Durham E-Theses

Boys will be boys, or will they? A study of youth offending team practitioners' constructions of masculinity of the young men with whom they work

BAUMGARTNER, ERIC,CHRISTIAN,GUNTER

Boys will be boys, or will they? A study of youth offending team practitioners' constructions of masculinity of the young men with whom they work

Eric C. G. Baumgartner CELTA, BA (Hons), MA
School of Applied Social Sciences
Durham University (2013)

A thesis submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Declaration

I declare that this is my own work and has not been submitted for the award of a higher degree anywhere else.

Statement of Copyright

Eric Christian Gunter Baumgartner CELTA, BA (Hons), MA

Van Mildert College

School of Applied Social Sciences

Durham University

Eric C. G. Baumgartner, School of Applied Social Sciences, Durham University

(2013):

Boys will be boys, or will they? A study of youth offending team practitioners'
constructions of masculinity of the young men with whom they work

Abstract

This doctoral thesis explores the relevance of concepts of masculinity in youth justice practice, the assessment of and the intervention work with young men who have been identified as having offended. It explores the ways in which practitioners at a Youth Offending Team in England construct the masculinity of the men with whom they work, the role criminal behaviour plays in those constructions, and what relevance practitioners in this setting attribute to ideas around masculinity in the work with young men in the Youth Justice System. Using a qualitative multi-method approach, the thesis employs documentary analysis of a total of 278 Assets and 3528 case diary entries, 12 interviews with Senior Practitioners, Case Workers, Intervention Supervision and Surveillance staff, and a focus group with members of staff who provide sessional support. The analysis of the data is informed by key sociological theorists such as Goffman and Bourdieu, engages with Butler's notion of performativity, and uses Connell's framework of hegemonic masculinity to explore YOT practitioners' constructions of masculinity. This thesis highlights how practitioners' explanations of offending behaviour in young men are deeply embedded in the ways they construct the young men's masculinity as homogeneous gender identity with discrete behavioural characteristics, understood as learned from families and performed with and policed by peers. A disjuncture is identified between underlying assumptions of offending behaviour, the masculinisation of risk in youth justice, and the central position ideas of masculinity play in how YOT practitioners explain offending behaviour, yet the complete lack of explicit gender-targeted assessment and intervention. Recommendations and implications for practice are debated.

Our heads are round, so our thinking can change direction.

(Francis Picabia)

Sic vos non vobis:

Thus do ye, Not for yourselves.

(Van Mildert College, Durham University)

Table of Contents

Part I

Chapter 1: Introduction

Introduction

Chapter one of this thesis introduces the background to and the starting point of this study. It will articulate its aims and objectives and clarify frequently used terms in this thesis. Chapter one concludes by explaining the structure of the thesis.

1.1 The Background

Youth justice policy in England and Wales has undergone radical reforms since the election of New Labour to government in 1997. Youth Crime had been appointed a central topic in the election campaign of New Labour. As part of this campaign, New Labour published its 'Tough on crime, tough on the causes of crime' booklet which underlined the motto of its election campaign (Alun, 1997). Stern election rhetoric in relation to crime, particularly youth crime, was backed up by the *Misspent Youth* reports of 1996 and 1998 (Audit Commission, 1996; 1998), which highlighted the over-spending and ineffectiveness of the Youth Justice System (YJS) under the Conservative government. Soon after their election victory in 1997, New Labour acted on their promise by introducing, and then passing the 1998 Crime and Disorder Act (Home Office, 1998: 33), which set out to reform the YJS. Central to this new approach in tackling youth crime was the establishment of the Youth Justice Board (YJB), a non-departmental body appointed by the Home Secretary, thus answering to the Home Office and situated within the Criminal Justice sector. Since 2007 the YJB has been under the jurisdiction of the newly created Ministry of Justice, which has attracted criticisms as to the ideological stand of the YJB (Allen, 2006). Indeed, Smith (2009; 2011a; 2011b) has argued that the changes introduced to youth justice by New Labour are not particularly radical, but simply signify a swing of the welfare-justice pendulum at the centre of youth justice in England and Wales. In summary, the core objectives of the YJB are to:

1. Prevent offending by children and young people so that fewer are criminalised.

2. Ensure that, when young people do offend, the manner and degree of intervention are appropriate to their welfare needs and/or their risk of re-offending or causing harm.

3. Ensure that children dealt with in the youth justice system, no matter what they have done, are treated equally and with respect (Goldson: 2008, 383).

At the centre of the YJB-led strategy was the creation of Youth Offending Teams (YOTs), which would coordinate a multi-agency response to youth offending (Goldson: 2008). They would assist in creating a more effective, systematic and consistent approach to combatting youth crime, with the underlying assumption that targeted intervention is more beneficial in promoting positive outcomes for children and young people. At the heart of this was the intention to combine the previously 'scattered' services (Fionda, 2005) for children and young adults to prevent offending and re-offending, and to circumvent the tension between welfare and justice approaches of previously disjointed services in youth justice (Graham and Moore, 2006).

These YOTs provide multi-agency services and as such draw together a number of professionals from diverse backgrounds. Dugmore (2006b) summarises that each YOT consists of at least: one social worker, one police officer, one probation officer, a nominated person from the health authority and another from the education department. The professional roles of staff at these YOTs consist of:

• The assessment of young people for rehabilitation programmes after reprimands/final warnings.
• The provision of support for young people remanded in custody or bailed.
• The placing in local authority accommodation when remanded.
• The composing of court reports and assessments.
• The allocation of referral orders.
• The supervision of young people subject to community sentences.
• The supervision of young people sentenced to custody (Dugmore, 2006b; Goldson, 2008).

While Goldson (2008) comments on the ambiguity of the position of YOT's within the wider YJS, YOTs have been identified as one of the prime vehicles for delivering 'the prevention of offending by children and young people as the principal aim of the youth justice system' (Goldson, 2008: 388). Although Smith (2007; 2011a) and others are highly critical of the roles and functions of YOTs, YOTs are central to the YJB's strategy of combatting crime and preventing re-offending of young people in England and Wales (Goldson, 2008). Consequently, every young person who has been detected as having committed a crime will be in contact with his or her local YOT.

Although a re-evaluation of the new YJS has commended improvements in services since the establishment of the YJB (Audit Commission, 2004), criticisms remain on a lack of clear ideology in relation to youth crime and sanctioning (Fionda, 2005; Rogowski, 2010), and the effectiveness of New Labour policies to combat youth crime have been under attack (Pitts, 2001; Solomon and Garside, 2008) throughout the YJS. At the centre of these criticisms is the identification of risk factors for offending in young people and the resulting creation of a target group for intervention and prevention (Garside, 2009; Phoenix, 2009; Smith, 2011a; 2011b), and hence the criminalisation of young people, which has been discussed widely elsewhere (Creany, 2013; Garside, 2009; Pitts, 2001; Robins et al., 2008).

The dominant group emerging from this focus on risk factors and offending behaviour consists of young men: young males are responsible for 79% of offences committed by young people, with 57% of offences being committed by 15-17 year old boys (Youth Justice Board, 2009b). The majority of those offences are theft and handling of stolen goods, violence against the person, criminal damage and motoring offences (Youth Justice Board, 2009b). Of the young people in the YJS during 2011/12, 80% were male (Youth Justice Board, 2012). Despite this particular cohort dominating youth justice services, recent youth justice policy has not made any attempts to explore further what makes white male youth the single biggest group in the YJS. Instead, policy has focused on the increased number of girls entering the YJS (Youth Justice Board, 2009a). In terms of offences committed, males are

disproportinately involved in sex crimes, drug offences, crimes against a person or property, and criminal damage (Ashford et al., 1997; Youth Justice Board, 2005b; Youth Justice Board, 2009b; Youth Justice Board, 2012).

Numerous authors observe the difference in how criminal activity is viewed, and dealt with, in relation to the gender of the individual who has committed the crime and in the Criminal Justice System as a whole (Gelsthorpe, 2004; Steffensmeier and Schwartz, 2009; Warren, 1981). In relation to prosecuting crime, several authors have pointed out that, while *the gender gap* (Steffensmeier and Schwartz, 2009) is narrowing, delinquent boys and girls are still treated differently by the criminal and thes youth justice system (Feilzer and Hood, 2004; Gelsthorpe, 2004). Gelsthorpe and Sharp (2006) argue that a key feature of the Criminal Justice System's response to crime is to regulate acceptable gender-role behaviour. Thus girls may be subject to *double jeopardy* prosecution (Ashford et al., 1997; Heidensohn, 2002), which, beyond the offence itself, also sanctions the 'social crime of contravening normative expectations of appropriate female conduct' (Ashford et al., 1997). As such, girls' criminal offending behaviour is understood through concepts of appropriate and inappropriate gendered behaviour, and potential prosecution and sanction consequently aim to address their 'assumed inadequate socialisation, rather than straightforward misbehaviour' (Gelsthorpe and Sharpe, 2006). This applies in particular to offences which are inherently considered male crimes, such as violent offences, and for which girls and women have traditionally been prosecuted much more sternly than their male counterparts. This indicates that female offending behaviour is viewed in the context of deviation from what is considered acceptable behaviour for a woman. Recent research projects commissioned by the YJS into the perceived increase in female offending (Youth Justice Board, 2009a) further highlight this tendency to understand crimes committed by females through the gender lens. However, there remains a lack of gender-focused inquiry into offences committed by the vast majority of service users in the YJS: young men (Messerschmidt, 1993).

This lack of inquiry into the role that masculinity may play in offending behaviour in the YJS remains in spite of the implicit identification of 'being male' as a risk factor in

offending (Youth Justice Board, 2005a), and academic literature exploring the potential relationship between ideas and practices of masculinity and masculinities, and criminal behaviour (Collier, 1998; Hobbs, 1994; Messerschmidt, 1993; 2000; 2010; 2012a; 2012b; Mullins, 2006; Newburn and Stanko, 1994; Winlow, 2002).

1.2 The Starting Point, Aims and Objectives

Dominelli argues that 'current constructions of juvenile crime neglect issues of masculinity [...] yet, gendered perspectives are evident throughout the juvenile justice system' (Dominelli, 2002b: 156). She presses for the inclusion of ideas around masculinity in the work with men and young men who have been identified as having offended. Several authors discuss the role of ideas around masculinity in wider social work (Featherstone et al., 2007; Pringle, 1995; Ruxton, 2009; Scourfield, 2003; 2001; 2002), and probation practice in particular (Buckley, 1996; Burnham et al., 1990; Cowburn, 2005; 2010; Cowburn and Dominelli, 2001; Dominelli, 1992; Johnstone, 2001; Scourfield, 1998; Taylor, 2003; Wright and Cowburn, 2011). At the centre of these discussions is not only the role masculinity plays in relation to how social work practitioners construct their clients (Cowburn, 2005; Cowburn and Dominelli, 2001; Scourfield, 2003; 2001), and how social workers could potentially challenge or reinforce a particular type of masculinity (Dominelli, 2002a; Pringle, 1995; Wright and Cowburn, 2011), but also the acknowledgement that an integration of ideas of masculinity in practice can assist in developing male-friendly approaches in their work with men and young men (Featherstone et al., 2007; Good and Brooks, 2005; Ruxton, 2009).

This literature, the lack of discussion of masculinity in youth justice and my own personal history of having received social welfare services as a young man are the starting points of this thesis. In particular, Dominelli (1992; 2002a; 2002b) and Cowburn (2005; 2010; Cowburn and Dominelli, 2001) emphasise the role of social workers in criminal justice and probation practice, and Pickford and Dugmore (2012) highlight the place of social workers in youth justice practice. Hence, the focus of this study is on YOT practitioners and its prime aim is to put masculinity 'on the map'

(Dominelli, 2002b: 8) of youth justice practice. Having highlighted the centrality of YOTs in youth justice, this thesis concentrates on YOT practitioners in one particular YOT in England with the following research objectives:

1. To investigate, describe and analyse the ways in which YOT practitioners make sense of the masculinities of the young men and boys in the youth justice system.

2. To consider, describe and analyse what, if any, role criminal behaviour plays in the way YOT practitioners understand the masculinities of young men and boys in the youth justice system.

3. To explore, describe and analyse what, if any, relevance is given to issues of masculinities in relation to the YOT practitioners' work with young men and boys in the youth justice system.

1.3 Definition of Terms

Youth justice practice and policy are highly politicised topics as indicated by much of the literature cited above (Garside, 2009; Pitts, 2001; Smith, 2007; 2011a; 2011b; Solomon and Garside, 2008). Equally, wider social work practice and youth justice practice with social workers at its centre are very complex areas of inquiry. It is, of course, not the intention of this thesis to downplay the political elements in youth justice policy and practice, nor to deny the complexity of social work practice and policy. However, the main objective of this thesis is to make the potential role of ideas around masculinity visible in the context of staff working at a YOT. This is to say that, while these complexities are acknowledged, the focus of this thesis and its inquiry is on the issue of masculinity in youth justice practice at this particular YOT. As such, it is important to define clearly some terms which are used frequently in this thesis.

YOT Practitioners and Youth Justice Practice

The term 'YOT practitioners' is used in this thesis to refer to members of staff directly working directly with young people at this YOT. This includes case workers, sessional

workers (for specific interventions as explained in more detail in chapter four), and members of the Intensive Supervision and Surveillance (ISS) team, but excludes all administration staff. While a brief profile delivered in chapter four will touch on their various backgrounds and training, all these members of staff engage in direct prevention and intervention work with young people within one or more functions of YOTs as identified above. This is to say that 'youth justice practice' is referred to as the practice engaged in by these members of staff and, for the purpose of this thesis, largely excludes practice engaged in with young people in contact with other services in the YJS, such as Young Offender Institutions (YOIs), Secure Training Centres (STCs) and so forth. The concentration is on YOTs as the prime vehicle for the delivery of the aims of the YJB as defined above, and an inclusion of the practices utilised in YOIs and STCs, where staff may have very different roles and training, would be a very different study indeed.

Youth Justice System

The term 'Youth Justice System' is used in the context of this thesis to refer to the collective services provided to young people under the umbrella term 'Youth Justice Services', promoting the aims of the YJB cited above, and coordinated by the YJB. This is not to undermine the complexity and potential contradictions across these services, nor to suggest that all services under this term share a clear and coherent ideology (Fionda, 2005; Smith, 2006; Solomon and Garside, 2008).

Youth Justice Services

The term 'Youth Justice Services' describes services delivered by YOTs to young people who have been identified as having committed an offence.

Youth Justice Board

'Youth Justice Board' (YJB) is the central governing body responsible for the provision and coordination of youth justice services (Goldson, 2008: 382). The YJB it oversees the youth justice system in England and Wales and works to prevent offending and reoffending by children and young people under the age of 18. It is responsible for ensuring that custody is safe, secure, and addresses the causes of their offending

behaviour.

1.4 The Structure of the Thesis

This thesis is divided into three main parts. Part one puts this study into context and summarises the dominant narrative on masculinity and offending as told by the academic literature in chapter two. Chapter three explores the underlying assumptions of this narrative in the wider sociological literature. While this literature may derive from different paradigms, the focus is on how it makes sense of gender and distinct gendered behaviour with particular reference to masculinity as emerging in chapter two. Chapter three concludes by refining research questions for this study.

Part two sets this study into the context of the research methods employed, describes the underlying methodology and explains how the data for this study was collected, stored and processed. It also gives consideration to the role of the gatekeeper and questions of ethics, confidentiality and informed consent. Chapter four concludes with a short profile of the sample of young men whose documents were used for this study. Chapters five, six and seven present the findings of this study, whereby the literature in chapter three informs the analysis of findings in order to explore underlying assumptions and implicit issues in youth justice practitioners' construction of masculinity and masculinity and offending behaviour.

Lastly, part three of this thesis discusses the findings of this study (chapter eight) by stressing the wider implications of the ways in which practitioners construct the masculinity of the young men with whom they work, and allowing room for reflections. Chapter nine concludes this thesis by returning to its research objectives, aims and questions, and discussing masculinity in the context of social work, then by offering recommendations and some closing remarks.

Part I

Chapter 2: Masculinity, and Masculinity and Crime

Introduction

Chapter two of this thesis is concerned with the way in which masculinities and masculinities and criminal behaviour are made sense of in most of the academic literature. It first considers recent research and the theorising of men and masculinities in the context of working with men, specifically in social work settings. Further, attention is paid to how men and masculinities are understood in the majority of relevant academic writings on men, masculinities and crime. This chapter explores the concept of hegemonic masculinity as an example of how masculinities can be theorised, and sets the discussion of men and masculinities in the context of crime by considering the importance of class. Connections made in the academic literature between male offending, aggression and violence are investigated, with particular focus on the experience of violence and the role of fathers. Chapter two concludes by discussing the ways in which masculinities and crime are made sense of in regard to youth justice practice by concentrating on the role of assessment of young people and the idea of risk.

2.1 Social Work Practice and Masculinity

Early calls for the need to expose existing notions of masculinity in social work (Bowl, 1987) and the need for a gender-focus in social work practice in criminal justice settings (Buckley, 1996; Dominelli, 1992; Scourfield, 1998; Taylor, 2003) have not yet been translated into the context of youth justice practice. One example of recent academic research into issues around gender and masculinity is the project 'Beyond male role models' (Robb, 2013) which explores the relationship between young men and boys and social work in social welfare settings. Other scholars have researched and theorised the potential role of masculinity in the work with sex-offenders and domestic violence (Cowburn, 2005; 2010; Cowburn and Dominelli, 2001; Wright and Cowburn, 2011), and the role of gender in child protection work (Scourfield, 2003; 2001) which has highlighted the importance of the role of social workers and their constructions of masculinities. However, explicit work on the construction of

masculinities by youth justice practitioners in general, and YOT practitioners in particular are absent from the academic literature and research.

The lack of reflection on ideas around masculinities is particularly striking when considering the different and diverse dimensions to working with predominantly young men who engage with youth justice services, ranging from the assessment of risk of reoffending, intervention work around substance use, mental and physical health to anger management and educational intervention. Evidence from across the research spectrum on men and masculinities suggest that working with men necessitates an inclusion of ideas around and concepts of masculinity (Buckley, 1996; Cowburn and Dominelli, 2001; Dominelli, 1992; 2002a; 2002b; Harvey, 2007; Reich, 2010; Wexler, 2009), and such research could inform the work with young men in the context of youth justice practice. This research considers the role of masculinity specifically in relation to issues around physical and mental health (Featherstone et al., 2007; Galdas et al., 2005; Hearn and Kolga, 2006; Ruxton, 2009; White et al., 2011), substance use and alcohol consumption (Featherstone et al., 2007; Ruxton, 2009), masculinity and the relevance of role models (Robb, 2013), masculinity and fatherhood (Featherstone, 2009; Furstenberg and Weiss, 2000; Lamb, 2000; Lupton and Barclay, 1997; Marsiglio and Cohan, 2000; Parke, 2000), and of course masculinity and violence (Heiliger and Engelfried, 1995; Hester et al., 2007; Katz et al., 2001; Mills, 2001). Indeed, Ruxton (2009) underlines the importance of the integration of boy- and man-friendly approaches in areas such as education and health, and thereby echoes wider literature on the differences in how men and boys access, for example, health services and education, and their specific needs and issues (Alloway and Gilbert, 2010; Galdas et al., 2005; Hearn and Kolga, 2006; Martino and Berrill, 2003; Weaver- Hightower, 2004; White et al., 2011).

While research on masculinities on a European and indeed global level (Critical Research on Men in Europe, 2005; Pease and Pringle, 2001; Pringle and Pease, 2001) emphasises both the commonalities and 'the extraordinary diversity in men's practices' (Pringle and Pease, 2001: 247), the way in which masculinities are conceptualised in research advocating an inclusion of issues around masculinities

and male friendly approaches is with a focus on their commonalities. This is to say that masculinities are reduced to the practices men are assumed to share rather than their diversity, which is captured by the use of the term 'masculinity' rather than masculinities in much of this research. Issues with essentialist understandings of masculinity as not only a distinguishable category from femininity but also with the underlying assumption of male practices shared by all men, and the inherent neglect of heterogeneity amongst men, run through this thesis and are discussed in relevance to their occurrence.

This research implies that working practices with men as individuals and in groups necessitate the inclusion of considerations of masculinity (Dominelli, 2002b; Featherstone et al., 2007; Good and Brooks, 2005). However, the explicit discussion of issues around masculinity in the context of social work appears predominantly in relation to either the wider frame of anti-oppressive and antisexist practice (Dominelli, 2002a; Morgan, 1992; Pringle, 1995) or in conjunction with male social work practitioners (Cavanagh and Cree, 1996; Christie, 2001), rather than focusing on an integration of male friendly approaches and issues around masculinities of those receiving social work and welfare services.

However, some authors have discussed the potential effects of the absence of male friendly approaches or an explicit focus on (male) gendered dimensions in social policy and social work practice (Cowburn, 2005; 2010; Cowburn and Dominelli, 2001; Dominelli, 2002b; Hearn, 2010; Wright and Cowburn, 2011). Hearn (2010) argues that the absence of men and boys from the discussion on social policy itself is part of gendering men as men, and Wright and Cowburn (2011) point out how the absence of discussions of masculinity can have the effect of reinforcing negative masculinities in the work with men. Scourfield (2002) highlights the ways in which policies implicitly target men and boys as causes of social problems and the need for intervention. This is particularly relevant to the arena of crime and criminal justice policies and the criminalisation of young people (Armitage, 2012; Dominelli, 2002b; Pitts, 2001), whereby specific behaviours are associated with offending, and, as discussed in relation to risk below, implicitly linked to issues around masculinity with

a focus on shared practices of men. This means that while current constructions of youth offending neglect the explicit problematisation of issues around masculinity, 'gendered perspectives are evident throughout the juvenile justice system' (Dominelli, 2002b: 156). Consequently, if young men who have been identified as having offended are to reform, and their offending behaviour is implicitly linked to their shared practices of masculinity, then these practices of masculinity need to be addressed and problematised (Dominelli, 2002b). The question then is, what does that mean in regard to the work of practitioners in youth justice services and wider social work practice?

Cowburn points out, on the example of male sex offenders, how 'constructions of the male [sex] offender conceal wider issues pertaining to the hegemony of men' (Cowburn, 2005: 215) and how, effectively, the use of risk assessment tools in work with male offenders is inadequate if they do not include the 'unmasking [of the role] masculinity plays in perpetrating [sexual] violence [...]' (Cowburn and Dominelli, 2001: 414). This absence of consideration of the role of masculinity in youth justice practice is particularly surprising not only because of the fact that most young people in the YJS are boys and men, but also because specific categories within the assessment framework can clearly be linked to concepts of masculinity, and masculinity and offending (as will be explored in the course of this thesis).

So, what is the role attributed to social workers in relation to 'gendered practices'? Wright and Cowburn (2011), and Scourfield (2003; 2001; 2002) have highlighted the dynamic processes in the work of social workers and male service users, while Smith (2011a), Phoenix (2009) and Baker (2005) make the role of practitioners visible in the specific setting of youth justice. Scourfield (2003) argues that 'social workers' constructions of clients are to a large extent limited by the discourses of their workplace' (Scourfield, 2003: 34) and stresses that both 'formal and informal occupational knowledge' (Scourfield, 2003: 31) needs to be considered when analysing social workers' practices. He emphasises how 'occupational discourse' (Scourfield, 2003: 31), 'organisational limits' (Scourfield, 2003: 33), the responding to 'material reality' and men's actual 'bodily practices' (Scourfield, 2003: 88) restrict the

knowledge which can be produced on men as clients. In other words, the specific policy context, the function and role of practitioners, and organisation-specific practices all shape the ways in which social workers and youth justice practitioners work with young men and boys. In relation to youth justice, and as highlighted above, the 'occupational discourse' here can largely be understood around the language of risk as Smith (2011a) and Phoenix (2009) have pointed out. While Phoenix (2009) and Baker (2005) stress the importance of practitioners in youth justice in making sense of young people's law-breaking and their consequent assessment, Scourfield (2003; 2002) highlights the tensions between social work ethics in relation to treating clients as individuals and allowing for structural gendered explanations of behaviours:

> How can social workers incorporate an understanding of social inequality alongside an individualised service that treats each client as unique? Most interpretations of inequality point to the profound effects of this inequality on social identities. If social workers accept that there are social trends in men's and women's behaviour resulting from the different opportunities given to each sex, and that informs their practice, how do they also then treat each client as individual? (Scourfield, 2003: 135)

In other words, youth justice practitioners and social workers need to incorporate a range of skills into their work with young men, acknowledging a gendered dimension to their behaviour, and 'making the links between personal and structural conditions that impact on their behaviour', while not treating all male offenders as an 'undifferentiated mass' (Dominelli, 2002b: 159).

This idea of men and young men who receive social work and welfare services as a homogeneous group spans through the literature on men and social work. Morgan (1992) and Pringle (1995) identify key issues in their work , which also run through this thesis; namely, issues around essentialist understandings of masculinity and in relation to understanding masculinity simply in terms of patriarchal structure and isolation in relation to women (Morgan, 1992; Pringle, 1995). Attempting to

overcome issues around essentialists notions of masculinity, Morgan suggests the recognition of diversity amongst men's practices while also acknowledging the common themes. In addition, Morgan (1992) and Pringle (1995) problematise the production of knowledge of men and masculinity by men in sociology and social work practice as it too is embedded in wider patriarchal structures, but see the 'insider knowledge' (Morgan, 1992: 191) of men researching and reflecting on men and masculinity as central advantage. While Pringle (1995) stresses that 'the oppressive power relations that structure our society also tend to structure the system of social welfare that operates within the terms of that society' (Pringle, 1995: 206), his focus is on the collaboration between male service users and service providers, in the wider frame of anti oppressive practice, to challenge dominant views, understandings and practices in relation to violent masculinity. Equally, Morgan notes that 'sociology does not simply reflect, unconsciously or consciously, wider practices, it also contributes to their production' (Morgan, 1992: 164). While Cowburn (2001) illustrates the construction of masculinity by practitioners using the example of sex offenders, Scourfield (2003) suggests the possible construction of multiple masculinities in social work practice within the restrictions of specific occupational discourses.

Building on this literature, the construction of masculinities by practitioners in youth justice could be understood as restricted by work practices, the occupational discourse (Scourfield, 2003), and risk-focused terminology (Phoenix, 2009; Smith, 2011a), and also influenced by practitioners' own sense making (Phoenix, 2009) and their professional discretion (Baker, 2005).

Chapter one highlights the centrality of YOTs in youth justice practice, and one particular YOT has been chosen for the purpose of this study (explained in detail in chapter four). So if practitioners in this particular setting are understood as operating within the parameters of wider society (Pringle, 1995), and indeed discourses on gender and offending, and their practice is a reflection of wider practices in relation to masculinity and masculinities, what does it mean when considering the ideas through which YOT practitioners construct the masculinities of the young men and

boys with whom they work? Further, how does the academic literature make sense of masculinities and offending?

2.2 Young Men and Offending- Essentially Speaking

Collier (1998) argues that dominant debates on masculinities and offending revolve around a particular kind of masculinity: the masculinity of young men. Central are characteristics associated with young men such as 'dangerous' and 'wild', being indicative of a specific period in their lives, when young men and their offending behaviour are dominantly understood through negative connotations associated with one specific form of masculinity, and the bodies of young men are criminalised through signifiers of this specific masculinity (Collier, 1998). Focus within the group of young men lies on social class (Canaan, 1996; Clark, 1995; Robins et al., 2008; White and Cunneen, 2006) and offending behaviour is associated with young and white working class masculinity, whereby committing crime becomes 'doing masculinity' (Hobbs, 1994; Newburn and Stanko, 1994; Webster, 2008; Winlow, 2002). Social class, more specifically working class, is associated with aggression, denying room for multiple forms of working-class masculinities (Roberts, 2013). This reflects an understanding of young men who have offended not only as an essentialist category (Messerschmidt, 1993), whereby 'utterly passive subjects [are] subordinated to the shaping influence of either nature or culture' (Fuss, 1990: 6), but also does not attribute any form of critical social agency to individuals. Agency here is defined as: the ability to reflect on and act independently of constraints of social structure and importance given to human intention, which 'places the individual at the centre of any analysis and raises issues of moral choice […]' (Jary and Jary, 2005: 9).

Such an understanding of young men who have offended is accompanied by a number of issues in the context of this thesis. Firstly, without the acknowledgement of critical social agency, and an understanding of crime as the direct result of socio-economic and structural inequalities, any crime intervention on the level of the individual agents and reliance on their ability to reform would necessarily have to be

understood as ineffective (Smith, 2009). If young men are not acknowledged to have the agency to desist from committing crime, then surely they cannot be understood as having the capacity to change. Indeed, Greener (2002) stresses the profound implications of particular understandings of agency in social policy and states that 'the underlying assumptions that policy makers hold about social agency are crucial for the effectiveness of policy' (Greener, 2002: 703), hence they are critical to the work of practitioners in translating and implementing these policies. In the specific context of youth justice, Smith (2009) argues that ideas around agency are absent from youth justice, but that the acknowledgement of agency of children in the youth justice system can be central to the design of interventions around offending behaviour. Secondly, and more importantly at this point, such an understanding portrays a singular image of homogeneous masculinity rather than acknowledging the plurality of masculinities (Collier, 1998; Messerschmidt, 1993; Pringle and Pease, 2001), and specific behavioural characteristics are attributed to masculinity and masculinity and offending without the acknowledgement that, while most detected crime is committed by men, most men do not commit crime (Hood-Williams, 2001), and indeed the differences in crimes committed by men (Messerschmidt, 1993). Young men who have committed crime are *subjectified* (Foucault, 1992) with a particular focus on a specific period of their lives (Carlsson, 2013), at a specific time and space (Messerschmidt, 1993), and masculinity is identified not only without consideration of intersectionality (Aboim, 2010; Brod and Kaufman, 1994; Collier, 1998; Dominelli, 2002b) but within a clear binary of essentialist understandings of 'men' and 'women' as static subject positions (Foucault, 1992; Gadd and Jefferson, 2007).

Pringle and Pease (2001) underline the commonalities and yet the extraordinary variety in men's practices around the world, and Coles (2007) stresses the importance of age, the associated access to resources and thereby a number of possible or impossible masculinities to be performed throughout the life course. The sense of complexity around specific practices of masculinities and the access to different masculinities throughout a man's life are mainly absent from the discussion of masculinity in the context of crime, and gender identity 'as one identity category is

instead treated as dominant' (Crenshaw, 1991: 1253). This absence stretches beyond the 'width of masculinities' into 'the depths of masculinities' and the intersectionality between masculinities, gender, sexualities and ethnicities. While social class does play some part in how both masculinity and criminal behaviour are theorised (as discussed in the next section of this chapter), issues around the intersectionalities between sexualities, ethnicities and wider considerations of gender are marginalised through their absence from the dominant discourse on masculinity and crime. Although Messerschmidt (2012) hints at the intersectionality between gender, heterosexuality and violence and numerous authors have written on the apparent importance of ethnicity in the analysis of crime and criminal behaviour (Pitts, 2008; Richardson, 2007; Webster, 2008; Youth Justice Board, 2010), ethnicity, as one example, is rather understood as an additive than comprehended as a constitutive part of a number of intersecting social factors.

Yuval-Davis (2006) stresses how an intersectional approach aims to analyse the different dimensions to disempowerment of marginalised groups to 'capture the consequences of the interaction between two or more forms of subordination' (Yuval-Davis, 2006: 197) and in order to explore both the way in which these different forms of power and suppression interact in relation to the management of identities and the full diversity of the individuals 'gendered' experience and performance (Weston, 2011). While Coles (2007) has touched on issues around access to resources and its link to possible masculinities in relation to age, and of course desistance from crime and criminal behaviour, literature on the interplay of masculinities, sexualities, social class and ethnicity is mainly absent from the dominant discourse on crime and masculinities. Despite the methodological and theoretical issues with intersectionality approaches (Walby, Armstrong and Strid, 2012; McDermott, 2011), such an approach in the study of men, masculinities and crime could assist in exploring 'how historically specific kinds of power differentials and/or constraining normativities, based on discursively, institutionally and/or structurally constructed socio-cultural categorisations such as gender, ethnicity, race, class, sexuality, age/generation, dis/ability, nationality, mother tongue, and so on,

interact, and in so doing produce different kinds of societal inequalities and unjust social relations' (Lykke, 2010: 50).

An intersectionality approach to the investigation of men, masculinities and crime could explore more clearly the interplay and interaction between different social dimensions of masculinities in relation to criminal behaviour. Such an approach could address questions of how exactly local identity, sexuality, class, ethnicity play into issues around masculinities and criminal behaviour, and investigate how the interplay of those different social dimensions foster particular types of masculinities and how these types of masculinities promote or discourage criminal behaviour of individual men. This would add plurality to the study of men, masculinities and crime and assist to deconstruct the inherent essentialism in the study of men, masculinities and crime.

However, the ways in which masculinity (rather than masculinities) is theorised in relation to crime bears a strong notion of young men and boys in the youth justice system as an 'undifferentiated mass' (Dominelli, 2002b: 159), whereby the focus is on their claimed commonalities as men with specific characteristics attributed to them and linked to their past and potential future offending behaviour, and without notions of complexity or intersectionality beyond the importance attributed to social class. What emerges is an essentialist understanding of masculinity in relation to masculinity and crime. So, what do studies on men and masculinities offer that could help dissolve this inherent essentialism?

2.3 Thinking about Masculinities and Hegemonic Masculinity

What has emerged in the study of masculinities as a variety of practices is that 'different masculinities are produced in the same cultural or institutional setting' (Connell, 2005b: 36). Consequently, the inquiry has seen a number of studies into masculinities in specific cultural and social contexts, with reference to ethnicity (Louie and Low, 2003; Morrell and Swart, 2005; Richardson, 2007), religious belief (Gerami, 2005), geographical position (Critical Research on Men in Europe, 2005;

Forth and Taithe, 2007), militarism and warfare (Higate and Hopton, 2005; Messerschmidt, 2010), sexuality (Anderson, 2012; Edwards, 2005; McCormack, 2012) and many more. However, introducing plurality into the study of particular masculinities to emphasise social and cultural difference does not necessarily translate into heterogeneity or resolve issues with the term masculinity in its singularity as summarising the practices of 'all men' (Hearn, 1996), and 'the essentialism at stake here is not so countered as displaced' (Fuss, 1990: 4).

Effectively, the essentialist notion of masculinity remains central to masculinities (Morgan, 1992), as men, however diverse their practices as individuals, remain linked in the literature through their (assumed) gender, and are reduced to the commonality of their practices even if their only commonality in fact is their assumed gender identity. Although the essentialist notion of masculinity does not allow much space for fluidity with regard to the intersection of different reference points such as ethnicity, class and sexuality, it has been argued that post-structural concepts of hybrid masculinities (Aboim, 2010) 'fail to challenge effectively the traditional metaphysical understanding of identity as unity' (Fuss, 1990: 103). While some of the wider sociological theory discussed here has aimed at conceptualising heterogeneity amongst masculinities, a number of authors (Fuss, 1990; Morgan, 1992) have questioned to what extent this has assisted in dissolving the essentialist understanding of men and male practices and not simply replaced it.

The most prominent and comprehensive theory of masculinity (McCormack, 2012; Messerschmidt, 2012b) is Connell's theoretical framework of hegemonic masculinity (Connell, 2005b). Connell builds on Gramsci's (1971) analysis of class relations, 'the cultural dynamic by which a group claims and sustains a leading position in social life' and defines hegemonic masculinity as 'the configuration of gender practice which embodies the currently accepted answer to the problem of legitimacy of patriarchy, and guarantees the dominant position of men and the subordination of women' (Connell, 2005b: 77). Connell's theory describes the practice through which male domination and hierarchy are created and legitimised, and key elements of this practice are physical domination and discursive marginalisation. While she argues

that domination ensures the materialised subordination of less hegemonic, as it were, groups of males, marginalisation stands for challenging particular masculinities and their claim to legitimacy. Hegemonic masculinity here is visible in that 'those who reject the hegemonic pattern have to fight or negotiate their way out' (Connell, 2005b: 37). Her concept of hegemonic masculinity allows for multiplicity, operates at the core of masculinity and assures the cultural dominance of masculinity through three key concepts: subordination, complicity and marginalisation. Thereby, she accounts for the interplay of masculinities themselves, and notes that part of this hegemony is indeed the subordination of less legitimised masculinities such as gay masculinities, which experience political and cultural exclusion, legal and street violence, and economic discrimination (Connell, 2005b). Connell recognises that most men actually do not embody hegemonic ideals of masculinity; she theorises their connection with hegemonic masculinity as being complicit with 'the hegemonic project' (Connell, 2005b: 79). In other words, while these men may not represent the ideal of hegemonic masculinity, they implicitly subscribe to its values by still benefiting from the resources available to them through a system which relies on hegemonic values in relation to masculinity. Her concept of marginalisation refers to the very interplay of dominant and subordinate masculinities as well as the relationship between subordinated masculinities. Within this framework of hegemony, domination/subordination and complicity, and authorisation/ marginalisation, Connell accounts for specific masculinities as well as the interplay between them. As such, hegemonic masculinity is not normal in any statistical sense, but normative as a pattern of practice (Connell and Messerschmidt, 2005).

In particular two aspects of this concept of hegemonic masculinity are relevant to this thesis and necessitate further explanation. Connell (2005b) originally defined 'hegemonic masculinity' theoretically and in a global context which has left wide room for criticisms as discussed below. The main issue, however, is 'the slippage' (Beasely, 2008: 88) of the term and how it has been widely used as synonymous with dominant masculinity. As a consequence, Connell and Messerschmidt (2005) revisited the term and stressed the need for contextualisation of hegemonic masculinities in a geographical context and the interplay of local, regional and global

masculinities. Firstly, a clear distinction is made between dominant masculinity and hegemonic masculinity in this thesis. While dominant masculinity refers to the 'commonest and/or most powerful pattern of masculinity in a particular setting' (Messerschmidt, 2012: 36), hegemonic masculinity refers to the status of a particular form of masculinity which excludes the existence and the possibility of other (dominant or not) masculinities without having to be dominant in a statistical sense (Connell, 2005b). This is to say that the main feature through which hegemonic masculinity is understood and defined in the context of this thesis is its hegemonic status and the need oppose it actively and negotiate one's way out of it (as explained above) rather than the possibility of the coexistence of multiple masculinities. Secondly, localised masculinity is utilised in this thesis in line with Messerschmidt's (2012) definition of masculinity which is 'constructed in arenas of face-to-face interaction of families, organisations and immediate communities' (Messerschmidt, 2012: 36). Messerschmidt (2012) provides examples of how forms of localised hegemonic masculinity can be contextualised. Perhaps most importantly here is that 'local' refers not exclusively to the geographical environment of individuals under investigation, but also to their peer environment (or reference groups as further discussed in the following chapter) within the geographical sense of 'local'.

So, how can this approach assist in dissolving essentialists understandings of masculinity?

Connell includes a number of ideas in her theory of hegemonic masculinity to which this thesis will return in the discussion of gender in chapter three: (A) the notion of 'currently accepted' hegemony (Connell, 2005b: 77) accounts for the fluidity of any specific kind of masculinity and indeed masculinities, and (B) sets it into its historic context (Connell, 1993), whereby she acknowledges (C) in the form of subordinate masculinities, that some are associated with femininity. Further, she emphasises the necessity of interplay of different masculinities, whereby masculinities are negotiated in relation to a reference group, with the reference point being the ideal of hegemonic masculinity. By explaining the origin and the manifestation of hegemonic masculinity through patriarchal structures (Connell, 1987), Connell

further highlights (D) how masculinities are socially controlled and (E) transcend the wider social structure in which masculinities are (F) context-specific, (G) embodied, and (H) monitored in social interaction. Lastly, (I) by pointing out that the ideal of hegemonic masculinity is embodied in the white, heterosexual male, Connell accounts for an a priori assumption of heterosexuality (Connell, 2005b; Wedgwood, 2009). Through a hegemonic ideal of masculinity, despite the potentially diverse practices of complicit, dominant, marginalised and subordinated masculinities, she captures both the commonalities men may share and the diversity of their practices.

Connell not only accounts for how hegemonic masculinity is produced through the domination of women and subordinate men, but also for how the ideal of hegemonic masculinity is undermined. As Wedgwood (2009) notes, she delivers a concept of masculinities that, through its complexity, is capable of accounting for different masculinities, highlights more specifically the embodiment of masculine values through the interplay of privilege and power, and recognises internal contradictions in attaining specific masculinities, whereby the achieving of any particular masculinity unfolds in two ways: through the social dynamics of developing gender identity, and the historical development of masculinities based on experience, which in turn are embedded in political and economic structures (Connell, 2005a; Donaldson, 1993).

Although the strengths of Connell's concept of hegemonic masculinity are acknowledged as its ability to theorise fluidity in gender identity and their relations to one another (Hearn, 2007), it is criticised widely (Collier, 1998; Demetriou, 2001; Hearn, 2004; Howson, 2006; McCormack, 2012). The main criticisms relevant to this thesis are as follows:

Demetriou (2001) argues that hegemonic masculinity should not be restricted to white heterosexual men, but be expanded, so that it is understood as a 'hybrid bloc that unites practices from diverse masculinities in order to ensure its reproduction of the patriarchy' (Demetriou, 2001: 337). He suggests a distinction between internal and external hegemony, whereby the effect that marginalised and subordinate

masculinities have on hegemonic masculinity can be acknowledged as well as the multiplicity of masculinities within them. While Connell acknowledges that the idea of internal hegemony may be helpful in contextualising specific masculinities in a particular setting, she points out that since the practical application of the concept itself necessitates being put into specific locations in which a distinct type of hybrid masculinity may be hegemonic, this would hardly allow a generalisation of this hybrid and dominant masculinity to be projected onto a national or global level (Connell and Messerschmidt, 2005). In other words, she admits that the concept of hegemonic masculinity is intentionally theoretical, and, in its application, would of course help to uncover more specific and even hybrid masculinities in a particular local context, and quite likely that in context only, without lending itself to generalisation beyond the very setting which it helps to explain. While the overall concept remains in the singular of hegemonic masculinity, she points out that 'whatever the empirical diversity of masculinities, the contestation for hegemony implies that gender hierarchy does not have multiple niches at the top' (Connell and Messerschmidt, 2005: 845).

