively constituting illegitimate male bodies as 'a bit gay' that are saturated in pink, effeminate activities and clothing:

SL: Give us an example?

Calvin: Like being feminine

Zack: Like being a boy and liking dancing and all of that

David: Like ballet

Zack: Like wearing tutus and all of that!

Charles: Pink

Robert: Wearing Pink

Zack: Being a bit gay!

Furthermore, maleness and valorised masculinity was intertwined by violence or being a 'Ned', which in their opinion underpinned their humanisation:

SL: How do you think in Drumchapel people are viewed who are violent?

Paul: A Ned

Calvin/Robert/David: Normal

Zack: A human being!

SL: Who thinks it's normal to be violent in Drumchapel?

Zack: Aye in Drumchapel anyway

SL: Why's that?

Calvin: Aye coz you wouldn't expect like cunts boxing all the time in Bearsden.

Zack: Aye Bearsden or Milngavie or something

This was affirmed by James, who stated that one of the ways you show that you are a man is by not letting 'people slag you, or walk all over you, if people do that you are classed as a gimp right!'. Moreover being categorised as a 'gimp' meant you 'didn't want to feel left out or thinking you were a gimp or scared, no want to fight' as you 'needed people to like you and obviously if you were going to gang fight you couldn't be scared to fight'. Subsequently 'you would want to show that you are game so people like you'. Being 'game' 'gave you a good name and if you weren't chased it would give the scheme a good name'. This provides protection as 'people know not to try and be cheeky with you, or get wide with

you’. Thus for James’s discursive and embodied valorisation of maleness is coded in being ‘game’ during gang fights and is synonymous with toughness and reputation. This affirms ideas set out by The Drumchapel Boys above, whereby authentic male bodies can be read as physically and emotionally resilient in order to affirm the legitimacy, power and privilege of their sexed subjectivities and position in the ‘youth gang’.

In his interview, Ryan stated: ‘Boys... need to carry themselves well and have that wee persona, and then they have that way about them’. In doing so, you need to keep an image codified as hard and able to fight:

Ryan: You need to keep your image for the in the street, because...a bit about you, has to be something that...good and the word in the street.

SL: But what, kind of, makes...what makes up the...

Ryan: Being a good fighter. Being able to stand up for yourself. Being mental...

Such an image facilitates reputation in the community, an embodied performativity whereby, according to Ryan: ‘[you] start to find a love for that feeling of people talking about you and that becomes maybe the same way a performer would enjoy performing...a performance becomes an act’. Ryan draws attention to Bulter’s (1990) notion of gender as performance and Gaten’s (1996) concept of ‘imaginary bodies’ discussed in Chapter 3. Ryan highlights lived-experience and meaning-making in the ‘youth gang’ as a ‘performance’ that grounds male bodies and subjectivities in the context of his community. Thus, the valorised male gang body is one discursively and socially constructed in the street to ascertain reputation and ‘image’. In light of this, Ryan states that ‘you need to fight’ in order ‘to get by’. Fighting can be suggested as a performance that constitutes male gang bodies as legitimately imbued with reputation and image that ‘becomes like, shoes, you need to fill

every one. You need to get and become...”. It is also a performance that requires a kind of sexed bodied clothing.

The Drumchapel Boys state that the clothes one wears and their movement could be interpreted as maleness and valorised masculinity, which implies heterosexuality:

Calvin: In some circumstances it’s the clothes you wear too [**SL:** How?] - [**Robert:** Like Lacoste trackie and that] – [**Zack:** Aye] – [**David:** You don’t wear Chinos and jeans and all that] – I don’t know – [**Zack:** Your hair cut too]

SL: so the way you dress shows that you might be straight as well?

David: that’s the main part...like the main part, that’s how I can tell

Calvin: how you walk, and how you talk too.

Likewise, Ryan declared that ‘youth gangs’ were ‘just a bunch of boys with tracksuits... all wearing the same...LACOSTE or football trackies...’. Hence youth male gang members ‘just wear the same clothes’. Ryan states that while the tracksuit valorises the sexed body of male gang members the performance of the male wearing the tracksuit is important:

Ryan: I’ve met some people that did dress the same way... Most of the time, you’re probably going to be right, they’re being an arsehole. But some of them can be wearing the same trackie as the guy who’s a bit of an arsehole, and he’s not even as bad as him. It’s what he shows you...’

Discursive sexual capital through sexualised language also affirmed maleness and valorised living masculinity for these young men. This enabled them to discursively dehumanise and ‘other’ young men. They achieved this by reducing them to the

objectification of sex-organs or impotent/abnormal maleness. The Drumchapel Boys constituted such illegitimate male bodies through language such as ‘gimps’, ‘cunts’ and ‘wee dicks’. They also discursively positioned young men who were not like them or part of their social groups in ways that signified heterosexuality and vaginal penetrative sex as privileged i.e. by defining them as ‘wee poofs’, ‘gay’, ‘wankers’ and ‘arseholes’; configuring a spectrum of legitimate heterosexual male bodies and heterosexualities. This language and imagery of ‘proper’ maleness obtains validity by tapping into wider societal normativity of being a ‘real man’. For example, 18-year-old Paul and Robert from The Drumchapel Boys stated: ‘being a guy, going and getting a job and that’; and: ‘having a family and taking care of them and all that’.

The young men reported that men policed each other’s maleness through sexual conquest with girls. Being scared to have vaginal penetrative sex and lose your virginity in the ‘youth gang’ was codified as not embodying proper maleness and heterosexuality:

SL: If a guy bottled to go with a burd, what would...

Ryan: He’s just...he’s a shitbag. A coward. A...scared of the beard.

SL: Scared of the beard

Ryan: That’s it...And I remember getting asked, was I virgin? And I hung about with a bunch boys that weren’t. And I had to say, aye. And they would all go...[make fun of you]...and all that shit. So your main aim, when you are a virgin, is to get your hole.

Deconstructing the empirical data from a sexed bodies position illuminates how maleness for these young men is actively constituted and valorised as lived out heteronormative masculinity. A sexed bodied interpretation suggests that maleness is an agentic creation, affirmation and performance through a range of social and discursive

resources. Deploying such resources enables them to construct an 'imaginary body' constituted as knowable and acceptable i.e. intelligible male gang body, which they embed - individually and collectively - overtime as the natural and privileged embodiment of young heterosexual maleness in their communities.

Thus the sexed bodies approach illuminates how these young men create a contextualised performative stable and acceptable heteronormative valorised male gang body and subjectivities coded with toughness, reputation, power and resilience. Performances that, as Ryan alludes to above, consist of 'the repeated stylisation of the body' (Butler, 1990: xv) through social and discursive resources, accentuating their humanisation and validity as street-orientated youth. This equips them to challenge, marginalise and dehumanise other young men's subversive stylisations of maleness and the perceived destabilising heterosexualities other males signify as 'gimps' or 'a bit gay'. These young men therefore draw on a range of resources that valorise their male bodies and affirm the 'heterosexual matrix' that contextualises their 'youth gang' sexed positioning and subjectivities.

Male Affirmation of the Heterosexual Matrix - Girls, Gays and the Gang

Feminist literature explored in Chapter 3 indicates 'youth gangs' can be a site whereby girls perceived as lesbians may be punished (Campbell, 1984). Stipulated research highlights how girls may accomplish 'bad-girl femininity' (Messerschmidt, 1995) or use a range of resources to be identified as 'one of the guys' in the 'youth gang' (Miller, 2002). The literature depicts a range of gendered accomplishments, embodiments and subjectivities of girls in the gang. In similar fashion, The Drumchapel Boys stated different kinds of girls affiliated with them as

part of the 'gang'. An analysis of the positioning of girls by boys provides insight to address the research question of how discourses, social practices and male positioning affirm or destabilises the 'heterosexual matrix' of the 'youth gang'.

Calvin stated three kinds of girls i.e. 'there are the lassies, the tomboys and then the psychos'; and based on the categorisation afforded by these young men this would influence how they viewed and treated girls. David stated that for 'tomboys' they 'would probably treat them like one of the boys', and Zack states: 'tomboy lassie I would talk to all the time but another lassie I would be like "alright hen!"'. For these young men, 'tomboys' looked different, who, for David, wore a 'Scooper Hat'. Tomboys were discursively constituted as acceptable friends who valorised aspects of maleness and lived out masculinity, which resembled aspects of their own 'intelligibility'.

'Tomboys' were not equal to them as 'tomboy' codification raised doubts about their heterosexuality. 'Tomboys', for Calvin, were sexed in such a manner that 'it's just not right because most of them are all lesbians'. Such an attitude affirms Campbell's (1984) point, and equally reinforced by Ryan who, coded 'tomboys' as sexually undesirable fighters, as fighting contravened legitimate female sexing by taking on valorised maleness:

Ryan: No, I wouldn't think they were attractive. But I think they're pally...they're not sexual appeal...Oh I think once they're fighter, they're just...and that's not something you would look at, know what I mean.

SL: What is it about lassies fighting that makes them unattractive?

Ryan: Because all the guys think they're meant to fight. That's what they all believe, that they're the fighters. They're just supposed to fancy us or agreeing that we are...

Ryan justified female violence as a means of gaining similar kudos that young men obtain from gang fights. This echoes some empirically informed arguments by Batchelor (2011); whereby girls may seek for ‘wan o’ the troops’ status through violence to ascertain respect and by extension protection. Having said this, Ryan claimed that fighting in the gang had a heteronormative dynamic:

Ryan: ‘Cause they get confused with...they look at the boys doing their fights...The boys are having a fight and they see their popularity and still...that fights with them. They get into fighting because...and it does make them popular, but not in the right way. Not in the way a lassie should want to up it, do you know what I mean, so that’s what I mean by confused? They look at the boys fighting and get popular so then they fight.

SL: What is it that they’re, kind of, aspiring towards? What is it the guys have got that they’ve not got? That makes them want to fight.

Ryan: As I say, guys for the women and women fight for the guys...

Counterbalancing such female violence in the ‘youth gang’ heteronormatively has the potential to affirm the dichotomous gender difference prevalent in much ‘youth gang’ enquiry by restricting understanding of how and why girls are violent to the perspective of valorised heteronormative maleness. Rather than contextualising girls agentic violent expression, for a myriad of reasons illuminated by Batchelor (2011) which for these young men seems ‘confusing’.

Moreover, for The Drumchapel Boys being signified as a ‘tomboy’ regardless of one’s female subjectivity meant facing the risk of physical violence from male gang members – dynamics identified by Miller (2001 and 2004) and Batchelor (2011):

Zack: If they are big enough to give it they are big enough to take it

SL: Does everybody agree with that or disagree with that – [**David:** Aye] – or does it depend on the situation or...

Zack: Aye it depends if they deserve it

Calvin: Aye it depends if they deserve it and what kinda lassie it is an all

SL: What do you mean?

Calvin: Say like it was a pure wee quiet lassie she ends up slapping you by accident you are not going to turn round and jab her but if it's a tomboy or something you'll like "bump" [illustrates head-butting someone]!

SL: So why would you stick the head on like a tomboy as opposed to – [**David:** Because she is a guy] – [**Zack:** You would see her as a guy so she would get it, even if she said she wasn't she would get it!]

James however, while acknowledging these wider discursive attitudes found them problematic and conflicting with his own subjectivity:

James: If a boy doesn't hit a lassie then you know it's just knowledge but some people say if she was to hit like a man she can take it like a man but I don't think I could ever hit a lassie... Some boys would say that if she can hit you hard enough she can take it hard enough.

Similarly, Ryan states that 'if a boy hit a lassie, it's fucking totally wrong in anybody's eyes. Don't get me wrong, if the lassie was fucking you with a bottle and the only thing had to do is hit her, fair dos'.

Reading the data above from a sexed-bodies position provides new insight. The data suggests that while 'tomboys' are positioned as unequal and unattractive friends, when viewed using a sexed-bodies lens such positioning accentuates how 'tomboys' destabilise and affirm the 'heterosexual matrix' of the 'youth gang'. For 'tomboys', coded as potential

lesbians, destabilise the sex/gender binary of the 'youth gang' as they signify undesirable sexual positioning. This potential challenge is addressed by these young men through unequal friendship. Unequal friendship regulates male privilege as young men determine the relationship as unequal but sustains the 'heterosexual matrix', as friendship with tomboys may be a means to affirm the validity of valorised maleness that 'tomboys' signify. Tomboys provide a discursive and social mirror of validity for maleness, which these young men use to position themselves as legitimate, and with it all the social practices and discourses they use, such as fighting, to do so.

Unequal friendship has risk attached for 'tomboys', as the worthiness a girl deserves to experience physical violence depends on attributes assigned to valorised male sexed bodies as 'big enough, 'hard enough' and 'hit hard enough'. If female bodies are coded as such then some young men merit this as being good enough for girls to be treated violently like 'one of the guys' in the gang. Applying insights from Butler (2004), such violence from males towards female bodies coded as 'hard enough' may be due to 'tomboys' challenging the proper site of toughness, hardness and violence, and the normalcy of the 'youth gangs' 'heterosexual matrix' i.e. these young men's male bodies. Violence from the young men becomes one means of regulating and sustaining their humanisation as intelligible male sexed bodies; affirming the power and privilege of maleness-masculinity over femaleness-femininity. As the for maleness validity mirror, which 'tomboys' symbolise for these young men, is unstable and not always a source of protection or reputation for young women who identify as 'one of the guys' due to the unequal friendship dynamic contextualised by the 'heterosexual matrix' of the 'youth gang'. This results in a double-dehumanisation of 'tomboys' who in synchronised fashion are made unintelligible as potential males and unintelligible as unconventional heterosexual females.

In contrast feminine girls were coded as proper (heterosexual) females viable for sexual and intimate relations, resulting in differential experiences of humanisation based on the young men's interpretation and codification of female sexualised bodies as highlighted by The Drumchapel Boys:

SL: How would you treat lassies maybe seen as feminine?

David: Fire into her!

Paul: Give her the patter

Zack: Take them out. Like a tomboy I would ask them to buy me stuff and that but a lassie I would be like 'what you want to eat and that'

SL: So a lassie who's a tomboy you would ask them to buy you something but a lassie who was a bit more feminine you would take her out – [**Zack:** Aye I would take control].

Sexed differentiations of female bodies were summed up by Paul from the focus group as: 'if it's an ugly [tomboy] burd, you slap her; if it's a nice burd, you bang her'. Young women coded as desirable were not equal to their heterosexual male counterparts. Data by The Drumchapel Boys conveys a respectability dichotomy whereby female bodies valorised of cleanliness exalted respectful heterosexuality and sexual-restraint:

SL: So you've ever been in a situation where you've treated lassies for sex?

Calvin: What shagged a burd and not spoke to her again?

Zack: Aye

SL: Or just seen her as like – [**David:** A shag] – as a shag, some of the language you have already used like a wee dirty, a wee slapper – [**Robert:** hairy]?

Zack: Aye

SL: And there are other lassies you treat with more respect?

Zack: Aye

David: The ones that don't put out easy

SL: Why are they worth more respect?

David: Coz they are probably a better shag!

Zack: They just play hard to get

Calvin: They are clean

Calvin: Because they have respect for themselves

SL: So if they have respect for themselves then you'll have respect for them?

Paul/Zack/David/Calvin: Aye!

This codification of respectable girls as clean and not promiscuous was affirmed by Ryan as appropriate femaleness:

Ryan: They [girls] should be dressed nice and...see that's...my brain doesn't really explain the way people see it. They just should be clean and shouldn't be a slut. Kept themselves well. Talking nice and all that.

Those girls who 'put out' sexually signified female bodies symbolised by the dirtiness/slag dynamic of the respectability dichotomy, which The Drumchapel Boys claimed they contributed to:

SL: Where there any lassies that were just treated with like total disrespect?

Robert: Mad slags!

SL: And was there lassies' – [**Calvin:** Aye] – [**David:** Slags] - Did you treat them with any respect?

David: She was a shag!

SL: You get you're hole and that's it!

Calvin: Aye!

David: A bike!

Zack: A booty-call!

SL: And why do you think those lassies were like that?

Zack: Coz we made them

This was affirmed by James who stated some girls who engaged in the 'gang' would be coded as 'sluts'. Being a slut embodied: 'coming out and doing things' but with different boys 'like done things with other boys on different nights sometimes the same boy another night but not always with different boys on the same night'. Again, Ryan affirms that girls were seen as sexual objects but sex could only be ascertained if male gang members performed appropriately. Having said this, if such girls valorised values such as sex, money and power they would be defined as promiscuous:

Ryan: the lassies then want to...that's why they're there, for you to put on your persona and, like...

SL: But you put on your performance and then hopefully get your...to pull at the end of the night?

Ryan: Aye, to get your pie at the end of the night

SL: The kind of, that you're meant to aspire to, was for a lassie...was money sex and power. How do you think the lassies would be seen as?