Along the same line of reasoning, McCormack (2012) suggests that the notion of hegemonic masculinity is built on the subordination of gay men and can be traced back to the homophobic zeitgeist when Connell's theory was developed. However, this ignores the fact that since hegemonic masculinity is rooted in history and is a dynamic two-way process, the subordination of gay men may no longer be a required mechanism in the hegemonic sense. In other words, while the homohysteria (McCormack, 2012) of the 80s may have may required the subordination of gay men in the hegemonic ideal of masculinity, it is perfectly reasonable to assume that this has changed with increasingly equal rights for gay men and lesbian women over the last thirty years. As such, inclusive masculinity (Anderson, 2012; McCormack, 2012), whereby male homosexuality is not understood in contrast to male heterosexuality but as an integral part of it, could potentially be a part of hegemonic masculinity. More importantly, what this criticism highlights is that critiquing the concept of hegemonic masculinity in reference to either marginalised or subordinated masculinities, or as static is indeed neglecting

the roots of the concept itself as Connell defined it, and 'it is desirable to eliminate any usage of hegemonic masculinity as a fixed, transhistoric model [as it] violates the historicity of gender and ignores the massive evidence of change in social definitions of masculinity' (Connell and Messerschmidt, 2005: 838).

Further, the criticism that the study of masculinity remains the 'child of its mother- [a] traditional feminist enquiry' (Whitebread, 1999: 58) and neglects the subject in the analysis of masculinity, thereby the agency of the social actor appears misplaced as within it Connell accounts for men being able to identify with or distance themselves from hegemonic masculinity, and as such 'masculinity represents not a certain type of man but, rather, a way that men position themselves through discursive practices' (Connell and Messerschmidt, 2005: 841).

Similarly, Cole (2007) argues that its focus remains on the structural elements and does not account for the experiences of men and how masculinities are lived out individually. However, while Connell's theory is established on feminist thought, the element of social and historic change attributed to the concept of hegemonic masculinity gives room for the concept itself to develop beyond its reliance on ideas of the patriarchy. Indeed, Connell and Messerschmidt argue that 'to locate all masculinities in terms of a single pattern of power' (Connell and Messerschmidt, 2005: 847) is too simplistic, hence should be disregarded from the concept of hegemonic masculinity, to give way to 'a more holistic understanding of gender hierarchy, recognising […] the mutual conditioning of gender dynamics and other social dynamics' among men and among women (Connell and Messerschmidt, 2005: 848). Equally, while recognising the limitations of the theoretical concepts of hegemonic masculinity, they advocate using its framework for the analysis of masculinity and masculinities in specific contexts, including the individual experiences of men in these contexts.

Therefore, the usefulness of hegemonic masculinity as a theoretical concept 'is not strictly dependent on Gramscian economic and class-based cultural economics' (Hearn, 2004: 65), as has been criticised (Demetriou, 2001; McCormack, 2012;

Wedgwood, 2009), but on how it is applied in a specific historical, local and cultural context and assists to deconstruct the understanding and interplay of masculinities and gender relations in the same, on the one hand, and how hegemonic masculinity is constructed in that context, on the other. Equally, as Beasley (2008) suggests, it can be utilised to 'produce a more nuanced understanding of privileged legitimating conceptions of manhood [not only at a specific local and cultural level, but] of relations between different masculinities in the global and national nexus' (Beasley, 2008: 86).

In summary, through the concept of hegemonic masculinity, Connell provides a theoretical framework, not a step-by-step manual, for studying men in their particular geographical, social and cultural contexts. She allows for multiplicity of masculinities in context, with subordinate and marginalised masculinities whose reference point is the hegemonic masculinity of that context. Underlining the socio-historic dimension to how masculinities develop, as stand-alone masculinities as well as in the wider gender order of that specific setting, hegemonic masculinity, and indeed marginalised and subordinate masculinities, are not only shaped by those influences, but also play a role in shaping these influences. In other words, she understands masculinities as shaped by the social structure as well as shaping that very structure. That means that any given masculinity in the analysis of that particular setting is not understood through an essentialist framework in so far as the inquiry focuses on the interplay with other masculinities in that setting, allowing for individual agency to embrace or resist the masculine values of their group. This allows heterogeneity amongst masculinities and incorporates an element of fluidity in an ever-changing structure of social and historic developments. However, if masculinity or masculinities are understood not through a single pattern of power, but social dynamics of power between men, and between men and women, then the question remains as to what extent these patterns of power continue to be tied to ideas around the patriarchy. In order to position masculinity, at least in relation to ideas around the patriarchy, as a non-essentialist category, masculinity needs to be placed outside the framework of gender and power (Connell, 1987; 2005b). Although the claim to commonality in male practices has been defused in relation to how

masculinities interact with one another in Connell's opinion (2005b), their position of power in the wider frame of the patriarchy remains ambiguous, and in principle essentialist.

Hearn emphasises that the 'accumulation of power and powerful resources of certain men' results in 'the pervasive association of the social category of men with power' (Hearn, 2004: 51), and this association is highly visible in Connell's concept of hegemonic masculinity. Although Connell and Messerschmidt (2005) argue that the idea of a single pattern of power needs to be diffused in the concept of hegemonic masculinity, no specificity is given to how exactly this could be done; more importantly, also absent is an analysis of how the elimination of this notion would potentially undermine the concept itself. Here Hearn's (2004) idea regarding different dimensions to power could provide a framework for exploring the relevance of power in relation to male practices and masculinity. Hearn (2004) argues that the investigation into hegemony of men should be concerned with the different ways of being a man in relation to other men and women, rather than 'the identification of particular forms of masculinity or hegemonic masculinity' (Hearn, 2004: 60), and Hearn and Collinson (1994) suggest a number of different identity reference points in order to dissolve the perceived unity of masculinity when theorising men in general. However, the focus in relation to masculinity and crime remains on commonalities of men who commit crime rather than their differences. While Hearn (1987) unpicks elements of the idea of patriarchy and offers additional ways of analysis, he upholds the theoretical concept and argues that though 'the patriarchy is not out there: it exists in our practices as men' (Hearn, 1987: 166).

So, in what way can the concept of hegemonic masculinity assist in understanding how masculinity and crime are made sense of? Collier (1998) argues that hegemonic masculinity in the context of offending behaviour has come to be understood through solely negative characteristics, in particular in reference to aggression and crime (Collier, 1998), which then are perceived as the cause of and the explanation for criminal behaviour (McMahon, 1993). While Connell outright rejects the conclusion that dominant aggressive behaviour in a particular group of males is a

reflection of the ideal of hegemonic masculinity of that group (Connell and Messerschmidt, 2005), and Messerschmidt echoes that dominant masculinities do not necessarily reflect hegemonic masculinities (Messerschmidt, 2012b), male aggression is a central theme in the vast majority of literature on masculinity and crime as explored below.

2.4 Masculinity and Crime

Coote (1993) argues that crime is a male occupation and Benstead (1994) elaborates that the source of crime committed by men is to be found in the way masculinity has been defined socially. While numerous authors have explored the relationship between masculinity and crime (Collier, 1998; Hobbs, 1994; Messerschmidt, 1997; 2000; 2010; 2012b; Mullins, 2006; Murnen et al., 2002; Tomsen, 2008; Winlow, 2002), Walklate (2004) argues that the detailed empirical examination of the potential connection between male gender identity and offending is under-explored. That most crime has been committed by men has been observed before (Cohen, 1955; Sutherland 1949), but inquiry into crime as a sociologically gendered dimension is relatively recent (Messerschmidt, 2012b).

Messerschmidt (1993; 2012b) argues that, through understanding gender as not biologically determined by sex (Oakley, 1972), the inquiry into masculinity and crime emerged in the context of feminist criminology, in the form of Marxist, radical and socialist feminist criminology. The way in which Marxist feminist theory makes sense of crime is to place emphasis on the structural conditions of a capitalist class society as the source of masculine domination, crime and gender inequality, whereby gender and class are both determinants. Radical feminist criminology understands the patriarchal structure of the root of gender inequality, from which crime emerges. Gender inequality is seen as structurally enforced through heterosexuality, and gender is socially practised on that basis. However, for socialist feminist criminologists, the interaction between class and gender is the central focus of their inquiry and crime is seen as the result of opportunities given by one's class and gender. While both radical and socialist feminist criminology highlight the function of

normative and compulsory heterosexuality on a structural level, no account is given of how heterosexuality is socially practised and maintained through social interaction. However, it is second-wave feminist criminology which broadens its focus from women and crime to include men. As Messerschmidt (1993; 2012b) outlines, it no longer understands men as normal subjects in the context of crime, but examining the social practices of men more closely in order to understand 'the highly gendered ratio of crime and crimes by individuals in society' (Messerschmidt, 2012b: 19).

Collier further stresses how, consequently, men remain the de-sexed norm in critical and left-wing studies in criminology and how sex is removed from the 'consideration of men's criminality' (Collier, 1998: 12). Building on the idea of double jeopardy (Ashford et al., 1997; Heidensohn, 2002), while female crimes continue to be viewed as natural differences between men and women (Gelsthorpe, 2004), the male body is left out of the discussion of masculinity and crime. He argues that while women are still seen as 'the other' in the arena of crime, the focus on individual male offenders and the involvement of men in crime results in men being separated into two groups; the *offending* (criminal) man and the *non-offending* (non-criminal) man (Collier, 1998: 12). This binary of law-abiding men and men who offend, Collier argues, remains throughout the criminological literature on men and offending, in which the structural power of men is central to explanations for criminal behaviour of men. He highlights how masculinity in reference to crime is conceptualised through the sex/gender paradigm in feminist criminology, and how this remains central to feminist critique of criminology, while sociological work focuses on men's gender within the sex-role framework with a focus on the individual embedded in institutionalised practices of one specific form of masculinity.

Collier criticises the way in which men and crime have been made sense of by relying on concepts which traditionally had been used to understand women and femininity, and articulates three main issues with this approach to conceptualising masculinity: (A) 'masculinity is politically ambiguous' as it has been applied to different contexts 'in which an underlying essentialism, an ontological assumption about the status of

the men/masculinity relation, is itself mobilised to different ends and at different historical moments' (Collier, 1998: 16); (B) consequently the concept of 'masculinity is conceptually imprecise' as it has been used both as a 'generalised form of culture' and to account for the 'diversity of men's experiences' and seems therefore to be a 'specific form of culture' and varying within broader cultures (Collier, 1998: 17); and (C) for not accounting for the possibility an individual's differing masculinities at certain times of his life. Hence, he concludes that thereby the concept of hegemonic masculinity, with reference to men and crime, builds on the pre-assumption that men aspire to a culturally homogeneous ideal of masculinity, which ignores the 'psychological complexity of men's behaviour', and thereby further 'seems to illustrate the more general uncertainty which surrounds a reductive conception of masculinity' (Collier, 1998: 22). In other words, Collier understands the concept of masculinity as upholding an idea of masculinity as a cultural unity in its hegemonic ideal, which is, in principle, essentialist. The essentialist notion of one particular kind of masculinity is indeed very visible in the literature on masculinity and offending. Equally, using the term hegemonic masculinity in reference to all crime committed by men, regardless of the diversity in crimes committed, and indeed the endless combinations of socio-economic, geographic and historic factors which may be associated with the specific men having committed particular crimes, neglects to pay attention to the very roots of the concept of hegemonic masculinity as discussed above.

In addition to issues discussed above, both Messerschmidt (2010) and Collier (1998) stress the importance of the body in criminological research on men and crime. While Messerschmidt explores the importance of embodiment in relation to violence performed by men and women, Collier stresses how men in criminological thought have been constructed as 'outside the realm of nature, as being apart from (their) bodies' (Collier, 1998: 27) and as such the body occupies a passive position, in which the male body is stereotyped in feminist representations in criminology, which reinforces the essentialism of 'the masculine' and does not allow for diversity amongst men and their bodies (Collier, 1998). The binary positions of men and women in the framework of heterosexuality become the vehicles through which

patriarchal structures are reproduced amongst the bipolarity of 'active/ passive, hetero/homo, and man/woman' (Collier, 1998: 31) in the performance of masculinity in feminist criminology (Collier, 1998; Messerschmidt, 1993; 2012b).

However, it has been argued that this understanding of masculinity within feminist criminology does not account for the diversity of men's practices and the fact that most men do not commit crime (Hood-Williams, 2001), on the one hand, and the diversity of crimes committed by men (Collier, 1998; Messerschmidt, 1993), on the other. Indeed, Hood-Williams questions whether the term masculinity adds anything to the analysis of crime beyond the 'empty tautology signifying nothing more than (some of) the things men and boys do' (Hood-Williams, 2001: 39), and criticises the generalisation of 'masculine traits' in reference to crime. Yet, despite the diversity in crimes committed by men and criticism by Collier and Hood-Williams in regards to the over-simplification of understandings of masculinity in reference to crime, it is not men in general who are discussed in most of the literature of crime and masculinity, but the concentration is on a very specific group of men. Morgan (2002) observes that 83% of adult male prisoners are from a manual, partly skilled or unskilled background (compared with 55% of the population as a whole), 23% of prisoners have a history of being in local authority care (compared to 2% of the population), with an increase to 38% when concentrating on the under twenty-one year olds, 13% had no permanent residence prior to being incarcerated, while two thirds of the remainder of the prison population were living in rented accommodation. In relation to educational achievements, he points out that 43% left school before the age of 16, in comparison to 11% of the whole population, and 43% of those left school without any qualifications (many of them functionally illiterate), which results in 60-70% of prisoners having literacy and numeracy levels so low that they are ineligible for 96% of jobs. He thereby highlights that the majority of the male prison population is 'seriously disadvantaged before their imprisonment and their social marginality is heightened by their incarceration' (Morgan, 2002: 1140). The overrepresentation of a particular group of individuals with specific life histories and issues has been confirmed again more recently (Lord Bradley, 2009), and a specific inquiry into issues of mental health and learning disabilities in the YJS has

underlined the multiple disadvantages of young people in contact with youth justice services (Nacro, 2011). Here the marginality of young men and men in the criminal and youth justice system is associated with their social status, so how is this idea of social class, masculinity and crime contextualised in the academic literature?

2.5 Masculinity, Crime and Social Class

The over-representation of working class males in both the criminal and youth justice systems (Morgan, 2002; White and Cunneen, 2006) suggests that social class, and practices associated with working class masculinity relate to how crime is understood. Social class and gender are key elements through which crime is understood structurally in radical feminist criminology (Messerschmidt, 1993; 2012b), and Connell (2005a) links particular masculinities to the 'historical process […] of gender-segregated forces' within the workforce. Morgan (2005) argues that it is difficult to make sense of the 'contradictions within the construction of masculinity without taking on board some sense of class distinction' (Morgan, 2005: 171), in particular in relation to life-chances of individual men. Central to issues around class in the context of masculinity and offending is the notion of aggressive heterosexuality and status (Mac an Ghaill, 1994), whereby fighting is an expression of 'hardness', which serves to exercise control over oneself and others (Canaan, 1996). The reasoning here is that male identity is given distinct social meaning in relation to social class, and working-class masculinity becomes associated with 'physical, embodied and oppositional' behaviour, whereas middle class masculinity is seen as individualistic, rational and relatively disembodied (Morgan, 2005: 170). Social practices of masculinity in a particular class setting are understood as internalised by the male child and their successful performance results in a 'pleasant experience in the male arena' (Harris, 1995b: 38). In the context of the white working class, heterosexual masculinity becomes an index of social identity with a clear signpost as to legitimate and illegitimate practices, which give or prohibit access to distinct behaviours and subject positions in relation to class and gender identity (Skeggs, 1997). Along the same line of reasoning, Winlow (2002) argues that

'delinquent lower-class male activities […] are not entirely divorced from wider male culture' (Winlow, 2002: 41) , and, by making reference to Tolson's work (Tolson, 1977), the performance of aggressive male behaviour is understood as normative in reference to their social and geographical position (Winlow, 2002). This link between white, working class masculinity and fighting or the expression of aggressive behaviour is evident throughout the literature on masculinity and offending (Cohen, 1955; Hobbs, 1994; Newburn and Stanko, 1994) and aggression and violence are understood as serving to affirm the young men's place in society (Canaan, 1996) with a strong perception of honour and 'not being subject to the will of others' (Winlow, 2002: 45). If aggressive and violent behaviour is seen as a key element in the formation of white working class masculinity, how is this contextualised in the literature in relation to crime?

2.6 Male Offending, Aggression and Violence

In considering male offending behaviour, Morgan emphasises how white working class men may be denied access to male identity 'as a moral as well as economical category' (Morgan, 2005: 169). Holter (2005) notes that 'the men at the top of the social hierarchy may use mainly their gender neutral ways to achieve their aims […] and the men below will use what they have, namely their gender (Holter, 2005: 20), and Messerschmidt discusses the utilisation of specific male behaviours when other 'resources are unavailable for accomplishing masculinity'(Messerschmidt, 1993: 85) Indeed, aggression and violence occupy a central position in the explanation of male involvement in criminal behaviour throughout the literature (Collier, 1998; Hobbs, 1994; Messerschmidt, 2000; 2012b; Mullins, 2006; Winlow, 2002).

Situating male aggression and violence within the wider social structure, Hatty argues that 'the broader picture of harm is tied to the socio-structural disadvantaged' and 'detected and reported violence is generally enacted by or inflicted upon the more marginalised groups in society' (Hatty, 2000: 7) and emphasises the link between social class and male violence. She points out how a

central feature of the 'patriarchal system is not only men's domination over women, but also some men's rule over other men through organisational hierarchies […], class and other social division' (Hatty, 2000: 46), and violence is the institutionalised male means in the working of the patriarchy. The idea of the patriarchy here assists in making sense of the group of men and boys, which dominates the discussion of masculinity and crime: white, working class young men. She states:

> Clearly, violence is still the prerogative of the youthful male, especially when confronted by the contradictions and paradoxes of thwarted desire and personal and social disempowerment. Reaching deep into the historical and cultural storehouse of masculinity, a young man may still retrieve the ultimate tool of manly self-assertiveness: omnipotence through violence. (Hatty, 2000: 6)

Hatty explains that aggression and violence come to be socially conditioned ideas, whereby males hold an entitlement to aggression, with a clear idea of legitimate forms of aggressive behaviour, and concludes that violence and aggression shape a particular form of male identity and masculinity, which in turn is deeply embedded in many forms of violence (Hatty, 2000).

In this context, what re-emerges is a very specific group of men and boys in relation to masculinity and offending through which crime is explained and social class becomes a key feature in this explanation. Aggression and violence are seen as an integral part of culturally specific white working class masculinity much beyond the idea of 'protest masculinity' (Broude, 1990). Aggressive and violent behaviour is understood as socially learned (Bandura, 1973; Bandura, 1977; Bandura and Walters, 1963), culturally validated (Winlow, 2002) and monitored by the family and peers (Lytton and Romney, 1991), whereby gender-inappropriate behaviours are suppressed and successful performance leads to 'pleasant experiences in the male arena' (Harris, 1995a: 38). Masculinity becomes the sum of access to resources, the legitimacy of practice of a very specific male identity, and monitored gendered behaviour, in which violence and aggression are historic and cultural elements to working class and serve to 'adhere to both the market place and […] and the moral

economy of commercial social practices (Hobbs, 1994: 121). This is to say, working class masculinity is not simply culturally inherited and socially learned on the level of the social actor, but also tied to wider social structure, whereby violence and aggression work to access market resources (Hobbs, 1994).

Central to the concept of social learning of violence and aggression and the successful performance of the same are the heterosexual family and peers. However, there appears to remain a distinct lack of agency of the social actor and a more in-depth analysis of the very specific context in which violence and aggression may flourish as integral parts to male identity. This, once again, leads to a very narrow and essentialist understanding that not all men share the same category, but a very specific subgroup is *subjectified (Foucault, 1992)* and has concrete characteristics attributed to them. The focus now will be on the specific context in which these male traits are thought to be learnt.

2.7 Masculinity and the Role of Fathers

While structural explanations of gender and masculinity pay little attention to the individual process by which male identity is obtained, psychoanalysis and sex-role and social learning theory emphasise the importance of the family (and peers) in this process. The underlying assumption of these will be explored further in the next chapter. Fathers become particularly relevant in relation to boundary control, the learning of independence, and as role models (Featherstone, 2009; Harris, 1995a; Popenoe, 2001). Binary subject positions occupied by men and women within the framework of heterosexuality become central features. As such, the institution of the heterosexual family emerges as key in understanding both the learning and monitoring of what is perceived to be gender-appropriate behaviour, at least in the first instance (Boehnisch and Winter, 1993; Furstenberg and Weiss, 2000; Lytton and Romney, 1991).

Robb (2010) underlines how prime importance is given to the role of fathers in relation to boys' and young men's development of gender identity and how the

influence of mothers is absent from much of the literature, neglecting 'the possibility of cross-gender identifications' (Robb, 2010: 193). Centrality is given to biological fathers, while the effect of step-fathers and their relationship with boys and young men is underexplored (Robb, 2010), and the co-production of fatherhood in interactions with their families and communities is equally neglected (Robb, 2010). Likewise, little importance is given to how practices of fatherhood and families intersect with other social practices (Featherstone, 2009). Indeed, numerous authors argue that fatherhood in itself is a social construct (Lamb, 2000; Lupton and Barclay, 1997; Robb, 2010), in which distinct roles are presented as static and are given meaning in relation to the development of the male child. Lamb (2000) summarises how, in the history of research on fatherhood, fathers have been assigned roles varying from the 'moral teacher', through 'the breadwinner' to the 'sex-rolemodel' and the 'nurturing father', whereby key themes associated with these roles are the development of self-esteem of male children and the access to fathers (Lamb, 2000). Here the absence of fathers from the home is understood as impacting negatively on the male child and as a potential source for 'abnormal' and delinquent behaviour (Lupton and Barclay, 1997). Consequently, while their presence is seen as enabling 'positive gender identification' (Robb, 2010: 184), their absence is associated with the lack of male role models for boys and young men (Lupton and Barclay, 1997; Robb, 2010). The one-dimensional understanding of fatherhood is striking, as is the lack of understanding fatherhood as multi-faceted (Lamb, 2000) as well as an interactional process, which changes over time and intersects with economic and cultural factors (Robb, 2010). Indeed, Parke (2000) suggests a 'system view' as a template to understanding fatherhood and father involvement, whereby both gender and interactional processes play vital parts (Parke, 2000: 50) and promote the understanding of fathers as 'embedded in dyadic relationships with children as well as with wives and partners' and may assist in highlighting how 'each follow separate developmental trajectories that can produce a diverse set of effects of how fathers enact their roles' (Parke, 2000: 49).

Returning to issues around fathers and the development of gender identity and learning of gendered behaviour in boys and young men, Winter and Boehnisch

(1993) draw together the different strands employed in understanding gender and masculinity: (1) the sociological and structural dimension of gender hierarchy, gender-specific interaction and gendered behaviour, (2) psychoanalytical approaches to gender (explored in more detail in chapter three) , and (3) add a biographical dimension. While this model relies heavily on psychological explanations of masculinity, it introduces a notion of how masculinity is attained with a focus on the individual and highlights the importance of that biographical experience. Interesting here is the very strong emphasis on the son's relationship with his father and the importance of other male role models, while the relationship between sons and their mothers is captured through concepts of dis-identification, if attributed any importance at all in the formation of the sons' masculinity, rather than being seen as relational (Taga, 2005).

Harris (1995a) summarises key elements of the discussion of attainment and social learning of masculinity through the son's relationship with his father. He emphasises how individuals build their gender identity around the messages they receive in response to their perceived biological sex and gender identity becomes something not as given but to be attained through the process of enacting these messages and learning gendered behaviour. He understands these gendered messages as deeply embedded in wider social structure and interwoven in methods of social control with reinforcement and sanctions to protect institutional order and the hierarchical organisation of institutions, and concentrates on specific messages 'with specific configurations that spell out specialised patterns of conduct' (Harris, 1995a: 9), which serve to construct and reinforce masculinity. The monitoring of behaviour that is deemed appropriate, in particular in relation to masculinity, is key in accomplishing masculinity, and 'by conforming to roles, boys participate in their social world [where] their conduct is subject to enforcement through a highly developed series of gender codes that spell out how males and females behave' (Harris, 1995a: 9). While Harris's sub-categorisation of these messages is in line with much of the literature on masculinity where self-reliance and the role of the breadwinner are central to being a man, he maintains room for heterogeneity amongst masculinities. He explains how, while the roles communicated through these messages are contradictory and

inconsistent, the violation of the same can lead to social condemnation and negative psychological consequences (Harris, 1995a). Harris's heterogeneity among masculinities remains within the idea of hegemonic masculinities, and he highlights how 'gender lenses are embedded in the cultural discourse and social practice that are internalised by the developing child' (Harris, 1995a: 38), leading to the construction of a gendered identity that is consistent with the messages received. Crucial to the construction of gendered identity, for Harris, is the performance of gender roles by imitating male role models and the reinforcement of successfully enacted male behaviour and the devaluation of gender-inappropriate behaviour (Harris, 1995a). Whereas Adams and Coltrane (2005) confirm that the messages men receive are crucial in the way they construct their masculinity, and note again the importance of the family as the first institution of socialisation and social learning of masculinity, Harris shifts the focus from parents to fathers in the construction of masculinity and stresses the significance of social learning and imitation of masculine behaviours.

Popenoe (2001) argues that fathers possess a distinct set of parenting skills in the form of role models and protectors of the family. This indication of fathers passing on specific traits is equally evident in Marsiglio and Cohan's (2010) idea of fathers being responsible for transferring 'social capital' to their sons, which is understood as allowing or denying access to social resources and social practices (Robb, 2010: 85). The idea of very specific behaviour deemed appropriate in the performance of masculinity becomes central to understanding the relevance and importance of the relationship between father and son. However, the 'relatively shallow process-based account how fathers affect their children's development' (Parke, 2000: 48) is striking as is the narrow picture this paints in relation to ideas around masculinity both as a basis and as an outcome. So if the relationship between fathers and sons is appointed central to the learning of gendered practices, which role does violence play in this relationship?

2.8 Masculinity and the Experience of Violence

The early part of this chapter records that much of the literature on male offending emphasises the role of normative working-class masculinity and aggression in relation to male youth and adult offending. Particularly important here are three elements: (1) aggression and violence as male means to assert control over others (Canaan, 1996), (2) the performance of such masculinity as a way of accessing resources (Hobbs, 1994; Morgan, 2005), and (3) the role violence and aggression play as a form of coping strategy (Boehnisch and Winter, 1993; Hatty, 2000; Lui and Kaplan, 2004). So far, account has been given of some of the ways the attainment of male identity is understood as taking place primarily in the context of the family, in which fathers play a central role in providing the source of what is understood as socially learned male practices (Harris, 1995a) with distinct behavioural features. So, if aggressive and violent behaviour is seen as a key feature in understanding masculinity and offending (Gadd, 2000; Heiliger and Engelfried, 1995; Hobbs, 1994; Messerschmidt, 2012b; Mullins, 2006; Wilson and Daly, 1985; Winlow, 2002), in particular in young males, what is the experience of violence of young males in contact with youth justice services?

Day, Hibbert and Cadman (2008) believe that up to 92% of young people in custody may have experienced some sort of physical or sexual abuse or neglect (prior to custody) and stress the potential correlation between the experience of such abuse and/ or neglect and serious offending. Indeed, Egeland evaluates the relationship between the experience of violence and abuse and stresses that there is 'considerable evidence from research into delinquent behaviour […] to support the notion of a cycle of violence' (Egeland, 1993: 197), whereby violent and aggressive behaviour serves to both neutralise the experience of violence as a victim and as a coping strategy in emotionally challenging situations. Physical aggression and violence are predominantly associated with men rather than women, and in particular young men (Hatty, 2000) as noted above, and male aggressive and violent behaviour plays a key role in how the much of literature makes sense of masculinity and offending. In the context of the experience of violence and abuse, the reasoning

here is that the way in which male victims potentially articulate their emotions is through legitimised and validated aggression and violence (Adams and Coltrane, 2005; Morgan, 1987); this form of expression is seen as normative masculinity in the absence of access to alternative coping strategies (Boehnisch and Winter, 1993; De Keseredy and Schwartz, 2005; Spatz Widom, 1994). While Spatz Widom emphasises that the majority of victims of abuse do not engage in criminal behaviour in later life, she argues that 'recent research convincingly demonstrate[s] that early childhood victimisation increases the risk for males and females of becoming a delinquent adolescent' (Spatz Widom, 1994). She points out that there is a surprising lack of research which differentiates between males and females and the effects of abuse, and links the expression of aggressive and violent behaviour and its consequent interpretation against the backdrop of gender to ideas of normative masculinity and the entitlement to aggression (Hatty, 2000; Spatz Widom, 1994). This potential link between the experience of violence and abuse and delinquent behaviour in adolescent life is evident throughout the literature (Howe, 2005; Malamuth et al., 1993; Malamuth and Thornhill, 1994; Segal, 2001; Walby and Allen, 2004), and re-establishes the centrality of fathers in both physical abuse and the social learning of aggressive and violent behaviour (Kimmel, 2001; Messerschmidt, 2010).

In summary, the discussion of the literature on masculinity and offending points to some clear issues concerning the ideas through which masculinity and crime are made sense of in much of the literature. Most importantly, (1) conceptualisations of masculinity and crime remain largely essentialist, whereby a very distinct picture is produced of 'offending men' without much heterogeneity being introduced in relation to the masculinity of men who have offended (Collier, 1998). Further, (2) in this process of subjectification, aggression and social class are identified as proxies through which the interplay of masculinity and class are understood as producing 'offending masculinity', and (3) this form of masculinity is comprehended as socially learned with particular reference to fathers, whereby the expressions of aggression and violence are appointed a prime role. The reference points of this form of masculinity are (4) seen to be families, in particular fathers, in the first instance, and other (unspecified) men, which serves to monitor and reinforce socially and

culturally accepted forms of masculinity, specific to that group, and sanction gender-inappropriate behaviour. Within this reference group, (5) a way of 'doing masculinity', especially among young males, is understood to be equivalent to engaging in aggressive and violent behaviour, and consequently, committing crime. This is set in the particular context (6) of the individual's experience of aggressive and violent behaviour and serves both to access resources and as a coping strategy in the absence of alternative models.

Social agency of the individual actor remains largely absent from the discussion of masculinity and crime. This is a similar case to the question of embodiment and the bodies of men who commit crime. Social class, however, is accorded a particularly important role, alongside the function of fathers and experience of aggressive behaviour and violence, especially in the form of physical abuse.

2.9 Masculinity and the Youth Justice System

Despite the wide-ranging discussion of the academic literature above, the YJS remains largely oblivious to potential links between masculinity and offending and the implication this discussion could have on how offending is understood, and consequently how assessment, intervention and sanctions are designed and put into practice. While some research commissioned by the YJS has explored the perceived increase in women's and girls' offending (Youth Justice Board, 2009a), an inquiry into male offending, as a gendered dimension, remains absent. This is similar for any guidance given by the YJB into case management and assessment, in which gender as a distinct category through which to assess and deal with young people does not feature at all (Youth Justice Board, 2010a). Additionally, while annual statistics on youth offending by the YJB only offer information on gender overall in terms of concrete offences, specific offending categories are not broken down into male and female (Youth Justice Board, 2005b; 2007; 2009b; 2012; 2013), regardless of documented differences in male and female offending (Smith and McAra, 2004; Steffensmeier and Schwartz, 2009; Warren, 1981). This demonstrates again that male offending is implicitly understood as normative, while female offending is

subjected to gender-monitoring (Gelsthorpe, 2004; Gelsthorpe and Sharpe, 2006). Indeed, it has been argued that the justice system as a whole is designed around males and operates on male values (Caulfield, 2010; Heidensohn, 2002). Caulfield (2010) stresses the importance of accurately assessing the needs of female offenders and argues that it is vital in the design of interventions around them, and assists in reducing the risk of reoffending. She thereby echoes Blanchette and Brown's (2006) call for a gender focus in assessing needs and risk in relation to offending behaviour. However, while they argue that the assessment of offenders is designed around males, there is no explicit and identifiable focus on specific risks or needs in relation to male or female offenders in the YJS, beyond the collection of ethnographic information on gender. This is in spite of academic literature, which records that the nature of crimes committed, detection and self-reporting of those crimes, and consequent sanctions in the YJS show distinct features in relation to males and females (Heidensohn, 2002; Walklate, 2004) who have offended, beyond the mere fact that the YJS predominantly deals with boys rather than girls (Youth Justice Board, 2005b; 2007; 2009b; 2012; 2013). Indeed, the document (Asset) currently used in the YJS to assess young people who have offended has an explicit focus on risk, more generally of re-offending and specifically of harm-related behaviour (Youth Justice Board, 2006) without taking any wider gender-related aspects into consideration, and thereby ignores that 'gender is highly predictive of the shape of young people's development and maturation' on a physiological or psychological level as well as in their personal and social lives (Smith, 2011a: 22).

Youth Justice and the Masculinisation of Risk

Much of the academic literature on masculinity and offending paints a rather essentialist picture in relation to male offending, whereby male traits predominantly bear negative connotations (Collier, 1998), and offending behaviour in the YJS is largely understood through the idea of risk (Case and Haines, 2009; Farrington and Painter, 2004; Garside, 2009; Home Office, 2007; Smith, 2010; Smith, 2011a; Wilson and Daly, 1985; Youth Justice Board, 2005a), without explicit reference to gender. Thus the knowledge of offending behaviour relies on the idea of risk, which is presented as measurable through key factors such as criminal history, care history,

living arrangements, family and personal relationships, education, training and employment, neighbourhood, lifestyle, substance use, physical, emotional and mental health, perception of self and others, thinking and behaviour, attitudes to offending and motivation to change (Youth Justice Board, 2006). As a result, the reasons for offending behaviour are contextualised on the level of the individual rather than understood in relation to socio-economic and structural elements (Smith, 2009). If offending behaviour in the YJS is understood in relation to risk, then how is or can the idea of risk be related to issues around masculinities?

McNay (1992) points out how Foucault understood the production of knowledge and truth as a particular process intrinsic to a specific society: 'The production of knowledge is always bound up with historically specific regimes of power, and, therefore, every society produces its own truths which have a normalising and regulatory function' (McNay, 1992: 25). While the idea of risk in relation to youth who have offended is not a new one, but can be traced back to the emergence of 'juvenile delinquencies' as a set category (May, 2002), explanations on risk and offending are central to the dealing with and assessment of young people who have offended in the New Labour-established YJB (Garside, 2009). Foucault emphasises that 'the problem does not consist in drawing a line between that in a discourse which falls under the category of scientificity or truth, and that which comes under some other category, but in seeing […] how effects of truths are produced within discourses which in themselves are neither true nor false' (Foucault, 1980: 118). In the YJB's terminology that translates into young offenders being placed in the discourse around risk with 'a set of fundamental rules that define the discursive space in which [young offenders] exist' (McNay, 1992: 26). While within this terminology 'non-discursive factors' and structural factors (McNay, 1992: 26) are accounted for (neighbourhoods, economic and educational background etc.), assessment and interventions are exercised and designed on the basis and targeting of individual risk factors (Smith, 2007). In other words, the assessments of, and the designing of interventions around young offenders takes place within a social reality, which itself is the product of these explanations. Hence, vital to the work with young offenders in the YJS is the knowledge produced by that discourse, which itself

produces the social reality of young offenders and constitutes 'regimes of truth' (McNay, 1992: 27) around what is assumed to trigger offending and reoffending.

This is particularly evident in the Asset document, which is used to assess young people who have been identified as having offended. While the format of the document itself provides a framework for assessing risk and the likelihood of reoffending overall, it relies on the explanation of offending behaviour, whereby certain categories are given specific meaning in relation to offending behaviour in line with youth justice risk terminology (Garside, 2009; Hopkins Burke, 2008; Muncie et al., 2002; Smith, 2011a; Stephenson et al., 2007), it implicitly excludes alternative ways of understanding a young person's involvement in criminal activities. Smith points out, how within the discourse reflected in these targeted schemes, the internal coherence is based on 'the principle of systematically identifying those most likely to [re] offend according to common characteristics' (Smith, 2007: 49). Here the function of the Asset is 'converting these signifiers [of offending and reoffending] into legitimised and scientific indicators of risk and a potential future threat to society' (Smith, 2011a: 196), whereby these indicators come 'to act as a presentation of reality because [they] provide the basis of formal accounts presented in decision-making forums such as the courts' (Smith, 2011a: 197). Although Assets indirectly rely on ideas about socialisation and reference groups in explaining offending, in that they identify families and neighbourhoods as key potential sources and reference groups for offending (Garside, 2009), they do not allow explicit room to accommodate the discussion of masculinity and offending. The key here in understanding offending behaviour is risk of the young person reoffending and/or causing harm to others (Garside, 2009; Youth Justice Board, 2005a).

Indeed, the idea that the family and neighbourhood combined may be a key socialisation source of offending behaviour is at the core of this discourse, as demonstrated by Tony Blair's speech with remarks on youth offending in 2006:

> We need far earlier intervention with some of these families,
> who are often socially excluded and socially dysfunctional.

That may mean before they offend; and certainly before they want such intervention. But in truth, we can identify such families virtually as their children are born (Blair, 2006).

While the concentration on families and the consequent stigmatisation of the socially excluded (Creany, 2013; Garside, 2009; Muncie, 1999a; Pitts, 2001; Smith, 2011a) and issues with this risk terminology (BBC News, 14 March 2013; Case and Haines, 2009; Phoenix, 2009; Whyte, 2009) have been discussed elsewhere, it has been pointed out that the effect of this is a higher emphasis on punishing young people due to a 'rise of actuarial justice and managerialism and the dominance of risk thinking in crime control policies' (Phoenix, 2009: 115). Indeed, Phoenix (2009) and others (Alderson, 2004; Case and Haines, 2009; Creany, 2013; Hopkins Burke, 2008; Stephenson et al., 2007; Whyte, 2009) reiterate that risk management, risk assessment and risk reduction are central to the YJS approach to young people who have offended, with the overall (claimed) aim of reducing reoffending and a corresponding apparatus of governance strategies (Muncie, 2006).

Key factors, in the YJB's own language, when assessing the risk of offending behaviour, are identified as follows: (A) family factors, including the birth of a child to a young mother and the absence of the biological father, poor parental supervision, family conflict and family breakdown, family history of criminal activity, and neglect and abuse, are considered to enhance the risk of offending. Here the role of the father and involvement in crime are central in assessing the risk of offending, and 'female gender is a protective factor' (Youth Justice Board, 2005a: 26), implicitly attributing more importance to the relationship between fathers and sons; (B) school factors, namely low educational achievement, aggressive behaviour and bullying, again with a focus on boys as 'more boys are bullies than girls [...]' (Youth Justice Board, 2005a: 16), are seen as contributing to the potential risk of the young person offending; (C) community factors, such as disadvantaged neighbourhoods, the availability of drugs, crime rates in the area, and the community's response to violent and aggressive behaviour; (D) personal and individual risk factors, such as hyperactivity and impulsivity, the ability to 'manipulate abstract concepts',

highlighting that boys' lower ability to grasp such concepts (Youth Justice Board, 2005a: 22), lack of social commitment, attitudes to offending, early involvement in crime and membership of a delinquent peer group further contributing to the risk of offending. Concentrating on evidence from research on young working class boys, whereby early involvement in delinquent behaviour is understood as a higher risk factor in reoffending, gender, in particular male gender, is once again appointed a key factor in assessing the risk of offending and reoffending (Youth Justice Board, 2005a: 25).

What emerges here is very interesting in light of the prior discussions of masculinity and offending in relation to the assessment of a young person's risk of offending and reoffending: while it highlights what Farrington and Painter have identified as 'some gender differences' in risk factors for males and females (Farrington and Painter, 2004: 1), it makes explicit that boys are at a much higher risk of offending than are girls. Implicitly, it connects some key points in the literature on masculinities as will be discussed in chapter three, and masculinity and offending as discussed in this chapter. Most crucially, this summary of risk factors for offending clearly emphasises that boys are at much higher risk of offending and reoffending, made particularly poignant by stating that being female is a protective factor. Further, it not only stresses the importance of the institution of the (heterosexual) family as the core source of socialisation, but more specifically places immense importance on the role of the father by referring to the increased likelihood of offending with the offending behaviour of the father. Most importantly, given the links made here between the literature on masculinity, and masculinity and offending as highlighted above, it seems surprising that very little explicit attention is paid to the role of gender, and in particular masculinity, in the wider context of the YJS and in the assessment of risk factors in the form of Assets.

Baker and others (Baker, 2005; Baker et al., 2011) point out the role of professional discretion in the completion of Assets when assessing the risk of young people offending and reoffending, while Phoenix notes the importance of the 'profound disjunctures between policy and practice' and how practitioners 'mediate policies

'(Phoenix, 2009: 115). Phoenix concludes that the 'process of identifying young people's riskiness […] has as much to do with the explanations that youth justice workers create about the young person's lawbreaking as it always did [but] the language of risk and the assumptions contained within it prohibit youth justice workers from expressing their own (professional) assessment' (Phoenix, 2009: 129), beyond the provided 'repertoire of responses' in the Asset document (Smith, 2011a: 197). Smith (2007) observes that 'policy originating at the macro level is interpreted, developed, revised and in some cases bypassed or subverted as it is translated into operational guidance and practice itself' which results into 'variations in the application of policy depending on local circumstances or the specific characteristics of the population' (Smith, 2007: 83).

Phoenix (2009) and Baker (2005) attribute immense importance to the role of the youth justice practitioner in this process of interpreting policy and consequently in assessing the young person the risk of reoffending. So, if practitioners are central to the assessment of young people in the YJS, and their 'professional discretion' (Baker, 2005) allows room for interpretation, what does that mean in relation to how they assess and deal with young men? In particular, what can the way practitioners assess and deal with young men in the YJS tell us about 'conventional assumptions about the subject [young man] and how it is constituted' (Smith, 2011a: 90) in youth justice practice?