Ryan: A crazy slut probably. A crazy slut. Oh she's off her nut man. Oh she's head to the boys.

Such data reiterates insights by Miller (2001), and Laidler and Hunt (2001) stated in Chapter 2, which indicates how girls may experience sexual double standards and sexual victimisation/devaluation along androcentric notions of respectability. However a sexed

bodies approach highlights that female bodies are engaged in a dynamic active discursive and social process of valorisation by young men. Female bodies coded as dirty are categorised as ‘sluts’ and ‘a shag’. Conversely female bodies coded as clean are worthy of respect and their personhood is acknowledged as they are potential sustainable partners. Both differential valorisations of female bodies support male gang members to position themselves in privileged ways through enacting and celebrating sexual conquest, and through respectable heterosexuality. In light of this, sexualised coded female bodies act as a means for these young men to affirm the ‘heterosexual matrix’; as clean female bodies are desirable for sustainable intimate relationships. However ‘sluts’ are reduced to sex and provide a discursive and social site for these young men to assert their ‘legendary’ heterosexual identity and privileged maleness in the context of the ‘youth gang’.

The Drumchapel Boys state that sexual conquest and heterosexual-identity was salient to their subjectivity and positioning, actively affirming the ‘heterosexual matrix’ through an asymmetrical sexual double-standard, monitored by girls:

SL: So say you’ve got 3 or 4 lassies sleeping about with different guys, and they are seen as dirties, slags – [**Group:** Aye] – How would you be seen?

David: Legends! If you were having sex with 2 or 3 different lassies

Zack: As kings mate!

Calvin: Legends

Zack: Legendary mate!

SL: So why would it be different for lassies

Zack: Coz not all the lassies think like that. All the boys think the same. All the other lassies are like ‘she’s a cow’.

SL: So do you think lassies would treat them differently as well?

Calvin: ‘She’s not coming out she’ll end up shagging my boyfriend’ {impersonating a girl concerned about the promiscuity of another girl}

David: And they start square-going.

SL: So why would they start fighting over a guy?

David: Because one lassie likes him – [**Zack:** and the other] – is shagging him – [**Zack:** Aye] – seeing two lassies fight is funny as fuck.

‘Banging a burd’ and walking about the streets ‘smoking snout saying I just banged her’ were central to The Drumchapel Boys heterosexual embodiment. In doing so, they affirmed girl’s sexual positioning, their own valorised maleness, and the subsequent humanisation and dehumanisation this entailed for both sexes.

The young men also recounted how they discursively construct sexed differentiation of females to emasculate other rival gang guys. Calvin stated that they shouted: ‘I’ve shagged your ma’ or ‘I shagged your burd’. Asked the purpose behind this Calvin explained that rival male gang members ‘go mental’ as ‘it makes them more raging and make them want to come over [for a fight]’. Zack explained how ‘everybody is going to laugh an all, and “yas” and fucking all that shit!’. However they stated that if they were on the receiving side during a gang fight which made reference to their girlfriends, ‘she would probably get rattled’ or they would ‘phone your burd and then she tells you she actually did [have sex with a rival gang member] and that’s when you go over, in it!’

This empirical data accentuates how male bodies signified as sexually active – free of virginity - are exalted as legitimate heterosexual male bodies worthy of celebration and legendary status amongst boys ‘as all boys think like that’. Sexually active male bodies indirectly affirm the ‘heterosexual matrix’ through sexual privilege as a result of female sexual partners enacting violence towards one and other due to the reputation and status attached to male bodies, which potentially assists female valorisation in the ‘youth gang’. Despite the sexual-double standard and gender inequality this affirms. Furthermore from a

sexed-bodies position, it can be suggested sexed female differentiation enables these young men to position the social kudos and humanisation of themselves and rival gang males by intertwining them through sexual discursive capital. Public performances of discursive dehumanisation of one's female relations, such as 'I shagged your ma', in the context of gang fighting, arguably makes them 'go mental' due to the humiliation and challenge to their valorised male position and sexed subjectivity. Nevertheless such sexed embodiment, positionality and discourse validates their male gang bodies as legitimate and privileged over female bodies; thereby sustaining the 'heterosexual matrix' of the 'youth gang'.

The Drumchapel Boys valorised and affirmed their male gang bodies and the 'heterosexual matrix' by challenging, dehumanising and marginalising the acceptance or expression of male gay-identity in the 'youth gang'. For any male gang member who was gay (or was perceived to be gay) would have to engage in behaviour and talk coded as heteronormative, affirming the sex/gender binary. To not do so would damage the image and reputation of the gang and by extension their sexed and heterosexual positioning. This is illustrated in the following excerpt from The Drumchapel Boys' discussion:

Zack: If he was still a good laugh and like still the way we talk and the way we act and that but he started battering into boys, I would be like whoa – you need to leave!

SL: What do you think that would do for the image of your gang or Drumchapel?

Paul: What had a gay boy fighting in your gang – [SL: Aye] – you would get slaughtered!

SL: So say you were fighting the Clydebank?

Calvin: They would say you hang about with a wee poof!

SL: What other things would they say?

Calvin: If you had one gay person in our gang then they would think we are all gay, that's what I think!

SL: How would that sit with you's? Would you be comfortable with it?

Zack: End up telling him he would need to go.

SL: So everybody thought you were gay because they were gay that – [Zack/Calvin/David: Aye, aye, obviously!].

Robert: If he had money and that!

Paul: If he had a house to let us drink then aye!

James echoed this:

James: I don't know, you would maybe get some people that would say aye that's alright and get the boys who would say no who wants to hang about with somebody who is gay and things like that...but if say you were hanging about with someone who is gay then you would get Clydebank [saying] "Oh they hang about with someone who's gay".

SL: So if one of the guys is gay that could actually damage not only your reputation for hanging about with him but Drumchapel's reputation as well?

James: Aye.

Ryan's interpretation slightly differed, but touched upon the latter points by Robert and Paul in the extract above, that if the gay gang member's social capital was other reputable family members – or other resources - this may alter the homophobia and marginalisation experienced. But not being ridiculed still required heterosexual codification:

Ryan: Depending on circumstances, eh because see if somebody was just a gay guy or something, probably get slagged. But if see one of the people within you [the gang], that was his good cousin, by the time you...right away, do you know what I mean. So that's when I mean...

SL: So can...does...so in that situation, there's a kinda, connections play a part in that? Does it depend also whether he's...can still be one of the guys or whether he's really fucking camp, or would that matter as well?

Ryan: Aye, it would be a bit...I'd say it would be a bit because everybody is more...ken...it would be even be that if he was there, he'd probably get slagged. That's just the way people are. That's the way schemes are.

Ryan explains this further by stating that:

Ryan: 'What I am saying to you is, I don't see why just because you're gay, you need to become...like, {Ryan enacts in a flamboyant mannerly way with high pitched noise}, somebody's kicked you in the balls and start and all that...You've still got balls. That is an act.

When questioned if gay males could be violent The Drumchapel Boys acknowledged this as possible but reduced this to homophobic and overtly sexualised imagery (while enacting effeminate screaming and voices), which did not embody valorised maleness:

SL: Can gay people be violent?

Zack: Aye – [**David:** Obviously fuck sake] – [**Zack:** Hitting you with a dildo and that] – [**Charles:** laughter] – [**Calvin:** Hit you with a tampon] – [**Paul:** Spiking you with fucking poppers] ...

In contrast, when narrating their own violent experiences they used (hetero)normative and male-centric imagery such as: 'gang fighting', 'battering a cunt', 'punched a cunt, 'put him in hospital the fucking gimp', 'bash him', 'slash him', 'break his legs', 'floor him', 'hit him with a bottle', 'whacked above the eye', 'one-connector', and 'smashing fuck out them'. Hence they discursively performed and positioned themselves in the focus group as not gay. Zack and Charles spoke about being 'whacked' with a golf club or 'hit with a hockey stick'.

Somewhat different and more normative from the imagery of sex-toy weaponry used by actual or perceived gay gang men.

The explored extracts from the case-studies regarding youth gay gang members, from a sexed bodies perspective draws attention to Butler's (1990) conceptualisation of violence as central to ontological notions of (de)humanisation that challenges or affirms the essentialism of the 'heterosexual matrix'. Being or perceived to be a gay male can be understood to challenge the legitimately constituted male gang body. Doing so subverts the implicit heteronormative knowledge/power nexus of the 'youth gang' and with it, individual and collective subjectivities of its valorised sexed male body. Violence, marginalisation and ostracising are symbolised by these young men as legitimate social and discursive resources towards actual or perceived gay gang males to position themselves and their communities as implicitly heterosexual. Violence in different resource manifestations assists in nourishing and regulating the sex/gender binary of the 'youth gang' and its locality. To do so, privileged reputation and image is coded with toughness, being 'game' and sexually active with acceptable female bodies, which are vital currencies for some of these young men to position themselves in ways that affirms their heterosexual maleness.

However the data illustrates from a sexed-bodies analysis, that the 'heterosexual matrix' is not static or monolithic, as being a gay male in the 'youth gang' is negotiable if the actual or perceived gay gang member has social resources or relations who have a reputation, signifying valorised maleness. Gay gang males may be punished for challenging the 'heterosexual matrix' but may equally subvert the 'heterosexual matrix' if they are coded as heteronormative, have accessible social resources for these young men, or possess social capital with family or peers with reputation(s), which provides valorised male dividends. Thus affirmation of the 'heterosexual matrix' and valorised maleness and femaleness is intertwined with violence as part of day-to-day life for these young men, which contributes to

a shifting but embedded 'imaginary body' of the 'youth gang'. This however occurs within wider social, discursive and spatial dynamics of street habitus.

Sexing Street Habitus

All the young men in these case-studies stated that they have deep-rooted connections with their local community in ways that intertwined and contextualised their sexed bodies and subjectivities, and in turn the 'heterosexual matrix' of their 'youth gangs' in particular space as sexed space. For example Ryan declares the emotional and discursive connection to Castlemilk in ways that knits his ontology with space:

Ryan: Castlemilk means a big thing to me. Within me, I actually do love the ground I walk on. I do. I love Castlemilk...you can take the boy out of Castlemilk, but you can't take the Castlemilk out of the boy.

Asked why this declaration of love, Ryan states: 'Because everything you experience and everything that might, say, become who, you are and everything. Everything you do in Castlemilk'. Ryan also stated that it was to do with building social connections with individuals over the generations, which creates continuity across time and a collective sense of micro-history:

Ryan: And some of them will still treat me the same ways, as in give me respect and that...

SL: So would you say it's all about... looking back... creating good memories, 'cause that helps create that sense of...

Ryan: See Castlemilk...it's because of your...you're sitting with people just a bit older than you sometimes and you're sitting with people that's older than me sometimes and you just hear stories about the place.

SL: And it's sharing that, kind of, history.

Ryan: So even though I've only...what 20-odd, I still feel like I know a lot more than years about Castlemilk.

Such emotional attachment and interconnectedness of place, subjectivity and belonging are expressed despite Ryan describing Castlemilk as a 'shitty' area full of violence. In fact dynamics of poverty, lack of amenities and everyday readiness for violence facilitate such subjective-spatial interplay as '...you're in the street 24/7...what's on the street is where you fucking live [as a gang member]. It's where you walk about. So you need to become part of it'. This is due to Castlemilk being 'one of the friendliest places that you'll be, but at the same time, it's one of the most dangerous places'.

Similarly, James' stated emotional connection to Drumchapel due to his experiences of growing up in the community, and despite his own ambitions he 'would try and stay as close to here as possible but wouldn't just want to abandon it' as 'its where I grew up...I'm proud to be from it'. Similar to Ryan, The Drumchapel Boys accentuated how their locality contextualised their day-to-day living with violence:

Calvin: Aye coz you wouldn't expect like cunts boxing all the time in Bearsden

Zack: Aye Bearsden or Milngavie or something

Calvin: Aye

SL: So what's different from Drumchapel in comparison to Bearsden or Milngavie?

Calvin: Because – [**Charles:** Junkies] – [**David:** Snobby bastards] – [**Zack:** all the drugs that going about] – [**Robert:** Who stays in the place] – Poverty – [**SL:** Poverty?] – Aye – [**Zack:** Welfare] – [**SL:** Welfare?] – [**Zack:** Aye] – [**Paul:** if they build houses like this they would be the same probably, coz there's fuck all] – [**SL:** so the houses are different?] – Aye – [**SL:** And you think it's about poverty?] – Most of it, I think it is.

What the above extracts illuminate is the 'street habitus' dynamic of the young men's lived experience and meaning-making as street-orientated youth in their communities. Dynamics situated in a wider macro/meso context of welfare, poverty and limited community and individual resources; subsequently constructing their meaning-making of space and subjectivity to create 'micorgeographies' and 'micorcultures'. But their 'street habitus' also enables the creation of micro-histories of place, which shapes their subjectivity and collective, spatially-bound identity. Identities shaped by 'respect', reputation and image, which are salient to them. In light of this, 'street habitus' is of analytical merit to the lived experience and meaning-making of street orientated youth. However from the sexed bodies' approach of this dissertation it is a de-sexed concept. Injecting Grosz's (1995) ideas of sexed bodies and their spatial time-based locality may assist in its conceptual development.

Grosz (1995) argues that bodies only make sense within the context of space and time, as sexed subjects can only obtain subjective positioning by placing themselves in the spatiality used by their body (ibid: 89). In doing so, one's sense of space and time only makes sense through movement. Movement by sexed subjects differs due to the space-time structure bestowed on different sexed bodies. This equates to a 'model of the relations between bodies and cities' (ibid: 108), as sexing of bodies' impacts the manner sexed subjectivities view other sexed beings, their understanding and connectedness with locality/space, and their lived experience of space and time. The city is a site for the sexing and sexualisation of bodies through: (i) constituting private and public space; (ii) formulating

the circuits of knowledge and interaction; (iii) culturally and spatially configuring the rules, practices and norms for inclusion and marginalisation; and (iv) organising geographical contact with goods and services (ibid: 109). This process is dynamical and convoluted as sexed bodies configure and reconfigure cities spatiality.

Thus, interpretation of the generated data above from a sexed bodies approach - by injecting Grosz's sexed framework of space and time - suggests that the 'street habitus' of the young men included in this study are valorised and imbued by maleness and heteronormativity. Hence categorisations of 'youth gang' maleness valorised and the affirmation of the 'heterosexual matrix' is a sexed performativity that configures situational dynamics between their sexed bodies, subjectivities and place. Demonstrated by Calvin from the Drumchapel Boys, who stated regarding gayness and community image: 'If you had one gay person in our gang then they would think we were all gay'; and James who indicates the importance of reputation coded as maleness which: 'gave you a good name and if you weren't chased it would give the scheme a good name'. Both of these extracts elucidate the intertwined dynamic of youth and sexed subjectivities and place, and illustrate its dynamical interplay in a wider macro/meso context and limited resources. All of which facilitates these young men's meaning-making and lived experience of 'micorgeographies', 'micorcultures' and micro-histories in their communities as sexed, and sexualised street-orientated youth.

Analytical Summary

The primary data explored in this chapter from a sexed-bodies queer criminological perspective explicates some salient dynamics to address the dissertation research questions.

The 'thick analysis' of the three-case studies suggests that 'youth gang' maleness is an agentic creation, affirmation and performance through a range of social and discursive resources. These resources are utilised to sustain and regulate the constitution of knowable and acceptable male gang bodies, naturalised over time as the privileged legitimate appearance of young heterosexual male bodies in their communities. The 'intelligible' valorised male gang body is a situational social and discursively heteronormative 'imaginary body'. An 'imaginary body' constituted through the repetitive performance of physical violence, hard image, tracksuit clothing, violently imbued reputation, losing one's virginity, being 'game' and using sexually degrading language. Valorisation of male gang bodies and by extension their 'intelligibility' does not occur in a vacuum. Violence in its various manifestations is salient to this 'intelligibility' as violence positions male sexed bodies and subjectivities as legitimate and privileged in comparison to 'tomboys', 'sluts' 'gays' and 'gimps'. Subsequently nourishing and regulating the sex/gender binary of the 'youth gang' and its locality, and with it, positioning male gang bodies as proper humanised and intelligible sites of maleness in their communities.

The data also illuminates that 'tomboys' have to negotiate a precarious and unstable mirror of maleness validity that challenges and subverts the 'heterosexual matrix'. Hence, while existing feminist literature discussed in Chapter 2 demonstrates how young women negotiate a range of positions across the gender accomplishment/identity nexus, their analyses are incomplete. As Daly (2010) states, to focus only on one side of the doing-gender/sexed-bodies coin diminishes the analysis. The sexed-bodies side of the coin demonstrates how female bodies are engaged in a dynamic active discursive and social process of valorisation by boys. A process that enables these young men and their rival gang counterparts the social kudos and humanisation they seek by intertwining their valorisation with female valorisation. All of which, positions their male bodies as legitimate and

privileged over female bodies, thereby sustaining the 'heterosexual matrix' of the 'youth gang'. In light of this, the current feminist literature of gang involved young women cannot provide a holistic account without critiquing sexual differentiation and valorisation of female bodies by young gang males, heteronormatively as intelligible or unintelligible.