While explanations around offending rely on ideas of socialisation and social learning with similar reference to families, they remain blind to the role of masculinity in offending, despite having identified that simply being male is a risk factor in assessing offending behaviour. Albeit having, retrospectively and implicitly, identified 'masculinity' as part of offending, it is not explicitly associated with causes of offending, and consequently plays no explicit role in the assessment of young offenders and their risk of (re) offending, and henceforth the interventions planned around the young male who has offended. In other words, although official statistics 'embody one particular narrative of the […] offender' (Cowburn, 2005: 221), youth justice and social work practice remains gender blind in relation to male offenders,

and consequently the risk assessment tools fail to uncover the role of masculinity in perpetrating these offences (Cowburn, 2010).

Summary

Chapter two began by contextualising the importance of concepts of masculinities in social work practice and arguing that the way in which men and masculinity in relation to crime are made sense of in the dominant academic literature holds an essentialist notion of men. It discussed the concept of hegemonic masculinity developed by Connell (2005b) as a framework through which to theorise masculinities. Chapter two then explored the way through which masculinity and crime are made sense of in relation to social class in the dominant academic literature. It highlighted how a central element in the discussion of masculinity, class and crime, is the expression of aggression and violence as socially learned behaviour from role models, in particular fathers. It further stressed the particular relevance of the experience of violence, before setting the narrative produced on young men and offending in the context of youth justice practice. Although key elements of this narrative emerged to be relevant in current youth justice practice, in particular with regard to the assessment of young men, it was emphasised that these elements in the discussion of masculinity and crime are not explicitly linked to issues around masculinity. Chapter two argues that the academic literature on masculinity and crime or criminal behaviour paints a rather essentialist picture of masculinity as homogeneous male practice, which identifies distinct behavioural traits as male characteristics and tells a specific narrative of men, masculinity and crime. This narrative does not include potential multiplicity of masculinities. The concept of hegemonic masculinity, however, allows room for heterogeneity amongst masculinities and accounts for the potential interplay between them as well as being capable of exploring the relationship of masculinities, men and women. It is therefore proposed that the framework of hegemonic masculinity is utilised to explore the ways in which youth justice practitioners construct the masculinities of

the young men with whom they work. This concept allows the various elements identified as central in the narrative created by the literature, namely the structural dimension of class (Connell, 2005b; Hatty, 2000; Morgan, 2005) as well as the underlying assumptions of the means through which men are understood to have attained and consequently perform masculinity, in particular through fathers (Lamb, 2000; Lupton and Barclay, 1997; Marsiglio and Cohan, 2000; Parke, 2000; Popenoe, 2001) to be integrated in the analysis of the constructions of masculinities by practitioners. While this concept continues to bear an essentialist notion of masculinity and its claim to power over women, it offers a way into conceptualising a variety of masculinities and male practices in relation to individual men and groups of men.

Ideas of the narrative on masculinity and offending behaviour imply importance of wider sociological concepts, in particular those of socialisation and social learning in regards to how men are understood to have obtained masculinity. When Harris (1995a) refers to 'a pleasant experience in the male arena' (38), he implies the legitimisation of certain male behaviours and the condemnation of others in particular in reference to an all male audience and specific performances of masculinity. Moreover, the clear identification of male behavioural traits which are linked with offending behaviour suggests the attribution of distinct behaviours inside an essentialist understanding of men within the binary of heterosexuality, and the monitoring of the same. Throughout the discussion in this chapter, the question of social agency of men remains, likewise how men desist from or embrace social structure and the ways in which they have learnt to be men. It is for these reasons that chapter three embeds key features of this narrative of men, masculinity and crime in relevant sociological theory, in particular with reference to how these theories conceptualise gender, the key features of distinct male behaviour discussed in this chapter, and how some of those theories have attempted to diffuse essentialist notions of masculinity.

Part I

Chapter 3: Thinking about Gender

Introduction

Chapter two has touched on how the investigation into crime has been tied up with the investigation into men and crime (Cohen, 1955; Collier, 1998; Messerschmidt, 2012b; Tolson, 1977). Masculinity or masculinities, however, as a stand-alone field of inquiry in sociological research and scholarship, are a fairly recent addition to the area of gender studies (Connell, 2005b; McCormack, 2012; Messerschmidt, 2012b). Although it is evident that men have engaged in the study of men for a long time, the direct problematisation of 'men' in those studies is relatively new (Hearn, 2004). Wider gender research has attempted mainly to address questions about women and has been occupied with uncovering the structures which assist in oppressing women and regulate unequal access to economic and social resources; but as a consequence it has implicitly also made the position of men visible (Kimmel et al., 2005). Although chapter two questioned to what extent ideas of the patriarchy are helpful in theorising men, masculinity, and masculinities in the context of this thesis, this is not to undermine the vital contribution feminist scholarship has made (Messerschmidt, 1993); and some elements of this contribution will resurface in chapter three.

Chapter three sets out to discuss relevant key theories on gender in relation to men, masculinity and crime. It does so by highlighting the contribution these theories have made to the way we think about gender and linking these ideas back to the discussion of men, masculinity and crime. It also embeds key ideas emerging from chapter two, in particular the idea of distinct male behaviours and of social agency, in context of relevant sociological theories, namely the work of Bourdieu (1986; 2001; 2005; 2007) and Goffman (1977; 1990; 2007). Throughout this chapter, the discussion around essentialist ideas of masculinity remains central, and examples will be provided of how theorists have attempted to conceptualise gender and thereby have either reinforced or questioned the essentialist ideas emerging from the narrative on masculinity and crime in chapter two. Chapter three will conclude by

discussing how these theories have made sense of social agency and the body of social actors, and refine research questions emerging from chapters two and three.

3.1 Psychoanalysis and Gender

Messerschmidt (2012b) identifies the first clear distinction between sex (as biological difference in reproductive organs) and gender (as the social difference associated with that biological difference) in sociological scholarship as made by Oakley in the early 1970s (Oakley, 1972). Whereas there had been numerous differentiations between men's and women's development as children (Connell, 2005b), these disparities were articulated through a dualistic concept marked by biological determinism, which understood biological sex as a determining factor in what is now vocalised as 'gender' or 'gender identity'.

However, Freud's theory (1923) was the first distinct attempt to theorise developmental differences between men and women. 'Gender', until then, had been taken as determined biologically and no consideration had been given to the social dimension of 'sex'. Freud, however, understood masculinity and femininity as being acquired rather than inborn, and suggested that sexual preferences are not innate, but result from phases of development in the child, and that subsequent failures in becoming male or female are indeed to be expected rather than irregular (Freud, 1923). Freud's model of development of the infant has obvious flaws, namely that it is infiltrated by the male ideologies of his time and based on genitalia and sexual desire (Elliott, 2003), and that it understands the environment infants grow up in as set in the nuclear –and of course heterosexual – family. However, Freud's distinction between the development of males and females has inspired much psychoanalytical work around gender (Chodorow, 1974; 1994; Klein, 1975; 1997; 1967). Central to this work is the development of gender through identifying with or in deflection of the phallus and desires deriving from the same. These ideas are closely knit to the institution of the family with biological fathers and mothers playing key roles in the development of gender identity. Although it is acknowledged here that his theory, in

many respects, is out-dated, it presents a good starting point for the discussion of gender.

While Freud did not question the biological determinism of sex, but simply described the differences in development, several aspects to his thought continue to be central to the discussion around gender as a social category: (1) gender is not inborn but rather achieved over time, (2) gender is not biologically determined, and (3) the acquisition of gender identity is indeed very complex (Connell, 2005b).

Whereas Freud still understood the outcome of this process of securing male or female identity as fairly distinct categories, his contemporary Jung (1933) provided a different picture of what femininity and masculinity encompass. In his theory of archetypes of the self, Jung (1959) understands the self as a combination of various dialectical elements which aim to achieve a harmonious self. 'Anima', the female part of his gender dialectic, and 'animus', the male part of this dialectic, are not competing, but, ideally, strive to constitute a balanced self beyond the polarity of male and female (Jung, 1933; 1959; 1989). This is interesting in that it adds an element of fluidity to the Freudian idea of rather static masculinity and femininity, while it still identifies male and female as inherently tied to one another without offering insight into how maleness and femaleness are achieved within themselves and in relation to other males and females. Although 'no historical change in their constitution is conceivable; all that can happen is change in balance between them' (Connell, 2005b: 13), Jung argued that the formation of masculinity encompasses an inclusion of feminine elements and vice versa. Thus, while having raised questions about the formation of gender and gender identity, psychoanalytical concepts of gender have little to offer to the sociological dimension of gender as a social process and expression. Nonetheless, Jung further developed an understanding of gender by: (1) adding an element of fluidity to the understanding of gender, (2) identifying that gender (masculinity and femininity) can be achieved through the harmonious co-existence of femininity and masculinity in the biological male or female individual, and (3) indeed that the formation of gender and gender identity is not limited to the development in infancy, but is a life-long process.

3.2 Sex-role Theory and Gender

Connell dates the questioning of sex-roles to the late 19th century during debates 'about sex differences, when resistance to women's emancipation was bolstered by a scientific doctrine of innate sex differences' (Connell, 2005b: 21). Eventually, this would lead to two main strands of sex-role research and theory; psychoanalytical theories, which continued to focus on the internal development of male and female identity with an emphasis on the role of mothers and fathers (Chodorow, 1974; 1994; 1975; Klein, 1997; 1967), and psychological research about sex differences, which, though still having its main focus on the role of parents in the development of their child's gender, introduced a social dimension to the question of gender, 'in which being a man or a woman means enacting a general set of expectations which are attached to one's sex' (Connell, 2005b: 22). Whereas the former provides relatively little scope, the latter has been at the centre of how masculinity is contextualised in reference to crime, as explored in chapter two. Still located within the dichotomy of male and female, sex-roles here are understood as somehow internalised biological sex-roles, which set the possibilities and limits of what is physically enacted as male or female as a product of social learning and socialisation (Connell, 2005b). This idea of set behavioural traits associated with masculinity corresponds to the narrative told by the academic literature in chapter two.

While Connell (2005b) states that much of the research on sex-roles highlights that, there are very few, if any, innate psychological differences between individuals born as biologically male or female, one particular aspect bears extreme relevance to this inquiry into masculinity and crime. This work centres around the occurrence of aggression and aggressive behaviour in young children, and attempts to theorise the differences in aggression and violence between male and female children.

Adding a psychological dimension to Parsons' (1951) sex-role theory, giving visibility to how gender roles are learned and enacted, and considering the importance of role construction and enactment, the work of Block (1976a; 1976b; 1983) is an example of how 'gender' is understood in sex-role theory. She concentrates on measureable

behavioural traits and concludes that males engage more in rough-and-tumble play, tend to dominate peers more readily than female infants, and participate in more physical aggression (Block, 1983). She argues that males show higher levels of physical activity, more explorative behaviour, including the manipulation of objects, react more strongly to barriers and perceive themselves as more daring and adventurous. She attributes higher impulsivity, here defined as 'insufficient control of impulse, inability to delay gratification, risk-taking and over-reacting to frustration' (Block, 1983: 1338), and finds that male infants are more likely 'to manifest behaviour problems related to under-control of impulse' (Block, 1983: 1338). Hence, males are 'stimulated in challenging and ego-involving situations […] and show less evidence of learned helplessness in achievement situations [and are more likely to engage in] the opportunity to exert control over external events' (Block, 1983: 1340).

Block argues that this differentiation between behaviours in males and females can be attributed to 'sex-differentiated parental socialisation behaviours, specific and consistent sex-of-parent and sex-of-child interaction effects' and concludes that 'differentiation in socialisation emphases appear to increase with the age of the child' and that 'sex-related socialisation values of mothers and fathers appear relatively consistent across socio-economic levels, educational levels, and cultural backgrounds' (Block, 1983: 1341). Block summarises:

(A) mothers and fathers employ punishment more often on male children and teenagers than on females;

(B) both parents encourage sons more than daughters to control the expression of affect, assume more personal responsibility and be more independent;

(C) fathers appear more authoritarian, stricter, endorsing physical punishment, firm, and are less accepting of behaviours deviating from the traditional masculine stereotype (Block, 1983).

Hence, she elaborates that the results of her studies 'indicate[s] that parents, particularly the fathers, act in a more instrumental, task-oriented mastery-emphasising way with their sons and in a more expressive, less achievement-oriented way with their daughters' (Block, 1983: 1342). Additionally, she underlines

that 'the different social context experienced by boys and girls over their childhood years accounts for the development of many social-psychological differences' in the behavioural traits of males and females' (Block, 1983: 1342).

The notion that aggressive behaviour by infants and children is interpreted, and therefore reacted to, differently, depending on their sex is further supported by more recent literature (Baillargeon et al., 2007). However, at the very core of sex-role theory is sex as a biological predisposition, whereby the two sexes are attributed certain physical and biological capabilities, most notably men's physical strength and women's reproductive facilities and preoccupation with caring (Geary, 2000; Wood and Eagly, 2002). Although some room is made for the influences of wider social structure and the idea of socialisation, the explanation for perceived sex differences remains biological (Wood and Eagly, 2002) and/or evolutionary (Kolb and Wishaw, 2011), whereby overt aggression is predominantly associated with boys and relational aggression with girls (Campbell, 2006; Crick and Grotpeter, 1995). Central here is the different development of males and females, where the difference of demands on sex-roles, over time, is seen as causing the development of different behaviours, and biological adaption to the environment and the demands of sex-roles is consequently the source of contemporary aggression in males (Bear et al., 2007; Breedlove et al., 2007; Kolb and Wishaw, 2011; Pinel, 2009). Foci are the differences in brain development of females and males (Kolb and Wishaw, 2011) and the role of gonadal hormones (sex steroids), in particular the direct link to the presence of androgens (hormones associated with the development of male sex organs and secondary male sex characteristics) and testosterone. Pinel (2009) distinguishes between aggressive and defensive behaviour of rats, and highlights that the relationship between testosterone and aggressive behaviour is rather ambiguous as the engaging in aggressive behaviour can trigger the higher production of testosterone, so the presence of testosterone in aggressive males cannot unproblematically be understood as the cause for the aggressive behaviour (Pinel, 2009). Campbell (1998) distinguishes between psychological understandings of instrumental (aggression serving as a useful function) and expressive (expressing anger or stress) aggression and acknowledges the role of emotions and inhibition

with regard to sex differences in aggression. She argues that the social dimension of aggression plays a more central role, and men employ expressions of aggression in which their body and physicality play a central role and women are protective of their bodies, as the centre of their capability of reproduction (Campbell, 1984; 1994; 1998; 2006; 2008; Campbell and Muncer, 1998; 1991).

In summary, while theories on sex roles have concentrated on psychoanalytical and psychological approaches to differences in perceived behavioural traits of men and women, there is little attempt to explore the potential relationship between these behaviours and expectations and norms in social life (Connell, 2005b) beyond the setting of the family. Indeed, gender is understood as harmonious with the biological sex of the individual, and biological differences in brain development and the absence and presence of gonadal hormones form the foundations of sex-role theory. However, based on Block's work, the following key aspects evolving from this work continue to be relevant to the sociological understandings of gender, namely: (1) the development of gender can be understood as a social process (socialisation), during which certain behavioural traits are developed and encouraged, while others are repressed; and (2) mothers and fathers are identified as playing a significant role in that social process, and that therefore the development of those traits does not simply occur as a result of the infant's biological sex, but is influenced by the social responses to the male or female child (Campbell and Muncer, 1998; Campbell, 1991; Cohn, 1991). While there are obvious issues with the biologically determinist stand those theories take, 'the idea that masculinity is the internalised male sex-role allows for social change [and] since role norms are social facts, they can be changed by social processes' (Connell, 2005b: 23).

The idea that gender is synonymous with biological sex is also highly evident in the narrative produced by much of the literature on masculinity and offending. Although Messerschmidt (2012b) discusses masculinity in relation to the offending behaviour of not only boys but also girls, and literature on girls' and women's offending sets this behaviour in relation to ideas around masculinity (Seal, 2010; Steffensmeier and Schwartz, 2009; Zahn, 2009), the discussion of femininity with regard to male

offending behaviour is largely absent from academic literature. Instead, biological sex is aligned with gender and a deeper problematisation of understandings of masculinity as well as the attainment of masculinity as a social process, rather than a static and one-directional outcome, is not visible. Similarly to sex-role theory, distinct behavioural attributes are associated with masculinity and the (heterosexual) family plays a key role in the attainment of masculinity, whereby the learning of social roles and the responses to behaviours are central elements in how masculinity is socially learned.

3.3 Socialisation, Social Learning and Gender

The idea that socialisation and social roles have a significant function with regard to the development of males and females was not a totally new discovery and had been implied by Mayer Hacker's (1957) earlier work. She points out that 'the underlying assumption [is] that social change has introduced certain cleavages between [male] values and [male] behaviour, and that the very forces which gave rise to these conflicts will contribute to their alleviation' (Mayer Hacker, 1957: 233). In her article, Mayer Hacker introduces two more elements to the discussion around sex and gender: (1) potential disparity between what is understood as being male and what is enacted as male behaviour, and by stating that 'masculine roles have been treated largely as a reaction and adjustment to the new status of women [as an effect of] recent developments in [our] occupational structure [having] added new tensions' (Mayer Hacker, 1957: 277). While this further underlines that masculinity is not simply determined by biology, but has a social dimension to it, which (a) is effected by social change, and (b) can potentially cause friction between what on a societal level is understood as masculinity, and on the individual level enacted as masculinity, it also raises questions about the relationship between societal structure and the agency of individuals.

Indeed, the origin of the term socialisation dates back as far as the end of the 19th century and is used with little concern for disciplinary boundaries as 'many kinds of child training, education [...] development of social characters and role learning'

(Clausen, 1968: 21). The definition of the term developed differently through the headings of various disciplines, namely psychology and anthropology; the sociological focus throughout the late 19th century and early 20th century remained on the integration of the individual into a particular group (Ross, 1896). This integration was deemed necessary in order to achieve political and moral order (Park, 1939), and understood to take place as a process of identification with particular groups as reference points (Clausen, 1968). Clausen points out that Giddings' *Theory of Socialisation* (Giddings, 1897) lacks 'explicit attempts to characterise the nature of the socialisation apparatus or the major features of socialisation as a continuing process' (Clausen, 1968: 23). Throughout the 1920s 'socialisation ' as a term was used rather casually, and understood as deriving from behavourism and against the backdrop of studies in the field of pedagogy (Clausen, 1968). Central here is Mead's (1934) idea of the self not being inborn, but rather accomplished through the social experience and practised through interaction, involving two key elements: (a) learning to take the role of the other, and (b) communication with the other through language and gestures.

Dollard (1939) understood the process of socialisation as one of the most significant concepts of social psychology, and his understanding of the term was the process of learning social skills. Similar to Freud's theory of development of the infant, Dollard comprehended the nuclear (heterosexual) family as the main institution through which this process was instigated and enforced. However, as Clausen (1968) points out, it was not until the end of the 1930s that socialisation came to be its own field of inquiry through the publication of two sociological text books, which understood and explored socialisation as the process through which the individual becomes a person (Ogburn and Nimkoff, 1940; Sutherland and Woodward, 1937).

The foundations for the most characteristic research on socialisation are built on social-learning theories developed since the late 1950s. Zigler and Child (1973) highlight that, while the work of Neo-Hullians and Skinner focus on stimuli-responses in social learning (Zigler and Child, 1973), Bandura and Walters (Bandura, 1977;

Bandura and Walters, 1963) emphasise 'modeling, imitation and vicarious learning somewhat independent of external reinforcement' (Zigler and Child, 1973: 25).

Scholars since have added numerous dimensions to the understanding and the process of socialisation, such as the group dimension to the socialisation of an individual (Harris, 1995b), differences in the developmental acquisition of morality between males and females, and have identified that socialisation is a life-long process. However, there are several issues with early and developmental writings on socialisation (Clausen, 1968). As pointed out before, though early works on socialisation identify the importance of the individual's 'social attainment' in groups and define socialisation as the process of this attainment, they do not provide insight into how exactly these social processes work. On the other hand, developmental accounts of socialisation in the wider frame of psychoanalysis and psychology focus on the internal workings of the individual and 'fail[s] to recognize the profoundly interactive nature of self-society relations and the complexity of variability of social environments' (Danneafer, 1984: 100). However, before turning to the work of Goffman (1963; 1990) to explore these social processes in self-society relations, it is important to note what socialisation and social learning theory have potentially added to the discussion of masculinity.

While most of the socialisation and social learning theories do not address issues around gender specifically, some implicit consequences can be drawn from theories in relation to the development of masculinity. Although these theories do not offer one comprehensive picture of how socialisation and social learning can be contextualised in relation to behavioural traits, they assist in locating the relevance of socialisation in the development of social roles, and thereby masculinity, by highlighting that: (1) the learning of social roles takes place in the context of and specifically reference to social groups (Clausen, 1968: 23); (2) these social roles are subject to social control and are 'shaped by participation in the social order' (Clausen, 1968: 25); (3) as such they are shaped by structural influences of that order; and (4) are acquired through 'modeling, imitation and vicarious [social]

learning' (Zigler and Child, 1973: 25) and external reinforcement (Zigler and Child, 1973).

Socialisation and social learning theories are particularly relevant in contextualising the role fathers are assigned in the development of masculinity in young boys and men as observed in chapter two (Lamb, 2000; Lupton and Barclay, 1997; Marsiglio and Cohan, 2000; Parke, 2000; Popenoe, 2001). While structural elements are not accounted for in this literature, they heavily rely on the idea that fathers provide both the role model from which to learn masculinity and the monitoring of the enactment of masculinity. The monitoring and the regulation of gender-appropriate behaviours are also made visible in sex-role theory as outlined above. This means that beyond the academic literature on masculinity, families in general, and fathers in particular are central to the explanation of how gender identity is attained, while mothers are largely neglected (Robb, 2010). This is particularly interesting in relation to the discussion of distinct male behaviours (identified above and in chapter two), and the underlying assumption emerges to be that those discrete male behaviours are understood as learnt solely from male individuals who themselves enact one particular kind of masculinity. In other words, masculinity is once again identified within a very specific and essentialist understanding of what it means to be male, and in distance and opposition to femininity, rather than with the notion of femininity as a possible element of masculinity (Jung, 1933; 1959; 1989). Although both sex-role and socialisation theories can be utilised in further theorising the ways in which distinct behaviours have become to be associated with one gender rather than the other, and assist in understanding how these gender roles are seen to be learnt, they lack a more detailed account of how gender identity is attained and enacted by the individual. However, an idea that reoccurs in relation to how gender is learnt and enacted is that of a specific reference group. While this reference group in sex-role and social-learning theory is generally identified as the family, fathers here appear solely responsible when it comes to the learning of masculinity. This idea of specific reference groups from which to learn and with which to enact masculinity is visible throughout the theories discussed in this chapter and will be discussed in the frequency of their occurrence.

3.4 Symbolic Interactionism, Habitus and Gender

Psychoanalysis and sex-role theory stress that biologically identified males and females develop in different ways and that, consequently, the attainment of masculinity and femininity follow different paths. Socialisation and social learning theories have raised awareness of potential ways through which femininity and masculinity are learned, reinforced and serve to maintain a particular moral and political order (Park, 1939). Though socialisation theory makes reference to social groups and their function in attainment of behavioural traits, it lacks a more detailed description of the socialisation apparatus and the relationship between the group and the individual (Clausen, 1968). At the core of the ways in which gender has been theorised above are clear assumptions of what is and what is not male behaviour. The essentialism discussed and the narrative on masculinity and offending are equally evident in these theories, and masculinity is associated with a distinct set of behaviours and practices.

The work of Goffman (1977; 1990; 2007) and Bourdieu (1986; 2001; 2005) set this idea of distinct behaviours of groups and individuals in a sociological context, and their theories are applied to explore the underlying assumption of the allocation of discrete behaviour to specific groups and individuals. Both theoretical concepts have been used in recent research on masculinity (Coles, 2007; De Viggiani, 2012; Stahl, 2012). Coles (2007) especially argues that the integration of Bourdieu's idea of habitus and field into Connell's concept of hegemonic masculinity can assist in overcoming the limitations of one theoretical paradigm only. It is in this sense that Connell's, Goffman's and Bourdieu's theories are employed in this thesis with a view onto gaining a more comprehensive understanding of how YOT practitioners make sense of the masculinity of the young men with whom they work.

Goffman's (1990) theory focuses on the interaction between individuals and individuals and groups and can shed light on how the socialisation process potentially unfolds. While he does not specifically concentrate on the development

of children, he views the source of display of behaviours and social roles as the family and attaches high importance to the child-parent relationship in order to prepare the child for social interaction (Goffman, 1990; 2007). Lemert (1997) notes that Goffman stresses this relationship between parent and child, and the importance of the child engaging in social situations in order to experiment with and adapt and modify behaviours and social roles and identifies the family in Goffman's theory as the source of the social experience, which serves to prepare for later mutual monitoring. Further, Lemert explains how Goffman understands individuals as engaging in 'social portraiture' (Lemert and Branaman, 1997: 219). Goffman attributes importance to how this social portraiture assists participating parties in assuming their social role by means of (a) verbal symbols and their substitutes, which 'convey the information that he and the others are known to attach to [these] symbols', and (b) 'a wide range of action that others can treat as symptomatic of the actor' with the aim to 'control the conduct of the others, especially their responsive treatment of him' (Goffman, 1990: 14-15). Thus the social interaction between individuals and individuals and groups becomes a performance in which a particular role is displayed (Goffman, 1990). Lemert (1997) stresses that Goffman sees the notion of authenticity of character as social and that there are an infinite number of performances from which to select. He stresses that those expressions are socially learned and patterned rather than intrinsic. Hence, it is the 'socially defined category which employs a particular expression, and a socially established schedule which determines when these expressions will occur' (Lemert and Branaman, 1997: 223), and consequently specific social situations and the displayed social behaviour are 'a consequence of what can be generated in [this specific] social situation' (Lemert and Branaman, 1997: 223). In other words, while the social actor in any specific situation has a variety of potential roles he or she could display, some of which may conflict with another (Mayer Hacker, 1957), 'it is not the character of the overall structure that is exposed, but rather particular, situation-bound features relevant to the viewer'(Lemert and Branaman, 1997: 223). Thus 'any property seen as unique to that particular person [or group], is likely to be seen as characterizing him [or them]' and 'the absence in him [or the group] of a particular property [is] seen as common to the [group] of which he is a member' (Lemert and Branaman, 1997: 223). Goffman

recognises that each individual possesses different and potentially conflicting character traits and distinguishes between *front* and *backstage regions,* whereby the *back regions* play a significant role in the process of performing a particular front and assists individuals to 'buffer themselves from the deterministic demands that surround them' (Goffman, 1990: 116).

This theoretical approach to explaining the 'socialisation apparatus' (Clausen, 1968: 23) is particularly interesting in a number of ways: (1) not only does it accentuate how interaction between individuals, and individuals and groups is tailored to very specific situations, but (2) also highlights how there can be a discrepancy between specific behaviours in any given situation and the identity as a whole of the individual. While psychoanalytical approaches, sex-role and social learning approaches imply an idea of coherent 'gendered identity', in which behaviour and actual character of the agent are in harmony with one another, in this approach (3) a notion of the possibility of conflict between behaviour and the self of the individual emerges. This notion of possible discrepancy between the expectations of social roles and the actual enactment has been absent thus far from the foregoing discussion on masculinity and masculinity and crime. Not only does such a notion give room for reflective agency of the individual, but also the idea that performances are situation-specific allows for a conceptualisation of masculinity beyond its singularity and essentialist understanding. Goffman stresses how specific situations require specific behaviours or *fronts* and thereby adds (4) a concept of context-specific-performance to socially learned behaviours, in which the individual utilises a particular type of his or her behaviour in the process of interaction.

Unlike the narrative in relation to masculinity and offending in chapter two and the aforementioned theories in this chapter, Goffman does not see the individual action of one performer as characteristic of that performer; he rather understands it as characteristic of the task at hand, and highlights that through performing a particular kind of *front*, the individual's performance itself will 'incorporate and exemplify the officially accredited values of society' (Goffman, 1990: 45) as a whole, and the values of the group the performer implicitly represents in particular by 'accentuating certain

facts and concealing others' (Goffman, 1990: 72). This notion, which Goffman captures by the term *idealization* (Goffman, 1990) can be closely linked to what Foucault understands as *subjectification* (Foucault, 1992), whereby exaggerated traits of a particular group of people serve to identify this group and members of it through these traits. Rabinow (1991) considers how Goffman understands these characteristic traits in reference to a particular group to which the individual may subscribe, while accepting its moral values and behaviours. It is precisely here that Goffman's theory could offer a way of conceptualising masculinity beyond an essentialist and static notion of discrete behaviours (Aboim, 2010) by contextualising the enactment of masculinity in specific situations.

Bourdieu (1986; 2005) understands the set of values, morals and discourses of a particular group and their symbolic interaction as their *habitus,* their modus operandi; similarly to Goffman, and to what Jenkins describes as 'an acquired system of generative schemes objectively adjusted to the particular conditions in which it is constituted' (Jenkins, 2002: 74) . Webb, Schirato, and Danaher elaborate that his concept of *habitus* in *cultural fields*, which are composed of interactions rules and practices, constitutes mainly three premises: (a) 'people more or less reproduce the objective structures of society, culture or community they live in [and these] are articulated through discourse, ideas, values, rituals and practices by employing various modes of communication'(Webb et al., 2002: 33); (b) sign systems are at the core of these modes of communication and 'do not only think people into existence [but] also determine how they perceive the world [..] and reality is both produced and limited by whatever sign system we have at our disposal' (Webb et al., 2002: 33); and (c) reality and people are processed through the meaning machines that constitute our sign systems; but the signs in this system mean nothing in themselves, they only mean in so far as they are part of a sign system and can be related to other signs in that system' (Webb et al., 2002: 33). This *habitus,* enacted in the *field*, is simultaneously a reflection and a confirmation of the individual's *social, cultural* and *symbolic capital*, which constitutes his or her position in a particular group and in relation to other groups and individuals (Webb et al., 2002: 34). *Symbolic violence,* violence that is perpetrated against a person with some degree of complicity, results

'only when both agents have deposited in their habitus the symbolic order that produces the corresponding actions' (Krias and Marston William, 2000: 58-59).

Further, Bourdieu, like Goffman, understands this taking in of rules and values as arbitrary and not as essential or natural practices (Webb et al., 2002). The displayed *front* or *habitus* is then to be seen as socially constructed and equips the individual with a set of discrete cultural rules for a specific social context (Krias and Marston William, 2000; Webb et al., 2002). While within the idea of habitus these rules are only partly taking in consciously and 'can only function effectively as habitus if we do not think about the specific sociocultural conditions or contexts of their production and existence' (Webb et al., 2002: 39), Goffman allows for more agency in the reproduction through his concept of *backstage* (Goffman, 1990). However, for both, a central aspect of *habitus* and *fronts* is the way in which they naturalise cultural rules and values in practice (Bourdieu, 2005; Goffman, 1990).

Indeed, Bourdieu (1986) understands the different kinds of capital as a reflection of the social structure of the world, at any given moment in time, which are constrained by the structure from which they derive and determine the success of any given practice. As such, he distinguishes between capitals as *economic capital* (institutionalised in form of property rights), *cultural capital* (with a potential to be converted into economic capital and is institutionalised in the form of educational achievements) and *social capital* constituted of social obligations (with a potential also to be converted into economic capital). While Bourdieu initially places an emphasis on the accumulation of these forms of capital relating to the family, these forms of capital are produced and reinforced through group membership which regulates the legitimacy and illegitimacy of specific practices (Bourdieu, 1986).

So, what does that mean in relation to masculinity or gender identity as a whole? Goffman has a very clear understanding of gender and how gender as a variable in social interaction is and can be operated:

One of the most deeply seated traits of man [...] is gender; femininity and masculinity are in a sense the prototype of essential expressions- something that can be conveyed fleetingly in any social situation and yet something that strikes at the most basic characterization of the individual (Goffman, 2007: 79)

While Goffman admits that the origins of 'gender displays' are dominantly attributed to biology, i.e. the (assumed) biological sex of the social actor, he leaves room to question these gender displays as essential characteristics (Goffman, 2007). Indeed, Goffman stresses that the expression of gender in interaction is merely a portrait 'of a version of themselves and their relationship at strategic moments- a working agreement [...] to facilitate each other's presentation of [...] the claimed character of their human nature' (Goffman, 2007: 80-81). As such they are not 'natural expressions of gender' but rather an expression of the individual's ability to choose what are considered appropriate learned responses. Goffman's (2007) concept of *gender display* refers to conventional portrayals of the correlates of sex and gender and highlights gender specific *fronts* or *displays* in social interaction. Although he understands the male and female roles within the gendered interaction as somewhat complementary to each another, he highlights their social construction: 'what the human nature of males and females really consists of [...] is the capacity to learn, to provide and react to depictions of masculinity and femininity and a willingness to adhere to a schedule for presenting these pictures' (Goffman, 2007: 81). Goffman argues that, consequently, what these gender displays reveal is not so much essential characteristics of one particular gender, but rather 'a schedule for the portrayal of gender' (Goffman, 2007: 81) by the particular social actor and a recognition of the same by the recipient. While he acknowledges that gender displays are outcomes rather than providing information on one's essential 'gendered' character, he points out that 'a considerable amount of substance of society is enrolled in the staging of it' (Goffman, 2007: 83). This contrast of clearly distinguishing between male and female gender performances on the one hand, yet stating that those displays of gender do not reveal the essential character of the actor, on the other, paint a confusing picture with regard to how much men and women are seen as essentialist categories by Goffman. His implicit understanding of

agency and the actor being able to choose between context-specific fronts in light of his ideas of gender display suggest that, while male and female actors may be able to choose from a variety of performances, this variety of performances is limited by its appropriateness to one gender rather than another. So while gender is not essentialised in the sense that only one specific performance or front is available to one gender, a notion of essentialism is still evident in that certain performances are applied to be accessible to one gender only.

Bourdieu (2001), subscribes to the structural dimension of gender and male domination (Bourdieu, 2001), but he does not discuss the gendered dimension in relation to his concept of the field or habitus (Krias and Marston William, 2000; McNay, 1999). Whereas Goffman's (2007) focus is on the individual display of gender, Bourdieu concentrates on the underlying patriarchal structure. Like Goffman, Bourdieu's work neglects to pay detailed attention to the apparent alignment between the (gendered) *habitus*, or *front*, and the wider social structure. McNay (1999) points out that the lack of more concrete discussions around gender and habitus in the field is even more surprising when taking Bourdieu's concept of the *bodily hexis* into account, through which he highlights the process of habitus turning into 'a permanent disposition, a durable manner of standing, speaking and therefore feeling and thinking' (Bourdieu, 2005: 93-94), the embodiment of rules regulating one's habitus as link between individuals' worlds and the culture they share with others. As McNay highlights, since 'hierarchical gender relations are embedded in bodily hexis, that is to say arbitrary power relations are inculcated upon the body in the naturalized form of gender identity' (McNay, 1999: 100) and bodies are socially understood through conceptions of what they can and cannot do. While Jenkins (2002) illustrates how, for Bourdieu, women are objects of value and that he recognises capital as gendered, Lovell (2000) argues that Bourdieu pays little attention to 'women as subjects with capital-accumulating strategies of their own' in the specific gendered employment of *habitus* in the *field*, despite admitting that gender plays a significant role in relation to this. So while Goffman (2007) understands gender as an over-riding factor in all specific social situations, Bourdieu (2001) highlights its importance in terms of overall male domination.

However, in neither approach is there any explicit space to analyse the demand of what Bourdieu calls the *field* on 'subject dispositions' (McNay, 1999: 108), or indeed deviations from dominant understandings of masculinity and femininity or how exactly masculinity and femininity are acquired. Moreover, both Bourdieu and Goffman set women's complicity in their own domination by men (Krias and Marston William, 2000) without any detailed consideration of how exactly gender operates in the arena of social interaction (McNay, 1999). Indeed, McNay (1999) elaborates that Bourdieu over-emphasises the 'alignment between the masculine and feminine disposition and the need for social reproduction […] as so stable' that it leads him to claim 'that the phallo-narcissistic view of the world can only be dislodged through complete rejection of gendered habitus' (McNay, 1999: 107). However, Bourdieu articulates two main ideas which can be helpful in the discussion on gender: (1) he ascribes the concept of *habitu*s to the way a specific social group embodies social values and structural inequalities, and (2) this embodiment operates through the *bodily hexis*, this is to say that the body of the social agent itself plays a role in how social values are internalised by the individual.

Beyond the above mentioned positions Bourdieu and Goffman have taken in relation to gender, some wider-reaching conclusions can enhance the discussion on masculinity and gender identity. Firstly, Goffman and Bourdieu have outlined the process of social interaction through concepts of *fronts* and *habitus* in particular with reference to social groups. Secondly, they have highlighted the social apparatus through which practices come to serve as identifiers of individuals' association with a particular group on the one hand, and are objectified as benchmarks in regulating legitimate and illegitimate behaviour within that group, on the other. Thirdly, both have further pointed out that those practices are being naturalised through the very process of practice and mutual monitoring, albeit with an element of fluidity. Especially in Bourdieu's theory, the physical body itself plays some role, which will be discussed later, in social interaction and the accumulation of capital. Fourthly, these practices are influenced by structural inequalities, which generate the different capitals of individuals and therefore determine the nature of those practices (McNay,

1999). In effect, this means that fronts and habitus are enacted and performed social structures by individuals with reference to one or more groups in their social world, and this performance is present in all social interactions.

Goffman's and Bourdieu's approaches assist in making sense of some issues raised in relation to the discussion on masculinity and crime; (A) if *front* and *habitus* are understood as situation and group specific, then aggression in the context of men and crime can no longer be understood as an element of masculinity, but needs to be understood as embedded in social interaction and in conjunction with specific reference groups. Further, (B) if social structure and the access to social, economic and cultural capital play a key role in the formation of habitus, then these elements need to be set in the context of obtaining and enacting masculinity and the way in which practices of masculinity are naturalised in social interaction. Lastly, (C) if structural inequalities impact on these practices of masculinity and the body itself plays a role in how these inequalities are subscribed on the body, then these inequalities need to be incorporated in any understanding of masculinity and the role of the body needs to be explored.

3.5 Performativity and Hetero-Gender

From the analysis of Goffman's and Bourdieu's theories on interaction and gender within them, some questions emerge as to the part they play in these interactions: (A) to what extent is this performance of gender a representation of overriding social structures and (B) how exactly is gender 'done' in interaction?

Butler (1988; 1990) argues that gender is performative and that the performance of gender is not in itself the result of an essential gender identity but rather the act of performance constitutes gender identity by the expression of the gender it utilises. Butler echoes Goffman's idea that the fronts expressed are merely evidence of socially learned behaviour and mutual monitoring without expressing the actual essence of the actor's character (Butler, 1990), and she further views performed gender positions as resulting from systems of power and therefore bearing notions

of cultural and political intersections (Butler, 1990). Consequently, gender identity is fluid and should be understood as, at any given time, a representation of the cultural, symbolic and social practices of the societal settings within which it is studied (Lemert and Branaman, 1997). As such, gender performance constitutes both the re-enacted cultural norms and possibilities of its society and their inscriptions onto the body. Butler outlines that the category sex is equally as constructed as the category gender in the 'context of the heterosexual matrix' (Butler, 1990: 5).

While foregoing contextualisation of sex in psychoanalysis (Freud, 1923), social learning (Bandura, 1977; Bandura and Walters, 1963) and socialisation theory (Clausen, 1968) and in Goffman's (1990; 2007) and Bourdieu's (1986; 2001; 2005) work have simply recorded the outcome of different behaviours of the sexes, as it were, rather than making assumptions about the essence of gender and gendered-identity, Butler emphasises that:

> Identity is assured through the stabilizing concept of sex, gender, and sexuality, the very notion of 'the person' is called into question by the cultural emergence of those 'incoherent' or 'discontinuous' gendered beings who appear to be persons but fail to conform to the gendered norms of cultural intelligibility by which persons are defined (Butler, 1990: 17).

Butler engages with Goffman's (1990) notion of mutual monitoring of behaviour, and seeks to explore the concept of gender by introducing into the equation those who do not conform to the gender-roles prescribed to the dominant social group and here sees an opportunity 'to expose limits and regulatory aims of that domain of eligibility and, hence, to open up within the very terms of that matrix of intelligibility rival and subversive matrices of gender disorder' (Butler, 1990: 17). At the centre of this investigation is the *a priori* assumption of heterosexuality and heterosexual desire in the analysis of sex and gender:

> The institution of a compulsory and naturalized heterosexuality requires and regulates gender as binary relation in which the masculine term is differentiated from a

feminine term, and this differentiation is accomplished through the practices of heterosexual desire. The act of differentiating the two oppositional moments as binary results in the consolidation of each term […] respective internal coherence of sex, gender, and desire (Butler, 1990: 22).

Thus compulsory heterosexuality generates a repetition of regulatory heterosexual practices from which the idea of gender results and through which gender identities appear uniform in themselves and binary in relation to one another. She puts the understanding of male and female practices into a wider context and appoints it central to the way both are performed. Butler understands gender as 'a repeated stylization of the body, a set of repeated acts within a highly rigid regulatory frame […] [that] produces the appearance of substance, of a natural sort of being' (Butler, 1990: 22). As a logical consequence, what 'Freud assumed to be primarily or constitutive facts of sexual life' and Goffman took equally as given, 'are effects of a law, which internalized, produces and regulates discrete gender identity and heterosexuality' (Butler, 1990: 64).