The data also demonstrates how male gay-identity can be understood to challenge the legitimacy of individual and collective male gang bodies and subjectivities. Violence for intelligibility is important to position these young men and their communities as implicitly heterosexual - nourishing and regulating the sex/gender binary of the 'youth gang' and its locality. Affirmation of the 'heterosexual matrix' is not static or monolithic, as inclusion in the 'youth gang' for gay males (or tomboys) is up for negotiation based upon heteronormative bodily codification or their social resources or valorised male dividends. This study elucidates how the 'heterosexual matrix' can be subverted and affirmed by sexed bodies and subjectivities in the 'youth gang'.

Finally, sexed bodies and subjectivities of gang involved youth are situated in a wider context of sexed street habitus, which highlights valorised 'youth gang' maleness, 'heterosexual matrix' affirmation and sexed subjectivities as repetitive performativity's. Sexed and sexualised performativity as an intertwining of sexed bodies, subjectivities, locality and the macro/meso context. Thus the data exposes scope for innovative conceptual development of 'street habitus' by injecting Grosz's (1995) framework of sexed space; and with it new criminological knowledge and enquiry.

Chapter 6: Conclusion

In Chapter 1, I introduced the research parameters of this dissertation. I suggested that that historical and contemporary analysis of ‘youth gangs’ in UK criminology has largely focused on implicit assumptions of an innate masculinity, and male violence, which portrays masculinity negatively. I equally asserted that criminological conceptualising and analysis on ‘youth gangs’ in the UK generally, and Scotland specifically, inadequately theorised issues of sex, body and sexuality. Doing so has led to a failure to conceptualise ‘youth gangs’ away from dichotomous gender difference, and an exclusion of a more sexed perspective, rendering current analysis as de-sexed and heteronormative. In light of this I set out 4 research questions for exploration: (i) to explore the discourses young men draw upon to privilege or challenge bodies as heterosexual; (ii) to identify the social practices and positions young men adopt to reaffirm or destabilise the ‘heterosexual matrix’ of the ‘youth gang’; (iii) to examine how these discourses and social practices facilitate violent engagement and; (iv) to critically assess and map out the merits of the applied queer criminological sexed bodies framework to ‘youth gangs’ in comparison to other feminist criminological approaches. These research questions were situated in the context of historical and current criminological literature at the empirical and theoretical levels in Chapters 2 and 3 respectively.

During the course of communicating the empirical landscape of ‘youth gangs’ in Chapter 2, I illustrated how conceptualisations in Britain, and specifically Scotland, are highly contested. A shifting and problematic idea embodied by social and historical manifestations of ‘youth crisis’ (Goldson, 2011) lacking in empirical foundation or theorisation into young people’s lived experience and meaning-making. I highlighted that the limited Scottish empirical data continues to focus on Glasgow as a site of research due to its

historical links to the ‘youth gang’ more so than any other British city. The interest of Glasgow as a research site for criminologists continues to conjure the importation of American notions of innate masculinity, economic marginalisation, social dislocation and criminality as expressed in classical works such as Thrasher (1927) and Cohen (1955), and the Eurogang’s definition (Weerman et al, 2009).

What this literature review equally demonstrates through the works of Davies (2013), Jephcott (1967), and Patrick (1973) is how the conceptualisation of the ‘youth gang’ in Glasgow is conceptualised by territoriality; specifically fresh insight from Fraser’s (2013) concept of ‘street habitus’ bears potential to deepen the analysis and conceptualisation by illuminating the intertwined dynamics of ‘youth gang’ subjectivities and space.

Old masculinist and de-sexed paradigms of the Glasgow ‘youth gang’ continue to appear empirically although in different contemporary guises. Much of the criminological Scottish/Glasgow research as explored in Chapter 2 is innately male-centric displaying essentialist perpetrator masculinity and girls/young women as passive victims. Batchelor’s (2011) Scottish empirical data, drawing on conceptual insights from Miller (2001) and Messerschmidt (2002) goes some way to address these old masculinist paradigms. As Batchelor (2011) illuminates the inadequacies of such dichotomous gender difference frameworks by illustrating how young women have to negotiate the masculinist backdrop of the ‘youth gang’ in agentic paradoxical ways to accomplish femininity or obtain recognition as ‘one of the guys’ as gendered beings in the ‘youth gang’.

Gendered conceptual development and empirical insights from Batchelor (2011) were salient to draw upon for this criminological enquiry. However the central argument of Chapter 2 was that the criminological literature continues to be heteronormative and de-

sexed, as it conflates gender with sex, and assumes that bodies have no social or cultural significance regarding lived experience and meaning-making in the 'youth gang'.

Theoretical exploration of criminological knowledge production in Chapter 3 illuminated that criminology should be understood as a dependent field susceptible to influence, and a field imbued with power relations that constitute what is regarded as valid knowledge and empirical enquiry. Such power-relations produce contestable boundaries to make distinctive its knowledge production and empirical claims to crime, punishment and social control. This historically has consisted of a concern on male criminal offenders by male criminologists. Feminist criminologists have critiqued this position by demonstrating that gender is as central to criminological enquiry as crime itself, and have done predominately from a gendered pathways approach and gendered crimes approach. In particular feminist epistemologies such as feminist empiricism and standpoint have been utilised by feminist criminologists to not only challenge and reconstruct theories of crime but also the masculinist social scientific model that underpins criminology. Having said this, postmodern feminist epistemology is largely absent. Hence I argued that this feminist epistemological position was salient to this dissertation in order to reconstruct theories of 'youth gangs' to advance a post-positivist queer criminology.

Unlike wider social science literature, criminology to date has not incorporated the feminist sexed-bodies mode of enquiry into knowledge production. This is despite 'doing gender' and 'sexed-bodies' modes of enquiry being two sides of the same coin (Daly, 2010). Although given the literature review in Chapter 2 whereby 'doing gender' through the gendered crimes approach has only entered the criminological field in the last decade or so, and has only commenced application in a British/Scottish criminological context to 'youth

gangs'. It is of little surprise given the heteronormative and de-sexed dynamic of British criminology that the applications of the 'sexed-bodies' approach to 'youth gangs' is absent.

Aware of these debates and dynamics, I set out the theoretical merits of the 'sexed bodies' approach. I argued that its potential utility was in making problematic the naturalised notion of sex and its subsequent conflation with gender, as well as its ability to understand how bodies are socially and discursively significant for young men to actively affirm their maleness and heterosexuality as legitimate and privileged. I therefore contended that the sexed bodies approach can illuminate how young men may use different resources, such as violence, to stratify bodies and subjectivities in ways that affirms a particular social and discursive configuration of the 'imaginary body' in the social context of the 'youth gang'; thereby making all other sexed and sexualised configurations unacceptable or subordinate.

The lived experience and meaning-making in 'youth gangs', and by extension criminology, can be queered through a sexed-bodies approach that denaturalises and decentres sex, bodies and sexuality as fluid and partial, open to transgression and renegotiation. This is the central argument laid out in Chapter 3 of this dissertation. Such insights, which rely on an understanding of bodies as important spheres of lived experience and meaning-making can be brought to the forefront of criminological analysis; utilising conceptual tools - 'imaginary body', 'heterosexual matrix', 'sexed differentiation', 'valorised bodies', 'humanisation' and 'intelligibility' - to do so. Thus an appropriate methodological framework to practically and empirically address the research questions and the central claims in Chapter 2 and 3 was required.

In Chapter 4 I critically outlined the manner in which I sought to address the research questions. I generated data across two comparable research sites in Glasgow through the

application of oral history interviews with 6 young men, and one focus group with 7 young men, with the support of youth gatekeepers. Applying this research design was very much explorative as ‘The Drumchapel Boys’ refused to engage in individual oral history interviews but were willing to engage in a group interview. The epistemological position and its ontological consideration empowered the research process through an interrogation of the meanings and lived experience of these young men as situational truths; facilitated by intersubjectivity and wider sexed and sexualised discourses. All of which was analysed through the concepts of ‘interpretative repertoire’ and ‘subject positions and identity work’.