Both Goffman and Bourdieu allow fluidity to their concepts of *fronts* and *habitus* and, in particular Goffman questions that the sum of practices hints at the essence of the character of the actor. The notion that a particular behaviour or even the sum of specific behaviours does not necessarily reveal the essence of the social actor is particularly interesting here as it potentially allows the isolation of 'aggressive and violent male practices' as one part of the actor's character, but not the over-riding essence. Butler here takes this idea one step further and highlights how the law to these gendered behaviours itself is subject to the *a priori* assumption of heterosexuality, and 'not only does the narration claim access to a "before" from which it is definitionally produced, but the description of the "before" takes place within the terms of the "after" and, hence, becomes an attenuation of the law itself into the site of its absence' (Butler, 1990: 74). In other words, what is assumed to be the result of a natural and inherent difference between the sexes and therefore their different behaviours, is in fact rationalised on the assumption of an *a priori*

heterosexuality which men and women understood through their binary, and their practices have already been naturalised as such. Butler observes that the resulting 'substantive grammar of sex imposes an artificial binary relation between the sexes, as well as an artificial internal coherence within each term of that binary' (Butler, 1990: 19), which works to regulate 'sexuality and suppress the subversive multiplicity of sexuality that disrupts heterosexual, reproductive and medico-juridicial hegemonies' (Butler, 1990: 19). At the centre of this idea is that gender roles, with specifically subscribed meaning and practices, are essential positions entwined in the historical framework of the patriarchy and the division of labour (Butler, 1990). Gender roles are thereby captured by the framework of 'compulsory and naturalized heterosexuality', which 'requires and regulates gender as a binary relation in which the masculine term is differentiated from a feminine term, and the differentiation is accomplished through practices of heterosexual desire' (Butler, 1990: 22). Butler here helps to understand how masculinity as discussed in the previous chapter is essentialised within a framework of the heterosexual binary, in which femininity and masculinity assume oppositional character and are defined as mutually exclusive, whereby men and women are allocated very specific subject-positions. The essentialist notion of gender here is placed outside of the social actor and seen as rooted in social structure, hierarchies of gendered power and manifested in the institution of heterosexuality.

In the same line of thinking, Ingraham (2002) argues that gender is secondary to the material conditions of the patriarchal society and is 'inextricably bound up with heterosexuality' (Ingraham, 2002: 80). Ingraham understands institutionalised heterosexuality to be integral to the organisation of the division of labour, whereby deviant sexual practices that do not contribute to dominant heterosexual arrangements are illegitimate. Consequently, gender can only be understood as hetero-gender since the entire concept of gender relies on a 'heterosexual dualism [which] implies a static or normative understanding of gender' (Ingraham, 2002: 83). In agreement with Butler, Ingraham highlights the presumption of heterosexuality when the focus is on gender; gender then is 'to learn the proper way to be a woman in relation to a man, or feminine in relation to the masculine', whereby

'heterosexuality serves the unexamined organizing institution and ideology (the heterosexual imaginary) for gender' (Ingraham, 2002: 83).

Indeed Wittig (2002) stresses the way in which the presumption of heterosexuality results in hetero-gendered notions about men and women, and argues that 'categories founded upon heterosexuality […] produce the difference between the sexes as a political and philosophical dogma' (Wittig, 2002: 146), while 'the discourse of heterosexuality oppress[es] in the sense that they prevent us from speaking unless we speak in their terms' (Wittig, 2002: 145). She argues that the terminology produced by and through concepts of an *a priori* heterosexuality closes off the possibility of defining gender categories outside the heterosexual realm. Consequently, the categories 'woman' and 'man' can only be articulated through the implicit idea of heterosexuality, and therefore make no sense in relation to individuals who do not identify as heterosexual. She states that 'the heterosexual mind is clothed in its tendency to immediately universalize its production of concepts into general laws which claim to be held true for all societies, all epochs, all individuals' (Wittig, 2002: 146). In relation to gender this necessitates the 'obligatory character of you-will-be-straight-or-you-will-not-be' (Wittig, 2002: 147).

Wittig (2002) and Ingraham (2002) offer a framework here in which to theorise the monitoring of specific behaviour, in this context masculinity, as it surfaced in Goffman's (1990; 2007) and Bourdieu's (1986; 2005) work. The legitimacy of specific male practices can be seen as being measured against their performance in relation to heterosexual desire and hetero-normative gender roles, whereby being a man translates into being a heterosexual men, and (heterosexual) male practices are oppositional to female practices.

Returning to the question of to what extent overriding social structures are represented in the social performance of gender, Butler (1990), Ingraham (2002) and Wittig (2002) have reached beyond the concepts of the patriarchy (Connell, 1987; 2005b) and male domination (Bourdieu, 2001). They understand gender through the distinct notion of the *a priori* assumption of heterosexuality, in which the terms

'men' and 'women' only make sense in reference to the dualism implied by the concept of *compulsory heterosexuality* (Butler, 1990: 19). Here heterosexuality and the ascribed subject positions within it reflect the way in which masculinity is essentialised in the discussion in chapter two. The central position of heterosexuality, and masculinity and femininity as being contextualised within this framework, becomes visible and is set into a sociological context.

This adds the following dimensions to the discussion on gender: (1) while gender may operate throughout patriarchal structures of society as a whole, these structures already hold an assumption of heterosexuality within them, and (2) this notion of heterosexuality persists through this particular *modus operandi*. Consequently, (3) the way we think about gender is in fact deeply embedded in ideas about heterosexuality, and gender itself becomes hetero-gender, whereby discrete subject positions are assigned to men in opposition to the subject positions understood as accessible to women.

Acker (1989) argues that, while theorising the patriarchy was the initial step to conceptualising the subordination of women, it cannot be a useful analytical system for the practical aspects of women's (and men's) lives as it does not incorporate the actual experiences of women (and men). The inbuilt dualism in theories of the patriarchy is only useful insofar as it relates to the household as the classic patriarchal institution and therefore is analytically independent of other structures and systems. Acker thereby notes the lack of inclusion of experiences of the actual gendered social agents in the discussion of gender, and she emphasises that social relations of gender are constituted through processes of social interaction, in which not only gender, as a category, but also class is re-affirmed (Acker, 1989). This criticism of using the patriarchy and the division of labour as a framework for analysing and explaining gender has been echoed by Fuss (1990), who stresses that, since the patriarchy as a concept is essentialist in itself, it can only produce an understanding of men and women as an essentialist category. Indeed, Messerschmidt argues that 'the patriarchy explains away real variations in the construction of masculinity within a particular society and, consequently, encourages

the theorization of one type of masculinity- the (patriarchal) male' (Messerschmidt, 1993: 58).

The absence of the experience of men themselves is particularly evident in the way much of the literature has theorised about men, masculinity and crime. As Collier (1998) argues, masculinity is dominantly associated with negative connotations and does not make room for the plurality of masculinities and the differences between men. Seidler (2006) stresses the importance of the integration of men's experiences, and Messerschmidt (2012b) presents an example of how this can inform the discussion on masculinity and crime. However, much of the literature on men, masculinity and crime focuses on specific ways in which masculinity is performed within hetero-normative boundaries (Ingraham, 2002) in association with working class masculinity (Morgan, 2005); 'doing masculinity' here is associated with 'doing crime' (Hobbs, 1994; Winlow, 2002).

3.6 Doing Gender

West and Zimmerman (1987) give a further insight into how 'doing gender' is accomplished. With reference to Goffman (1990), they understand gender as 'an emergent feature of social situations; both as an outcome of a rationale for various social arrangements and as a means of legitimating one of the most fundamental divisions of society' (West and Zimmerman, 1987: 126). They heavily build on Goffman's idea of the mutual monitoring of behaviour in relation to gender. In other words, gender, for West and Zimmerman (1987), is not an added factor in social interaction, but rather determines the nature of the social interaction itself and social agents organise their interactions to display and receive confirmation of their gender. Hence, they argue that gender is not essential to the person, but the product of social interaction, in which it is constituted. West and Zimmerman move beyond Goffman's notion of *gender display* (2007), and stress that gender is an ongoing process, embedded in and constituted by everyday interaction, involving a gender attribution process, whereby the biological sex of a person is assumed, and their behaviour categorised in reference to the presumed sex, which results in assigning a

gender to that person (West and Zimmerman, 1987). This categorisation process, according to West and Zimmerman, occurs when we interact with others and the gender of the person interacted with is taken at 'face value, unless we have special reason to doubt' (West and Zimmerman, 1987: 133). In this social process individuals are not only identify the sex of the people they interact with, but also assume that social agents display their sex in a fashion we understand and easily associate with one particular sex, so 'produce configurations of behaviour that would be seen by others as normative gender behaviour' (West and Zimmerman, 1987: 134). Messerschmidt (2012b) echoes this assumption of sex in relation to identified gender traits in the research on masculinity, and this assumption is equally evident in the ways in which masculinity and crime have been made sense of in chapter two. Building on West and Zimmerman (1987) theory, *gender display* is not stagnant and transferable into any given situation, but rather carefully constructed to specific situations in which the display of a particular kind of gendered behaviour is deemed appropriate. Hence, gender and its situation-specific display are designed around the idea of accountability for particular circumstances, and effectively any activity is designed in reference to being 'at risk of gender assessment' (West and Zimmerman, 1987: 136). Subsequently, placing oneself in and perceiving others as belonging to a particular sex category is enforced and 'doing gender is unavoidable' (West and Zimmerman, 1987: 137). Gender, and the placement of behaviour in terms of essential sex categories, is not simply representative of what one is, but what one does and gender becomes a situational accomplishment.

While Butler (1990) postulated that the performance of gender is produced through the presumption of heterosexuality, Ingraham (2002) and Wittig (2002) have divided this structure into acting male and female agents. They stress that, in fact, being gendered is regulated and patrolled by ideas of hetero-gender, whereby being male or being female only substantiates within the difference constructed in the hetero-gendered binary of the sexes. Although West and Zimmerman (1987) do not explicitly integrate the concept of heterosexuality into their theory on how gender is done, they have emphasised how 'doing gender' is an ongoing process, constituted in social interaction, in which the social agents are held accountable for their

situation-specific display of gender. Thus, having accounted for both the structural and the interactional elements of what we understand as gender, and having given an insight into how gender is socially learned in the process of socialisation, the role of agency in the process of acquiring and enacting gender remains largely absent.

3.7 Gender, Agency and the Body

Throughout chapter two and this chapter the question of social agency arises frequently. Although some of the theories above implicitly allow room for agency of social actors and their potential ability to reflect critically, here with particular reference to the attainment of masculinity, social agency is not explicitly addressed in the narrative on masculinity and offending or the way in which the above sociological theories make sense of gender. As touched upon in chapter two, Greener (2002) highlights the importance of agency in relation to social policy and thereby its relevance to practice. The remainder of this chapter discusses how agency is or is not conceptualised in the theories discussed in this chapter and concludes by drawing together key elements of the narrative on masculinity and offending and sociological theories outlined in this chapter.

Freudian (1923) psychoanalytic accounts of identity and of how persons come to be individuals are articulated through the idea of the self are divided into three distinct categories: the Id, the Ego and the Super Ego. While the Id operates largely unconsciously, it consists of desires, wishes and impulses and its main drive is the *libido*, aiming to satisfy these desires. At the other end of the spectrum, the Super Ego is ruled by morality principles, which are deeply entrenched in ideas of morality of the social structure of which the individual is part. The Ego here acts as mediator between the Super Ego and the Id and somewhat regulates the tension between them. Whereas its task is self-reflection between desires and morality principles, its focus is dominantly inward and its brief is regulatory (Freud, 1923). While, in theory, there is some potential for the Id to possess the capacity for personal agency, the central place of the unconscious in Freudian theory and the focus on the inner world of the individual prohibit wider-ranging commodities as for their agency. Equally, the

personhood is created prior to the individual entering the social world and thereby does not account for structural dimensions to the formation of identity and, consequently, gender identity (Lawler, 2008). As Elliott (2003) cautions, while Freud identifies the adjusting of 'projected fantasies from social relations a key task for the self-reflective individual' (Elliott, 2003: 57) as an ongoing process, he does not understand the self as transcending cultural or social values and responsibilities of society as a whole, and thereby sees it as isolated from societal structure. The inward focus of the self in Freudian psychoanalysis, as such, does not take any structural social forces into account in the formation of the self and therefore cannot account for inequalities between individuals (Lawler, 2008). Consequently, there is little evidence of an understanding and incorporation of agency in Freudian thought (Elliott, 2003; Lawler, 2008). While the Ego may be the regulatory element between the Id and the Super-Ego, it pays no attention to social structures or indeed reflexive capacities and autonomy within the person.

Sex-role theory (Block, 1976a; Parsons, 1951) is equally dominated by an inward focus, though this focus is on the institution of family rather than the psyche of the individual. While it remains within the *a priori* assumption of heterosexuality in the institutionalised form of the family, the emphasis here is on the relations between the child and the parents, specifically how fathers and mothers react to the expression of gendered behaviour and regulate it. The key roles here are enacted behaviours by children attached to their gender and the expectations that go along with that. Whereas sex-role theory suggests how these behaviours are understood and reinforced as normative along the lines of gender expectations, it does not allow for any agency in the child to make active decisions, specifically in regard to deviations from those somewhat naturalised gendered behaviours. It concentrates on the symptoms of gendered behaviours and how they are regulated within the family rather than analysing the causes and attributing a decision-making capacity to the child as a person.

The picture remains fairly similar in the framework of socialisation and social learning theory (Bandura, 1977; Bandura and Walters, 1963; Clausen, 1968; Mead, 1934) in

relation to how the individual is considered as an empty vessel to be filled with socially learned behaviours, and a lack of consideration for agency and reflexivity within the person remains. Despite some theoretical exploration into how individual gendered behaviour may differ from the expected behaviour, and the potential tensions between them (Mayer Hacker, 1957), no critical competence is attributed to the individual. Instead *stimuli* are seen as key in the successful learning or repression of specific behaviours, which are then practised in social interaction (Bandura, 1977; Bandura and Walters, 1963; Zigler and Child, 1973). While the focus does not necessarily remain on the family, the acquisition and practice of behaviours is understood as an ongoing process and in reference to social groups as well as the institution of the family. However, within the theory of social learning and socialisation there remains a lack of the acknowledgement of agency.

For Goffman (1990; 2007), however, continuous monitoring of the different roles and their multiplicity is a key element to the formation of the self. The individual's ability to reflect is operationalised through and regulated by the concept of *front* and *back regions*, whereby fronts function to give impressions of the self to others (Goffman, 1990). The individual is actively involved in the 'strategic manipulation of impressions' and is a 'creative and reflective agent who decides' (Elliott, 2003: 32). The dramatic realisation of fronts then 'rest on impression management' (Lawler, 2008: 107) with the individual making active decisions. Goffman (1990) acknowledges and in fact highlights the discrepancies between performed roles and the self of the individual and distinguishes between true and false, or convincing and not convincing performances.

In feminist theory the concept of agency has been articulated through ideas of embodiment; gender identity here is 'a lived set of embodied potentialities, rather than an externally imposed set of constraining norms' (McNay, 2000: 31). Concepts of embodiment are evident in both Bourdieu's (1986; 2001; 2005) and Butler's (1993; 1988; 1990) ideas. As McNay (1999) underlines, the body is seen as the medium through which the individual's social experience is realised, and henceforth 'embodiment expresses a moment of indeterminacy whereby the embodied subject

is constituted through dominant norms but is not reducible to them' (McNay, 1999: 99). While both Butler and Bourdieu have been criticised for relying heavily on the one-directional structural inscription of values and norms on the body and their lack of consideration of 'how the symbolic investment of the body is overlaid and altered by social and material relations' (McNay, 2000: 31), they add the dimension of the body itself to the discussion on agency.

Jenkins (2002) observes how for Bourdieu, power relations are instilled on the body and form the *bodily hexis* as a 'permanent disposition', whereby the body is the 'mediating link between an individual's subjectivity and the cultural world' (Jenkins, 2002: 75). That means that the *habitus* of the individual is the imprint of the process through which cultural and social norms have been learned, and thus are routinely expressed through the body without the active knowledge of the actor. The key element here, in relation to gender, is the inscription of structural inequalities of power through *symbolic violence* (Bourdieu, 2001), whereby women become symbolically objectified and social structure becomes visible through social interaction in form of 'schemes of perception and appreciation inscribed in the bodies of the interacting agents' (Bourdieu, 2001: 63). These schemes are representations of structural dichotomies (such as weak/strong, big/small etc.), which are imposed on social agents and their bodies from the outset, and provoke perceptions and reactions that are themselves at the heart of these schemes. In other words, they are inscribed on the construction of the body through power relations of the structure and their representation reinforces the structure itself as well as the schemes being read through dichotomies produced by the structure. McNay (2000) emphasises that for Bourdieu, the 'body is a dynamic, mutual frontier […] through which the subject's lived experience of the world is incorporated and realized' (McNay, 2000: 33). Bourdieu (1986; 2005) understands the habitus as expressing and anticipating temporal tendencies and regularities in social practice and interaction, which implies, as McNay (2000) highlights, that the concept of habitus is not static but that it is 'a historical structure that is only ever realised in reference to specific situations' (McNay, 2000: 43). Acknowledging that the structures as embodied habitus are historical and change over time, Bourdieu implies

potentiality for active and critical agency in his social actors. However, agency is only made explicit in Bourdieu's work in relation to the embodiment of structures, and social actors appear to be simply active in that they enact and participate in social situations. So, if the body is where agency takes place for Bourdieu, and the body itself is a social construct as it is a manifestation of power relations, then there is effectively no agency as there is no reflective and decision-making process, but only the socially enacted habitus through a medium that is socially constructed and not independent of social structure. While psychoanalytical accounts of gender identity and agency depend on an inward focus, Bourdieu stresses the one-directional inscription of power relations, neither of which actively allows room for an understanding of critical and reflective agency (McNay, 2000).

Butler (1990) does not understand gender as inherent in the body, but rather first sexed through speech acts, the classification of 'boy' or 'girl' in speech along the lines of the dualism of the sexes. She heavily refers to Foucault's work (1992) on the construction of the human subject as 'constituted and regulated by a bureaucratic discourse of sexual classification, the rationalization of culture and administrative surveillance and management of population' (Elliott, 2003: 96), which in turn underplays the potential role of agency.

Foucault understands the body as the element through which discourses are contested (Foucault, 1992; Mills, 2003). He places immense importance on the body, whereas the body is understood as the *essence* and the individual as the *effect*, and itself is constituted through the process of discourse (Foucault, 1992). He does not understand the body as passive, and explores how power relations are competed on the body (Mills, 2003; Smart, 1985). As McNay (1992) points out, Foucault, like Bourdieu, comprehends the body as the medium or historical entity through which patriarchal power relations and dominance are expressed, but does not account for experience and individuality.

Butler (1988) states that:

> If gender attributes and acts, the various ways in which a body shows or produces its cultural significance, are performative, then there is no preexisting identity by which an act or attribute might be measured [and] that gender reality is created through sustained social performances means that the very notions of an essential sex and true or abiding masculinity or femininity are also constituted [...] (Butler, 1988: 528)

She understands agency through Foucault's concept of *subjectification*, and overcomes the lack of concrete mechanism through which the subject is pushed into submission in Foucault's (1992) work by describing this very process through the idea of temporarity, rather than through a static and chronological apparatus. For Butler, agency is 'a sedimented effect of reiterative or ritualised practices; the repeated inscription of the symbolic norms of heterosexuality upon the body' (Butler, 2011: 14). While this idea of agency still carries a notion of passivity, it has been pointed out that Butler acknowledges the capacity for resistance in individuals (McNay, 2000), but remains fairly one-dimensional in her explanation of the formation of gender identity through *interpellation* (Lawler, 2008). However, her idea of effective and critical agency is limited to those situations where the configuration of social structures and subjectification do not work in performances which are set to achieve gender identity. In coherence with the way Wittig (2002) and Ingraham (2002) outline the function and power around the idea of heterosexuality, Butler (1993; 1988; 1990) implies that critical and decision-making agency is only activated when there is some discrepancy between what ought to be performed and the actual subjectivity of the acting social agent. In other words, absent from Butler's argument is a more detailed account of agency, which holds the capacity to reflect critically and decide consistently. McNay (2000) argues that, although Butler notes that 'the performative construction of gender identity causes agency [...] through which norms are materialised [and which] permit the stabilization of a subject who is capable of resisting those norms' (McNay, 2000: 34), her explanations focus on the structural conditions which potentially enable agency. In other words, she does not account for how 'performative aspects of gender identity are lived by individuals in relation to the web of social practices in which they are enmeshed' (McNay, 2000: 46).

Turner (2000; 1991) further stresses that the body is socially produced and regulated by institutional discourses such as religion and medicine. For him, agency plays a crucial part in this process, and the embodied self is not simply the passive product of those discourses but integral to the presentation and performance of the self. Building on Foucault's work, Turner attributes an idea of multiplicity to how individuals form their identity, and underlines how on various symbolic levels the embodiment of specific discourses is regulated, whereby the doctrine of those institutions produces ideas around which are legitimate and illegitimate bodies (Furstenberg and Weiss, 2000; Turner, 1991).

This idea of multiplicity, alongside agency, in relation to the formation of gender identity, and resulting masculinity and femininity, is surprisingly absent from the discussion of gender in the theories summarised here. Psychoanalysis (Freud, 1923) draws a complex but coherent picture of how masculinity and femininity are acquired, with an inward focus on the psyche. Agency here is understood as internal and regulating the Super Ego and the Id, but without the capacity to reflect critically beyond the dichotomy of desire and morality. Sex-role (Block, 1976a; Parsons, 1951), social learning and socialisation theories (Bandura, 1977; Bandura and Walters, 1963; Clausen, 1968) echo this coherence in relation to expression and the social learning of gender identity and there remains a lack of agency. Heterogeneity of masculinity and femininity is equally underplayed in Bourdieu's (1986; 2005) idea of *habitus*, which perhaps is a logical consequence of the dualism provided by the idea of patriarchy and embodied in the *bodily hexis*. However, Bourdieu (2001) adds the dimension of embodiment of the individual's social structures. Although Goffman's (1990) idea of *front* and *back region* and Butler's (1988; 1990) approach to gender through performativity allow more room for critical and reflective agency, they fail to provide a detailed account of how exactly this agency operates and the multiplicity it could consequentially have in relation to the formation of gender identity. While the body itself is taken as given by Goffman (1990), Butler (1993; 1988; 1990) understands it as the medium on which and by which gender is inscribed. While the body has physicality in sex-role, social learning and socialisation theory as well as in Goffman's concept of interaction, Bourdieu (2001), Foucault (1985) and Butler (1993;

1988; 1990) stress the importance of the body. Here the body becomes both sexed through social structure and dominant discourses, as well as instrumental in sustaining the very structure of which it is a reflection. While critical and reflecting agency is an implied potentiality in Bourdieu (1986; 2001; 2005), Butler (1993; 1988; 1990) and Foucault's (1985) approach to the formation of identity and indeed the creation of gendered-identity, the processes through which this agency is activated are underexplored. Equally, by virtue of analysing gender identity through the idea of male dominance and the patriarchy, multiplicity of masculinity and femininity generally lacks depth. The dimension of experiences of men and women is not explicitly evident in their accounts of gender. However, while these theories have raised questions around the idea and function of agency in relation to gender and possible heterogeneity of masculinity and femininity, they have also highlighted the importance of the body through which structural values are transcended.

Lastly, the idea of reference groups is evident throughout the literature in chapters two and three. While in psychoanalysis parents play a distinct role in the formation of gender identity (Chodorow, 1974; 1994; Freud, 1923; 1975; 1997; Klein, 1967), here fathers as points of identification and mothers of 'disidentification', sex-role theory attributes importance to the same and their reactions to what is understood as gender-appropriate behaviour (Block, 1976a; 1976b; 1983). Social learning theory (Bandura, 1973; 1977; Bandura and Walters, 1963) and socialisation theory (Clausen, 1968) rely equally on parents as modeling gendered behaviour and the learning and reinforcement of gender appropriate characteristics, whereby fathers play a distinct role in providing the model from which to learn masculinity. Reference group for Connell (2005) appears to be the arena of men (and women in relation to male power), whereby masculinities are enacted and negotiated within hierarchies of men. Bourdieu's (1986; 2001; 2005) concept of habitus and the field can be applied to make the connection between male practice and men as reference group in the field (Coles, 2007; Stahl, 2012). Goffman explicitly refers to 'the performance team' (Goffman, 1990: 85), whereby 'incorporated moral standards' are associated with a 'reference group' (Goffman, 1990: 87), and in the performance of masculinity male peers can be identified as this reference group (De Viggiani, 2012). Throughout the

literature cited in these chapters, reference groups on which to measure the appropriateness of gendered behaviour and with whom to stage the performance of masculinity play a key role. Consequently, the idea of reference groups will inform the research questions for this study, and it will be explored to what extent this idea is evident in the ways YOT practitioners make sense of masculinity and masculinity and offending.

Summary

As outlined in chapter one, the approach of this study is to set in sociological context the ways YOT practitioners construct masculinities, and masculinities and offending through which to explore potential issues and implications of those constructions. This chapter has discussed relevant sociological theories in terms of gender and incorporated sociological approaches to how distinct behaviours of groups and individuals are theorised. Chapters five, six and seven will contextualise the findings of this study in the frame of these sociological theories. However, it is important to first summarise what this chapter has added to the way gender is understood.

Psychoanalytical accounts of gender have demonstrated that (1) gender is not inborn, but rather achieved over time, and the acquisition of masculinity and femininity is very complex indeed (1923). Jung (1933; 1959; 1989) expanded on this by emphasising that (2) the process of acquiring gendered-identity is not limited to infants but is a life-long process, (3) whereby masculinity and femininity can potentially work together harmoniously and form gender identity. Whereas sex-role theory has identified (4) that attaining identity in relation to the individual's gender is a social process during which certain behavioural traits are encouraged and others are repressed and stressed that (5) mothers and fathers play a key role in the social response to the child (Block, 1976a; 1976b; 1983; Parsons, 1951), social learning and socialisation theories have pointed out that (6) this social process (socialisation) is instrumental in the learning of social roles, which (7) occur in the context of social reference groups (as discussed above). Further, they identify that (8) social roles are subject to social control (Clausen, 1968), which are shaped by the structure of that social order, and (9) are acquired through modeling and imitation (Bandura, 1977;

Bandura and Walters, 1963; Clausen, 1968). While (10) gendered roles, as a reflection of wider social structure, are employed and mutually monitored in social interaction (Goffman, 1990), they bear (11) a distinct notion of the social structure (Bourdieu, 2001), which is (12) context-specific and can be seen as the embodiment of that structure (Bourdieu, 1986; 2001; 2005). Further, queer theory approaches to gender have argued that (13) at the core of the performance of gender lies an *a priori* assumption of heterosexuality, which effectively means that the way gender is understood is through the binary of gender identities resulting from *compulsory heterosexuality* (Butler, 1990), which results in an understanding of gender as *hetero-gender* (Ingraham, 2002). Lastly, Butler (1990), Bourdieu (2001) and Turner (2000; 1991) have (14) highlighted how the body itself is a crucial element to how gender is understood, socially constructed and regulated.

The issue remaining with the above ways of theorising gender is the lack of critical agency attributed to the social actor. In both social and biological determinism approaches, social actors remain -to a greater or lesser extent- 'utterly passive subjects, subordinated to the shaping influence of either nature or culture' (Fuss, 1990: 6). In either case, the categories 'men' and 'women' lack heterogeneity in relation to the different formations of gender identity in each individual, and both categories remain principally essentialist and reductionist in the sense that they lack accounting for the complexity of individual men's and women's experience of being a man or a woman (Morgan, 1992). They imply the categories 'men' and 'women' are clearly distinguishable from each other and so are their social performances. Interesting here is the extent to or the ways through which an essentialist notion of gender identity surfaces in the above theories. While psychoanalytical approaches highlight differences in the development of the male and the female child, as clear essential categories, sex-role, social learning and socialisation theories do not problematise gender as such, but understand gender unproblematically deriving from sex. This distinct categorisation of 'men' and 'women' as opposing categories remains in symbolic interactionism thought. Although it has been noted how Goffman's work (1990) could potentially offer a way into conceptualising masculinity in its multiple forms, the concentration remains on the commonalities of men, rather

than their differences, in particular in relation to women. While queer theory (Butler, 1990; Ingraham, 2002; Wittig, 2002) assists in questioning some of dominant notions of masculinity and femininity and criticises that men and women are only understood through the concept of heterosexuality, implicitly defining lesbian women and gay men in opposition to or deference of heterosexual men and women simply displaces the essentialism of gender rather than resolving it. By defining lesbian women and gay men in opposition to heterosexual men and women, the latter are theorised along clear essential notions of heterosexual masculinity and femininity. Although queer theory contributes to essentialist notions in the way straight gender is understood, it appears to fail to conceptualise fully exactly how gender could be theorised allowing for commonalities in gendered practices as well as heterogeneity, while also employing the very notion it criticises, that of essentialist male and female categories, in defining lesbian women and gay men away from heterosexual men and women. While, for Wittig, agency derives from or is activated through difference, and lesbian women and gay men are constructed in 'a pure space above and beyond the problematics of sexual difference' (Fuss, 1990: 45) and differences exist among these groups in relation to their social performance, she implies the existence of essentialist gay men and lesbian women categories in deference to heterosexual men and women.

Similarly, understanding social performances of masculinity and femininity through the embodiment of social inequality and the *bodily hexis* (Bourdieu, 2001), which serves to reinforce those inequalities, requires an essentialist view of men and women, in which men dominate and women are subordinate. In other words, ideas around the patriarchy when thinking about gender are by default essentialist (Fuss, 1990) and do not account for either individual experiences of masculinity and femininity, or the role of what McNay and Fuss call the 'psyche' (Fuss, 1990; McNay, 2000). Although Connell's theory of hegemonic masculinity (2005b) can assist in understanding masculinities in their plurality and account for the interplay between different masculinities, its notions around gender and power remain, in principle, essentialist. So, while these ideas provide an understanding of how individual attainment of gender identity transcends from social structure (Rose, 1989), little

detail is given about the active and reflective agency of the individual and no heterogeneity is directly attributed beyond the main distinction of male and female.

Further, if the body itself is sexed through speech acts (Butler, 2011), then the result of this process constitutes 'men' and 'women' as distinct from one another. This means, at the core of Foucault's *subjectification* (Foucault, 1992) implicitly lies a tendency to taxominise and stereotype, whereby characteristics of subject-positions are not only linear but can also be easily distinguished from one another. Moreover, shared experience in the form of social class (Bourdieu, 1986; Jenkins, 2002; McNay, 1999) and/ or sexuality (Foucault, 1992; McNay, 1992; Mills, 2003; Rabinow, 1991; Wittig, 2002) is politicised (Fuss, 1990). This means that identity is implicitly understood as an entity (Elliott, 2003; Lawler, 2008), if not as a whole, then certainly in relation to gender, and in queer theory, to sexuality. This is to say that, while queer theory helps to uncover some of the initial essentialism of sex role, social learning and socialisation theory, and Goffman (1990), Connell (2005b) and Jung (1989) potentially allow for plurality amongst masculinities, their concentration on commonalities amongst men, rather than their differences, inherently continues to bear an essentialist notion in the way they theorise about men.

Although some of the theories above (for example queer theory) attempt to eliminate the essentialist notion to gender, it appears that this notion is evident in all the theories discussed here, though on different levels of analysis of gender as summarised below:

Level 1:

The direct allocation of discrete gender specific behaviours in accordance with biological sex (psychoanalysis, sex-role and social learning theories).

Level 2:

Essentialist notion of men and women deriving from their position in the hierarchy of gendered power [patriarchy] and their consequent institutions (Connell, Bourdieu, Butler, Ingraham, Wittig) such as families.

Level 3:

The allocation of a number of possible gendered behaviours, but with a focus on their correspondence to shared practices between members of one gender rather than cross-gender practices (Goffman, Bourdieu, and to some extent Connell).

Level 4:

Essentialist notions of male- female interaction as 'complementary' (Goffman, West and Zimmermann) with a strong notion of structural influences (class, geographical location etc.).

Level 5:

The linking of essentialist notions of men and women to 'institutions' of gendered power (heterosexuality), and the definition of individuals outside of these institutions as oppositional, i.e. not sharing any aspects of these practices, and thereby being essential lesbian women and gay men (Wittig).

It becomes obvious that understanding essentialists notions of gender only as evident in theories in relation to either shared practices or ideas around the patriarchy is not enough. Even if multiplicity of male practices is accommodated in such theories, the idea that male practices are complimentary to female practices indicates an essentialist notion to male practices, in the sense that they are defined in opposition to female practices. Equally, understanding gay and lesbian as oppositional to heterosexual practices and denying any elements of shared gendered practices across different sexual orientations, in effect, essentialises both gay and lesbian as well as heterosexual male and female practices. While some of the theories discussed above operate these essentialist notions of gender simply in relation to shared practices and/ or the patriarchy, others evidently embrace such notions on multiple levels.

Consequently, key issues in relation to how masculinity and crime are made sense of are equally evident in the ways in which gender is theorised. These elements are: (1) an inherent essentialism in the discussion of masculinity, which (2) allocates either specific behaviours or concrete positions in the hierarchy of gendered power to men and produces a binary understanding of men and women and/or heterosexual men and women and gay men and lesbian women. Further, (3) this understanding mainly

focuses on commonalities amongst men rather than understanding masculinity in plurality, and also (4) lacks a distinct notion of critical social agency as it largely understands gender, and thereby masculinity, as (5) unproblematically derived from social structure and/or social interaction with little regard to reflective ability of social agents. These key issues will be discussed in relation to the findings of this research project, following chapter four which is concerned with the methods and methodology employed in this study. However, before concluding this chapter, attention will be paid to how these theories have helped to refine the research questions for this study.

3.8 Research Questions of this Study

Chapter two started by arguing that the exposition of notions of masculinity (Bowl, 1987) and the need for gender-focused social work practice in criminal justice (Buckley, 1996; Dominelli, 1992; Scourfield, 1998; Taylor, 2003) has not yet been translated into the context of youth justice. Several authors have explored the constructions of masculinity of practitioners in child protection settings (Scourfield, 2003; Scourfield and Drakeford, 2002; Scourfield, 2001; Scourfield, 2002) and probation work (Buckley, 1996; Burnham et al., 1990; Dominelli, 1992; Johnstone, 2001; Scourfield, 1998; Taylor, 2003) and in relation to sex offenders (Cowburn, 2005; Cowburn, 2010; Cowburn and Dominelli, 2001; Wright and Cowburn, 2011), making both the relevance of ideas around masculinity visible and identifying the ways in which practitioners construct masculinity within the setting of the particular social work setting in which they find themselves (Scourfield, 2003; 2001). While Smith (2011a) argues that the way practitioners make sense of young people in youth justice is limited by the possible responses within youth justice terminology, Phoenix (2009) and Baker (2005) highlight practitioners' own sense-making of young people and their professional discretion as relevant in their work with young people in contact with the YJS. It is the aim of this study to explore the ways in which YOT practitioners construct young people in relation to their masculinity. For this reason, chapter two continued by exploring the concept of hegemonic masculinity (Connell, 2005b) as a theoretical framework which would be able to cope with a number of

constructions of heterogenic masculinities. The chapter then explored the narrative about masculinity and crime in most of the academic literature, and looked at key ideas through which men who have been identified as having offended are made sense of. This narrative emerged to produce a very narrow picture of how ideas around a particular kind of masculinity are linked with men's offending behaviour. Chapter three then explored how masculinity is made sense of in the wider sociological literature and how relevant sociological theories can assist in capturing the distinct male behaviour emerging from chapter two, or indeed challenge it. Equally, it explored some of the underlying ideas around masculinity and offending in chapter two, such as social learning and socialisation (Boehnisch and Winter, 1993; Clausen, 1968), the role of reference groups (Goffman, 1990), heterosexuality (Butler, 1988; 1990; Ingraham, 2002; Wittig, 2002), the body (Bourdieu, 2001; Butler, 1988; 2011; Turner, 1991; 2008) and agency (Greener, 2002; McNay, 2000; Smith, 2009) in the performance of gender (Butler, 1988; 1990; Goffman, 1990; 2007; West and Zimmerman, 1987). On the basis of the literature in chapters two and three, and the summary above, the research questions in regard to the objectives of this thesis can be refined as follows:

OBJECTIVE 1

To investigate, describe and analyse the ways in which YOT practitioners make sense of masculinities of the young men and boys in the youth justice system.

Research Questions:
- Which, if any, behaviours do YOT practitioners associate with masculinities, and how far do these reflect stereotypical and/or essentialist notions of masculinity or how do they differ from those notions?
- How do YOT practitioners understand young men to have obtained their male identity?
- What is the role that, if any, reference groups play, and who constitutes these reference groups?

- To what extent, if any, do practitioners at this YOT understand young men to exercise agency in relation to how they obtain their gendered identity?
- How is the way in which YOT practitioners understand young men to obtain their gendered identity linked to structural elements?

OBJECTIVE 2

To consider, describe and analyse what, if any, role criminal behaviour plays in the way YOT practitioners understand the masculinities of young men and boys in the youth justice system.

Research Questions:

- In what ways, if any, do YOT practitioners link ideas around masculinities to offending behaviour?
- How do practitioners at this YOT explain the offending behaviour of young men?
- What, if any, role do reference groups play in offending behaviour of young men?

OBJECTIVE 3

To explore, describe and analyse what, if any, relevance is given to issues of masculinities in relation to YOT practitioners' work with young men and boys in the youth justice system.

Research Questions:

- What, if any, relevance do practitioners at this YOT attribute to ideas of masculinities?
- How, if at all, do practitioners at this YOT explain the absence/presence of ideas around masculinities in their work with young men?
- In what ways, if any, are issues around masculinities visible in YOT practitioners' work with young men?
- How are or could issues around masculinities be integrated in YOT practitioners work with young men at this YOT?

Part II
Chapter 4: Research Methods

Introduction

While chapter three explores the academic literature in relation to the attainment and performance of gender identity, chapter two discusses the way in which masculinities are made sense of in relation to crime and criminal behaviour. Chapter three discusses the relevance of the integration of concepts of masculinities, and focuses on the role of practitioners in relation to how young people and their behaviour are understood in the context of youth offending. It concludes by articulating specific research questions and objectives for this study. On the foundation of these objectives and questions, chapter four explains the methods employed in this study by discussing how they have shaped the data and subsequent data analysis. It begins by discussing the methodology employed and concludes with profiles of the ten young men whose documents have been analysed as well giving a short summary of the various backgrounds and roles of practitioners at this particular YOT.

4.1 Research Methodology

The introduction to this thesis broadly defines the study's research objective as exploring ideas of masculinities in youth justice practice. Specific research questions are refined on the basis of chapters two and three and in relation to the specific objectives of this study. This part of the thesis embeds these into its methodological framework.

The epistemological foundations for this study are built on social constructionist thought (Berger and Luckmann, 1991; Burr, 2003), rooted in symbolic interactionism (Goffman, 1990; Mead, 1934). The underlying assumption is that the ways in which YOT practitioners understand young men's and boys' masculinities can be uncovered by the language with which practitioners describe and assess young men and boys as a consequence of their interaction with them. Berger and Luckmann (1991) argue

that 'the reality of everyday life contains typificatory schemes in terms of which others are comprehended and dealt with in face-to-face encounters' (Berger and Luckmann, 1991: 45), hence that specific forms of a person's conduct are interpreted as a result of these typifications. Similar to Foucault's idea of subjectification (Foucault, 1992), discrete characteristics are attributed to specific groups of individuals and the bodies of young men are sexed through speech acts (Butler, 1990; 2011), which, in turn, reveal the way in which practitioners socially construct the category 'men' in relation to their work with young men. Consequently, if gender is a social construct as implied by a number of authors (Butler, 1988; 1990; Ingraham, 2002; Wittig, 2002), embedded in wider social structure (Connell, 1987; 2005b) with specific male practices (Anderson, 2012; Bourdieu, 2001; Goffman, 1990; 2007), then social constructionism is a fitting research methodology for the study of YOT practitioners' understanding of masculinities.

However, using social constructionism as the basis of and the framework for research on gender is accompanied by a number of considerations. Issues around conceptualising the sex-gender debate in applied social research are made particularly visible by Scourfield (2003) in his work on gender and child-protection. He states that he does not 'accept wholesale the rejection of the category women and men in postmodernist feminism and queer theory' (Scourfield, 2003: 144) by referring to Oakley (1998), who argues that the rejection of such classifications inherently denies the existence of a world distinctly organised around gender systems. Rejecting classifications such as 'men' and 'women' on the basis of assumed shared practices, authors such as Coleman (1990) have argued that there is no need 'for a theory of masculinity at all' (Coleman, 1990: 198). While such arguments may be an interesting academic exercise, it allows very little application of ideas around and the relevance of masculinity, and indeed femininity, to practice and a world that so clearly is gendered. Best (2011) considers that social constructionism 'require[s] locating claims-making within at least part of its context [and that] it is neither possible nor desirable to ignore the context of claims […] and, because context has so many elements, the analyst has to make assumptions about some of these elements' (Best, 2011: 343). This is to say that if the idea of a material reality to

gender, whereby gender and gendered behaviour are strongly associated with each other, was fully rejected, then research on gender and attributed behaviour to either gender would be impossible.

As Messerschmidt (2012b) stresses, we make assumptions about someone's sex by interpreting their actions, and largely associate specific and often distinct behaviours with a particular gender. Claiming that men and women are categories resulting purely from social construction without acknowledging the role of material realities or what Scourfield calls men's 'bodily practices' (Scourfield, 2003: 88) would mean that any attempt to research gender would be immensely difficult from the beginning as it is arguably difficult to verify the sex of persons who are involved in research. It is important here to refer back to chapter three and Morgan's (1992) and Pringle's (1995) acknowledgement that social workers and sociologists share gendered practices and are themselves part of a gendered world. In other words, neither practitioners nor the researcher can entirely isolate themselves from this gendered world in which assumptions are made about a person's gender as the result of associating specific behaviours with discrete sex categories. This thesis seeks to investigate the ways in which masculinities are constructed in work with young men in youth justice by remaining reflective and critical of associations made between gendered behaviour and masculinities, but also acknowledges the restrictions of gendered practices and the possibility of verifying the sex of people involved, actively and passively, in this study.

While the critique of gender definitions and their social construction are set in the context of this thesis as valuable in understanding the number of gender roles available to YOT practitioners' constructions of masculinities, the aim here is to uncover the specific ways in which YOT practitioners make sense of young men and their law-breaking behaviour by associating them, or not, with distinct forms of gendered behaviour. Hence, it is vital to state that the methodology in this study is embedded in the framework of 'contextual constructionism' (Best, 2011: 342); the category 'men' as created by practitioners was adapted and it was assumed that the YOT practitioners constructed the masculinities of those young men as a result of

and as a map for their social interaction with them. This is by no means an attempt to question the validity or undermine the complexity of issues around the sex and gender debate, but rather an acknowledgment of the assumptions made in this thesis in relation to gender. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that a system as multifaceted as the YJS works with classifications and ascribes certain meanings to people's identity. As Morgan (1992) and Pringle (1995) have pointed out, social researchers, sociologists and social workers are not isolated from this process, and these classifications have to be understood in the context of bodily practice and reactions to practices of people in this particular setting (Scourfield, 2003), both young men and YOT practitioners, rather than isolated one-way processes. It is important to note here that the overall objective of this thesis is to make the construction of young men's masculinities by YOT practitioners visible and to inform youth justice practice and wider social work practice. It is this application to practice which lies at the heart of this thesis.