The analysis presented in Chapter 5 demonstrates the limitations of de-sexed and heteronormative nature of British criminology broadly, and the existing empirical data on ‘youth gangs’ specifically. The data illuminates ‘youth gang’ maleness as an agentic creation, affirmation and performance through a range of social and discursive resources; such as: physical violence, hard image, tracksuit clothing, violently imbued reputation, losing one’s virginity, being game and using sexually degrading language. These resources assisted a repetitive performance, which makes their valorised male and heterosexual bodies and subjectivities privileged, facilitating attitudes and practices towards violent engagement, as violence is salient to ‘intelligibility’. Violence positions male sexed bodies and subjectivities as legitimate and privileged in comparison to ‘tomboys’, ‘sluts’ ‘gays’ and ‘gimps’. The use of such resources suggests capacity to sustain and regulate the constitution of knowable, humanised and acceptable male and female bodies. In essence the young men were able to nourish, regulate and affirm the ‘heterosexual matrix’ of the ‘youth gang’ and its locality. ‘Heterosexual matrix’ affirmation is not static or monolithic, as the status of girls and gays in the ‘youth gang’ is up for negotiation based upon heteronormative coding, social resources or valorised male dividends. The data illuminates how the ‘heterosexual matrix’ can be subverted and affirmed through different bodily and subjective positioning in the

'youth gang' depending on one's social capital. Such negotiation is precarious and unstable, underpinned by a discursive and social mirror of maleness validity and female sexed differentiation, where the threat of violence in its various manifestations is possible; and these sexed and sexualised dynamics are situated in a wider context of sexed street habitus.

Thus the central argument developed in this dissertation is that young men's valorised male gang bodies are a performative situational social and discursive heteronormative 'imaginary body' that may engage violence to humanise and dehumanise male and female bodies to affirm their legitimacy, and affirmation of the 'heterosexual matrix'. In light of this, I suggest two recommendations for further research to continue queering criminology and the 'youth gang' from a sexed-bodies approach: (i) research directly with young women and LGBTQ youth to ascertain their lived experience and meaning-making as sexed and sexualised street-orientated youth, as this research only illuminates these dynamics from young men's voices, and (ii) empirical and theoretical development to construct new criminological knowledge and enquiry regarding the concept of sexed street habitus.

The significance of this dissertation is that to focus only on 'street habitus' and/or gender accomplishment/identity nexus of 'doing gender' is to construct an incomplete account, or one-half of the coin, of young peoples lived experience and meaning-making of the 'youth gang'. A holistic account requires critiquing bodily sexual differentiation, body valorisation, violent intelligibility and the affirmation/subversion of the 'heterosexual matrix'. Hence the social and discursive significance of young people's sexed and sexualised bodies is central to any analysis. In communities shaped by inequality and scarce social, spatial and economic capital, bodies and meaning-making in the 'youth gang' may take on increased socio-cultural significance, valorising maleness and heterosexuality - in essence their existence and legitimacy as human beings.

Bibliography:

Abrams, L (2010) 'Oral History Theory'; Routledge: London.

Alexander, C (2008) '(Re)thinking Gangs'; Runnymede Trust: London.

Ball, M et al (2014a) 'Introduction to the Special Issue on Queer/ing Criminology: New Directions and Frameworks', Critical Criminology; Volume 22: Pages 1-4.

Ball, M (2014b) 'Queer Criminology, Critique, and the "Art of Not Being Governed"', Critical Criminology; Volume 22: Pages 21-34.

Bannister, J and Fraser, A (2008) 'Youth gang identification: learning and social development in restricted geographies', Scottish Journal of Criminal Justice Studies; Volume 14: Pages 96-114.

Bannister, J et al (2010) 'Troublesome youth groups, gangs and knife carrying in Scotland'; The Scottish Centre for Crime and Justice Research: Glasgow.

Batchelor, S (2005) 'Prove me the bam!: Victimization and agency in the lives of young women who commit violent offenses', Probation Journal; Volume 52: Pages 358-375.

Batchelor, S (2011) 'Beyond Dichotomy' in: Goldson, B 'Youth in Crisis? 'Gangs', territoriality and violence'; Routledge: London.

Bourdieu, P (1977) 'Outline of a Theory of Practice'; Cambridge University Press: Cambridge.

Butler, J (1990) 'Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity'; Routledge: London.

- Butler, J (2004) *'Undoing Gender'*; Routledge: London.
- Campbell, A (1981) *'Girl Delinquents'*; Basil Blackwell Publishers Ltd: Oxford.
- Campbell, A (1984) *'The Girls in the Gang'*; Basil Blackwell: New York.
- Campbell, A (1987) 'Self Definition by Rejection: The Case of Gang Girls'; *Social Problems*; Volume 34: Pages 451-466.
- Canaan, J (1998) 'Is 'Doing Nothing' Just Boys Play? Integrating Feminist and Cultural Studies Perspectives on Working-Class Young Men's Masculinity' in: Daly, K and Maher, L *'Criminology at the Crossroads: Feminist Readings in Crime and Justice'*; Oxford University Press: Oxford.
- Chamberlain, J (2013) *'Understanding Criminological Research: a guide to data analysis'*; Sage Publication: London.
- Chan, J (2013) 'Globalisation, reflexivity and the practice of criminology' in: McLaughlin, E and Munice, J *'Criminological Perspectives: Essential Readings'*, 3rd Edition; Sage Publications: London.
- Clarke, A (2003) 'Situational Analyses: Grounded Theory Mapping after the Postmodern Turn', *Symbolic Interaction*; Volume 26: Pages 553-576.
- Cohen, A (1955) *'Delinquent Boys: The Culture of the Gang'*; Collier-Macmillan Ltd: London.
- Collier, R (1998) *'Masculinities, Crime and Criminology'*; Sage Publications: London.
- Daly, K (1997) 'Different Ways of Conceptualising Sex/Gender in Feminist Theory and their Implications for Criminology', *Theoretical Criminology*; Volume 1: Pages 25-50.

Daly, K (2010) 'Feminist Perspectives in Criminology: A Review with Gen Y in Mind' in: McLaughlin, E and Newburn, T *'The Handbook of Criminal Theory'* (eds); Sage Publications: London.

Davies, A (1998) 'Street Gangs, Crime and Policing in Glasgow during the 1930s: The Case of the Beehive Boys', *Social History*; Volume 23: Pages 251-267.

Davies, A (2007) 'Glasgow's "Reign of Terror": Street Gangs, Racketeering and Intimidation in the 1920s and 1930s', *Contemporary British History*; Volume 21: Pages 405-427.

Davies, A (2013) *'City of Gangs: Glasgow and the rise of the gangster'*; Hodder Stoughton Ltd: London.

Denzin, N and Lincoln, Y (2000) 'Introduction: The Discipline and Practice of Qualitative Research' in: Denzin, N and Lincoln, Y *'Handbook of Qualitative Research'*, 2nd Edition; Sage Publication: London.

Fraser, A (2013) 'Street Habitus: gangs, territorialism, and social change in Glasgow', *Journal of Youth Studies*; Volume 16: Pages 970-983.

Fraser, A (2015) *'Urban Legends: Gang Identity in the Post-Industrial City'*; Oxford University Press: Oxford.

Fraser, A and Atkinson, C (2014) 'Making Up Gangs: Looping, Labelling and the New Politics of Intelligence-led Policing', *Youth Justice*; Volume 14: Pages 154-170.

Gadd, D (2000) 'Masculinities, violence and defended psychosocial subjects', *Theoretical Criminology*; Volume 4: Pages 429-449.

Gadd, D (2002) 'Masculinities and Violence Against Female Partners'; *Social and Legal Studies*; Volume 11: Pages 61-80.

Gadd, D (2003) 'Reading between the lines: subjectivity and men's violence', *Men and Masculinities*; Volume 5: Pages 333-354.

Gamson, J (2000) 'sexualities, Queer Theory and Qualitative Research' in: Denzin, N and Lincoln, Y '*Handbook of Qualitative Research*', 2nd Edition; Sage Publication: London.

Garland, D and Sparks, R (2000) 'Criminology, Social Theory and the Challenge of our Times' in: Garland, D and Sparks, R '*Criminology and Social Theory*'; Oxford University Press: Oxford.

Gatens, M (1996) '*Imaginary Bodies: Ethics, Power and Corporeality*'; Routledge: London.

Gelstrophe, L and Morrison, A (1988) 'Feminism and Criminology in Britain', *British Journal of Criminology*; Volume 28: Pages 93-109.

Goldson, B (2011) 'Youth in Crisis?' in: Goldson, B '*Youth in Crisis? 'Gangs', territoriality and violence*'; Routledge: London.

Groombridge, N (1999) 'Perverse Criminologies: The Closet of Doctor Lombroso', *Social and Legal Studies*; Volume 8: Pages 531-548.

Grosz, E (1995) '*Space, Time and Perversion: Essays on the Politics of Bodies*'; Routledge: London.

Groves, J et al (2011) 'Youth Studies and Timescapes: Insight from an Ethnographic Study of "Young Night Drifters" in Hong Kong's public Housing Estates', *Youth and Society*; Volume 30: Pages 1-19.

Halberstam, J (1998) '*Female Masculinity*'; Duke University Press: Durham.

Hammers, C and Brown, A (2004) 'Towards a feminist-queer alliance: A paradigmatic shift in the research process'; *Social Epistemology*; Volume 18: Pages 85-101.

Harding, S (1987) 'Conclusion: Epistemological Questions' in: Harding, S '*Feminism and Methodology: Social Science Issues*'; Indiana University Press: Bloomington.

Harding, S (2008) 'Feminism and Theories of Scientific Knowledge'; *Women: A Cultural Review*; Volume 1: Pages 87-98.

Heidensohn, F and Silvestri, M (2012) 'Gender and Crime' in: Maguire, M et al '*The Oxford Handbook of Criminology*', 5th Edition; Oxford University Press: Oxford.

Jephcott, P (1967) '*Time of One's Own: Leisure and Young People*'; Oliver and Boyd Ltd: Edinburgh.

Joe, K and Chesney-Lind, M (1998) 'An Analysis of Gender and Ethnic Variation in Youth Gang Membership' in: Daly, K and Maher, L '*Criminology at the Crossroads: Feminist Readings in Crime and Justice*'; Oxford University Press: Oxford.

Kintrea, K et al (2008) '*Young People and Territorialism*'; Joseph Rowantree Foundation: York.

Laidler, K and Hunt, G (2001) 'Accomplishing Femininity among the girls in the gang', *British Criminology*; Volume 41: Pages 656-678.

Loader, I and Sparks, R (2012) 'On the production and consumption of knowledge about crime and justice' in: Maguire, M et al '*The Oxford Handbook of Criminology*', 5th Edition; Oxford University Press: Oxford.

Mason, G and Stubbs, J (2012) 'Feminist Approaches to Criminological Research' in: Gaddis, D et al '*The SAGE Handbook of Criminological Research Methods*'; SAGE Publication: London.

Messerschmidt, J (1995) 'From Patriarchy to Gender: Feminist Theory, Criminology and the Challenge of Diversity' in: Rafter, N and Heidenshohn, F (eds) 'International Feminist Perspectives in Criminology: Engendering a Discipline'; Open University Press: Buckingham.

Messerschmidt, J (1993) 'Masculinities and Crime: Critique and Reconceptualisation of Theory'; Rowman and Littlefield: Maryland.

Messerschmidt, J (1997) 'Crime as Structured Action: Gender, Race, Class and Crime in the Making'; Sage: California.

Messerschmidt, J (2000) 'Nine Lives: Adolescent Masculinities, The Body, and Violence'; Westview Press: Oxford.

Messerschmidt, J (2002) 'On gang girls, gender and a structured action theory: A reply to Miller', Theoretical Criminology; Volume 6: Pages 461-475.

Messerschmidt, J (2012) 'Gender, Heterosexuality, and Youth Violence: The Struggle for Recognition'; Rowman and Littlefield Publishers: Plymouth.

Messerschmidt, (2014) 'Crime as structured Action: Doing Masculinities, Race, Class, Sexuality and Crime', 2nd Edition; Rowman and Littlefield: Plymouth.

Meuser and Loschper, (2002) 'Introduction: Qualitative Research in Criminology'; Forum: Qualitative Social Research; Volume 3: Pages 1-10.

Miller, J (2001) 'One of the Guys: Girls, Gangs and Gender'; Oxford University Press: Oxford.

Miller, J (2002a) 'The strengths and limits of doing gender' for understanding street crime', Theoretical Criminology; Volume 6: Pages 433-460.

Miller, J (2002b) 'Reply to Messerschmidt', *Theoretical Criminology*; Volume 6: Pages 477-480.

Miller, J (2004) 'The Girls in the Gang: What We've Learned from Two Decades of Research' in: Chesney-Lind, M and Pasico, L '*Girls, Women and Crime: Selected Readings*'; Sage Publication: London.

Miller, J and Mullins, C (2006) 'The Status of Feminist Theories in Criminology' in: Cullin, F et al '*Taking Stock: the status of criminological theory*'; Transaction: London.

Panfil, V (2014) 'Better Left Unsaid? The Role of Agency in Queer Criminological Research', *Critical Criminology*; Volume 22: Pages 99-111.

Patrick J (1973) *A Glasgow Gang Observed*, Eyre Methuen: London.

Pavarini, M (1994) 'Is Criminology worth saving?' in: Nelken, D '*The futures of criminology*'; Sage Publications: London.

Plummer, K (2013) 'Critical Humanism and Queer Theory: Living with the Tensions Postscript 2011 to Living with the Contradictions' in: Denzi, K and Lincoln, Y '*The Landscape of Qualitative Research*'; Sage Publication: London.

Portelli, A (1997) '*The Battle of Valle Giulia: Oral History and the Art of Dialogue*'; Wise: Madison.

Potter, J (2004) 'Discourse Analysis' in: Hardy, M and Bryman, A '*Handbook of Data Analysis*'; Sage Publication: London.

Sanders, W (1994) '*Gangbangs and Drive-bys: Grounded Culture and Juvenile Gang Violence*'; Aldine de Gruyter: New York.

Sangster, (2006) 'Telling our stories: feminist debates and the use of oral history'; Women's History Review; Volume 3: Pages5-28.

Seidman, S (2003) 'Introduction' in: Seidman, S 'Queer Theory/Sociology'; Blackwell Publishers Ltd: Oxford.

Sharp, C et al (2006) 'Delinquent Youth Groups and Offending Behaviour: Findings from the 2004 Offending, Crime and Justice Survey'; Home Office: London.

Smart, C (1990) 'Feminist Approaches to Criminology, or Postmodern Women Meets Atavistic Man' in: Gelstrophe, L and Morrison, A 'Feminist Perspectives in Criminology'; Open University Press: Milton Keynes.

Smart, C (1995) 'Law, Crime and Sexuality: Essays in Feminism'; Sage Publications: London.

Thrasher, F (1927) 'The Gang: A Study of 1,313 Gangs in Chicago'; University of Chicago Press: Illinois.

Weerman, F et al (2009) 'Eurogang Program Manual', Online Report; University of Missouri: St Louis.

Woods, J (2014) 'Queer Contestations and the Future of a Critical "Queer" Criminology', Critical Criminology; Volume 22: Pages 5-19.

Young, T (2009) 'Girls and Gangs: 'Shemale' Gangster in the UK?', Youth Justice; Volume 9: Pages 224-238.

Young, T (2011) 'In search of the 'shemale' gangster' in: Goldson, B 'Youth in Crisis? Gangs, territoriality and violence'; Routledge: London.

APPENDIX A: Interview Themes**Sexed Bodies, Heterosexuality and Glasgow ‘Street-orientated’ Youth:****Growing Up and living in Castlemilk/Drumchapel**

- Prompts:
 - Tell me about the place you live?
 - How would you describe Castlemilk/Drumchapel? Why?
 - How do you think others see the place you grew up/live?
 - Do you think how you or other people describe Drumchapel/Castlemilk is mirrored in you?
 - What was it like growing up here?

Family and Friends: REMEMBER: Inform participant of ethical considerations if need be.

- Prompts:
 - Do you live with your family or someone else? (Mum, Dad, Siblings, Grandparents, Friends, Flatmates).
 - What things do you like/dislike about living there?
 - How would you describe your family relationships?
 - Do you have a lot of friends?
 - Are your friends mostly male, female, or mixed?

- Do your friends mostly live in the same area?
- Are your friends mostly the same age, or younger, or older?
- Do you have a best friend?
- What do you and your friends get up to?
- Do you have any enemies?

Work/education and Leisure:

- Prompts:
 - What do you understand by the term 'leisure'?
 - What do you normally do in your spare time, when you are at home?
 - What do you do in your spare time, when you go out of your home?
 - Describe a really enjoyable Saturday/weekend?
 - Do you think there are enough work and education opportunities for you?

Hanging about the streets: REMEMBER: Inform about ethical dynamics if need be.

- Prompts:
 - Where do you and your friends normally hang out?
 - What kinds of things do you do? (Smoking, Drinking, Drugs, Fighting etc.)
 - Do you hang about the streets? Why? What's it like?
 - Have you ever been involved in something you shouldn't be?
 - Have you ever been in trouble with the police?
 - Have you ever spent any time in youth detention, prison or rehabilitation?