4.2 Research Design

Robson (2002) considers the advantages of a multi-method approach in social research, namely the verification of results deriving from one method by employing multiple qualitative methods. Ritchie (2003) and Fielding and Fielding (1986) argue that the use of multiple methods adds depth to the data obtained, and Mouton (2001) stresses how multiple methods can assist in overcoming the deficiencies of one single social research method. Thus a multi-methods approach combining several qualitative methods has been used for this research to explore different angles in relation to the research aims and objectives. This multi-method approach consisted of employing three different qualitative research methods: documentary analysis, semi-structured interviews and one focus group with staff at this YOT; all of those methods will be discussed in their individual context below. The use of documentary analysis has informed the questions posed in the interviews, which in turn have assisted in creating topics for discussion in the focus group (Morgan, 1997). For example, it became obvious when conducting the first few interviews that YOT practitioners allocated very specific behaviours to the young men with whom

they work. While in interviews staff were asked what were the main issues of the young men with whom they work, the emergence of clear behavioural traits associated with boys rather than girls prompted the opening up of the question for the focus group, in which staff were subsequentially asked what it meant to them to be a boy or a man. The aim here was to elicit some more general data on what YOT practitioners understood as key elements in being a boy or a man beyond the issue based approach in the interviews. Further, interviewees struggled with the question 'are there any similarities/differences in the assessment of young people, intervention work and interaction?' As a result this question was asked in the focus group directly in relation to what it means to be a boy/man and in relation to prevention, intervention and treatment of service users. It was hoped here that the direct link to boys would enable participants in the focus group to explore issues around prevention, intervention and treatment, rather than asking about differences between boys/men and girls/women. Equally, while in interviews gender-related questions with regards to the assessment of young people initially were very general, clear assessment categories (such as housing, emotional and mental health, substance use and so forth) were linked to this question in the focus group to enable practitioners to give concrete examples and relate direct categories to the potentially different ways in which those issues could affect young men and young women with whom they work (see appendix 2 for more details). Comparing the results from the different methods employed has contributed to refining themes and highlighting contradictions, discrepancies and commonalities.

4.3 The Research Site

Numerous authors (Dugmore, 2006b; Fionda, 2005; Smith, 2007) have cited the centrality of YOTs in working with young people who have been identified as having committed a crime, and chapter one briefly outlined the function of YOTs. The multi-agency work of YOTs was an important reason for deciding the kind of research site at which this study would take place. As Smith (2007) and Dugmore (2006b) point out, YOTs are constituted of a team of professionals from different backgrounds such as probation, police, social services, and health and education authorities. While this

means that practitioners working at YOTs come from an array of different professional occupations, the most commonly shared training is social and youth and community work (Dugmore, 2006b; Fox and Arnul, 2013; Pickford and Dugmore, 2012; Whyte, 2009). As explained in chapter one, the working definition of all members of staff at YOTs for the purpose of this thesis is 'YOT practitioners' on the basis that all practitioners work within the wider frame of youth justice services under the umbrella of YOTs. While the majority of employees at YOTs are responsible for case management, YOTs offer distinct services around specific issues such as substance abuse, various ISS interventions, training and employment and others. The assumption for choosing a YOT as the research site for this study here was that practitioners within YOTs bring together different professional and personal experiences regarding work with young people, which would provide rich data in relation to ideas around masculinities and masculinities and offending. Scourfield's (2003) work on gender and child protection suggests the existence of a coherent occupational discourse within child protection agencies. Choosing a YOT as the research site was also based on the assumption that with the variety of staff backgrounds at a YOT would come a variety of different occupational discourses and therefore heterogeneity in the ways through which YOT practitioners would construct masculinities of the young men with whom they worked. Data collected at a site like this would offer more variety and reflect more diversity in relation to the construction of masculinities and the role criminal behaviour may play, than would data from a site such as a police station or a court, where not only is the staff role more restricted, but likewise presumably, the occupational discourse through which employees would construct ideas around masculinities. Additionally, YOTs were also chosen due to their function of coordinating services for young people who have been identified as having committed an offence (Dugmore, 2006b; Fionda, 2005; Smith, 2007) in terms of engaging with young people, their parents, intervention and prevention programmes and assessing young people in the YJS.

Initial contact with YOTs was made through an established relationship between the university and the YOT coordinator for the North of England. An introductory email contained an outline of the aims and objectives of the study, and invited YOTs to

contact the researcher directly. In response to this email, contact was made by two YOTs, both of which agreed to an exploratory meeting. The meeting with the first YOT was arranged with the YOT worker (YOT A) who had made initial contact, while the meeting with the second YOT (YOT B) was held with the Senior Manager of this YOT and the administration manager for research. While the meetings opened up the possibility of conducting the research with either YOT, there were distinct differences in terms of logistics and time management of the research (Bryman, 2008) as well as access to the closed formal setting of the YOTs and relevant data within them (Bryman, 2008; Burton, 2000; Gilbert, 2006; May, 2001; Robson, 2002).

The central role of gatekeepers in accessing research sites and establishing rapport with potential research participants (Bryman, 2008; Celnick, 2000; Mason, 2002) soon became evident. The importance of the ability of the initial contact to grant access to the research site surfaced to be an issue for consideration. While YOT A contact was very keen to assist with the research, he had not discussed it with his senior manager, who would eventually be the person with the authority to grant access, potentially act as gatekeeper and also present the case for this research, and an application, for final approval by the YJB. While an 'on-going evaluation' (Bryman, 2004: 297) of the study throughout the research process was expected, the very question of initial access to this YOT became problematic as the contact at this YOT did not have the necessary authority to permit the study. However, discussions regarding access, research aims and the timeframe in which the research was planned to take place progressed very differently at YOT B. The initial meeting took place with the senior manager of YOT B and the assistant responsible for research projects. Consequently, initial and continuous access to the field and to potential participants appeared far more likely due to direct approval by the senior manager. Equally, the initial meeting with YOT B included more detailed discussions of ethical dimensions to the research, namely the recording, anonymisation and storing of data (Bryman, 2008; Burton, 2000; Fielding, 2006; Gilbert, 2006), and the requirements of ethics approval by the university, CRB check and final approval of the YJB. The reasons for deciding on YOT B as the research site, hence, were that the senior manager gave direct approval to this study and appointed the assistant as

gatekeeper throughout the research process, as well as being responsible for logistical considerations (Bryman, 2008).

4.4 Role of the Gatekeeper, Access to Data Sources and Sampling

Much consideration has been given to the importance of gatekeepers in social research, and their role has been defined as enabling initial and ongoing access to data and research participants (Bryman, 2008; Celnick, 2000; Mason, 2002). Due to the need for confidentiality and anonymity discussed below, considerable time was spent at the research site. Effectively, this meant that the initial gatekeeper who had been appointed to overlook and enable this study in this role throughout the research process was also the person to whom the researcher was held accountable. She introduced the researcher to all staff and informed them about the aims and objectives of the research. She remained central throughout to conducting this study as access to Assets and case diaries was negotiated and coordinated through her. Townend (2000) records how access to data differs in bureaucratic organisations, and places importance on the level of the gatekeeper's authority in relation to accessing data. The gatekeeper here played a vital role in identifying and in transferring cases for this study onto a secure server through which they could be accessed by the researcher. Beyond questions of access, she also assisted in clarifying youth justice terminology and in explaining to the researcher the work and hierarchical structure within this YOT, which was vital in relation to identifying participants for interviews and the focus group.

It is important here to clarify the position of the gatekeeper in relation to the selection process of young people's Assets and case diaries as well as the identification of participants for interviews and the focus group.

Quinn-Patton (2002) argues that 'it makes strategic sense to pick the site that would yield the most information and have the greatest impact on the development of knowledge' (Quinn-Patton, 2002: 236), especially when the research is conducted at a single site. While sampling techniques will be discussed in relation to each data

source, the role of the gatekeeper needs to be understood. Full access to the data collected for this study was achieved through the gatekeeper, although it was not her role to select individual cases or research participants. An initial meeting with the gatekeeper, however, helped the researcher to familiarise himself with the workings and the terminology of this YOT (May and Perry, 2011). This was essential in identifying young men who engaged with this YOT and potential 'cases' for the analysis of Assets and case diaries as well as understanding the structure of the YOT and isolating specific YOT practitioners as research participants. For this purpose the gatekeeper helped to create a map (Kawulich, 2005) of the different branches and their functions within this YOT, and provided a list of all young people who at the time of the study engaged with its services. Although the gatekeeper was required to give final approval to the selection of young people and research participants, the researcher selected samples entirely independently. Numerous authors have suggested issues around gatekeepers in the process of sampling and granting access as well as the potential effect this can have on research findings and the creation of knowledge (Burton, 2000; Homan, 1991; May, 2001; Punch, 1986; Quinn-Patton, 2002). However, all initial requests for access to files were granted. Equally, the gatekeeper approved without interference the selection of participants for interviews and the focus group.

An internal email account and log-in to the computer system were organised by the gatekeeper and all files of the young men identified as meeting the individual sampling criteria were transferred onto a secure internal server which could be accessed by the researcher. Further contact with potential research participants for interviews and the focus group was made by the researcher independently using the internal email account.

In addition to the detailed explanation of deciding on this particular YOT as a 'case study' on issues around masculinity on the example of the youth justice system in England and Wales given in section three of this chapter, some further clarifications are needed. Winlow (2002) highlights the importance of local identity in the formation of gender identity and the construction of masculinity, in particular in the

North East of England, and Messerschmidt (2012) and Connell and Messerschmidt (2005) advocate the study of masculinity in the 'local' context (as discussed in chapter 2). In particular, Messerschmidt (2012) elaborates that 'local' masculinity here stands for masculinity 'constructed in arenas of face-to-face interaction of families, organisations and immediate communities' (Messerschmidt, 2012: 36). Hence, only one research site was chosen in order to potentially capture particular local masculinities in a narrow geographic area. Equally, since the researcher was not familiar with working in youth justice settings, it was felt that a more in-depth study at one site was going to be more beneficial in terms of both the richness of data to be collected (Quinn-Patton, 2002) and to enable the researcher to familiarise himself with the workings of this particular YOT and specific youth justice terminology.

While sampling techniques for each method of data collection are discussed in detail in the relevant section, it is important to give a brief overview of the techniques employed. Here it needs to be stressed that the researcher chose all samples independently without any interference from staff at the research site. The ten young men's files (Assets and Case Diaries) which were analysed for the purpose of this research were identified through the critical case sampling technique (Quinn-Patton, 2002). Special attention was paid to young men on Intensive Supervision and Surveillance Orders, Final Warnings and Youth Rehabilitation Orders, in essence orders presenting the last resort before custodial sentences. As explained further in chapter 4.8 of this thesis, the reasoning for this choice was that young men who had been identified as 'high end offenders' within the youth justice apparatus would potentially provide the richest data possible. As a result of this sampling technique ten cases were identified as meeting the sampling criteria.

The sampling technique employed for both interviewees and focus group participants was purposive sampling (Bryman, 2008). Dugmore (2006b) stresses the multidisciplinary backgrounds of practitioners at YOTs and this research project sought to capitalise on this diversity. A map of the hierarchical structure and individual professional positions at this YOT was created (see chapter 4.9 and 4.10) on the grounds of which individual interviewees from each sub-team at the YOT in

respect to both their professional function and their position within the organisational structure of the YOT were chosen. Participants for the focus group were exclusively selected from the sessional support team, as they were the only members of the YOT who spent time with young people in groups (rather than individually). These two samples guaranteed both that all sections of the YOT were represented in the data collection process, including different levels of the management structure, and that potential hierarchical conflicts within the focus group were avoided.

4.5 Confidentiality, Ethical Considerations and Informed Consent

 Following the ethical approval of this study by the university, a CRB check and the approval of the YJB to conduct this research project, the YOT manager gave consent for the research to commence. Confidentiality and anonymity of research participants and research subjects has been given wide consideration in social research (Bryman, 2008). Regarding the use of visual data, Crow and Wiles (2008) have questioned whether in fact research participants in social research prefer to have their data anonymised. However, the anonymisation of 'research subjects' is of particular importance when the data on them is obtained from secondary documents and it may not be possible to attain direct consent (Corti et al., 2000). This is even more relevant in relation to research which includes a wide range of information on vulnerable young people (Fraser et al., 2004). Here consent to accessing the information of all young people was given by the YOT manager and agreed by the YJB, and strict guidelines were put in place to protect the personal information of the young people whose documents were used for this research.

Corti, Day and Blackhouse (2000) state that all data which could lead to the potential identification of the 'research subject' should be removed or anonymised. While case diary entries usually only contained names of the young people and their peers, Assets included a wide range of information on the young person (including date of birth, address, names of parents, names of case workers, and names of services and institutions with which the young person was in contact. Consequently, a 'robust

system' (Corti et al., 2000: 7) was developed, whereby all young people whose case diaries and Assets formed part of this research were assigned pseudonyms, relatives' names were replaced by 'mother', 'father', 'brother' etc. and locations were changed to YOT town or near YOT town, and street names were left out).

Although the anynomisation of data was a requirement of the YOT itself (Youth Justice Board, 2011), other ethical considerations were taken into account also. It soon became evident during the initial analysis of Assets and case diaries how complex and traumatic the backgrounds of the young men, whose files were used for data analysis, were. While their offence history alone was sufficient reason to anonymise records to protect the identity of young people and potential victims of detected crimes, their family circumstances, history of care and experience of violence and potential physical and sexual abuse further urged a commitment to confidentiality (see profiles at the end of this chapter). Although issues around vulnerability did not surface with members of staff themselves, the reasons for anonymising their records was with respect to some of the personal information they had provided in interviews. Equally, it was not the purpose of this study to evaluate individual YOT practitioners' working practices or indeed their performance, and in particular the sampling of focus group participants was in consideration of institutional hierarchies and power relations within this YOT. Consequently, the anonymisation of names was important in order to grant confidentiality to individual participants and make them sufficiently comfortable to express their views without having to expect professional evaluations (Krueger and Casey, 2000).

While the sheer number of practitioners involved (at least in the completion of Assets and case diaries) required a numbering system (F1, F2, M1, M2 etc.), assigning names to the young people whose documents were analysed in this research would have simply produced an inappropriate contrast between the young men and the YOT practitioners referred to in this study. Hence, the data of young men has also been anonymised in a similar fashion (YP1, YP2, YP3 and so forth). Although it is arguably true that main consideration and depth is given to the information available on the young men, or at least the way this information has been constructed and

linked within Assets and by practitioners, rather than to YOT practitioners, it is simply because the focus of this study is on how those young men's masculinities are constructed by practitioners. This is, of course, not to suggest that the backgrounds and experiences of YOT practitioners as individuals are not equally complex.

Informed consent was obtained from each active participant before the interview and the focus group, and consent to access documents on young people was given by the senior manager of the YOT. While the YOT itself did not require the documents to be anonymised before they were accessed for analysis, they were consequently anonymised by the researcher. Each member of staff who actively participated in interviews or the focus group was offered an opt-out, and signed a consent form at the beginning of the interview or focus group (Bryman, 2008) after the clear aims of the interview and focus group had been explained by the researcher. Equally, all actively participating members of staff in this research were made fully aware that they could terminate the interview at any time if they felt uncomfortable (Bryman, 2008; Mason, 2002; Quinn-Patton, 2002).

4.6 Data Storage and Processing

All data extracted from Assets and Case diaries was stored securely on an internal file on the computer system at this YOT and not taken off-site before it was anonymised and checked by the gatekeeper in order to maintaining the confidentiality of sources and individuals (Youth Justice Board, 2010a). It was then stored as a password-protected file on the researcher's computer and taken off-site for in-depth analysis. All interviews and the focus group were recorded digitally on two separate dictaphones and stored similarly as a password-protected file on the researcher's computer and transcribed on-site. Upon completion of the transcription and anonymisation of the participants, these files were taken off-site for in-depth analysis.

Bazeley (2000; 2007) has recorded how NVivo assists in organising large amount of data effectively. NVivo (version 9) was used to create initial categories and sub-

categories in 'free-nodes', the main advantage of the programme being that it is extremely flexible in accommodating changes of relationships between categories and sub-categories as well as creating new categories or relationships between them. This was particularly important as data was collected simultaneously from different sources and the combination of different qualitative methods was central to the way data was collected and subsequently analysed. Equally, NVivo allows the allocation of a particular piece of data to more than one category simultaneously, and thereby makes the organisation of data more efficient (Bazeley, 2000; Bazeley and Richards, 2007). After the process of developing 'free nodes' on the basis of themes emerging in the first process of coding the data, 'tree nodes' were created to accommodate sub-themes and to capture the relationships between those themes (see table 2 in chapter five). While the 'free nodes' categories were helpful in the initial coding process of the data, the subsequent coding process involved a revision of those nodes and the consequent amendment, deletion of and/ or integration into other tree nodes to establish the relationship between different themes as emerging from the data.

4.7 A Grounded Theory Approach

Since the combination of different qualitative social research methods is at the core of this study, it is important to clarify the overall approach to the collection and analysis of the data, and highlight the dynamic interdependencies of the individual methods.

The overall approach to the collection and analysis of data at this YOT was situated within Grounded Theory (Corbin and Strauss, 2008; Glaser and Strauss, 1967). Gilgun (2014) argues that Grounded Theory is an appropriate method in social work research which focus on 'human interactions in social environments' (Gilgun, 2014: 1), and theory building is particularly important 'in social work because of the need to understand complex social situations' (Gilgun, 2014: 3). Glaser and Strauss advocate the building of theory from 'pure' data without prior theoretical knowledge

of the field of data collection or indeed a hypothesis at the beginning of the data collection process. However, 'whether or not we do so explicitly, it seems that we are bound to import certain very basic assumptions into any form of social inquiry' (Smith, 1989: 56). Indeed, Gilgun (2014) argues that studies utilising Grounded Theory methodology, which are aiming at developing theory, always start with some form of hypothesis and that, hence, data are not 'pure', but always filtered through the prior academic knowledge and practical experience of the researcher.

While it is evident throughout this thesis how the personal interest of the author has motivated this research project, several key aspects of the Grounded Theory approach are both central to the method of data collection and analysis as well enabling the 'objective' building of data categories through three central elements of Grounded Theory methodology: Triangulation, Constant Comparative Method and Saturation.

The mixed method approach to this study, or better the triangulation of methods, aims at collecting data from different sources and as the foundations for the constant comparison between different categories built from the data. The data was collected simultaneously, and emerging data from one source informed and guided the data collection from another source (Charmaz, 2000; Charmaz, 2003). The triangulation of methods here served to build analytical themes. Such themes from the initial analysis of Assets informed the interview guide by creating themes, which helped to obtain additional data that informed, extended and refined analytical themes across the data, and in turn assisted in the collection, analysis, verification and the identification of contradictions of data from all sources in order to fill conceptual gaps (Charmaz, 2003). Glaser and Strauss (1969) explain how the constant comparative method assist in not only building themes but equally verifying or falsifying existing categories of data analysis.

Charmaz (2003) argues that 'data collection and theorizing are intertwined' (Charmaz, 2003: 313) and that a Grounded Theory approach assists in building a theoretical framework in which categories are constantly refined and inform the

progress of further data collection. While these themes from one source were used to inform the category building from another, themes were constantly checked against one another. The use of a multi methods approach (triangulation) in this study and the continuous analysis and reflection of new data emerging allowed the creation of a theoretical framework in which to compare dynamically, probe and verify the themes arising from different data sources through the constant comparative method.

This process of constantly comparing the categories which emerged from the data was repeated until (a) it became clear which categories were indeed central elements of the data analysis, and (b) the constantly comparing of categories did not produce any more data, falsify or verify data beyond prior verifications or falsifications. Glaser and Strauss (1967) identify this stage of the data collection process as the stage of saturation, the point at which all data categories are saturated in the sense that further comparison could not produce any more data in any of the categories created.

4.8 Documentary Analysis

On the basis of the multi method approach and the dynamic process of the analysis of the data, analysis and the sampling techniques for each method are discussed in relation to each method, rather than separately. This approach aims to examine the interplay of these methods, and to underline how the analysis of data from one source has informed the design of data collection from another.

Assets

As briefly discussed in chapter two, numerous authors (Phoenix, 2009; Scourfield, 2003; Smith, 2011a) have considered the idea of set responses and occupational discourse in relation to work with men and young people who engage in law breaking behaviour. The analysis of Assets as set documents which aim to assess the risk of young people's re-offending behaviour was conducted in order to explore those set responses (Smith, 2011a) and their potential limitations (Phoenix, 2009) as

an indication of the occupational discourse (Scourfield, 2003) around offending behaviour of young people. Several authors (Baker, 2005; Baker et al., 2011; Dugmore, 2006a; Dugmore, 2006b; Fox and Arnul, 2013; Pickford and Dugmore, 2012; Smith, 2011a) have identified the importance of Assets in YOT practitioners' work with young people who are involved with the YJS, although their accuracy in predicting offending and re-offending behaviour has been under some scrutiny due to their function of assessing individuals on the basis of risk factors (Baker, 2005; Baker et al., 2011; Creany, 2013; Phoenix, 2009; Smith, 2011a). While these documents enabled the identification of signposts through which the interpretation of offending behaviour was navigated in relation to risk factors, they also assisted in pinpointing how these were or could be related to issues around masculinities. Assets provided rich data on how the young people were made sense of and what parameters were deemed important in the assessment of young people. Assets are mandatory for the assessment of all young people who are or have been identified as having committed an offence in England and Wales and come into contact with a YOT team. Hence they record a wide range of information, including a young person's demographic details, their living circumstances, and their offence history, while also offering an analysis of the latest offence committed by the young person and detected by the police.

Quinn-Patton (2002) suggests it is important to identify critical cases. For the analysis of Assets and case files, ten young people were chosen following the critical case sampling technique (Quinn-Patton, 2002: 236). These critical cases were identified out of all cases of young people involved with this particular YOT. The basis of this sampling technique was a print-out listing all young people at this YOT with a summary of their demographic data (gender, ethnicity, age) and the nature of the order to which they were subject. Since the focus of this study was on how YOT practitioners make sense of the masculinities of the young men with whom they work, girls and young women were removed from the list of potential cases. Although the overrepresentation of ethnic minorities in the YJS has received warranted attention (Youth Justice Board, 2010b), the sampling techniques employed in this study resulted in a sample of ten young men who identified as

white British. Specific attention was then paid to young men who were or had been subject to Intensive Supervision and Surveillance Orders (ISS), Final Warnings or Youth Rehabilitation Orders (YRO) (Youth Justice Board, 2009c) as either a last resort before custody or post-custody orders. The underlying assumption in identifying these as critical cases was that more documentation on these young people would be available and consequently more information on how they were made sense of in relation to their masculinities and their masculinities and offending. Lastly, all young people who were subject to the above orders and were supervised by the ISS team were then chosen as cases for this study. This was relevant as the ISS team spends a lot of informal time with those young people and keeps case diaries, which could complement the data gained from the Assets (Robson, 2002: 371). A total of 278 Assets (between 20-30 pages each) and ten case diaries (with a total of 3528 entries) were analysed. Assets were then analysed with four main objectives: (1) to identify the parameters deemed important in assessing risk of offending and re-offending, and how issues of masculinities were contextualised; (2) to explore whether, and if so how, ideas around masculinities were explicitly set into the context of offending behaviour and/or assessment categories; (3) how offending behaviour was contextualised by YOT practitioners, and lastly; (4) to establish whether the parameters deemed important in assessing young people could be set into the context of ideas around masculinities.

Silverman (1993) summarises the grounded-theory approach in analysing data as: (1) an initial attempt to develop categories which illuminate the data; (2) an attempt to 'saturate' these categories with many appropriate cases in order to demonstrate their relevance; and (3) developing these categories into more general analytical frameworks (Silverman, 1993: 71). Charmaz (2000) argues that 'focused coding' can help to sort large sets of qualitative data. Equally, she elaborates how a Grounded Theory approach means the going backwards and forwards in the data and how initial categories can 'shape our developing analytical framework' (Charmaz, 2000: 516). Thus the creation of this analytical framework was deeply intertwined with the collection of data from different sources. While preliminary coding helped to create the foundation of this analytical framework, categories were revised and expanded

throughout the research process, and each newly emerging theme necessitated a return to data already analysed in order to explore this data in light of themes deriving from other data sources.

From the Assets, broad classifications for data collection were developed, corresponding to Asset categories. These classifications were as follows: Living arrangements; Family and personal relationships; Education, training and employment; Neighbourhood; Lifestyle; Substance use; Physical health; Emotional and mental health; Perception of self and others; Thinking and behaviour; Attitudes to offending; Motivation to change; Risk factors; Positive factors; Indicators of vulnerability; and Indicators of serious harm to others (Youth Justice Board, 2006). Information in relation to all ten young men whose documents were analysed was then summarised under each of these classifications. On this basis, major themes in the Asset data were identified in relation to frequency of occurrence, and initial themes were created. All major themes deriving from the analysis of Assets were checked against major themes in the literature, and a new set of themes was created, combining those themes derived from both Assets and the literature. Categories built from the literature assisted in the final analysis of the data and enabled the researcher to identify which elements were missing from the data emerging from all sources. In some cases these themes overlapped in the sense that they were present in the literature as well as in Assets, such as 'aggression and violence', 'domestic violence' and 'the role of fathers' which were both present in the literature and frequently cited in the Assets. However, some themes were present only in Assets or in the literature. To give but a few selected examples, while 'the role of mothers' was not a theme which surfaced much in the literature, it frequently appeared in Assets. While the literature pays attention to the relationship between social class and masculinities, and masculinities and offending, this was not directly articulated in the Assets. Most strikingly, the explicit verbalisation of issues around masculinities, in relation not only to offending behaviour but also to 'health', 'mental and emotional health' and 'thinking and behaviour' was entirely absent from the data emerging from Assets. Categories created from the literature were kept separately and not used in the process of data collection. The information in each

category was obtained solely from Assets themselves and did not include any information drawn direct from the academic literature. The purpose of including categories reflecting the literature around masculinities and masculinities and offending was to make the researcher aware at all times of the themes which were or were not included in the sense-making of masculinities and masculinities and offending by YOT practitioners. This made it possible to create themes for interviews and the focus group, which probed ideas deriving from the data itself as well as obtaining opinions on themes in the literature such as the relevance of incorporating issues around masculinities.

Equally important here was to identify, especially in the absence of explicit problematisation of issues around masculinities, how categories within the Asset, and indeed some of the descriptions YOT practitioners used within it, could or could not be linked to ideas around masculinities, and identify the absence of potential connections being made. For instance, while the format of the Assets allowed for the description of aggressive and violent behaviour, no explicit detail was given as to how practitioners did or did not set this in the context of issues around masculinities or masculinities and offending. The identification of this behaviour as a major theme in Assets, in terms of both frequency and dominating explanations around offending behaviour, and the absence of context in relation to masculinities informed the design of the interview guide, so that more detailed explanations could be elicited from participants. Equally, the presence of some issues identified by most of the academic literature as related to offending behaviour in young men in these documents, and the absence of others, permitted a comparison between those two, at times, very different frameworks. This, in turn, enabled the theorising of the data from Assets in a wider academic context.

Case Diaries

An additional source of documents explored for the purpose of this study was case diaries. It is important to note here that the term 'case diaries' was directly adapted from the term used for these documents by YOT practitioners. As such, it is slightly misleading in the sense that 'case diaries' were not actual diaries in which

practitioners reflected on specific cases of young people, but rather acted as a recording device to capture interactions with young men who engaged in intervention activities. Case diaries did not follow any particular format, but simply included what YOT practitioners deemed necessary to record. Some entries were purely descriptive and listed the number and nature of activities engaged in, while others were more analytical and in-depth. This source of data was particularly useful as it gave an insight into the range of activities offered to young men and allowed a view of how practitioners engaged with young men in regard to their approach and rapport-building. Equally, they provided data on which intervention activities were offered to the young men. Recognising the limitations of the set focus and format of Asset documents (Bowen, 2009; Smith, 2011a), namely, that Assets were completed by practitioners within an occupational discourse of risk and offending and with set categories of responses (Phoenix, 2009; Scourfield, 2003; Smith, 2011a) and thereby reflected, at least in part, this discourse rather than only the way individual practitioners made sense of masculinities and masculinities and offending, case diaries of ten young men formed a complementary data source. Consequently, case diaries were used here to allow the analysis of documentary data which was not subject to a set format or structure, but entirely dependent on what importance individual YOT practitioners attribute to contacts they have with young men and boys, and which issues they choose to highlight.

Similarly to Assets, the data from case diaries did not explicitly highlight any direct connections made by practitioners in relation to issues around masculinities and offending, but insights given by case diaries into which activities were offered and how practitioners built rapport with young men allowed to set some of the issues around specific intervention approaches and their potential relationship to issues around masculinities into context in interview situations. It is important to highlight here that while a combination of methods of data collection and analysis is set into a logical sequence for the purpose of this thesis, the practicality of the same was less straight-forward, which will be further explored in relation to discussing interviews below. However, data collection from case diaries resulted in the revisiting of major categories created from Assets. This was particularly relevant to the data derived

from activities and the interaction with YOT practitioners. The major categories created were revisited and expanded to allow room for data from case diaries. In turn, the creation of these new categories necessitated the return to Assets already analysed in order to collect data that could be associated with this category.

It became evident that case diaries were indeed a valuable source of data, not least because of their informal structure, but also because they recorded information which did not appear in Assets. While it has been pointed out that the main purpose of Assets is the assessment of young people, including the description of some of the circumstances surrounding offending behaviour and prediction of the likelihood of re-offending, case diaries were not set into the same format but used to record interactions with young people, frequency of contact between young people and YOT practitioners, and any additional information they deemed relevant. Equally important here is that the information in these diaries was recorded by members of staff of the ISS team. This is significant because members of this team were not responsible for or involved in the assessment of young people through Asset; consequently, they shed a different light on how young men and their masculinities and their masculinities and offending behaviour were understood, especially as they were further removed from the 'occupational discourse' (Scourfield, 2003) reflected in Assets. Additionally, only two out of five members of the ISS team were trained in social work, while two other members had a professional background in sports and sports coaching, and the fifth had a military background. It was in this team in particular that the diversity of professionals working with young people at this YOT became evident (Dugmore, 2006b; Smith, 2011a).

In summary, the strengths of case diaries as a data source were twofold: firstly, they allowed the creation of new major categories for further theory-building, in particular in relation to intervention activities and interactions between young men and practitioners. Secondly, the information recorded here was neither in a set format (Phoenix, 2009; Smith, 2011a), nor was it recorded by staff whose responsibility it was to assess young people who have offended, or indeed by staff who were all trained in social and/or youth work.

4.9 Interviews

While Scourfield (2003) and Phoenix (2009) point out how the occupational discourse and assessment of risk in these documents restrict the way in which practitioners can make sense of young people, Phoenix (2009) also stresses that practitioners make sense of young people's law-breaking behaviour in their own terms. Hence, the purpose of the interviews was to explore the ideas through which practitioners made sense of masculinities, explained the young men's offending behaviour, and to explore whether or not these explanations were similar to or different from the set categories and the occupational discourse in the Assets. It was hoped that the diversity of backgrounds of YOT practitioners and their various professional functions within the YOT team (Dugmore, 2006b; Pickford and Dugmore, 2012) would enable the collection of a variety of viewpoints. Consequently, this data assisted the cross-analysis of data from Assets, case diaries and interviews, therefore theory building and verification of findings (Fielding and Fielding, 1986; Robson, 2002). Moreover, since the data from Assets was limited in the sense that the purpose of Assets is to assess risk and therefore does not necessarily encourage any individual sense-making of young men, and young men and their offending behaviour, interviews helped to overcome those deficiencies (Mouton, 2001) and added to the data obtained from Assets while enhancing this data through the addition of ideas around young men and offending by individual practitioners in their own terms (Robson, 2002).

The sampling technique for the semi-structured interviews was 'purposive sampling' (Bryman, 2008: 458). The initial mapping-out of the hierarchical structure of the YOT supported the identification of potential interviewees from a variety of positions within this structure. As a result, interviews were conducted with the senior manager of this YOT, the operations manager, the coordinators of each of the three units within the YOT, three case workers and all members of the ISS team, amounting to a total of 12 interviews each lasting from approximately 35 minutes to one hour and 20 minutes. The reasoning behind employing a purposive sampling strategy was that

the variety of staff from different positions within the hierarchical structure of the YOT would potentially provide a diversity of perspectives on the young men's and boys' masculinities and explanations of their offending behaviour as they had different professional backgrounds and roles and engaged with young people with different frequency and in a variety of situations. This was particularly relevant in relation to the ISS team as those were not involved in any of the formal assessment of young people as highlighted above, but responsible for activities, educational and intervention programmes, some of which were based outside the location of the YOT (eg. boxing, fishing, gym, playing pool). This meant that ISS staff contact with young people was informal, and the young person was not subjected to any structured form of assessment. Equally, due to the intensity of individual ISS programmes (maximum of 25 hours intervention per week) ISS staff were in more frequent contact with the young men than the actual case worker.

All potential participants were contacted by email directly by the researcher and made aware of an opt-out (Bryman, 2008) before and during the interview. Equally, the structure and the purpose of the interview was explained to all participants before the interview, and the interview did not commence until consent was granted.

Charmaz (2003) argues that the comfort of interviewees 'should be of higher priority for the interviewer than obtaining juicy data' and that 'questions must both explore the interviewer's topic and fit the participant's experience' (Charmaz, 2003: 315). It is for precisely this reason that the format chosen for the interviews was semi-structured rather than structured interviewing. The absence of explicit discussions around masculinities and masculinities and offending behaviour from Assets and case diaries was seen as an indicator that unstructured interviews around these topics could potentially be difficult for the interviewee and also not particularly fruitful as a starting point. Hence, employing semi-structured interviews as a research method allowed the implementation of some structure, but also space for the articulation of issues or themes which YOT practitioners deemed important independently of that structure.

Drever (2003) attributes high importance to the 'natural flow' (Drever, 2003: 21) of interview questions and how they should be divided into clear themes. Given that the participants had different professional roles within this YOT, questions were adapted to accommodate these different experiences. However, the overarching themes remained the same in all interviews.

May (2001) argues that semi-structured interviews allow the interviewer to investigate the interviewee's ideas beyond their answers and thereby enter a dialogue to explore positions and beliefs in more depth, and Mason (2002) highlights the importance of an interview guide. The interview guide was constructed on both themes emerging from the analysis of the Assets and case files, and on the basis of extensive academic reading before the start of the research. Reflection on prior academic reading was relevant in so far as some of the major themes in the literature were absent from the list of themes emerging from the documentary analysis, and the intention of the researcher was to explore whether this absence was due to the 'insufficient detail' and the 'set format' (Bowen, 2009) of these documents or simply because they were not deemed relevant in the work with young men and boys who have been convicted of a crime.

The interview guide (appendix 1) presented a mixture of closed and open-ended questions, which were asked in a non-leading and neutral manner (Drever, 2003). Drever (2003) stresses the importance of the first question in an interview and suggests that it should be asked in a way that enables the interviewee to talk at some length; this assists the interviewer in judging what kind of interviewee the respondent is in relation to his or her readiness to engage in the interview. Hence, the introductory question focused on the staff member's role, their professional backgrounds, and the length of time they had been at this YOT.

The main interview questions were developed on the basis of themes emerging from the preliminary analysis of data from some of the Assets and case diaries. Although clear themes were emerging from the Assets and the case diaries, it was evident in

the first couple of weeks of conducting the research that most practitioners at this YOT had not explicitly considered issues around masculinities of the young men and boys they worked with. While the Assets and case diaries contained clear themes which in the academic literature are associated with masculinities and masculinities and offending, such as aggression and issues around coping mechanisms, these were not set in the context of discussions of masculinities. These themes were understood as normative in the work with young men rather than being explicitly seen as issues in relation to masculinities. Interviews were concluded by inviting the interviewee to ask questions or elaborate on ideas (Drever, 2003).

At the start of the interview, interviewees were invited to talk about the length of time they had worked at this YOT, to define their current role and to elaborate on their professional background; initial questions were aimed at establishing rapport and making the interviewee feel at ease. The subsequent section of the interview was designed to elicit responses in relation to working with young men and women, and explore how practitioners make sense of their work with young people, their particular issues, and how they contextualised these. The last section of the interview was designed specifically to encourage practitioners to talk about the way gender is or is not contextualised in youth justice services, and to explore whether practitioners attributed any importance to gender-tailored assessment, intervention and general approaches in their work. Themes included questions around differences and similarities in working with young men and young women. Initial questions invited discussions on masculinities of the young men and boys with whom practitioners worked at this YOT through asking participants about the differences between the young boys and men, and young girls and women they worked with. This proved a useful way into the discussion around masculinities, a subject most practitioners did not seem to be used to talking about. Prompts and probes (Drever, 2003) were then used to direct, in a non-leading way, the discussion towards masculinities and enable interviewees to say 'what they know but have not yet mentioned' (Drever, 2003: 23). While the interview guide was of great use in relation to probing more specific discussions around masculinities of the young men and boys, it also provided a clear structure; this was particularly helpful in one interview,

when the interviewee appeared ill at ease, but equally had not chosen to opt out. The structure here provided a framework to the interview situation and a clear ending point. At the same time, the extent to which each question in the interview guide was articulated varied. On the one hand, this was due to the different ways in which YOT practitioners engaged in the interview, on the other hand, it was dependent on which major themes identified in Assets and case diaries surfaced during the interview and could then be investigated in more depth. Extreme examples of this were two members of staff. One appeared to find it difficult to answer some of the more open-ended questions, here a clear structure provided the framework to 'work through' the questions. Another member of staff, however, had a very clear focus on what he wanted to verbalise, knowing the study's focus.

Importance was also given to where the interviews were conducted. Since all data had to be collected onsite, interviews were held at the YOT. Drever (2003) discusses the importance of the interviewees' confidence that the setting provides. It was interesting that some of the interviews were conducted in interview rooms situated on the ground floor of the YOT building, the same rooms used to interview young people. These rooms had designated seats for practitioners and young people. Recognising that this must be a somewhat uncomfortable situation for some of the practitioners, the interviewer waited for the interviewee to take a seat and then seated himself. This resulted in all practitioners who were interviewed in those rooms choosing to sit in the 'practitioner's' seat.

Semi-structured interviews allowed for exploring how individual practitioners make sense of this behaviour and these explanations then caused an expansion of the major themes initially established from the preliminary analysis of the Assets and case diaries, and consequently the creation of sub-categories (Charmaz, 2000) and exploring the potential relationship between categories (Corbin and Strauss, 2008) , such as 'explanation for aggressive and violent behaviour' and 'motivation for aggressive and violent behaviour'. The preliminary analysis of interviews and theme categories created from this then informed the focus group, where such ideas could be discussed and elaborated (Krueger and Casey, 2000). On completion of data

collection from each interview, the researcher revised previously created major and subcategories (Charmaz, 2000).

4.10 Focus Group

While interviews with staff provided a wealth of data, in particular in relation to how some practitioners constructed the masculinities of the young men with whom they worked, and allowed each individual participant to express his/her views and opinions, the focus remained on the ideas of individual interviewees. Krueger and Casey (2000) argue that focus groups assist in collecting viewpoints and opinions from across a group and identify the group dynamics and processes in focus groups as vital in the production of data. Importance here is given to how different participants of a focus group challenge and expand ideas of other members who take part, and aim 'to come to some conclusion at the end of a discussion- reach consensus, provide recommendations, or make decisions amongst alternatives' (Krueger and Casey, 2000: 11). Further, Cronin (2006) points out how focus groups can be useful in identifying similarities and differences in participants' opinions and ideas in relation to the research topic. Hence, the focus group was used as another complementary method towards the end of the research process and has thereby been informed by the data collected through the prior analysis of documents and the interviews (Morgan, 1997). The reasoning behind the decision to employ a focus group towards the end of the research process was precisely to test the data which emerged from Assets, case diaries and interviews and enable YOT practitioners to further explore, challenge, dispute or agree on themes.   Collectively, themes emerging from these different methods constituted the focus group guide (appendix 2) and laid them open for discussion amongst the focus group participants. This was particularly useful as ideas around masculinities and masculinities and offending behaviour could be tested and probed beyond individually constructed narratives of interviews and case diaries, and beyond the occupational discourse of offending behaviour of Assets.

Interviews and the focus group shared the same sampling technique: 'purposive sampling' (Bryman, 2008: 458). The reasoning behind this decision was that the study aimed to captitalise on the diverse backgrounds and professional roles of individual practitioners at this YOT. Since a number of case workers and all ISS staff had already been included in the interview sample, the concentration here was on staff who provided sessional workshops to young people, such as courses on substance awareness, manual work projects and intervention, as well as on sexual health and education. The advantage of selecting these members of staff was that they worked directly with groups of young people, unlike case workers and ISS staff. However, similarly to ISS staff, these practitioners were not responsible for the assessment of young people, but simply provided intervention workshops and were the only members of staff who engaged with more than one young person at a time. It was hoped that this could give insights into how YOT practitioners made sense of young men in the group settings of such workshops. In order to encourage discussion (Krueger and Casey, 2000) around issues articulated and probed, and provide a framework in which YOT practitioners could share similarities and discuss differences in opinion, one case worker and the police liaison officer at this YOT were included. Consequently, the total number of participants in the focus group was six. In consideration of potential issues around institutional hierarchies (Krueger and Casey, 2000), none of the participants in the focus group was a member of the management team.