Change over time

- Prompts:
 - What sorts of things did you do in your spare time when you were younger?
 - In what ways has this changed?
 - How do you think this will change over the next five years?

Closing

- Is there anything else you would like to share with me about the themes we've discussed?

APPENDIX B: Statement of ethical risks (taken from PGT ethics application form
(28/04/15)

(1) Involving young people in research

The proposed research focuses on young people and young adults. While the majority of participants (N=6) are likely to be 18 years and over, Scott is keen to include the views and experiences of one or two 16/17 year olds. The inclusion of 16 and 17 year olds provides an important age cohort as they embody an important point in terms of life transition from childhood to adulthood in relation to political and civil citizenship, economic and educational rights and opportunities; as well as being situated between the youth justice system and the criminal justice system in Scotland designed for adults. Given this, reflexive engagement with 16 and 17 year olds in this study may assist in illuminating and exploring experiences in contemporary Glasgow that have shaped their street-orientated activity and how this may shape their adulthood. Such data generation may have practical implications for those practitioners and agencies that work with street-orientated young people aged 16 and 17 years old.

Research involving young people raises specific issues relating to their legal status, their knowledge and experience and capacity for decision-making, as well as their relative lack of independence/autonomy, which requires specific attention in order to ensure appropriate and ethical research practices. For example, young people may feel pressured into taking part in research as a result of researchers contacting them through adult gatekeepers. Such

circumstances demand a sensitive approach, where attention is paid to minimising the influence of authoritative figures or peer pressure. My own previous and current experience of conducting research with young people suggests that providing young people with a range of accessible information (both oral and written) and taking a proactive approach to encourage questioning are effective strategies, as these support young people to make informed decisions and empower them to either consent or refuse engagement in the research process. Young people will be given at least 24 hours to consider whether or not they want to take part in the study and the option of withdrawing from the research will be reiterated throughout the research process. It is my view, informed by the literature relating to research with young people, that 16 and 17 year olds are at a suitable age to give voluntary informed consent.

(2) Anonymity in research about illicit activity

Research which brings the researcher into actual or possible contact with those engaged in illegal activities can present a number of specific ethical considerations. The major issue is that of access to information collected in the course of research. Data collected by researchers on illegal behaviour, including illicit drug use, do not have legally protected status to protect them from either, a search of premises by police officers or a court order to provide information and data. This raises issues in relation to the welfare of both research participants and researchers: information about illegal behaviours obtained by researchers may incriminate research participants, resulting in direct harm as result of their participation in research; researchers who fail to disclose information when called upon by a court face the possibility of punishment for contempt. Of course, these concerns must be placed in context. The literature advises that the likelihood of authorities seeking access to research material is

relatively small. There is no indication, for example, that police are likely to regard research data as a significant source for investigative purposes and the occasions when this may occur are likely to involve very serious matters e.g. the death of a participant. Nevertheless, the proposed study will take these concerns seriously by (i) making participants aware of the limits of anonymity; (ii) recording their verbal rather than their written consent; and (iii) anonymising all interview data on transcription.

(3) Ethical obligations to breach confidentiality

In the case of criminal acts or life-threatening circumstances there can be an obligation (legal or otherwise) to inform the authorities that over-rides the ethical requirement of confidentiality. For example, researchers may become aware of a participant's need for help or support with serious mental health problems or an imminent risk of harm. Given that the current study focuses predominantly on participants' historical experiences of street-orientated activity; I do not consider this to pose a significant risk within the current study. Nevertheless the consent materials will explain to participants that if they tell the researcher something that gives cause for concern and raises the need for a breach of confidentiality, the researcher has a duty to act, but will talk with the participant first about what to do.

APPENDIX C:**Plain Language Statement/Participant Information Sheet**

Study Title and Researcher Details MRes Criminology Dissertation Research: Sexed Bodies, Heterosexuality and Glasgow, Street Orientated Youth Gangs

Invitation paragraph

Hi! I'm Scott Lafferty and I am a postgraduate student at the University of Glasgow, Glasgow, G12 8QQ; and currently doing my Master Research (MRes) in Criminology.

'You are being invited to take part in a research study. Before you decide if you want to take part it is important for you to understand why the research is being done and what it will involve. Please take time to read the following information carefully. If there is anything that is not clear to you or if you would like more information feel free to ask me questions. Please take time to decide whether or not you wish to take part. Thank you for reading this!'

What is the purpose of the study?

This study hopes to engage between 8 and 12 young people or young adults aged 16 to 30 years old from Castlemilk and Drumchapel in interviews to explore and understand their lived experience of spending time hanging about the streets in their local community. Interviews will centre on leisure, in particular involvement in street-orientated activities,

which may include ‘gang’ activities. Participants will also be asked to explore their values, opinions and experiences related to sexuality and/or gender identity, and relationships and interactions with friends and peers.

Why have I been chosen?

You have been chosen to take part in this study because either you, a peer or an adult such as a youth worker has identified you to the researcher as a potential participant for this study that is aged 16 to 30, lives in Castlemilk or Drumchapel and has first-hand experience of spending – currently or in the past - either parts of or all of your leisure time hanging about the streets in your community. In the event you have been identified by someone else please read the next section of this information sheet.

Do I have to take part?

In short, No! You don’t have to take part in the study that you do not want to. It is your decision if you want to take part. You are under no pressure at all to participate. If you decide freely to take part, and later decide that you don’t want to participate anymore at any time, that’s entirely your right and perfectly acceptable and will be fully respected by the researcher. You don’t have to explain why and you will not be pressurised to change your mind.

What will happen to me if I take part?

After reading this you will be provided 24 hours to consider whether or not you want to take part in the study. After the 24 hour window, if you decide you want to take part in the study you will be asked to take part in a one-to-one interview with me, the researcher. The interview will take place in a mutually safe space such as a youth centre, café, community centre, or sport centre at an agreed appropriate time for you and me between 10am and 9pm. If easier and possible we will look to carry out our interview in a room in a nearby youth work centre/club at a time that suits us both.

The interview should last approximately 90 minutes and during this time we will have the opportunity to explore a range of topics and themes that may be related to your life and personal opinions. You can contribute as much or as little as you like. Before the interview you will be given a ‘support agency information sheet’ so that you can, before or after, the interview contact any of the agencies to seek advice or support due to any thoughts or emotions that may arise due to your participation in this study. At the start of the interview your verbal voluntary informed consent will be sought and audio-recorded to show that you have understood the purpose of this study. Our interview will also be audio-recorded by Dictaphone. At the end of the interview you will be asked to complete a nameless short evaluation form too – you don’t have to complete this if you do not wish too.

Participating in this study is voluntary and therefore no-one will be paid for taking part. Equally no-one will be repaid for travel expenses from their home to the place of where we have our interview for this study.

Will my taking part in this study be kept confidential?

The information that you give will be coded so that names and places as best as possible cannot be identified i.e. no-one will know that it was you, who personally gave a certain piece of information or opinion. In the case of criminal acts or life-threatening circumstances there can be an obligation (legal or otherwise) to inform the authorities that over-rides confidentiality e.g. if someone is in current risk of harm or danger. Therefore if you tell me something that gives cause for concern and raises the need for a breach of confidentiality, the researcher has a duty to act, but will talk this through with you first about what to do.

What will happen to the results of the research study?

If young people agree, we will audio record the interviews. All recordings and notes will be stored securely and only the researcher will have access to the information young people provide. They will not be given to anyone else. The only circumstances where any information that young people provide would be passed on is if they disclose that they or someone else is at risk of harm. I would discuss this with the participant first.

I expect the research to be completed by September 2015 and at the end of the study, for the results to be written up and submit in the form of my dissertation to the University of Glasgow. What participants tell the researcher may be referred to in this dissertation, but it will be written in a way that tries to make sure that no one knows who said it. In terms of feedback about the study, if you require or want a written summary of the research results this can be made on request.

Who has reviewed the study?

This study has obtained ethical approval by the School of Social and Political Science Ethics Committee on: 2nd June 2015

Contact for Further Information

If you have any concerns regarding the conduct of this research project, you can contact the College of Social Sciences Ethics Officer Dr Muir Houston, email: Muir.Houston@glasgow.ac.uk

Alternatively if you have any questions or concerns regarding this research project you can also contact my Dissertation Supervisor, Dr Susan Batchelor, via email: susan.batchelor@glasgow.ac.uk or telephone: +44 (0)141-330 6167.