The focus group lasted one hour and 43 minutes, at the beginning of which the research objectives and the structure of the focus group were explained to research participants, and they were reminded of the opportunity to opt out. Consent forms were signed after each participant had the opportunity to ask questions about anything which was unclear in relation to the process of the focus group or indeed the explanation of the research objectives. The focus group guide was designed to address questions similar to those posed in individual interviews, as well as more specifically eliciting responses and initiating discussions of some of the major themes which had derived from the analysis of the Asset, case diaries and the interview data. While the focus group guide included similar categories to the interview guide

(introductory questions and gender-streamed questions), more direct questions were asked around what practitioners thought it meant to be a boy/ young man for service users, specific issues around masculinities, the relevance of concepts of masculinities in their work and the importance of role models. Additionally, regarding assessment categories and specific issues on which some of the participants worked with young people, questions were asked directly in relation to specific topics which had surfaced as major themes in interviews and some of which were part of the structure of the Asset.

Data from the focus group was then analysed in the context of existing major and subcategories, specifically with a view to how it confirmed, contradicted and expanded previously emerging themes. Since participants in the focus group were the only members of staff who engaged with young men in group settings, a further major category was created to capture the data in relation to this (groups/ individuals). Equally, any other newly emerging themes prompted the creation of new categories and subcategories, and previously created categories which had not proven useful in the analysis of the data were amended or deleted. The final version of the major and subcategories used for the analysis of the data are presented in a table at the beginning of chapter five (table 2, pages 139/40) . In preparation for the writing up of the findings, they were organised into three major categories as presented in the subsequent chapters of this thesis on the basis of the overall themes emerging: constructions of masculinity (chapter 5), performing and monitoring masculinity (chapter 6), and masculinity and offending (chapter 7).

4. 11 Research Diary

In addition, the researcher kept a diary throughout the time spent at this YOT. The purpose of this research diary was to keep track of relevant activities and create a glossary of unfamiliar youth justice terminology (Bryman, 2008). Since approximately 4 months were spent at the research site, the diary contained notes of informal conversations to be followed up in interviews and the focus group and getting 'a feel

of [the] place' (May and Perry, 2011: 121) and its people. This was particularly relevant in regard to identifying and taking into account the organisational hierarchy at this YOT (Krueger and Casey, 2000) and being able to identify potential participants for interviews and the focus group. In one case this led to changing one participant initially allocated to the focus group to an interview, as this person appeared very shy and was perceived to be uncomfortable in a group setting. Equally, informal conversations with staff, who had been informed about the topic of the research, made it clear that the way the staff talked about the young men with whom they worked was by comparing them to young women. This was important as it helped to create an interview guide which allowed for this approach in order to elicit as much data as possible but also to make participants feel comfortable (Charmaz, 2003). While the research diary does not provide any data *per se*, it actively created a space for the reflection of ideas (May and Perry, 2011) and theoretical constructs through which the data was later analysed.

4.12 Completion of Data Collection Process

Coffey (1999) discusses how leaving the field can be difficult and Hammersley and Atkinson (2006) advise a planned exit from the field. Although the literature on leaving the field is associated mainly with ethnographic methods of research, it is important to comment on the exit from the field upon the completion of data collection for this study. As is obvious from the discussion of research methods above, the design of this study included what may be called 'traditional' methods of social research. This may give the impression that collecting data for this study and indeed the contact with staff as well as studying the lives of young men involved in the services of this YOT were a fairly straightforward process. However, numerous authors who write about the context of conducting research in social work settings discuss their own experiences and motivations, especially in the context of conducting research on men and masculinities (Christie, 2001; Featherstone et al., 2007; Morgan, 1992; Pringle, 1995; Scourfield, 2002), and highlight key values and ethics in wider social work and social work in youth justice settings (Dugmore, 2006b; Fox and Arnul, 2013; Pickford and Dugmore, 2012; Whyte, 2009). While some of the

researcher's interest in the topic of men, masculinities and youth justice have been touched on in chapter one and reflections on the experiences of conducting this study will be elaborated in chapter nine, it is important to comment on some of the insights which emerged from spending an extensive period of time at this YOT.

Spending approximately four months at this YOT, because of the necessity of having to analyse documents on site, meant that some friendships were formed and that the researcher had daily contact with most members of staff, especially during lunch, coffee and cigarette breaks, which led to many informal discussions on the topic of masculinities and work with young people in general. While these occasions were not treated as 'data', they assisted in getting a 'feel for the place' (May and Perry, 2011: 121) and the people who worked there. This was important in relation to the data collection process, in particular in gaining knowledge around youth justice terminology, the structure of the YOT, different responsibilities of individual members of staff, and consequently the identification of participants for interviews and the focus group, and of course in order to build initial rapport with staff members. Moreover, having informal conversations with most of the practitioners at this YOT allowed an insight in the ways in which they talked about gender and masculinities, which helped to contextualise some of the data and inform the design of the interview and the focus group guide. Equally, witnessing some young people waiting for their case workers in the reception area revealed some of the contradictions between the YOT practitioners' construction of masculinities and what Scourfield (2003) identifies as some of the bodily practices, which became particularly evident in relation to 'body images' as discussed in the data analysis chapter. In short, spending this length of time at the YOT during data collection enabled the researcher to gain a deeper understanding of the circumstances surrounding the youth justice practitioners' knowledge of issues around gender and masculinities and thereby informed the research process.

The researcher had daily contact with the gatekeeper and kept her up-to-date with the research process and the completion of data collection. The exit from the field was set two weeks prior to the end of the study. As part of this exit the researcher

organised a buffet lunch to thank all staff for their assistance and participation. It was also agreed that a presentation would be given of preliminary findings to all staff a few months later, and the research door was kept open for possible future research (Coffey, 1999) by leaving the researcher's contact details and having an exit meeting with the senior practitioner of the YOT. It was also agreed that a follow-up presentation of the findings would be given upon completion of the thesis.

4.13 The Sample: Ten Young Men

This chapter concludes by providing profiles of the ten young men whose documents have been analysed for the purpose of this study. These profiles, which will be referred to at different stages of this thesis, have been created on the basis of information available in Assets and case diaries. Information on these young people differed in depth and length, depending on how long the young men had been involved with this particular YOT and the way in which individual YOT practitioners record their information, which is reflected in these profiles.

Profiles of Ten Young Men

The purpose of summarising the young men's information and how they have come to be in contact with this YOT is to set the context in which their lives played out. Since the analysis of the data only accommodates fragments of their biographies and themes emerging from the data in relation to selected aspects of their lives and behaviours included by practitioners at this YOT in the way the latter constructed the young men's masculinity, this allows an insight into the complexity of their lives. The profiles vary in length and depth of information on the young person, which can be attributed to both the different lengths of time these young men have been involved with this particular YOT and the differentiations of styles of writing (Baker, 2005; Baker et al., 2011) of different YOT practitioners as well as differences in the frequency of contact between individual practitioners and the young men who engaged with the services at this YOT. A short overall profile will be provided of the practitioners at this YOT who actively participated in interviews or the focus group. This overview assists in establishing a more comprehensive picture of the variety of

experiences and backgrounds of staff at this YOT who engaged in practice with young people (Dugmore, 2006b). In order to assure the anonymity of individual members of staff (Bryman, 2008; Burton, 2000; Gilbert, 2006), the information here will be delivered in the form of a group profile rather than individual silhouettes.

YP1

At the time of data collection YP1 is, like many of the young men in this research, at the margins of receiving youth justice services. This means that while he is technically an adult (19 years old), in the eyes of the law, the YOT is responsible for him until he has completed his last order imposed by the YJS. A few days before the analysis of his case file was started, YP1 was recalled to custody due to a breach of his YRO. This is one of many incidents which emphasised how fast-lived the YJS is. YP1 first came into contact with the YJS at the age of ten when he stole a bicycle from a neighbour's child. Since then he has been in continuous contact with the YJS for a number of offences, including 'criminal damage', 'being carried in a stolen vehicle', spitting at his teacher ('common assault'), 'racially aggravated harassment', 'possession of controlled drugs', 'breach of supervision order' 'theft', 'assault', 'shop lifting' 'trespassing', 'theft of motor bike', and lastly the breach of his YRO. He lived with his biological mother, his sister, and his mother's male partner in a bedsit in what is described by the YOT practitioner in his ASSET as a 'deprived household', and the family has regularly been in danger of losing their council accommodation due to his mother's alcohol consumption and consequent escalations in the household. His mother has received a number of 'parenting orders', of which she is in breach. YP1 has regularly spent time living with his maternal grandparents as a result of the escalation of situations 'at home'. He appears to have a volatile relationship with his mother, which ranges from supporting him in complying with his order to throwing him out of the house. YP1 has no contact with his biological father, and has been excluded from school, while having been identified with special needs. Additionally, he has been diagnosed with hearing problems and has undergone several operations on his ears, which left him partially deaf. His step-father intermittently supported him when he had scheduled YOT visits, and appears to be responsible for all the

housework and cooking at YP1's house. YP1 stated that he regularly witnessed domestic violence from his step-father towards his mother, but there is no indication of whether or not he himself has been the victim of domestic violence.

YP2

YP2 was 18 years old at the time this research project started. He lives with foster parents and has been in contact with the YJS since the age of 14. His offence history includes 'taking vehicle without consent' (TWOC), 'threatening and abusive behaviour, 'breach of bail', 'public order offence' and the breach of several orders. Additionally, he has received an 'unacceptable behaviour order' due to his 'behaviour in the community'. He is also subject to a full-care order. He has regular contact with his biological mother, although not with his biological father. YP2 frequently visits his birth mother, and several of these visits ended with his mother calling the police, and having him removed from the house. There is evidence that his mother is a heavy drinker. He has witnessed his mother being subjected to domestic violence by previous partners, and it remains unclear in ASSET and case diary entries whether he himself has been the victim of domestic violence. YP2 witnessed the suicide of his friend. YP2 goes to the local comprehensive school, but has a high number of absences and has previously been excluded as a result of an 'assault on another pupil'.

YP3

YP3 is 17 years old at the time of this research, and has been in contact with this particular YOT for nearly a year, although ASSETs and case diaries indicated that he has previously lived elsewhere and has been in contact with youth justice services through another YOT from the age of 11. At the time this research project commenced, YP3 was subject to an ISS. He has lived with several foster parents since the age of 11 and in a care home prior to that. YP3 is in contact only with his birth mother, not his siblings or his birth father. His offence history includes 'common assault', 'theft', 'criminal damage' and 'rape and sexual assault'. He has witnessed

'severe domestic violence' and has been removed from the house of his biological mother on the basis of evidence of neglect, physical, emotional and suspected sexual abuse. He has been exposed to extremely pornographic images since the age of 8. While he has been in contact with mental health services, he has not officially been diagnosed with any mental health related illness. Although he regularly missed school, at the time of this research he was awaiting his GCSE results.

YP4

YP4 is 17 years old at the beginning of this research project. He has been in touch with this YOT for 4 years, but it appears that he has been in the YJS since the age of 12. YP4's offence history includes 'breach of order', 'causing harassment and distress', 'putting person in fear of violence', 'burglary of a dwelling', 'dangerous driving', 'threatening, abusive and insulting behaviour' and 'cultivating cannabis'. YP4 is subject to a YRO at the time of this research. His accommodation frequently changed from living with his biological mother, with an aunt or in a B&B. He is not in touch with his biological father, but has lost his step-father. He has been removed from his mother's house regularly by the police due to physical and verbal altercations with his mother. YP4 has witnessed domestic abuse, although the extent to which he is exposed to it as a victim is unclear from the Assets and the case diary. At the time of this research YP4 is a pupil at the local comprehensive school, but has been absent for several months. He has instead started to work casually in scaffolding. While there is no indication of mental health issues, YP4 has been diagnosed with diabetes.

YP5

YP5 is 17 years old at the start of this research, and the offence for which he is in touch with the YOT is his first offence, 'drunk and disorderly behaviour'. For this offence he received a final warning. YP5 lives with his mother, his father having left after his birth. He is taking his A-Levels at the local college, and has no identified mental health, emotional or physical health issues.

YP6

YP6 is 17 years old and has been in touch with this YOT from the age of 13. He lives with his maternal grandparents and is in contact with his biological mother and siblings, but not his father. His offence history includes 'abusive/ malicious phone calls', 'common assault', 'shoplifting', 'breach of order', 'criminal damage', 'threat/ conspiracy to murder', and he is subject to a YRO. YP6 has formerly served a DTO at a local secure young offenders institution. He attends a school for pupils with emotional and behavioural problems. He has formally been diagnosed with a mental illness, 'conduct disorder' and asthma, and has a number of health-related issues in relation to his obesity. He has a history of attempted suicide and self-harm.

YP7

YP7 is 16 years old at the time of this research and has been in contact with this YOT team since the age of 13. His offence history includes 'causing intentional harm and harassment', 'assault of a police officer', 'breach of order', 'criminal damage', 'possession of offensive weapon', 'common assault', 'causing harassment, alarm and distress' and a breach of his YRO, to which he is still subject. He has a history of living in various children's homes, but is temporarily residing with a female foster carer. He was removed from his mother's house at the age of 10 as her partner perpetrated sexual and physical abuse on YP7 and his siblings. Since the age of 6, YP7 has been looked after by social services. He is one of seven siblings, some of whom he stays in contact with, as well as frequently being in touch with his biological mother, but not his birth father. YP7 has a history of alcohol and substance misuse dating back to the age of 7 as well as of not engaging with mental health services. He has not been officially diagnosed with any mental health or physical illnesses. However, he has self-harmed in the past.

YP8

YP8 has been in contact with this YOT since the age of 10 and is 17 years old at the time of this research. His offence history includes 'causing danger to road users',

'common assault', 'burglary', 'possession of weapon', 'theft and bodily harm', 'criminal damage', 'TWOC' and 'causing harassment and distress'. He is subject to a YRO. He lives in a children's home as the result of domestic violence in the family setting and does not appear to have contact with any members of his biological family. His accommodation changed frequently during the time of the research. YP8 has been diagnosed with 'social exclusion disorder', and only engaged in education intermittently. He has identified special needs, but there is no indication of any physical illnesses.

YP9

YP9 is 19 years old at the time of this research and has been in contact with this YOT since the age of 14. His offence history includes 'criminal damage', 'harassment', 'assault against partner' and 'assault with bodily harm', which resulted in him being subject to a YRO. He lives independently with his female partner and their child, and seems not to have contact with his biological father. He was unemployed at the time of this research, and has no identified mental or physical health illnesses or special needs.

YP10

YP10 is 17 at the time of this research and lives with his siblings at their maternal grandparents' house. He has been in contact with the YOT since he was 14 years old, and his offence history includes 'careless driving', 'common assault by beating', 'possession of controlled drugs', 'drunk and disorderly behaviour', 'criminal damage' and 'possession of fireworks'. He is subject to a YRO, and in contact with both his biological mother and father. His father, however, is serving a two year sentence for domestic violence as a result of holding his mother hostage for three days, and raping and physically abusing her repeatedly. While there has been no formally diagnosed mental illness, YP10 has repeatedly self-harmed and attempted suicide as a result of 'emotional difficulties'. He attends school only intermittently, but has not been diagnosed with any special needs.

4.14 YOT Practitioners: A Summary

Lastly, a short summary of practitioners working at this YOT is given. The purpose of this summary is to give an insight into the variety of backgrounds and roles of practitioners working at this YOT. While the young people's profiles provide more detail on the individual young men and their circumstances, this sort of detail cannot be provided for the practitioners working at this YOT due to ethical considerations. Providing more specific information on ages, backgrounds, gender and roles would make this YOT easily identifiable, hence, here is a group profile of practitioners who work at this YOT.

The YOT at which the study was conducted employs approximately 30 members of staff. The team is divided into five distinct sections: Administration, Police Liaison, Case Management, ISS Team and Sessional Support. The Administration (5 members) and the Police Liaison Team (2 members) are not considered to engage in practice with young people at this YOT; all remaining 23 members of staff engage in practice with young people in the sense that they are actively involved in the assessment of young people, the design and delivery of intervention programmes, or on-call duties during nights and weekends. This applies to staff throughout the organisational hierarchy of this YOT, from ISS staff to the senior manager. The ages of YOT practitioners ranged from approximately 25 to 50 years old. While two-thirds of staff were trained as social workers, one-third have not engaged in any formal training in social or youth work. These members of staff were mainly represented in the sessional support work with young people (alcohol and substance misuse, sexual health, art projects) and the ISS team, where two members of staff entered work at this YOT through voluntary work on the basis of previous experiences in sports coaching and one member of staff has an army background. The professional backgrounds and experiences of individual YOT practitioners varied greatly from teaching, various sections of social services (child care, health care, fostering services), counseling and sports coaching. All but one member of staff originated from the North-East of England, and only three members of staff were identified as belonging to an ethnic minority. At the time of the study (May 2011- September

2011) the number of young people this YOT dealt with was approximately 120, of whom 10% were female.

Abbreviations

Lastly, in order to clarify some of the abbreviations used in this thesis and the source of quotations and data, the table below has been created.

Table 1: Abbreviations

Abbreviations	Source
F	Female Practitioner (Interview or Focus Group)
M	Male Practitioner (Interview or Focus Group)
YP	Young Person
CD YP	Case Diary Young Person
ASSET YP	Asset Document Young Person

'F' stands for Female Practitioner and 'M' stands for Male Practitioner. While each practitioner involved in the research was given a number (1,2,3,4 etc.), the source of data abbreviated with F or M is either data from an interview or the focus group. Although young people's names were anonymised, this was purely to be able to distinguish between the different 'Assets' and 'Case Diaries' and no data in this thesis is the result of direct interaction with the young men at this YOT. Hence, CD YP1 indicates that the data quoted or used derives from one of the 'case diaries' composed on Young Person number 1. Equally, ASSET YP1 indicates that the data cited derives from data generated from one of the ASSETs composed on Young Person number 1.

Part II

Chapter 5: Constructions of Masculinity - Displaying Masculinity

Introduction

In part II the findings emerging from this study are analysed and set in context. Chapters five, six and seven summarise the findings with reference to the academic literature as outlined in chapters two and three. This chapter provides an account of how YOT practitioners at this YOT construct masculinity of the young men with whom they work in relation to displaying masculinity, understanding masculinity and male capital and performing masculinity. It begins by elaborating the analysis and findings categories which have been employed to make sense of the data collected for this study.

5.1 Analysis and Findings Categories

Table 1 below illustrates the main and subcategories through which the data from this study has been analysed and the findings have been considered. The numbers in relation to each category of analysis reflect the number of occurrences of this category in the data on the basis of the final version of categories and subcategories. These final categories have been developed through a Grounded Theory approach (Charmaz, 2000; Charmaz, 2003; Corbin and Strauss, 2008; Glaser and Strauss, 1967), constant revision during the analysis of the data from different sources, and were amended in view of both their verification and occurrence across data sources (Bazeley, 2000; Bazeley and Richards, 2007) as well as to how different elements were employed by YOT practitioners' constructions of the masculinity of the young men with whom they work. Inevitably, some of these subcategories appear in more than one major category as they are elements YOT practitioners used to both construct masculinity and explain the young men's offending. From the overall findings and their associations three main categories emerged: masculinity, young people and YJS (gender and offending). The category masculinity contains all the elements YOT practitioners employed directly in the way they constructed the young men's masculinity. The category 'young people' highlights the main issues YOT practitioners attributed to the young men with whom they work as well as elements

of the narrative they told about the young people's lives with particular reference to their experiences and to the ways in which they explain young men's aggression and violence. The third category, YJS (gender and offending), specifically considered the ways in which YOT practitioners attributed relevance to masculinity and masculinity and offending in their work with young men.

Table 2: Findings and Analysis Major and Subcategories

Main Category	Subcategory 1	Subcategory 2	Subcategory 3	Subcategory 4
Masculinity	Aggression and violence (131)	Displaying masculinity (137)	Male habitus (123)	Male capital (82)
	Families (86)	Social learning and socialisation (43)	Embodiment of social structure (12)	Agency (2)
	Normative masculinity (113)	Drinking (84)	Fighting (146)	Low impulse and temper control (32)
	Performing masculinity (151)	Individual (32)	Peers (48)	Mothers (24)
		Reference groups (137)	Fathers: social learning of masculinity (49)	Peers: Bravado, Reputation, Respect (39)
	Education (10)	Special Needs (9)	School exclusion/ attendance (9)	n/a
	Family (90)	Masculinity and fathers (36)	Role models: Socialisation and social learning of masculinity (59)	Role models: Socialisation and social learning of criminal behaviour (47)
		Masculinity and mothers (27)	Performing masculinity: localised hegemonic masculinity (14)	n/a
	Personal relationships	Role of peers (49)	Kudos, respect, reputation (56)	Policing masculinity (21)
	Neighbourhood (53)	Working class masculinity & localised hegemonic masculinity (42)	Drinking and fighting as being a man (16)	Social class (2)
	Groups/ Individual (31)	YP in group (14) YP alone (12)	Presentation at YOT/ in sessional group work (focus group data) (4)	'Offending in group' (31) 'Offending alone' (12)
	Behaviours (137)	Role of aggression & violence (86)	Relationship to masculinity (93)	Relationship to offending behaviour (48)

	Risk (34)	Male behaviour (30)	Relationship to risk (37)	n/a
Young People	Living arrangements (10)	Care history (8)	Vulnerability/ being a man, mental health (3)	Individual needs (36)
	Experience of violence/ abuse (26)	Link to offending behaviour (2)		
	Witnessing domestic violence (42)	Learning of aggression and violence as coping strategy (81)	Reaction to frustration & conflict situations (36)	Consumption of alcohol & violent behaviour (43)
	Male conflict resolution (81)	Witnessing of violence and aggression (42)	Learned coping strategies (41)	Absence of alternative coping strategies (18)
	Low self-esteem (11)	Wanting to gain kudos & reputation (43)	Enacting masculine behaviour (52)	Expression of anger and violence (49)
	Reaction to frustration and conflict/coping strategies (37)	Enacting masculine behaviour/ being a man (52)	Aggression and violence (43)	Drinking & fighting as localised masculinity and criminal behaviour
	Communication skills (23)	Expression of feelings (51)	Relevance of (learnt) masculinity (43)	YOT practitioners approach (12)
YJS: Gender and offending (Staff and YOT)	Male offending (83)	Length of time in contact with YOT (10)	Type of offences (24)	Motivation/reason (83)
	Female offending (41)	n/a	Type of offences (31)	Motivation/ reason (11)
	Masculinity and Risk (74)	Offending behaviour (61)	Conflict resolution (35)	Vulnerability (4)
	Professional background (18)	Approach to YP (male) (39)	Building rapport (male) (15)	Own experience and masculinity (3)
		Approach to YP (female) (3)	Building rapport (female) (1)	n/a
	Intervention activities (ISS and sessional support) (18)	Gender specific approach (21)	Relevance of gender (17)	Individual (gendered) needs and masculinity (26)

Writing up of the findings followed those three major themes (highest number of occurrences across the data) emerging from this table: displaying masculinity (chapter five), performing masculinity (chapter six), and masculinity and offending (chapter seven). Chapters five and six elaborate on the constructions of masculinity of YOT practitioners in relation to displaying and performing masculinity, specifically in relation to the relevance of masculinity, its attributes and how they are explained in regards to their occurrence and origins. Here relevant sociological theories discussed in chapter three are employed to highlight the main issues around these

constructions of masculinity and to help explain their underlying assumptions. Equally, these findings are discussed in reference to how key categories in YOT practitioners' constructions of masculinity can be linked to issues around masculinity.

Chapter seven considers the relevance those constructions are given in relation to the offending behaviour of the young men with whom YOT practitioners work, and examines to what extent these constructions of masculinity are seen as important in the work with young men at this YOT with regard to individual needs and wider youth justice practice.

5.2 Displaying Masculinity

As is evident from the table above, aggression and violence presented one of the most frequently occurring themes across the data. YOT practitioners associate the display of aggression and violence with being male and distinct behavioural characteristics and particular backgrounds. Connell (2005b) identifies how specific sets of behavioural traits are associated with either femininity or masculinity. Goffman (2007) developed the term 'gender display' to capture gender-specific displays of behaviours in interaction. Chapter two of this thesis establishes how, in sex-role theory (Baillargeon et al., 2007; Block, 1976a; 1976b; 1983; Parsons, 1951) and psychological approaches to gender (Campbell, 1994; 1998; 2006; Crick et al., 1996; Crick and Grotpeter, 1995; Geary, 2000; Wood and Eagly, 2002), overtly aggressive and violent behaviour is mainly associated with boys and men, whereby the perceived sex of a person is aligned with their gender and specific behavioural traits. Aggression and violence were the most frequent themes emerging from across the data sets. As the profiles above illustrate, all young men whose documents were analysed for the purpose of this study had engaged in aggressive and violent behaviour against another person or/and property. However, their experience of aggression and violent behaviour is two-fold in that the vast majority also witnessed and/or suffered from domestic violence. Hence, in order to investigate, describe and analyse the role played by aggression and violence in how YOT practitioners construct the young men's masculinity, this section concentrates on both the context

in which the expression of violent and aggressive behaviour of young men is understood and explained by YOT practitioners, and how these young men's witnessing and experience of aggressive and violent behaviour is viewed.

Low Temper and Impulse Control

A number of authors (Cohn, 1991; De Keseredy and Schwartz, 2005; Hanmer and Maynard, 1987; Hatty, 2000; Heiliger and Engelfried, 1995; Mooney, 2000; Morgan, 1987; Wilson and Daly, 1985) identify low control of temper and impulse as a gender-related trait in boys. YOT practitioners frequently make this association in Assets produced on the young men and boys, where they cite impulsiveness and the lack of control over impulses as one explanation for the young men's and boys' behaviour:

'Throughout this assessment, I have said that this is an impulse offence and a reaction to YP2's own issues of dealing with his friend's death' (Asset YP2). Further, *'YP6 is impulsive, easily gives into pressure from others and has a poor control of his temper'* (Asset YP6).

Here Scourfield's concept of 'occupational discourse' (Scourfield, 2003: 31) becomes most evident. The design of the Asset actively encourages YOT practitioners to assess the young person's lack of impulse and temper control by providing a box to be ticked. Clear association is thereby made between offending behaviour and the low control of impulse and temper, and some YOT practitioners continued to use this terminology in explaining offending behaviour beyond the box-ticking exercise.

A number of authors theorise the expression of anger in the form of violent and aggressive behaviour as a reaction to frustration (Berkowitz, 1989; Malamuth et al., 1993), particularly in relation to boys and men (Boehnisch and Winter, 1993; Hatty, 2000). Similarly, YOT practitioners align the lack of control and the over-reaction to frustration with boys and men in their work rather than girls and women:

[…] the only feeling they show is, I am stressed , I am angry, I am going to smash them in the face! You can tell from the girls, the way they move and their body language […] they will sit and talk for ages with staff and the lads will go 'fucking pissed off', they'll hit a wall or something and then it will be all fixed […] once they have done that, it seems to be all over. Once they've hit that door […] that's it dealt with. (M13)

Violence and aggression is associated mainly with boys and men, and the comparison between the behaviour of young men and women appears the main gateway through which most YOT practitioners pinpoint the boys' and young men's behaviour:

I would say for offenders who are arrested you get a lot more people, a lot more males expressing their concerns through anger and violence, and a lot more females expressing their concerns through drink and drugs. (F19)

What Smith calls 'set repertoire of responses' (Smith, 2011a: 197) and Scourfield terms 'occupational discourse' (Scourfield, 2003: 31) forms part of the practitioners' explanation of the young men's aggressive and confrontational behaviour, and the lack of impulse and temper control thus becomes central in this explanation:

'YP6 has shown that he can act on impulse with little or no thought [and] appears to be comfortable directing his aggression towards any professional. Any issues appear to manifest in aggressive and threatening behaviour (Asset YP6). *YP7 appears to thrive on conflict situations […]* (Asset YP7).

While the expression of frustration in aggressive and violent behaviour is not explicitly linked to ideas around masculinity, it is identified as a coping strategy in conflict situations.

Conflict Resolutions and Masculinity

Adams and Coltrane (2005) observe how aggression and violent behaviour of boys form their response to conflict situations, and Hatty (2000) underlines how specific groups of men utilise their gendered strategies to respond to conflict situations. While her emphasis here is on 'disempowered' young men (Hatty, 2000: 6), which will be considered fully in the next section of this chapter, she suggests that violence and aggression as potential responses to conflicts are still 'the prerogative[s] of the youthful male, especially when confronted by [the] contradictions and paradoxes […]' (Hatty, 2000: 6). YOT practitioners at this YOT viewed aggressive and violent behaviour in boys and young men as a response to stressful and challenging situations:

'How males and females handle it, that's different. So males would be more confrontational […] the way males act on that is if they've been grassed up, they'll just go and there will be a confrontation and they'll kind of have a fight (M7).

Throughout the data, the way young men and boys are understood by YOT practitioners to deal with their difficulties and respond to conflicts through confrontational behaviour, often results in aggressive and violent behaviour and a clear recognition of their inability to 'discuss their feelings':

The majority of boys will put like brick walls around them, and one in particular, that I am seeing today, he won't speak about it. He's got lots of, he attempted suicide in the past, major issues with his mum, he has a really volatile relationship with his mam, but no matter how you try he won't sit down and talk about his feelings and emotions […] it comes back to the bravado thing. If you talk about feelings and emotions you are showing a weakness, and young men don't like showing weakness' (M6).

In the vast majority of cases, the source of aggressive or violent behaviour is identified as arguments with either the young men's mothers or girlfriends or confrontation with other males. While the relationships between the young men in

this research and their mothers will be discussed in detail in chapter six, Assets and case diaries produced on YP4 here give an insight into the circumstances in which issues around conflict solutions were seen to arise:

YP4 has displayed behaviour that has been controlling and manipulative towards his mother, and I would assess that at times he has not gotten something he wanted or needed to avoid embarrassment or further consequences he has lashed out at his mother and showed inappropriate aggressive behaviour in front of others […] YP4 tells me that people were annoying him and he began to kick down doors and blinds (Asset YP4).

Although aggression and violence are major themes emerging from the data, very few YOT practitioners set such behaviour in a context with issues around masculinity:

I have noticed with young people who we would assess as having anger management issues really struggle with male workers, because it's a man thing […] It's just like 'don't you challenge me' and they just see another male. I suppose it's like a group of lions, isn't it? You only have that one, and that one for a reason, and you have lots of lionesses. It's like 'you are challenging my masculinity and I have to step up here'. (F9)

While most YOT practitioners acknowledge the 'poor management of feelings' (Asset YP2) as an issue of the young men they worked with, this is conceptualised as 'anger management' with only very few references to issues around masculinity. It rather appears that the expression of aggressive and violent behaviour of young men at this YOT is almost expected and, to an extent, accommodated in practice with young men:

YP9 describes behaviour towards his partner that is controlling and aggressive, and he admits that he has poor control of his temper and will damage property […] YP(needs to find ways of dealing with his feelings like hitting a pillow rather than a wall or a door rather than causing damage to himself or property (Asset YP9).

The resistance of young men and boys to articulating verbally their emotions and issues is highlighted by the vast majority of YOT practitioners and identified as a barrier in working with young men at this YOT.

When they get aggressive, having a talk about it is not the approach, do you know what I mean? You need to just take them outside, give them some fresh air, walk them around a bit, let them just kind of calm down in their own time (M12).

Most YOT practitioners understand this resistance as a conscious decision by the young men not to talk about their feelings on the basis of wanting to maintain their image of toughness, but some question the young men's communication abilities. What is interesting here, however, is that while the unwillingness or inability of the young men to engage verbally in relation to any of their issues is recognised by most practitioners, a number of YOT practitioners also state that they would not necessarily engage with young men in that manner:

The last thing they want to kind of hear […] because masculine males don't want to acknowledge that they are upset, that they have feelings or that they are not tough […] (M12).

Here also is some evidence of staff working with the young men's inability to articulate their feelings. In other words, while most staff recognise that young men in their work do not want to talk about their feelings, their approach consciously makes allowances for this perceived inability by not directly attempting to engage them in such conversations. However, only one male staff member at this YOT explicitly acknowledges that his general approach to young men differs from his approach to young women he works with:

I approach it differently, most males would approach it differently. I guess, it's a harder approach, I think, a more direct approach […] there is no way of getting away from that. I think my approach is masculine, a masculine approach to problem solving

[…] I think you would have to be slightly more careful with the girls, just approach things a little more delicately, not as direct (M7).

Hatty (2000) argues that reacting aggressively to conflicts or controlling the verbalisation of emotions may be related to both a utilisation of a basic 'male resource' to which disempowered male youth have access, and the attempt of exercising control by young men, who feel that they do not have any control over other aspects of their lives. Some practitioners explained the young men's disengagement from conversations about their feeling in a similar way:

[…] a lot of them, they don't control anything else in their lives. There are a lot of things that… some of them have really, really hard lives and they haven't had any control over anything, so that is just one part of their lives they can control […] some of them hang onto it with their dear lives, and they don't want to be perceived as being not in control, and it's so important to them […] (F9).

Lui and Kapland (2004) explain how aggression is understood as integral to male identity and Crick, Bigbee and Howes (1996) emphasise the role of expressed aggression as affirmation of masculinity. The data analysis here emphasises that YOT practitioners understand the young men's aggression as a response to conflict situations. This is seen as normative for boys, in the sense that both an expected reaction of boys and young men and, to some extent, accommodated in how YOT practitioners approach the young men in their work or which strategies they employ to defuse problematic situations. While the young men's lack of engagement in conversations about their feelings as a coping strategy is attributed to their unwillingness or their inabilities, little consideration appears to be given to their potential lack of alternative coping strategies (Boehnisch and Winter, 1993; De Keseredy and Schwartz, 2005).

Alcohol Consumption

Although the consumption of alcohol and substance use form categories of the Asset, none of the Assets analysed made a direct link between offending behaviour

and the consumption of alcohol or drugs within the categories. However, the consumption of alcohol in particular becomes central as an explanation for aggressive and violent behaviour of young men at this YOT, mainly in the offence analysis section. This is to say that rather than through issues associated with masculinity, alcohol here is seen as the trigger, and the inability to manage feelings and the consumption of alcohol were seen as factors contributing to the escalation of violent and aggressive behaviour:

It is concerning that YP2 has been drinking so excessively, allowing himself to get caught up in what appears to be impulsive and mindless, alcohol-fuelled behaviour […] my knowledge of YP2 leads me to the view that YP2's drinking excessively is due to his inability to cope with problems […] and this offence [assault] appears to have been impulsive in nature, triggered by YP2's argument with his mother and also the consumption of alcohol […] (Asset YP2).

Featherstone, Rivett and Scourfield (2007) explain how in many cultural contexts men consume alcohol as a coping mechanism and emphasise the link between excessive consumption of alcohol and a particular masculinity. Winlow (2002) provides an insight into the importance of high alcohol consumption and masculinity in the North-East of England. The acceptance of a certain drinking culture and its association with masculinity becomes evident in the data analysis in relation to Asset scorings on alcohol consumption as evidenced below.

Ruxton (2009) identifies the large consumption of alcohol as risk-taking behaviour and states that 'risk-taking is closely linked to men's sense of what it means to be male and what helps to differentiate men from women' (Ruxton, 2009: 96). Equally, Smiler (2013) links both the use of substances and risk-taking behaviour to young men's attempts to prove their masculinity. While the consumption of alcohol is seen by YOT practitioners as part of normative masculinity, it more closely associated by them with how young men react to difficult situations, through aggressive and confrontational behaviour and/or the consumption of drugs, mainly alcohol. The consumption of drugs and alcohol is stressed by YOT practitioners in relation to all

young men whose Assets and case diaries were analysed for this study. However, while only YP10 has been identified by YOT practitioners as having a serious issue in relation to his use of cannabis, all but one of the other nine young men are only described as heavy drinkers. In all cases staff at this YOT associated the misuse of substances and alcohol as a way the young men 'cope with strong emotions and relieve stress' (Asset YP10). However, it is notable in the data that Asset scores for individual young men in relation to their consumption of alcohol increased significantly as identifying a risk behaviour when set in the context of violent and aggressive behaviour. This is to say that as a stand-alone issue, the consumption of alcohol is not necessarily understood as problematic (in terms of Asset risk scoring), unless it formed part of the offence analysis or explanation. Wright and Cowburn (2011) point out that issues around social workers' own perceptions of masculinity can have an impact on the work with men. It appears here that YOT practitioners do not necessarily comprehend the high consumption of alcohol as problematic, unless it results in offending and or violent behaviour, and there seems to be an acceptance of the same as part of local masculinity. For YOT practitioners, the consumption of alcohol in the context of a violent or aggressive altercation thus becomes associated with both an increase in 'impulsiveness' and a decrease in the ability to make informed decisions:

I have assessed that YP3 has been going through an unsettled period of his life at the time [...] and that his way of dealing with stress has been the use of alcohol, which impacted on his ability to make an informed decision. I believe this offence is impulsive in nature and not pre-planned (Asset YP3).

The consumption of alcohol, binge-drinking in particular, is clearly associated by a significant number of practitioners with 'being a man'. One practitioner directly articulates this by setting the consumption of alcohol in the context of masculinity:

Like boys, you gotta drink, you know what I mean. You are not a man unless you drink, whereas I think you do get binge drinking with females and stuff like that, you do, and alcohol use with girls coming into the system is a problem (M12)

While the analysis of violent and aggressive offences is not contextualised around issues of masculinity by YOT practitioners, drinking, and to some extent violent and aggressive behaviour, is understood as part of 'being a man'. As reflected in the higher scores in Asset mentioned above, aggression and drinking, up to a point, are understood as part of how young males display their masculinity:

[…] I think there is a cultural acceptance almost that lads do things that are more, they are more boisterous. A bit more aggressive, they drink more, more violent and what have you… and then, when you get to a certain age, you have gone too far, that's too boisterous, that's too aggressive….that's more acceptable behaviour by boys, more expected behaviour by lads, it's engrained (M13).

The point at which violence and drinking were articulated as an issue by the majority of YOT practitioners is when the combination resulted in a recorded criminal offence, although this offence in turn is then, paradoxically, not directly associated with issues around masculinity in relation to the offence analysis or the assessment of the young person, but rather the consumption of alcohol and poor impulse control.

Normative Masculinity

While aggressive behaviour is seen as an issue in relation to engaging young men at this YOT in assessment and intervention, it is expected of the young men and associated with their display of masculine behaviour:

'I think it's the masculine behaviour. I think aggression and violence is seen as a normal part of masculine behaviour […] if a man is violent, it's violence, that's it, that's what men are like […] (M14).

Winlow (2002) underlines the role of violence and aggression and their relationship with lower white working-class masculinity in the North-East of England. While both ideas around local masculinity and social class will be explored more fully in the next section of this chapter, it should be noticed here that both drinking and violence and

aggression were frequently cited by staff at this YOT as characteristics of being a man in the area of the YOT. The consumption of alcohol and the expression of violent and aggressive behaviour of the young men who engaged with this YOT are not understood as entirely different to the wider male culture in this area, but rather understood as normative in reference to their social and geographical position (Winlow, 2002).

The importance of the relationship between ideas around masculinity and the geographical area where the YOT is situated directly surfaced in numerous interviews with staff at this YOT.

Connell and Messerschmidt (2005) emphasise the necessity of setting the concept of hegemonic masculinity into geographical and local contexts, when researching masculinity, and Wedgwood (2009) identifies one of the main strengths of this concept to be its capacity to account for different masculinities and their hierarchical structure as well as their relationship to one another. The picture of the localised hegemonic form of masculinity as understood by staff emerges throughout the data, but is particularly stressed by one man who works at this YOT:

You'd walk into a room knowing that you're working with a lad who's really sort of embedded in the local culture, he is very masculine, he fights a lot, he's got very strong values about what a man can do (M4).

The personal experience of some men working at this YOT of having grown up in the area of this YOT and some of them under circumstances similar to the living situations of the young men they work with is seen as a clear advantage in the work with these young men, and a particular 'display of masculinity' (Goffman, 2007) is 'used as a tool' (M12) in order to build rapport with young people and relate to them:

It's a rough area, you know, very deprived area. I was brought up by a single mum [in this area], so I can relate to these young people now, you know [...] because I is sort

of in their shoes, so I can relate to and understand. It's all about survival on these estates, council estates like that, you have to be tough, otherwise if you weren't tough, you were victimised (M4).

Familiarity with the area, personal experience of growing up in the area and the use of local language is a central element to this display of masculinity:

They see me down the gym, they know I am from around the estate […] a familiar accent by language and what have you, knowing all the shortened words that Geordies use and things like that […] does help breakdown some barriers (M4).

However, not being from the local area is described as being sufficient reason for some young men who engaged with services at this YOT to question the YOT practitioner's masculinity. This is evident by the only man working at this YOT who is not from the local area:

I was working with some young people once and one of the lads asked a colleague: 'Is that bloke gay?' I kind of overheard him saying it and asked 'Why would you think that I am?', and he said 'it's just the way you speak. So in his mind the way I speak somehow makes him question my sexuality, because I am not Geordie' (M13).

In other words, not conforming to the local display of masculinity (Plummer, 2001) by not using the local accent is sufficient reason for some of the young men at this YOT to subordinate (Connell, 2005b) this particular YOT practitioner's masculinity by associating it with being gay.

Both Pringle (1995) and Morgan (1992) emphasise the potential relevance of what they call 'insider knowledge' in the work and research with men. They argue that practitioners (and researchers) are as much part of the gendered world as the men they work with and as such contribute to the production of gender, and here masculinity. In other words, although the vast majority of YOT practitioners do not articulate issues around their own masculinity or femininity and the possible effect of

those in relation to working with young men, not conforming to the same is pointed out as a source of having one's gender identity questioned. This is to say that 'insider knowledge', and the embodiment of a particular kind of localised masculinity (Connell, 2005b), is seen as an advantage by some working at this YOT with young men in terms of being able to relate to them, understand them, and build rapport with them:

When I speak to young people, they sort of straight away get a sense of where my experience is [...] I think they are impressed as well, that I go to the gym and work out, they are impressed by that all and it sort of straight away strikes up a good relationship with the majority of young people. It's sort of what you wear, what you look like and what your hairstyle is like [...] it strikes up a good relationship....they feel comfortable with you (M4).

Wright and Cowburn (2011) stress the relevance of male social workers' own masculinity in the work with men on the example of programmes for male perpetrators of domestic violence. Dressing like the young people and embodying a similar style of localised masculinity is understood as a way of relating to the young person and making them feel comfortable. The masculinity of some men working at this YOT becomes central to the way they approach the young men with whom they work. The dress code of some men working at this YOT and their appearance in terms of hairstyle and informality, in particular in the ISS team, underlines how masculinity is both enacted and masculinity norms are produced (Kelan, 2009) by displaying a particular kind of role-dominant localised form of masculinity, in which 'conduct and appearance' play a central role (Goffman, 1990: 81).

Returning to Connell and Messerschmidt (2005), what is interesting here is that while masculinity of the young men is contextualised geographically and locally, only one YOT practitioner implies a hierarchy of multiple forms of masculinity and their interplay by highlighting the differences between himself and the young men with whom he works. This is to say that the majority of practitioners, especially the two men cited above, who relate to the young men they work with through their

personal experiences of being a man in the local area, do not acknowledge a multiplicity of masculinity as being available to the young men. Consequently, the behaviour of the young men they described as coming across through work is both identified as the localised form of hegemonic masculinity and the only form of masculinity through which those young men are understood. This form of hegemonic masculinity is understood as being aggressive, confrontational and lacks the ability or willingness to articulate emotions and resolve conflicts other than through aggression and violence. This understanding of masculinity echoes the association of aggressive and violent behaviour with boys and young men, rather than girls and young women (Campbell, 1994; 1998; 2006; 2008; Crick et al., 1996; Crick and Grotpeter, 1995). Similarly to the sex-role literature reviewed in chapter two of this thesis (Baillargeon et al., 2007; Block, 1976a; Block, 1976b; Block, 1983) male aggression is seen as of part of normative masculinity (Crick et al., 1996).

Collier (1998) argues that the academic literature on offending and masculinity predominantly connotes masculinity with negative characteristics and lacks multiplicity in relation to understanding masculinity in the context of crime. This is equally evident in the data which emerged from this study and emphasises the strong tendency of YOT practitioners to associate the masculinity of the boys and young men at this YOT with negative characteristics and only one form of masculinity, described here as localised hegemonic masculinity.

Front and Back Regions– Localised Hegemonic Masculinity and Vulnerability

Goffman (1990) distinguishes between front and back regions, understanding the *front region* as the location where the performance of a particular behaviour takes place, and the back region as the place that holds the multitude of all possible performances and from which the front performance both emerges and is controlled. This idea suggests not only active social agency (discussed further in the next chapter) of the performer but also the performer's access to a multiplicity of possible performances, all of which add up to the essence of a person rather than

one singular performance being an indicator for the overall repertoire of performances. In other words, while aggressive and violent behaviour in young men may be evidence of the potential of those young men to perform such behaviour, it does not reflect the entire sum of behaviours potentially available to this person and, in itself, is not an indicator of this person's essence. As outlined above, the idea of multiplicity of performances of masculinity seems to be largely absent from how YOT practitioners understand the young men with whom they work. However, data from interviews suggests that practitioners have an understanding of the young men, which can be described along the lines of Goffman's idea of front and back regions and is illustrated here on the data emerging mainly from the category 'vulnerability'.

Morgan (2002) considers the extent of mental health issues among the adult prison population, and several independent reports into issues around mental health and learning disabilities in the criminal (Lord Bradley, 2009) and youth justice system (Nacro, 2011) have noted the overrepresentation of individuals with mental health and learning disabilities in the criminal justice system as a whole. In particular, the Nacro report argues that the focus of assessment of risk of offending and reoffending causes physical health related issues to be overlooked and 'mental health problems and learning disabilities [to be] underestimated' (Nacro, 2011: 11). Furthermore, numerous authors make a connection between childhood experience of abuse and/or neglect and criminal offending behaviour in later life (Egeland, 1993; Ketterlinus and Lamb, 1994; Malamuth et al., 1993; Spatz Widom, 1994). Day, Hibbert and Cadman (2008) further stress the overrepresentation of young people engaging with youth justice services and their experience of abuse, violence and neglect prior to custody, while Whitted, Delavega and Lennon-Dearing (2013) point out the significant differences in relation to gender specific problem behaviour and mental health issues resulting from children in care and involvement with youth justice services. Issues around the vulnerability of young people in contact with the youth justice system have received recent attention in both the national press (O'Hara, 2013) and charities concerned with mental health issues and learning disabilities of young people in the YJS (Nacro, 2011). In essence they argue that not only do criminal and youth justice systems fail vulnerable young people and adults,

but also that an acknowledgement and professional assessment of mental health issues, learning disabilities and related vulnerabilities and targeted intervention can assist in reducing (re) offending. The term vulnerability used here is Nacro's definition:

> We use the term [vulnerability] in the wider sense […] to include those who experience multiple and complex problems which restrict their life chances and need extra attention to improve their well-being. We use it for children and young people in (or at risk of) contact with the youth justice system. This differs from the narrow sense in which the term is used in the youth justice system- to help determine whether a child can cope in a young offender institution (Nacro, 2011:6).

Although the official Asset document includes a section on vulnerability, very few of these Assets explicitly consider in more depth the vulnerability (as defined above) of the young person assessed. This is despite prior information, often in the same Asset document, which clearly binds mental-health issues and issues around abuse and the experience of violence, and is particularly surprising since YOT practitioners do not understand the young men they assess as possessing coping strategies beyond the expression of anger and consumption of alcohol as discussed above. All but one of the young people in this study witnessed domestic violence as children, although it remained unclear to what extent they have themselves been victims of domestic violence. Scourfield (2001) points out how violence against mothers is associated with a high likelihood of physical and emotional abuse of the child itself, whereby the child gets 'caught up in the violence against their mother' (Scourfield, 2001: 79). This connection is rarely made by YOT practitioners, and the status of victim of domestic violence predominantly remains with the mother. As in the Asset section on vulnerability, very few mental health concerns are explicitly expressed in relation to this experience of the young men. The contradiction between identifying the young men as having experienced traumatic events and domestic violence, yet not being assessed as vulnerable, can be particularly well illustrated by considering the examples of two young men, YP2 and YP3.

As is evident from his profile, YP2 has witnessed extensive domestic violence, seeing his mother subjected to domestic violence from various partners. Through his Assets and case diaries the extent to which he himself has been victim of domestic violence is unclear, despite his offences almost exclusively being related to violent outbursts aimed at his various girlfriends. Although it is frequently pointed out by YOT practitioners that his experience of the suicide of his friend and finding his body is a major issue he is 'struggling to deal with' (Asset YP2), the Assets completed on YP2 over the period of 2 years do not make a connection between this experience and his potential emotional vulnerability or mental health issues. Equally, the high number of moves across the country as the result of his mother being subjected to domestic violence and the consequent placement in a variety of foster care families were not understood by YOT practitioners as impacting hugely either on his mental and emotional health or his vulnerability.

YP2 is chosen to illustrate the fact that as with the majority of young men in this study, despite a detailed account of experiences of witnessing domestic violence, there is very little evidence in the data collected for this study that the young people are explicitly considered by YOT practitioners as being vulnerable. While mental and emotional health issues as well as the potential vulnerability of the young person are not explicitly seen as related to the young men's offending behaviour, overtly aggressive and violent behaviours were viewed as being linked. Numerous authors have explored the link between experience of abuse and the witnessing of domestic violence and problem and offending behaviour (Day et al., 2008; Egeland, 1993; Malamuth et al., 1993). However, this association is not made by YOT practitioners in the Assets. Further, these experiences are largely not seen as generating substantial concern for mental and/or emotional health issues, beyond the acknowledgement of the young person's difficulty with coping strategies, nor do they lead to an understanding of the young person himself as being vulnerable. Aggressive and violent behaviours are viewed through the lens of localised hegemonic masculinity rather than as the result of traumatic childhood experiences.

It emerged from the data collected from Assets that the young men are predominantly understood as exercising violence with few explicit considerations given to their own vulnerability resulting from personal histories. This becomes extremely obvious in the Assets of YP3. YP3 is suspected of having committed a number of sexual offences against under aged girls. Although his Assets clearly state that he himself has been subjected to 'extreme pornography from the age of 8' (Asset YP3), no obvious connection is made between his own experiences and the alleged offences or, in fact, his own vulnerability in relation to his 'inappropriate sexual behaviour' (Asset YP3) towards under-aged girls and female staff. However, his Assets reveal that such behaviours have occurred from an early age and the newly emerged alleged offence has not been an isolated incident. While he is assessed as having emotional and mental health issues, he is not explicitly considered to be vulnerable in any of the Assets completed for him over a one-year period. This remains the case throughout, even when one of the Assets highlighted that:

It is believed that YP3 engages in a sexual relationship with his girlfriend's father, who takes them to places in City A to watch gay people have sex [...] His girlfriend's father also has a large collection of gay and transvestite porn, which they regularly view together [...] (Asset YP3).

Assets portray the young men's behaviour as wider practice of the specific localised hegemonic masculinity, as discussed above, in the frame of 'the configuration of gender practices which embodies the currently accepted answer to the problem of legitimacy [...] which guarantees the dominant position of men [...] (Connell, 2005b: 77). Cowburn (2005) argues that 'with acts of sexual coercion perpetrated by men attention should be focused beyond the dominant discourse to wider issues relating and how they exercise [....] power (Cowburn, 2005: 230). What emerges from the data here on YP2 and YP3 is that YOT practitioners construct a form of localised hegemonic masculinity, which solely relies on aggression and violence as the exercise of power as normative masculinity without consideration of the young men's own experiences of powerlessness and do not construct the young men as 'the other'

(Cowburn, 2005) but as the norm in the Assets analysed here. Seidler (2006) and Pollack (2000; 2006) stress the importance of taking into account men's own traumatic experiences and accommodating men's experiences as victims, while Andersen (2013) further emphasises how 'culturally established understanding[s] of manliness […] reject men as victims' (Andersen, 2013: 242), using the example of sexually abused men and boys. Indeed, Weiss (2010) highlights how issues around sexual victimisation are deeply tied up with ideas around masculinity. YOT practitioners do not seem to directly consider the experiences of physical abuse in the Assets and how they have shaped the young men's aggressive and violent behaviour or a notion of their vulnerability. The following extracts from the Assets show that practitioners did not consciously consider the degree to which these young men were left vulnerable by their troubling experiences earlier in life and how perceptions of vulnerability are influenced by gendered perceptions of possible victimisation (Weiss, 2010):

I think the active male is not seen as vulnerable, he's seen as the one with the power. Obviously, the female one is seen as the vulnerable, you know (M4).

The polarised view of men being perpetrators of violence and aggression and women being victims of the same is highly visible throughout the data, in particular as one senior practitioner put it in an interview:

What they don't realise is that they have a whole view of boys and a different view of girls, and they see all girls as victims and all the boys as perpetrators (F17).

If vulnerability of young men and boys at this YOT is articulated, it is mainly through either the consumption of alcohol or the consequent loss of control or expressed through issues such as accommodation:

It's mainly the males that I have worked with, you know a couple of kids sleeping rough over the winter […] if you're vulnerable they will look for accommodation for you […] we've had kind of daily occurrences of self-harming and suicide attempts, but

we have quite a lot of lads who are self-harmers. It's just [...] who will actually kind of talk about it [...] (F22).

The primary way in which practitioners at this YOT made sense of the lack of discussion around vulnerability and the young men they work with is to refer to the young men's unwillingness to talk about their experiences, how they interpret their experiences, and how practitioners themselves interpreted these experiences:

But then what's true is that the lads are equally as victimised and victims as the girls, as anybody else, but how they interpret that and how other people might interpret that [...] can be different. We had lads through here [...] with an extraordinary level of abuse and you know terrible, terrible, terrible things, which they have kind of told us about [...] I don't think we necessarily address it as an issue, the Asset is not lined up for this [...] (M13).

While some importance is given to the format of the Asset itself and the lack of room in it to accommodate issues of abuse and/or vulnerability, there is also an acknowledgment by YOT practitioners that the young men are understood as less vulnerable:

[...] I think they are pretty flexible with females. You know, they sort of protect them, you know, if they are females with males again is sort of 'oh, you are male, you can handle it. Females, I think, again it's vulnerability...males are not seen as vulnerable (M4).

Emerging here is a kind of complicity (Connell, 2005b) between young men at this YOT and YOT practitioners in that young men do not want to talk about their own experiences of violence and abuse, on the one hand, and practitioners implicitly accommodate the lack of articulation of these experiences by their own understanding of 'men being able to handle it' (M12). In other words, the 'staging' (Goffman, 2007: 83) of this particular kind of masculinity is accommodated by YOT

practitioners, and they become complicit in staging and accommodating a particular kind of hegemonic masculinity (Connell, 2005b).

Fineman (2010) highlights how ideas of autonomy are closely linked to the idea of vulnerability, and Parkes and Conolly (2013) emphasise the role of autonomy as part of tough masculinity amongst peers. Fineman (2010) argues that 'as desirable as autonomy is as an aspiration, it cannot be attained without an underlying provision of substantial assistance […] and support from society and institutions, which give individuals the resources they need to create options and make choices' (Fineman, 2010: 17). While the absence of explicit identifications of vulnerabilities in the young men with whom they work from the interview and Asset data may partially be the result of the specific context in which YOT practitioners work, it appears that it is also closely linked to ideas around legitimate practices of masculinity of which 'being vulnerable' is not seen as part of 'being a man' (Weiss, 2010). De Viggiani (2012) using the example of prisons, observes that male prisoners enact a particular type of masculinity 'to ensure emotional, psychological and social survival [by] employing strategies to mask self-perceived weaknesses or vulnerabilities […]' (De Viggiani, 2012: 271). YOT practitioners here appear to be complicit in the staging or verifying of a particular kind of masculinity and discrete male practices, which exclude the acknowledgement of the potential vulnerability of young men at this YOT. The association of dependency and vulnerability, and the disassociation of autonomy and vulnerability takes place through 'roles and relationships traditionally defined and differentiated along gendered lines' (Fineman, 2010: 24) and vulnerability, 'learned helplessness' (Block, 1983: 1340) and dependency are dominantly associated with girls and young women rather than boys and young men by YOT practitioners.

Pollack (2006) elaborates on the effect that he refers to as 'gender straightjacketing' (Pollack, 2006: 190) and argues that 'given the profound insights being uncovered about the social and emotional struggles of today's girls, it is striking how scant research on boys has been over the last several decades' (Pollack, 2006: 191). Although this can partly be seen as the result of the lack of training of YOT practitioners around issues of masculinity, as will be discussed later, their own

'cultural scotomas about "normal boys"' (Pollack, 2006: 193) stands in the way of integrating young men's own experiences and vulnerabilities (Pollack, 2000; Seidler, 2006; Smiler, 2013) in their assessment and intervention as practitioners (Pollack, 2006).

However, while YOT practitioners have an understanding of the experiences of violence and abuse most of these young men have witnessed, there is little evidence from the data collected that it explicitly enters their constructions of the young men's masculinity. Instead the 'tough front' (M12) the young men put on is understood as representing the full essence of their character. While the young men themselves may have held up a tough front and may not have been willing to talk about their experiences, practitioners' own understanding of the young men 'being able to handle it' (M12) and their own interpretations of masculinity make them complicit in keeping up the masculine performance of the young person. Although on some occasions conversations arose between YOT practitioners and young men about their experiences, this does not seem to lead practitioners to question the masculinity of the young men, but is rather seen as letting down the front:

Sometimes they share and open up about it, but as soon as it comes to leaving the front door, they put a different face on (M13).

Goffman (1990) describes the idea of 'front region control' (Goffman, 1990: 137), whereby a specific performance is addressed to a specific audience. While both YOT practitioners and young men, seem to have a 'working consensus' (Goffman, 1990: 135) on the project of performing masculinity, temporary deviation from that specific performance by the young men does not seem to lead practitioners to question the performance itself, but rather to see it as part of the same, or as Goffman (1990) words it: 'Front regions where a particular performance is or may be in progress, and back regions where action occurs that is related to the performance but inconsistent with the appearance fostered by the performance' (Goffman, 1990: 135). In other words, the showing of vulnerability by the young men does not seem to make YOT practitioners question the essence of their construction of masculinity

itself, but is rather seen as part of that masculinity, albeit contradictory. This is to say that even the acknowledgement of young men's vulnerability does not seem to lead YOT practitioners to open up their idea of normative localised hegemonic masculinity, but is understood as a temporary letting down of the front rather than evidence of a masculinity which incorporates feminine as well as masculine values (Jung, 1933; 1959; 1989). In terms of vulnerability this means that although some of the interview data indicates that most YOT practitioners have an awareness of the vulnerability of the young men they work with, the young men themselves and their actions are not considered in the context of their potential vulnerability, specifically in Assets or case files, or as the result of specific experiences as pointed out by some of the literature, but rather view the young men's actions and circumstances through their idea of localised hegemonic masculinity.

This is equally evident in issues relating to mental health, the articulation of which is mainly absent from Assets as well as interview and focus group data. By referring to violent and aggressive behaviour of young men, one practitioner explained this non-existence as follows:

I've explained to the boys that have had mental health issues that it is a lot tougher for them to get noticed, because their unusual behaviour is put down to behavioural issues rather than mental health issues […] it's the masculine behaviour, I think aggression and violence are seen as a normal part of masculine behaviour, but it's not seen as a normal part of feminine behaviour […] the boys are always considered to be behavioural […] long before it's considered a mental health problem, whereas the women, the girls, their mental health problems are kind of accepted a lot sooner (M14).

5. 3 Masculine Capital and Male Habitus

The display of aggression and violence of the young men with whom YOT practitioners work is not simply understood as separate and independent incidents, but as deeply rooted in the young men's histories and environments. Hatty (2000)

links aggressive and violent behaviour in men with 'disempowerment' (Hatty, 2000: 6) at the lower end of the social hierarchy, and Goffman (2007) states that 'the content of [gender] display distinguishes the classes' (Goffman, 2007: 83). This section of the chapter concentrates on what role class played in the YOT practitioners' constructions of the young men's masculinity.

As outlined in chapter two, Bourdieu (1986) understands practices and rituals of a particular social group as their *habitus.* This *habitus,* in turn, is linked to their cultural, social and economic capital (Jenkins, 2002) and an expression of the same. The idea of 'social class' in relation to the work with young men at this YOT is only articulated directly by one YOT practitioner:

I think our predominant offending groups are 14, probably 14 or 15 years olds. Definitely middle to high teens rather than the younger age group, and the predominant background, in terms of social class or something like that, would be working class […] everything we do must be about assessing and looking to act on things that we can fix, you know, so issues like class […] have been pushed into the background […] (M13).

However, that social class is a vital ingredient in how practitioners assess young people emerged clearly from the assessment of YP5. YP5 is the only young man in this study who attended college and whose record only showed one recorded offence. Equally, he is presented as the only young man whose Asset sections on 'Neighbourhood' and 'Education' scored 0, indicating that they were not associated with his offending behaviour. Education and neighbourhood, in other words sources for *social* and *cultural capital*, and consequently *economic capital*, and as basis for a specific *habitus* (Bourdieu, 1986; Jenkins, 2002), are mentioned as problematic in the assessments of all other young men in this study, and understood as the source of their aggressive behaviour (neighbourhood) and the result of their non-compliance with boundaries and issues around impulse control (education).

Bourdieu (1986) underlines how *cultural capital* may be institutionalised, for instance in educational achievements, and forms part of the practices of individuals, their *habitus*. It is particularly evident in the Assets that the young men in this study struggle with educational achievements and the formal setting of education. All but one young man has been subject to school exclusions, and about half of them have received education at schools for young people with behavioural difficulties, some also having been identified as having learning difficulties. This is to say that *cultural capital* in terms of educational achievements is not understood as something these young men have access to, but rather that a high number of YOT practitioners comprehended this lack of educational achievement as compensated for by aggressive and violent behaviour, in which masculine display become central to their practices:

I think that every individual needs some sort of stimulation […] lots of young people who come through the door have been removed from mainstream education […] they are sort of in groups where it's not really aimed at getting qualifications and working towards GCSEs […] and very few go on and do qualify […] so they find other ways to stimulate them, you know […] they puff out their chests and it's all about being masculine, it's all about the image and how they look towards their friends […] (M5).

The lack of educational achievement and stimulation through being engaged in mainstream education is seen by a number of YOT practitioners as part of the reason why young men at this YOT got involved in aggressive and violent behaviour. Central to this understanding then is the clear display of masculinity and toughness, embedded in the local context.

Further importance is also given to the role of the neighbourhood in the way YOT practitioners understand the young men's behaviour to flourish, and associated with neighbourhood, the type of accommodation young people live in, and practitioners thereby emphasise the form of cultural capital (Bourdieu, 1986) available to those young men. This is to say that neighbourhoods are identified as 'pro-criminal' throughout the remaining Assets, and while there is some variation as to whether or

not practitioners deem the accommodation of the young men suitable, the vast majority are identified either as council accommodation or young people's accommodation, both of which expose the young person to 'pro-violent peers' (Asset YP10) and are understood as contributing to the young person's behaviour:

You find these people, they feel that they are part of a community that accepts it [fighting]. That's what they should do, because everybody else does it, because they are living in an environment and surrounding themselves with people who do what they do, so it's socially more acceptable (M7).

While general criminal behaviour is understood as socially accepted and 'normal practice' in the area in which the young men live, so is a certain level of aggression and violence among men:

It's the rite of passage in this area, you know. It changes with areas…the young people here, they all live on the same estate, you know. It's the culture within the area, you know. I think that's a key thing because male like, you know, there's that kind of very strong value, you know, the males in that area, you know, if you grass their friend up…that's it (M4).

As pointed out earlier in this chapter, here the ideas around masculinity in the local area are very clearly articulated by YOT practitioners throughout the data sources:

I think it's the estates they grow up on, and I think they have that mentality in these areas […] they are pretty well known for their masculinity, don't cry and all that […] you had the mines and the shipyards […] it's quite a geographical issue as well (F7).

As pointed out through reference to Winlow (2002) and elaborated in the last section of this chapter, masculinity is very much understood through the local context and aggressive behaviour. Young people's drinking is seen as part of 'what a man does' (F12) in the area of the YOT.

Goffman (2007) argues that gender displays are 'something that can be conveyed fleetingly in any social situation' (Goffman, 2007: 79). Here YOT practitioners understand the display of a specific masculinity as deriving from cultural and social capital, on the basis of the lack to access to other forms of capital, as well as ritualised practice:

I am a man, we do man things rurr [...] I have seen it when I have been out shopping. I is at the shop the other day and there is a young man, cap on, tracksuit, classic from a socio economic background that we work with. Saw another one, another lad, exactly the same, didn't know each other [...] they both started squaring up and checking each other out and glancing at each other, a little bit higher, a little bit more proud [...] (M14).

Being a man in the context of the geographical location of the YOT is seen as having very clear resonance in the young men's practice:

It's all about being the alpha male, their sense of purpose is being the alpha male [...] that means living up to that alpha male role. It means being tough, kicking off, getting off your face (M14).

Hatty (2000) argues that young males at the lower end of the social hierarchy utilise in particular their gendered strategies. YOT practitioners understand the young men with whom they work in a similar way, and construct their practices around specific displays of masculinity. The young men's practice of masculinity becomes identified as what Bourdieu would term their *habitus* and associated with the inability to access other forms of cultural and social capital. Anderson (2012) develops the idea of *masculine capital*, which he identifies as the 'fuel of masculinity', and understands *masculine capital* as describing 'the level of masculinity' (Anderson, 2012: 42). This term is useful in describing how YOT practitioners understand the young men to compensate for their inability to access other kinds of *cultural* and *economic capital* by employing their gendered strategies to achieve their aims (Hatty, 2000), namely 'goods, services [...] privileges' and recognition (Anderson, 2012: 42). *Masculine*

capital is further understood by YOT practitioners as not only describing the young men's level of masculinity but also by understanding it simultaneously as source and expression of their behaviour. While Anderson limits the definition of masculine capital to the description of 'attitudes and behaviours' (Anderson, 2012: 42), the data indicates that YOT practitioners not only identify a specific level of masculinity and masculine behaviour, but, similarly to Hatty (2000), understand young men drawing on their *masculine capit*al as a form of cultural and social resource as demonstrated by M5 earlier on. The practices of localised hegemonic masculinity therefore become *male habitus*, which function as 'social currency' (Anderson, 2012: 42) in the interaction with other young men in the geographical location of the YOT, and this male habitus expresses itself in a specific form of 'durable manner of standing, speaking and thereby of feeling and thinking' (Bourdieu, 2005: 93-94). What has been identified as displays of masculinity in the previous chapter forms an essential part in how YOT practitioners construct the young men's male habitus. Thus expressions of toughness, or displays of violent and aggressive behaviour, are no longer understood as separate incidents, but seen as the expression of essential male practices. These practices are not situational and in reaction to frustration utilised as coping strategy, but rather permanent dispositions.

Anderson (2012) and McCormack (2012) suggest, using the example of mainly white male students and pupils at universities and high schools in the UK and the US, the existence of *inclusive masculinity* and the demise of homophobia. However, the assumption of *compulsory heterosexuality* (Butler, 1990) and the subordination of homosexuality (Connell, 2005b) is very much central to how YOT practitioners construct the young men's masculinity in this study:

There is a gender difference between the sexes, if you know what I mean, I think anyone who is homosexual, homosexuality is frowned upon, gay 'ah you are gay', it's a negative term, it's a major term used. There are very clear rules of what you can be and what you can't be, they are kind of entrenched in their culture (M14).

While the form of masculinity of the young people constructed by YOT practitioners and the idea of a specific kind of *male habitus* in relation to it is consistent throughout the data, some of the descriptions of young men at this YOT around their body language and body image are contradictory. One practitioner states that:

You have a massive masculine culture of steroids, who have the body image or try to create it, I mean it's not across the board, but it's the vast majority who come through here (M9).

McNay argues that, in Bourdieu's (2001) concept of the *bodily hexis* (outlined in chapter two), cultural norms around the idea of power relations are projected onto the body as 'naturalised forms of gender identity' (McNay, 1999) and around ideas of what the body can and cannot do. Like the example above, some YOT practitioners generate the impression in interviews that most of the young men at this YOT are 'buffed up' (F16) and intimidating in their appearance. Although Gill, Henwood and McLean (2005) have found in their study on 140 British men that they use their bodies as expressions of self identity in which the regulation of normative masculinity plays a key role, the YOT practitioners suggestion as to the body size and shape of the young men at this YOT is in stark contrast to the observations made by the researcher when based in the reception office for approximately two-thirds of the study. During that time the researcher witnessed only 2 young men who appeared to be working out and were 'buffed up'. The majority of young men, however, appeared rather timid and of small to medium build. Cameras located in the reception office itself, which allowed a view of the waiting area outside the office, suggested that the young men were rather intimidated by the setting of the YOT and nervous. However, it is evident that this behaviour and the accompanying body language changed when a second young man entered the waiting area and came closer to the behaviour of young men as described in the shop above by M14. This is to say that while some YOT practitioners produce an image of the young men consistent with their construct of localised hegemonic masculinity, this could not be verified by observation. In other words, the bodies of the young men with whom they work are socially constructed by some YOT practitioners, and 'schemes of

perception' (Bourdieu, 2001: 64) are projected onto the same alongside structural dichotomies such as strong/weak , big/small (Bourdieu, 2001) in accordance with the construction of their localised hegemonic masculinity. Thus, for some YOT practitioners, the male practices of young men in this YOT based on their masculine capital are accompanied by and legitimised through a body image of being 'buffed up' (Turner, 1991); a body image is imposed on the young men, which made them both 'inclined and able to enter into the social games most favourable to the development of manliness' (Bourdieu, 2001: 56). For those YOT practitioners, the young men's bodies are constructed through their position occupied in the 'social space' (Bourdieu, 2001: 64), whereby the young men's habitus and specifically assigned 'social taxonomies' (Bourdieu, 2001: 65) are applied to their bodies, which in turn brings out the core elements of the YOT practitioners' construction of localised hegemonic masculinity. Drummond (2003) reinforces the link between male practices of elements of aggression and violence in the context of sports and highlights how the 'male body is quickly brought into focus as the vehicle through which this type of behaviour [aggression and violence] is manifested' (Drummond, 2003: 139). In other words, some practitioners construct the body of the young men with whom they work along the lines of their behaviour rather than their actual physical appearance.

Embodiment of Social Structure

Butler (1988) argues that, if specific acts are attributed to gender and the reality of gender is constructed through social performances, then the notions of 'an essential sex and true abiding masculinity and femininity are also constituted' (Butler, 1988: 399). Although social performance of masculinity will be discussed in detail below, it emerges from the data that YOT practitioners construct the masculinity of the young men they work with around their social performances. Central to this social performance is what has been termed here male habitus. This construction of the YOT practitioners implicitly incorporates dimensions of social structure, in particular the young men's inability to accumulate social, cultural and economic capital other than through their masculine capital expressed in their male habitus as considered in the academic literature (Hatty, 2000). However, the display of the young men's

masculinity and the social performance of masculinity is only directly set into the wider context of ideas around the patriarchy by one practitioner:

It's his gender and the family's perception of his role and his own perception of his role in the family that actually means that part of his domination of the family comes from the cultural view of the male role in the family […] (F8).

Although data collected from Assets, case diaries and interviews strongly suggests that what is understood as the male habitus of young men, namely aggressive and violent behaviour, is also highly present in some of the young men's interactions with mainly their mothers and/or girlfriends, little reference is made by YOT practitioners to ideas around male domination and the patriarchy (Bourdieu, 2001; Connell, 1987). Absent from the discussion of social performances of this male habitus are ideas around hierarchies of masculinity (Connell, 2005b) beyond the above mentioned subordination of homosexuality. This is to say that practitioners at this YOT construct the young men's masculinity as directly deriving from positions and behaviours available to them on the basis of their social class and in response to their inability to accumulate other social and cultural capital. In relation to the young men's masculinity this means that YOT practitioners did not appear to understand a variety of masculinities as being available to these young men, but construct the young men through the idea of localised hegemonic masculinity as the only available masculinity. Scourfield (2003) articulates similar findings in his research on masculinity and gender protection by highlighting the limited number of masculinities of clients available to child protection workers. Other authors (Featherstone, 2009; Featherstone et al., 2007; Lupton and Barclay, 1997) too explore the number of possible roles allocated to men in social and welfare work, but this multiplicity is mainly absent from the way YOT practitioners construct young men's and boy's masculinity in this study.

Similar to the discussion of Bourdieu's concept of the bodily hexis (Bourdieu, 2001), wider structural social values and inequalities were understood as being directly embodied by the young men without much consideration for their social agency. This

is particularly interesting in light of the previous discussion on front and back regions, which indicates some notion of social agency attributed to the young men. If practitioners understand the young men as being able to let down their 'front' and put it back on when leaving the YOT premises, then they understand the young men themselves as having some sort of control and capacity to reflect- in other words, some social agency. However, in the discussion above on masculine capital and the resulting male habitus this idea of social agency is entirely absent, and young men are seen as embodying wider social structures without any notion of reflexive social agency. Possible tensions between these social structures and the exclusive availability of only one particular masculinity as suggested in chapter two by Mayer Hacker (1957) and the ideas around different positions within a hierarchy of masculinity as discussed in chapter three on the example of Connell's (2005b) theory of hegemonic masculinity are absent from how practitioners construct the young men's masculinity. This means that YOT practitioners predominantly constructed the young men's masculinity through their negative practices (Collier, 1998), or their male habitus, and deviations from these practices, such as temporarily letting down their front and admitting vulnerability, are not actively accommodated in the way in which the young men's masculinity is constructed.

In summary, what has been identified as separate incidents of displays of masculinity in the form of aggression and violence and been understood by YOT practitioners as coping strategies of the young men by practitioners, becomes, through the data analysed above, embedded in wider considerations of social structure and capital in relation to the young men's socio-economic situations. As a result, displays of masculinity progressed from separate incidents to a permanent disposition in the YOT practitioners' construction of the young men's masculinity.

Summary
Chapter five has summarised the main elements of YOT practitioners' constructions of masculinity of the young men with whom they work. Key elements in these constructions can now be viewed as distinct behaviours associated with these young men. Central are aggressive and violent behaviours as the result of these young

men's low temper and impulse control and their inability, as understood by YOT practitioners, to respond to conflicts other than through the expression of violence and aggression. Alcohol consumption is understood by YOT practitioners as both a part of 'being a man' in the local culture of the area in which the YOT is located and an attempt to resolve conflicts. Equally, YOT practitioners understand the young men's engagement in aggressive and violent behaviour as normative in relation to the wider male culture of this area, which has been termed as localised hegemonic masculinity. Goffman's idea of front and back regions (Goffman, 1990) has been used to contextualise the way behaviours of young men at this YOT are understood through distinct gender displays, and how issues around potential vulnerabilities of these young men are not understood to be part of their essential masculine identity. Further, Bourdieu's work on habitus (Bourdieu, 1986; 2001; 2005) was used to conceptualise the particular practices of masculinity (male habitus) of these young men as interpreted by YOT practitioners and to stress how they are implicitly understood as embodying wider social structures on the basis of their social, cultural and economic capital, and thereby not attributed the capacity of reflective social agency. Chapter six will build on the findings of this chapter and discuss which role peers and families play in the YOT practitioners' constructions of masculinity of the young men with whom they work.

PART II

Chapter 6: Constructions of Masculinity- Performing and Monitoring Masculinity

Introduction

Chapter five elaborated on the findings of this study in relation to how YOT practitioners understand the young men with whom they work to display discrete male practices in relation to how they express their masculinity. These practices are strongly linked by YOT practitioners to ideas around social class in the form of neighbourhoods and social and cultural capital. This chapter considers how these male practices are understood as integral to the young men's performances of masculinity in interactions with peers and families and stresses the relevance of ideas of reference groups and monitoring of these performances.

6.1 Peers and the Performance and Monitoring of Masculinity

The table at the beginning of chapter five demonstrates the importance YOT practitioners attribute to the impact of reference groups in regard to the performance of masculinity, and peers here form the main part of this group. Numerous authors (Bandura and Walters, 1963; Block, 1976a; Bourdieu, 2005; Butler, 1990; Clausen, 1968; Goffman, 1990) have given high importance to the idea of reference groups throughout the academic literature as discussed in chapter two. According to sex role, social learning, socialisation, psychological and psychoanalytical approaches, parents are portrayed as primarily forming the initial reference group for children and thereby influencing the development of gendered identity; Bourdieu and Goffman also understand this reference as important. The main function of reference groups in relation to displayed behaviour is the mutual monitoring (Bourdieu, 1986; Goffman, 1990; Lemert and Branaman, 1997) of behaviour and the regulating of legitimate and illegitimate practices. As stated above and evident in the table in chapter five, reference groups emerge to play a key role in how YOT practitioners understand young men to perform their masculinity.

The element of monitoring legitimate performances of masculinity emerges particularly strongly from data collected through the focus group. While interview, Asset and case diary data are surprisingly homogeneous in relation to YOT practitioners' constructions of masculinity, it is in the focus group data that deviations of young men from the particular kind of masculinity described in the previous chapter surfaced. This is accentuated by a practitioner using the example of one young man she had worked with:

[…] he decided that he didn't want to dance anymore. He had auditioned, and he was a really fantastic dancer but then he was like 'no, all my mates are going to laugh at us', and now he is trying to fit in with his peer group […] and then he just went out and punched this other kid (F18).

Dancing is understood as being too feminine and clearly identified as being in contrast to the masculinity his peers displayed. What is interesting here is that this practitioner implicitly identifies physical aggression, in other words the opposite behaviour of what could be seen as feminine, as the way this young man consequently gains the approval of his peers. A similar case was described by another YOT practitioner:

And poetry was the one thing no matter what was going on with his family […] but his main thing was 'don't tell anyone I have been doing drama when when I am inside', but he loves it (M13).

In other words, dancing and drama are not understood as resulting in, as Harris puts it, a 'pleasant experience in the male arena' (Harris, 1995a: 38). This means that a very specific performance of localised hegemonic masculinity is seen as being harvested and policed (Ingraham, 2002; Wittig, 2002) and any deviations from that are understood as leading to the exclusion of the young man from his peer group. Connell (2005b) argues that a central element to hegemonic masculinity is that 'those who reject the hegemonic pattern have to fight or negotiate their way out of it' (Connell, 2005b). YOT practitioners do not see this 'way out of it' as an option

available to young men. Peers function as the reference group in relation to a working consensus on the performance of localised hegemonic masculinity, and are responsible for monitoring and patrolling it (Steinberg et al., 1997). As noted in chapter five, this form of masculinity is associated by YOT practitioners with specific displays of masculinity, embedded in the 'heterosexual dualism' (Butler, 1990: 80) and its hegemonic status is confirmed through the lack of alternative masculinities available to the young men.

Smiler (2013) terms what has here been called reference groups 'identity groups' (Smiler, 2013: 94) and argues that one clear theme emerges from the research on young boys and men: 'masculinity has to be proved, over and over; it is never a given' (Smiler, 2013: 99). It is here, in the way in which YOT practitioners construct the masculinity of the young men with whom they work, where peers as reference groups become central and 'those who reject the hegemonic pattern have to [potentially] fight their way out of it' (Connell, 2005b: 37). Smiler (2013) links specific ways in which men can prove their masculinity to both their age in their resources and contests Gillmore's (1990) notion of proving masculinity through providing, protecting and procreating. Instead he argues that young men, not having access to subject positions which would allow them to prove their masculinity through these, engage in rituals designed to prove their masculinity, which involve 'physical risk, substance use, criminality or some combination of these' (Smiler, 2013: 99). Similar to findings emerging from the data of especially the focus group, Smiler attributes high importance to the role of peers in the proving of young men's masculinity.

Numerous authors argue that focus groups enable participants to challenge each other's opinions and allow the researcher to probe ideas (Bloor et al., 2001; Cronin, 2006; Krueger and Casey, 2000; Litosselitili, 2003; Morgan, 1997; Oates, 2000). This is evident in data collected from the focus group as ideas around the dominant construction of masculinity discussed in the last chapter are explored in more depth and challenged by some YOT practitioners. It is worth noting here that the majority of YOT practitioners participating in the focus group delivered what was termed 'sessional work' to the young people; in other words workshops around sexual

health, risk behaviour, anger management, and substance misuse as well as engaging a number of young people in recreational intervention programmes. The sessional YOT practitioners tend to work with groups of young people, while interview participants mainly engage with young people on a one-to-one basis. Participants of the focus group have direct experience of young men interacting with one another, whereas most interviewees generally engage with one person at a time, which is reflected in both Assets and case diaries. Unlike data collected from interviews, Assets and case diaries, participants of the focus group call attention to a hierarchy of masculinities in those interactions:

We have some very effeminate males, who in their peer group have been victimised and therefore developed behaviour because of that, you know. It led them on to be the 'clown' in that group or to be the 'joker' and be the one that always has to do the running around and the one that does the stealing for them and takes it back to the main group […] it's kind of helping them understand that, that might be part of kind of gender or not their sexuality but their kind of masculinity or their femininity or whatever it is …(F 19).

This statement points to an understanding of numerous ideas which are mainly absent from data collected from other sources for this study. Namely, a comprehension of a hierarchy of masculinities (Connell, 2005b), whereby some masculinities are dominant and others are subordinate or marginalised, and hints at an understanding of masculinity which potentially includes feminine aspects (Jung, 1933; Jung, 1989) without the necessity of concluding that the display of such masculinity may be connected to the young men's sexuality (Anderson, 2012; McCormack, 2012).

Another aspect emerging from the focus group data is the unwillingness of young men at this YOT to challenge or dominate young women in mixed-sex activities:

The males will challenge the males' decision, but they won't challenge the females…but the females will challenge the males (F20).

Unlike indications made by the academic literature in relation to the domination of women by men, YOT practitioners here understand the young men as not dominating the young women but rather directing their 'team performance' towards other young men only.

How the idea of masculinity is challenged by other young men in group activities becomes equally evident in a situation described by another YOT practitioner:

He wanted to be a hairdresser, and going to his meetings and everybody was laughing their heads off and saying 'why do you want to be a hairdresser? Get extra lasses for that' and all the rest. You know, he is a big lad, and you wouldn't expect him wanting to be a hairdresser […] and when we spoke to him and what he wanted to do, he said 'oh, landscaping' (F19).

Male peers are understood as the reference group for the young men with the function of monitoring and policing the performances of masculinity (Bourdieu, 1986; Butler, 1990; Wittig, 2002), especially in relation patterns which do not conform with those of localised hegemonic masculinity (Connell, 2005b).

Goffman develops the idea of 'performance team' and refers to the team as a set 'of individuals who cooperate in staging a single routine' (Goffman, 1990: 85). Although Goffman emphasises that the sharing of social structure, in other words social class, is not vital but rather the 'relation to an interaction or series of interactions in which a relevant definition of the situation is maintained' (Goffman, 1990: 108). This is to say that Goffman attributes enormous importance to the interaction between individuals and how they engage in it. Here the idea of male habitus, as developed in the previous chapter, becomes central in understanding how practitioners understand the young men in interactions amongst each other at this YOT.

Alongside other indicators, which will be discussed below, it becomes obvious that the 'working consensus' (Goffman, 1990: 97) of the group performance of

masculinity is very clear on what to include in this performance and what is understood as an illegitimate performance.

Parkes and Conolly (2013) discuss the importance of the role of tough images of masculinity amongst young men and their group of peers, and support Hatty's notion (2000) of the enactment of tough masculinity through aggression and violence in the absence of access to alternative masculinities and tied to young men's socio-economic standing. However, while Parkes and Conolly (2013) link the performance of tough masculinity to issues of safety in particular neighbourhoods, this notion is absent from YOT practitioners' construction of the young men with whom they work.

Equally, for some YOT practitioners, body size became associated with what this young man could and could not do (Butler, 2011; Turner, 1991) as discussed in the previous chapter. While the discussion of homosexuality or effeminate masculinity is largely absent throughout the data sets, it is clear that masculinity of the young men is tied up with specific ideas of how to be a 'proper man' (Ingraham, 2002). Not conforming to these ideas and the working consensus of the team is reason to doubt or subordinate a young man's masculinity, in which peers as a reference group play an essential part in the understanding of YOT practitioners. Thus masculinity emerges as closely interlinked with 'compulsory and naturalised heterosexuality', which 'requires and regulates gender as a binary relation in which the masculine term is differentiated from a feminine term, and the differentiation is accomplished through practices of heterosexual desire' (Butler, 1990: 17). Not displaying male habitus and joining the performance of masculinity, in turn, becomes associated with not being a man (Wittig, 2002) and ideas around masculinity could thereby be understood as hetero-normative as highlighted in the work of Ingraham in chapter two (Ingraham, 2002).

Butler (1990) understands gender as performative and Goffman underlines the importance of 'the cooperative effort of all members to maintain a working consensus' (Goffman, 1990: 97). While the above findings articulate some aspects of

the YOT practitioners' construction of masculinity which are absent from other data sources, there still is a strong agreement amongst practitioners in the focus group and throughout the data of what the male performance of young people in this YOT consists of. Despite having illustrated an understanding of some practitioners which reaches beyond the construction of a homogeneous idea of masculinity, the dominant construction of masculinity of the young men remains within similar parameters as discussed in the previous chapter.

Bravado, Kudos and Respect- Peers as the Reference Group

The data that emerged in relation to peers as a reference group bore connotations of front and back region behaviour in the previous chapter. However, dominant themes are around bravado and kudos and how the young men are perceived to behave differently in groups in comparison to their behaviour in individual sessions. Bravado, kudos and respect become key explanations in how YOT practitioners understand the motivation behind the display of male habitus and the dynamics of the groups become central to the performance of masculinity:

It all depends on the dynamics of the group [...] if I put them with their peers, the group they hang out with, it's like fireworks! (F9)

While there is no deliberate attempt by YOT practitioners to have all male groups (which will be discussed in more detail in chapter seven), it becomes evident throughout the data collection that due to the fact that the vast majority of young people they work with are young men, most group interventions are delivered to all male groups. Bravado and the gaining of kudos and respect amongst male peers is seen as the main reason for young men to act out in groups with their male friends:

Males are quite the bravado in the group, they want to be the main person in the group [...] quite a lot of males, especially the ones who have been with us before or have been with us for a while. They are trying, you know, to humiliate staff and things like that (F20).

Bravado as part of the performance of masculinity, with the aim of gaining kudos or a reputation, is clearly identified in relation to young men being in a group with peers rather than to one-to-one situations with practitioners:

I think it's survival a lot of the time and bravado. So when you are having a one-to-one session with young lads, they can be quite positive and they can engage really well, and they are very respectful. But then you can see the same person an hour later in a group setting where there are other male peers and they can present completely differently, and it seems bravado, and they want this reputation as being kind of the loudest (F13).

Thus certain displays of behaviour in the wider performance of male habitus are seen by YOT practitioners as the means by which the young men gain kudos and reputation among their male peers. What has been described as displays of masculinity in chapter five, comes to be seen as essential male habitus, which in turn is understood to be central to the performance of masculinity:

When he is with his peers, his big thing is 'I've smashed somebody over the head last night with a paving stone' [...] but when you are with them, one-to-one, they'll justify why they have done it (F18).

Goffman (1990) draws attention to the idealisation of impressions through the accentuation of facts and performances. YOT practitioners equally understand young men they worked with to 'brag about' (M6) their aggressive and violent behaviour when among male peers and as a means of gaining a reputation and respect. While Goffman (1990) does not directly attribute the performance of specific behaviours as the result of socialisation, he points out that the individual only needs to display a sufficient number of pieces of a particular kind of performance in order to achieve the desired effect. Parkes and Conolly (2013) discuss how the performance of tough masculinity acts as a vehicle to popularity for young males among their peers, and Plummer (2001) views the enactment of violent and aggressive masculinity functions as an affirmation of belonging to the group. YOT practitioners attribute similar

importance to this behaviour of young men, and their talking about aggressive and violent behaviour in front of their male peers is understood as the young man's attempt to gain kudos and a reputation amongst his peers. It is not only the articulation of such behaviours of young men, but also the anticipated reaction of his reference group that is seen as vital in this interaction. This means that the way a young man gains reputation and kudos amongst his male peers is understood by YOT practitioners as being through articulating and demonstrating idealised violent and aggressive behaviour and conforming to a particular type of masculinity.

Integral to this understanding of how young men who engage with services at this YOT gain reputation and kudos is the understanding of the young men as essentially aggressive and violent (as recorded in chapter five). However, explanation for this kind of behaviour here shifts from neighbourhood and aspects of social class to their male peers as a clear reference group:

Lads just get off their face, because that's what all their mates do on a Friday night (F18).

This explanation of the young men's conduct applies not only in the context of large groups of young men, but also as a means of interaction between just two young men:

When you are out with a young person, you might see another young person of a similar background. You see them, the way they are walking the dogs and the staffies […] it's like the staffies, the staffie sees another staffie, what does that staffie do straight away? It starts squaring up […] well, young people do exactly the same […] and it's very much about masculinity [...] it comes more so when they are together, I think their peer culture has an impact on that, on defying their masculinity (M14).

Kudos and gaining a reputation are key functions of the YOT practitioners construction of the young men's masculinity and the performance of masculinity is

seen as gaining the young men a reputation through which they affirm their belonging to the group of their male peers:

Males want a reputation and so they go out the way to gain a reputation and a name on the streets, you know. It's part of the fitting-in process […] it's par for the course, you get beaten up on the street, you know you get into fights, you know you are part of the group and you have to get involved […] (M4).

YOT practitioners throughout accentuate the importance of reference groups in the construction of the young men's masculinity, but only one practitioner related the reference group to domination and the division between public and private spheres in relation to men and women (Connell, 1987):

I just think it's the way society is and has been for such a long time. I think males hang around a lot in groups and it comes down to […] masculinity, trying to dominate other young people […] to be part of the group and be accepted (M5).

As with ideas around displaying masculinity in chapter five, there is a distinct absence of YOT practitioners referring to young men, as a group or individuals, dominating young women or females in relation to how they thought of young men gaining kudos and reputation. However, it clearly emerges that YOT practitioners do not understand the impact of group dynamics and reference groups as being as vital in relation to young girls they worked with:

Say you go to a group with youth disorder, if it's a group of females you tend to talk to them as they are, a group of females. If it's a group of males, you will pick one person out who's the main key speaker, take them away on a one-to-one basis, mainly for risk (F19).

Especially in regard to working in groups, practitioners continue to view the young men's behaviour in comparison to young females' behaviour in their work:

You can't just talk to them like to the girls, you know. They won't be respectful. They start shoving and pushing each other, you know, wanting tab breaks all the time. Just basically acting out, like trying to be the one who is, you know, the loudest (F9).

In other words, while previously YOT practitioners have explained young men's display of violent and aggressive behaviour as the result of (a) their coping strategy particularly in emotionally difficult situations, and (b) as normative masculine behaviour in relation to their socio-economic background and the neighbourhoods they grew up in, here the same behaviour is understood as actively employed by young men in order to gain kudos, display bravado and gain respect of their male peers. The performance of masculinity by employing male habitus is understood as being closely monitored and regulated by their peers in the form of a 'working consensus' (Goffman, 1990: 97), whereby it turns into a specific way of doing and thinking masculinity and avoiding difference (Bourdieu, 2005; West and Fenstermaker, 1995; West and Zimmerman, 1987) in relation to the performance of masculinity (Butler, 1990), guaranteeing acceptance by their peer group and a positive experience among their male peers (Harris, 1995a):

YP1 places himself in a peer group, where this behaviour is likely to happen again. He acts on suggestions of friends to gain kudos and remain part of the group (Asset YP1).

Self Esteem- Reference Groups versus the Individual
Some YOT practitioners interlink the idea of the young men's performance of masculinity with their lack of self-esteem and in order to gain respect when among their peers:

In a certain way I feel, these young people feel tough and that it will give them protection, because they will get respect from that […] sort of give them a reputation, sort of a small way of fate and boost, boost of confidence (M5).

However, direct articulation of the young men's issues with self-esteem mainly emerges from Asset data, rather than from interviews or the focus group. Here self-

esteem is a frequent theme and related to ideas around self-identity, illustrated most poignantly in an extract from YP2's Assets :

YP2 describes himself as being invincible […] he has inappropriate self-esteem [and] difficulties in relation to his self-identity. As a consequence of this, he seeks to gain kudos from his peers and is looking for approval from his peers as a way of increasing his self-esteem (Asset YP2).

However, a number of practitioners explain how issues of self-esteem, in their interpretation, plays out differently, particularly when a young man is incarcerated:

They are out in a group first off, so we see that side of things and how they act up and play the big man […] then they get locked up and taken to a cell and all of a sudden they are all like little sheep and very quiet, you know, and all so sorry (F19).

Goffman highlights the importance of group solidarity with 'one's fellow performers and some distance from the witness' of that performance (Goffman, 1990: 77). Along similar lines, practitioners understand the young men's confident behaviour as the expression of 'high in-group solidarity' (Goffman, 1990: 209) in relation to their self-esteem and stress the changes in expressed self-esteem when the young men are on their own, in particular in prison or secure young offenders institutions:

I find with a lot of young lads in the group talk is that they say 'oh well, my mate says it's great being inside [prison]. They are going to come out, telling you that it was fab in there. But really, how many of them don't want to go back, really struggled in there with their self-esteem, and cried themselves to sleep?! (F18).

Emerging from all data sources is the understanding by the YOT practitioners of a clear difference in behaviour of the young men, depending on whether they are in a group with their peers or on their own with YOT practitioners. As with issues discussed around vulnerability in chapter five, YOT practitioners have an understanding of the young men's front and back region behaviours (Goffman,

1990), but the performance of masculinity to gain kudos and respect from the young persons' peers dominate the way practitioners construct the young men's masculinity. This is to say that the performance of hegemonic and localised masculinity is treated 'as symptomatic of the actor' (Goffman, 1990: 14). Goffman highlights how performances contain specific symbols, and the young men's performances of masculinity are predominantly comprehended by YOT practitioners as enacting the symbols of being confident and tough as the young men's wider practice of masculinity. Such symbols include the use of aggression and violence in order to gain kudos and respect of peers and are seen as falling into what peers as a reference group understand as legitimate performances of masculinity.

6.2 Masculinity and Families

Chapter two discussed the importance given to ideas around socialisation and the social learning of roles (Bandura, 1977; Bandura and Walters, 1963; Clausen, 1968; Dollard, 1939; Zigler and Child, 1973). Strong emphasis has been placed on the early acquisition of social skills by the child in the context of the (heterosexual) family (Adams and Coltrane, 2005). Although YOT practitioners identify peers as the main reference group for the performance of masculinity of the young men, the importance of families, in particular in relation to how these young men have socially learned to be man, emerges as a strong theme from all data sources as is evident in the table at the beginning of chapter five.

As is obvious from the profiles of the young men whose documents have been used as data sources for this study, none them lives permanently with both biological parents, and in the vast majority of cases the young men only intermittently lived with their biological mothers. Since most of the young men reside with either foster parents, grandparents or in children's homes, biological mothers are, for all but one of these young men, the only immediate family with which whom they had regular contact:

It's very rare that we have like a full family unit, where we have like the biological mam, dad, siblings all living in the same household, very rare that we come across that. We have some young people in that situation, but it's few and far between (F13).

Families are seen by many YOT practitioners as the initial source of the young men's problematic and aggressive behaviour. Information obtained from the Assets in particular draws attention to that most of the young men's families are themselves caught up in the criminal justice system and they are viewed as encouraging aggressive, violent and criminal behaviour as articulated by one YOT practitioner:

Well, you have to open the work up and work with the parents. Young person X is a good example. All his family have a criminal background, quite extensive as well […] all he wanted was to be accepted by his family. He thought he was going to be accepted by his family, because he was in the care system since he was three, and he thought by him offending, they were going to love him. The reason why he wanted to go to jail in the first place was that he thought they were going to love and respect him (F18).

This statement underlines how practitioners understand the young men's family and their involvement in aggressive, violent and criminal activity in relation to seeking their family's approval and acceptance, and thereby making their family a further reference group (Bourdieu, 1986; Goffman, 1990).

The vast majority of practitioners not only indicates in Assets and interviews their idea of the function of families as important in relation to how young men have learned to be aggressive and display violent behaviour, but also how little support young men receive from their families with regard to changing their own behaviour:

So many young people we have, they don't have the same sort of support networks as other young people and like mainstream young people. A lot of young people don't have parents, they are in care. A lot of young people come from single parent

families. A lot of young people are estranged from their parents or they are residing with sort of extended family (M7).

While the Assets and case diaries mainly contain information on the young person's and the YOT practitioners' contact with mothers, it also becomes clear that young men are mainly only in contact with their mothers when practitioners reflect on who would accompany the young men to appointments:

In general they attend appointments by themselves, but initial appointments, so when they first go to court, mostly they take their mum, when you go for your assessment at the house, it will be the mum that's there. If they come here for an assessment, it will mostly be their mum that brings them. So at key stages where you are supposed to have a parent or guardian, there would be a female…I would definitely say that… (M13).

For most YOT practitioners in interviews and the focus group, the overrepresentation of mothers in their work with young men is not articulated as problematic but rather understood as normal, but one practitioner states that she found it problematic:

If you look at the parents, the carers that come and take responsibility for their children…so we have an 80/20 split male to female in young people, but a 20/80 split female to male in those adults with whom we come in contact and will put their hand up as being responsible…that makes it much more complicated …(F17).

While families are generally understood by YOT practitioners as having a great impact on how and why young men have offended, mothers and fathers played two distinctly separate roles in relation to their importance in the practitioners' construction of masculinity of the young men.

Fathers as Role Models

Most striking about the findings emerging on the role of fathers as understood by practitioners is the stark contrast between how significant fathers are seen to be in

the young men's development of aggressive, violent and criminal behaviour, and how little they actually feature in the young men's lives. In other words, while the last section of this chapter emphasises that mothers are predominantly the primary guardian with whom young men and YOT practitioners are in contact, and fathers are absent from the lives of all but one young man, fathers were given a prime role in the YOT practitioners' explanations for how and why young men had become aggressive and violent, and understood as the reference point for such behaviour within the setting of the (heterosexual) family. Centrality here is given to fathers as dangerous men (Scourfield, 2001) and their negative influence (Lupton and Barclay, 1997) on the young men with whom YOT practitioners worked.

Numerous authors across the academic literature stress the role of fathers in young men's learning of boundaries, independence and self-control (Block, 1983; Chodorow, 1994; Crick et al., 1996; Crick and Grotpeter, 1995; Featherstone, 2009; Freud, 1923). Although young men's issues with boundaries and impulsive behaviour control are frequent themes in data collected from the Assets (as discussed in chapter five), YOT practitioners do not understand such issues to be related to ideas around fathering or indeed absent fathers (Lupton and Barclay, 1997). Emphasis is placed on the impact of fathers during their contact, rather than their absence, and their function as role models in relation to how young men are understood to have learned socially to be aggressive and violent and eventually to become involved in criminal activities:

I have three people on my case load at the moment. I've got one that lives with his dad, so I think that he is the only role model he's got…but when you look at his dad and look at his background, he's served a ten-year prison sentence for shooting someone with a gun …and that's his dad, that's his role model (M4).

Fathers are predominantly understood as negative role models by YOT practitioners throughout the data. The aggressive and violent behaviour of young men at this YOT is strongly associated with their fathers and the learning of that behaviour, rather than their experience of abuse or as victims of violence. Chapter three touches on

Marsiglio and Cohan's (2000) idea of the transfer of what they term 'social capital' from fathers to sons. Chapters two and three of this thesis have explained the relevance of social capital in relation to masculinity and developed the term 'male habitus'. Here the idea of an exclusively negative 'male habitus' in the form of violence and aggression becomes central in the role practitioners allocated to the role of fathers. In other words, fathers are seen as having transferred their 'male habitus' either through their involvement in criminal activities or through their history of perpetrating domestic violence against the young men's mothers or the young men themselves:

If you have a young male, he hasn't had any positive role models. Say if they had a father and an older brother who's beaten the crap out of them for years, like many of our kids had. […] unless you sat them down and kind of highlighted some of the issues, they would never give it a second thought, because it's just how their dads behave. It's how their granddad behaved, it's how their uncles behave and their friends, so they don't see it as anything other than normal…(M14).

Thus YOT practitioners comprehend the aggressive and violent behaviour of the young men as normal for them and as learned from their fathers and other male role models. Although Assets contain very little information as to how young men themselves are victims of domestic violence and abuse, the significance of being subjected to physical violence is most frequently confirmed in relation to their fathers as male role models.

As discussed in chapter two in relation to the academic work on fathers as role models (Featherstone, 2009; Harris, 1995a; Popenoe, 2001), fathers emerge as central to the YOT practitioners' construction of the young men's masculinity in the context of families. Hence, the young men's masculinity is seen as deriving from the enactment of masculinity by fathers and their performance of specific conducts of masculine behaviour (Harris, 1995a). Similarly to criticism voiced by Parke (2000), YOT practitioners utilise a 'relatively shallow process-based account of how fathers affect[ed] their children's development' (Parke, 2000: 48). Entirely absent from those

ideas around fathers are elements of co-production of fatherhood (Robb, 2010), multi-faceted ideas of fatherhood and heterogeneity in relation to the enactment of fatherhood (Featherstone, 2009; Lamb, 2000; Parke, 2000). While Harris's model (1995a) includes a variety of diverse messages and hence of masculinities which sons could potentially enact as male behaviour, YOT practitioners almost exclusively understand the position of fathers as role models in a negative light (Collier, 1998). This is to say that in the YOT practitioners' construction of the young men's masculinity, the 'gender codes' (Harris, 1995a: 9) which fathers offered their sons are associated with aggression, violence and criminal behaviour. Interestingly, the relationship between sons and fathers is deemed important and a positive factor in the young men's lives, even when the violent and aggressive behaviour of the father was acknowledged:

YP10's father has been reported to have perpetrated significant physical harm and sexual abuse, including rape […] YP10 remains fiercely loyal to his father [and] his relationship with his father is described as a positive and protective factor […] (Asset YP10).

Despite the absence of fathers in most of the young men's lives, male role models are understood as vital in relation to how the young men's masculinity is constructed:

You know, they need that male role model…if their dad wasn't available in their family, you know, it could be an uncle or a neighbour (F9).

Further, while most issues YOT practitioners encountered with mothers are in relation to non-compliance regarding their sons' orders or disputes between sons and their mothers at home, issues with the few fathers they had come in contact with are in relation to their difficulties engaging with YOT practitioners and challenging their authority:

There is (sic) more females than others [coming in with the young person]. Fathers who come in normally have an agenda, they have had trouble with authorities in the past …(M9).

Masculinity and Mothers

As discussed above, the young men with whom YOT practitioners work are mainly in contact with their biological mothers but not their biological fathers. The academic literature in relation to masculinity, and masculinity and aggressive and violent behaviour, attributes a great deal of importance to the role of fathers (Featherstone, 2009; Harris, 1995a; Popenoe, 2001) and explanations of such behaviours as expression of structural male dominance in the wider social structure of the patriarchy (Bourdieu, 2001; Connell, 1987; 2005b; Hatty, 2000). It is predominantly the psychoanalytical literature which pays closer attention to the formation of male gender identity in relation to mothers (Chodorow, 1974; 1994; Freud, 1923; Klein, 1975; 1997; 1967), whereby (here very simplified) the 'othering' of the mother is vehicle to achieving male gender identity, and attachment theories (Parke, 2000) in which 'boys with insecure attachment to their mothers conform more to stereotypical gender roles' (Brigid et al., 2005: 869). However, central here is the relationship between son and mother (dis-identification and attachment) rather than cross-gender identification and her potential function as a role model (Robb, 2010).

It is in relation to the young men's relationship to their mothers that the construction of YOT practitioners of localised hegemonic masculinity becomes implicitly associated with ideas around the domination of women and thereby the patriarchy. This is to say that through the allocation of gender characteristics such as 'perpetrator' to young men and 'victim' to their mothers, the elements of gender inequality and oppression surface in the YOT practitioners' construction of hegemonic masculinity. A number of YOT practitioners draw attention to the relevance of mothers in relation to the young men's masculinity:

If you look at the carers who come in with their children […] we must clearly look at females' attitudes to masculinity. If your mother is your primary figure in your

nurturing, then her perception of masculinity must be incredibly important […] I have not yet read anything or listened to anything that suggests to me that people don't think the primary carer is important to the young person's life. So if the primary carer is female, how can that not have any relevance? Their perception must, somewhere along the line, have some bearing […] (F17).

It is quite paradoxical that, while mothers often are the only family present in the young person's life, fathers are understood by YOT practitioners as the reference point for the development of the young person's masculinity, whereby the father acts as role model. Robb (2010) discusses the absence of discussions around mother-involvement and argues that 'gender identities develop' through a 'multiplicity of relationships […] which include the possibility of cross-gender identification' (Robb, 2010: 193). However, central to the development of masculine identity of the young people here is the importance YOT practitioners attribute to fathers exclusively, despite several acknowledgements by practitioners in Assets and interviews that violent and aggressive behaviour is indeed part of the interaction between mothers and sons also. While only one YOT practitioner directly emphasises that violence perpetrated by young men against their mothers was a 'real and common issue' (M5), description of physical altercations between mothers and sons are frequent throughout the Assets:

On Tuesday mam stated that YP4 got up for work and demanded that she go and get him some tabs and she refused, so he punched the window in her bedroom. Mam advises that he stayed in his room all day until 3pm and got up and asked mam to go to the phone box to cancel his session at the YOT. When she refused YP4 kicked off again and hit his mam (Asset, YP4).

It is evident from the findings emerging from Assets that most young men who are in contact with their biological mothers have a very volatile relationship with them. This was apparent in the frequent changes in support with which mothers are perceived to have provided their sons and numerous incidents recorded in Assets, whereby the young men were removed from their mother's house by the police because of

physical and verbal altercations. However, similar to the discussion of the young men's vulnerability in chapter five, there is some ambiguity as to who was the initiator and/or perpetrator in those physical altercations between mothers and sons, as became obvious in of the Assets completed on YP4:

YP4 stated that when he was younger his mam use to blame him for stealing her cannabis. Additionally, he stated that he used to lock himself up in his room and barricade himself in due to her beating him up. He also describes that now that he has gotten older, when his mam tries to assault him he pins her down, so that she can't hit him. YP4 stated that it is at this point, when she can't hit him, that she rings the police (Asset YP4).

While the above extract from YP4's Asset clearly identifies the son as a victim of domestic violence perpetrated by his mother and his physical reaction to the same as a means of protecting himself, most accounts of physical altercations between mothers and sons portray the young men only as perpetrators of violence, despite numerous mentions of the son being abused elsewhere in his Assets (and sometimes the same Asset).

Krias and Marston William (2000) elaborate on how Bourdieu's concepts of masculine domination (Bourdieu, 2001) suggests clear gendered subject positions within the social structure of the patriarchy, and how the idea of symbolic violence 'implies a certain complicity on the part of the dominated' (Krias and Marston William, 2000: 58). Here the concept of male habitus developed in chapter five plays a central role. This is to say that this male habitus is implicitly seen to incorporate the symbolic order of the patriarchy; violence and aggression are seen as means of domination and as integral to the male habitus. Further the dominated subject, here the mothers, are understood as having incorporated their subordinate position from that very social structure. In other words, while the young men in these physical altercations with their mothers are predominantly seen as perpetrators of violence, in accordance with YOT practitioners' construction of normative and hegemonic localised masculinity in which violence and aggression are essential as form of

gender displays and the performance of masculinity, mothers mostly are understood as victims of that physical altercation. Hence, YOT practitioners' construction of the young men's masculinity is interpreted through ideas of 'corresponding actions' of the young men and their mothers, whereby the young men are perpetrators and the mothers victims. Indeed, some YOT practitioners understood the mothers' roles as complicit in such altercations, as is illustrated by the statement of one practitioner at this YOT:

What's interesting here is that they [the mothers] are looking for a protector not a partner. Maybe it's wrong, but I often feel that, or maybe they are looking for both a partner and a protector, sometimes to replace what they …but that's interesting, because that's initially what people would see as a father figure. I think they are looking for the boy to take care of them, they want somebody to take care of them. This goes back to the perception of masculinity, what do males do, they are hunters and gatherers and they take care of you, fight the enemy off, all that, so it goes right back to basics (F17).

Not only are young men mostly understood as the perpetrator of violence in physical altercations with their mothers, and seldom portrayed as victims of domestic violence or abuse by mothers or fathers, but mothers themselves are further seen as complicit in the way in which YOT practitioners seem to understand their accommodation of their sons' performance of masculinity, along the same lines as discussed in relation to displays of masculinity and performance earlier in this chapter.

 In other words, while fathers, despite their absence from the young men's lives, are seen as both role models and reference group for the young men's acquisition of male violent and aggressive behaviour, mothers are comprehended as accommodating the performance of this male habitus and as playing the complicit counterpart in the interaction with their sons (Krias and Marston William, 2000). Thus, inherent in YOT practitioners' constructions of masculinity of the young men with whom they work are ideas of socialisation (Clausen, 1968; Parsons, 1951),

whereby a violent and aggressive family environment encourages the social learning of these behaviours (Bandura, 1973; 1977; Bandura and Walters, 1963), along the lines of clearly identifiable sex roles (Baillargeon et al., 2007; Block, 1976a; Block, 1976b; Block, 1983). These sex roles were interpreted to have been embodied (Messerschmidt, 2012b) and presenting themselves in the young men's interaction with their peers as displays of masculinity, which in turn is understood as essential to the performance of masculinity among peers. Peers here are identified as both reference group in relation to monitoring and regulating this behaviour, as well as providing the space in which the performance of masculinity is comprehended to gain kudos and respect. However, while peers are complicit in the sense that they are seen to encourage this particular performance of masculinity by having a 'working consensus' (Goffman, 1990: 97), mothers are understood as the complementary counterpart in social interaction (Goffman, 1990; Krias and Marston William, 2000). Thus the embodiment of the symbolic order of wider patriarchal structures of the young men as well as their mothers is central to YOT practitioners' construction of localised hegemonic masculinity and unequal male/ female power relations form the basis for it.

Central to the construction of the young men's masculinity is the *a priori* assumption of heterosexuality (Butler, 1990), and behaviours embodied by the young men are clearly linked to assigned sex roles. Despite the YOT practitioners' acknowledgment of behaviours of young men which deviate from the sex roles assigned, such as mentioned in relation to vulnerability and back and front regions in chapter five, the construction of the young men's masculinity continues to be produced through clear gender displays such as the expression of aggression and engaging in violent behaviour. Vital to this construction also is the association of characteristics of each sex through dichotomies within the 'heterosexual matrix' (Butler, 1990: 33), whereby male and female behaviour are distinctly differentiated from one another as opposites and understood as resulting in specific practices and performances of masculinity. Thus the masculinity of the young men is constructed around hetero-normative understandings of gendered practices (Butler, 1990; Ingraham, 2002). Displays of behaviours which do not conform to these are closed off from the

construction of masculinity (Wittig, 2002) and are seen as back region activity (Goffman, 1990) rather than prompting for the reconstruction of what is understood to be masculine. The masculinity of young men is made sense of only in reference to the dualism implied by the concepts of compulsory heterosexuality (Butler, 1990; Ingraham, 2002; Wittig, 2002) and displays of behaviour deviating from this are excluded from the construction of masculinity of the young men by practitioners.

It is on the example of the young men's relationships with their mothers where the complexity of the young men's position within wider social structures and their dual capability of being 'the oppressed' as well as being 'the oppressor' becomes most visible. Hearn (1987) discusses the ambiguous theoretical stance of the concept of patriarchy and suggests that 'the patriarchy may be used as a shorthand to refer to a complex set of social relations within and by which men tend to dominate women (Hearn, 1987: 57) and Carlsson (2013) emphasises the various limitations of men's access to patriarchal power throughout the life course. It becomes obvious on the example of the young men's relationship with their mothers that this access to power is multi-dimensional not only in relation to the linearity of time during their life course, but also contextual in the sense that it is situational. Messerschmidt (2012) elaborates on the example of a young girl how her gender identity is created and performed in response to the emphasised hegemonic masculinity of her stepfather. In the context of this thesis, it appears that the emphasised femininity of the young men's mothers enables a heightened performance of hegemonic masculinity, whereby male sexual practices are reproduced in the form of violence and violent behaviour (Hearn, 1987; Messerschmidt, 2012). While their (previous) vulnerability is highlighted through experience of abuse by their mothers, their dual capability of being both 'the oppressed' and 'the oppressor' finds expression in their hetero-normative and male practices as aggressor, and their 'occasional transformation' (Messerschmidt, 2012: 168) into (abusive) surrogate husbands. This position of power embedded in wider and very complex patriarchal relations stands in stark contrast to their vulnerability (as discussed earlier) and their attempt to empower themselves with and amongst their peers.

Summary

Chapter six has examined the importance given to the performance of masculinity and the monitoring of masculinity in the YOT practitioners' construction of masculinity. Peers play a vital role in this performance and the monitoring of masculinity of the young men as understood by YOT practitioners, and this performance is seen as the young men's aspiration to gaining bravado, respect and kudos from their peers resulting from low self-esteem. YOT practitioners understand peers to be the reference group for the young men with whom they work, whereby only discrete and heterosexual practices are understood as legitimate performances of masculinity. While peers are understood by YOT practitioners to be the arena for the performance of masculinity and the monitoring of the same, families are seen as where masculinity has been learnt. In this learning process, fathers are understood as role models by YOT practitioners, and the young men are seen as socially learning, once again without the consideration of social and reflective agency, masculinity from their fathers. Mothers, on the other hand, do not appear to play a significant part in YOT practitioners' understanding of how young men have learnt to be 'men', but are understood as complicit in staging this masculinity. It is this element of the performance of masculinity in the interaction with mothers that has allowed to the application of the concept of localised hegemonic masculinity. Although the element of unequal power relations on the basis of gender only becomes obvious in relation to young men and their mothers, they are implicit throughout the data by the way in which young men are allocated clear gendered subject positions and corresponding behavioural attributes. Chapter seven of this thesis will explore how the findings of chapters five and six are seen as relevant to the young men's offending behaviour.

Part II

7. Masculinity and Offending

Introduction

Chapters five and six have explored the ideas through which YOT practitioners construct the young men's masculinity by considering displays of masculinity and the performance of masculinity as understood by practitioners. Central here was the construction of male capital as foundation for YOT practitioners' understanding of the young men's practices and the understanding of those practices as embedded in the localised hegemonic form of masculinity, whereby the young men's behaviour was understood as normative. Chapter six set these practices in relation to the performance of masculinity and in relation to peers' function as a reference group and monitoring legitimate and illegitimate male practices. Additionally, it discussed the role the young persons' families play in the YOT practitioners' construction of masculinity by exploring the importance YOT practitioners attribute to fathers as role models and showed how this construction of localised hegemonic masculinity is implicitly linked to ideas around the patriarchy through the ways in which YOT practitioners understand the young men and their relationship with their mothers. This final findings chapter discusses the role of criminal behaviour in the YOT practitioners' construction of the young men's masculinity and the relevance attributed by YOT practitioners to this construction in their work with young men.

7.1 Normative Masculinity, Risk and Offending Behaviour

Chapter six concluded by elaborating on the role played by hetero-normative ideas in the YOT practitioners' construction of the young men's masculinity. Similarly to the discussion in chapter five in relation to displays of masculinity, a large number of practitioners at this YOT explain the offending behaviour of young men by setting it in contrast to the offending behaviour of women (see table at the beginning of

chapter five), whereby a distinct difference is evident between male and female offending behaviour:

Girls tend to have a lot more acquisitive crime, so shop lifting for beauty products […] and that kind of thing […] I think we see a high percentage of offences coming through linked to rumour and that also (M7).

Definitely more acquisitive crime for the females, whereas the males certainly come through this system from our point of view, they're more offences against a person like assault (F17).

Even when young women had engaged with this YOT because they had committed an assault or violent crime, the majority of YOT practitioners stress that these offences are a lot less serious than assault offences committed by young men, and they are seen as less of a risk:

Of the two females that I've dealt with there is none of them sort of being risky, they've been like shoplifting offences. A few got assaults on their records, but when you look at the assaults, it hasn't been a serious assault, just a push or a slap you know (M4).

This is to say that violent and aggressive offences are associated with young men rather than with young women by the majority of YOT practitioners, and they clearly distinguish between male and female offences:

I think there is different patterns in terms of violence is predominantly more male […] females do more thefts than males do […] so there's definitely different patterns (M12).

Some YOT practitioners observe that young women are strongly associated with issues around vulnerability by both magistrates and judges in relation to their offending behaviour, and are therefore seen as receiving less severe sanctions:

I would say from my experience, in front of magistrates they are treated differently. Magistrates seem to look at them like 'ahh' all lovely eyes and all that, 'bless her' [...] I don't know how many times this girl has been breached, but just now she is on reparation... that wouldn't happen with a lad (F18).

As discussed in chapter two, a number of authors have argued that a key feature in the criminal justice system's response to crime is the regulation of acceptable gender role behaviour (Ashford et al., 1997; Gelsthorpe, 2004) and that men and women are treated differently for the same offences (Feilzer and Hood, 2004; Gelsthorpe, 2004; Gelsthorpe and Sharpe, 2006; Heidensohn, 2002). Some YOT practitioners echo this difference in the treatment of young men and women.

At the same time, the young men's engagement in aggressive and violent offences is interpreted by YOT practitioners as one of the main reasons for their offending and reoffending and remains central in explanations for offending behaviour of young men. Assault and criminal damage are understood to be the dominant offending behaviours young men engaged in and this is explained by YOT practitioners as young men taking more risks in the type of offences they committed than young women:

They come through for criminal assaults [...] I have noticed that in the types of crimes what the females are doing, the lads tend to be more risky [...] (M9).

This is to say that, similar to the discussion around risk factors in chapter two, being male is implicitly understood by practitioners at this YOT as a risk factor for offending and reoffending behaviour since the majority of offences committed by males are seen to evolve around violence and aggression, which, in turn, are integral to how YOT practitioners construct the young men's masculinity. While family, peers and neighbourhood (further discussed below) also play a significant role in relation to the YOT practitioners' understanding of the reasons for the young men's involvement in

criminal behaviour, the key feature across these categories and linking these categories is the young men's engagement in violent and aggressive behaviour.

This behaviour is central to the way YOT practitioners explain the young men's offending behaviour, and it also is fundamental to how practitioners construct the young men's masculinity as highlighted in the previous chapters. This is to say that aggression and violence are simultaneously essential to how YOT practitioners constructed the young men's masculinity and how they explain the young men's involvement in criminal behaviour. Thus criminal behaviour, in particular concerning offences around assaults and criminal damage, are seen as part of the young men's masculinity:

[…] I think because, you know, expectations maybe of some young people or they feel that there is an expectation, especially linked to males, feel that crime is more acceptable. Often when we speak with the young men and try to get them to reflect on how it all started, they generally say that it started with grafting, smashing a window with a football, kind of just messing about with their friends (F9).

While the above interview extract emphasises how this YOT practitioner sees the way young men understand themselves, another practitioner explains how it was also vital to the practitioners' construction of masculinity of the young men:

I think it's because, you know, that subconscious horror, when a girl is sat in front of me, this isn't what girls do. With males, you know, oh boys will be boys, you know social acceptance that boys are, well, rough and tumble, they are a bit more up for it (M7).

Here social class not only becomes a central element in the construction of the young men's masculinity in relation to their aggressive and violent behaviour (as discussed in chapter five), but also the link to how YOT practitioners understand their offending behaviour:

It comes down to masculinity, trying to dominate other young people, to be part of the group and be accepted, especially in poor areas and council estates […] It's like the estate I grew up on, you know, it was common that young males […] would be arrested or be involved with criminal activity. It was common (M5).

What was termed localised hegemonic masculinity in chapter six is constructed by practitioners in this YOT not only as consisting of aggressive and violent behaviour in relation to the young men, but also as criminal behaviour resulting from aggression and violence. Thereby, the young men's involvement in criminal behaviour is interpreted as normative in the wider construction of their localised hegemonic masculinity and integral to this construction. In other words, it is not seen as simply overlapping with wider male culture (Winlow, 2002), but in fact to be that culture. As such, YOT practitioners understood the display and performance of localised hegemonic masculinity by the young men in the context of 'doing crime' (Mullins, 2006), whereby delinquency is the result of being a man and violence and aggression the main ingredient (Winlow, 2002):

It's par for the course, you know, you get beaten up on the streets, you get into fights […] you have to get involved […] this is the way it is (M13).

Collier (1998) argues that in the dominant criminological literature on masculinity, masculinity becomes associated with its negative connotations and synonymous with crime. This tendency is also evident in how YOT practitioners construct the masculinity of the young men they work with, whereby violence and aggression become key features in localised hegemonic masculinity, and the discussion of other forms of masculinities is largely absent from the data. Indeed, only one YOT practitioner mentions the presence of some effeminate young men in their work, and behaviours of young men which deviate from this idea of localised hegemonic masculinity are understood as 'letting the front down' (F16), rather than as indications of the presence of other masculinities or the re-thinking of the idea itself.

7. 2 Male Offending, Families and Peers

Mooney (2003) argues that the family has long been identified as the cause of crime and criminal behaviour in youth. The centrality of the family in explaining criminal behaviour is evident in a number of documents produced by the Youth Justice Board on youth offending (Youth Justice Board, 2005a; 2006; 2009a). Families, in particular fathers (as discussed in chapter six), play a significant role in relation to how YOT practitioners understand the young men to have learned to be men and thereby have become involved in criminal activity. Although a greater emphasis is placed on peers in relation to how and why young people engage in offending behaviour, importance is given to families as the origin of socially learned behaviour (Bandura, 1977; Bandura and Walters, 1963; Clausen, 1968) and to how offending behaviour is learnt , particularly from fathers:

It's running through the families, the families where you got crime …the gang, the boys gang, like the boys from place A, massive drug-dealing fathers, it's called baby boss, it's their lads now that are running the show (M2).

Here a notion of normativity in relation to the young men's offending behaviour emerges as one of the reasons for their offending and as originating with their families. Equally, some families are seen where criminal behaviour has become socially validated and accepted:

Some of them come from crime families, so their influence is their family, and it's a negative influence [...] and it's all they've ever known. So you know when we get them I am hoping that the workers try and instill values, try and lead them from a life of crime and show them another side to life, because some of these young people don't even realise that what they are doing is necessarily wrong [...] (F9).

While the Assets actively encourage YOT practitioners to seek information on criminal behaviour of family members by ticking specific boxes, this connection is also made in other parts of the assessment. All but one family are articulated as pro-

criminal in Assets on the young people, meaning that at least one member of the family had been identified as having committed a crime. This is particularly evident among the fathers of the young men, half of whom had or are serving a prison sentence. In the case of YP7 the criminal history of his family is stated to be the main reason for him to have committed crimes.

However, while the family is seen as the source of young men's criminal behaviour and initial reference group (Bandura and Walters, 1963; Block, 1976a; Bourdieu, 2005; Butler, 1990; Clausen, 1968; Goffman, 1990), where this behaviour was socially learned and validated (Bandura, 1977; Bandura and Walters, 1963; Clausen, 1968; Parsons, 1951), peers are understood as the main arena in which this criminal behaviour is enacted. As discussed in chapter six, gaining kudos and a reputation among peers was fundamental to how YOT practitioners construct the young men's localised hegemonic masculinity. Mullins (2006) stresses how 'the streets' themselves are highly gender-segregated and highlights the importance of 'reputation' (Mullins, 2006: 21-22) in interactions between (young) men on 'the streets'. Achieving kudos and a reputation is the most dominant theme in YOT practitioners' explanation for the young men's offending behaviour in groups.

Connell (1987; 2005b) stresses how masculinities are not only constructed in relation to women, but also in relation to men. As discussed in chapter six, YOT practitioners' construction of masculinity relied heavily on the interaction between young men, rather than the young men and women. Although the performance of masculinity in family relations, for example in mother-son relations, emerged as a theme from the data, interactions between young men are understood to be both the arena where masculinity is predominantly displayed and performed, and where criminal activity takes place.

In this interaction between young men and their peers, the main features of YOT practitioners' construction of masculinity are the key elements in YOT practitioners' understanding of the young men's aggressive and violent behaviour, resulting in

criminal offences. Fundamental to how practitioners understand this interaction is the young persons' focus on obtaining a reputation among their peers. A key strategy of the young men hoping to achieve this reputation is seen to be the role of their male habitus, whereby the idealisation of impressions (Goffman, 1990) of aggression and violence are understood to be essential to how the young men present themselves. Mullins (2006) considers, using the example of street violence among men in the US, the role violence plays in the interaction between males and how 'the dialect of masculinity and violence' generates 'situational role strain in the accomplishment of masculinity' (Mullins, 2006: 74), motivated by the desire to achieve a reputation. Similarly to Hatty (2000), Adams (2002) illustrates, using the example of young Afro-American men, how, when adult masculine roles such as worker and father are not available, risky, aggressive and violent behaviour serves to gain respect and a reputation as substitute means of achieving masculinity. Adams (2002) argues that peers play a significant role in the achievement of reputation and ultimately masculinity as external validators. Similarly, YOT practitioners understand violence between these young men as central in their obtaining and sustaining localised hegemonic masculinity. Thus, the presence of the 'potentiality of violence out of even the shallowest social interaction' (Mullins, 2006: 74) is understood as the source of criminal behaviour, whereby the display of aggression and violence serve both to gain a reputation and to affirm the young men's belonging to their peer group. This is particularly expressed by one YOT practitioner:

It's kind of the males get more kudos with their social group when they commit offences, it makes them more of a man in their eyes and they become more accepted gender wise, [their] standing within their peer group. Then it becomes more of a status than really anything to do with making money from crime, because these kids are never going to be professional criminals […] these kids are petty criminals who rarely commit offences […] in isolation…more frequently as a group, they are influenced by their peer pressure to go and do something [...] to gain kudos, they like to be the main man on the estate (M7).

Hobbs (1994) emphasises the role of violence in the context of working class masculinity as a means to obtain material capital through crime. This notion is almost entirely absent from how YOT practitioners explained the young men's involvement in criminal behaviour. The acquisition of goods and money is hardly ever associated with reasons for young men's violence and aggression, and acquisitive crime is largely linked with young women's offending behaviour as discussed above. Rather, the young men's offending behaviour is predominantly associated with the attainment of kudos, respect and reputation as central to key features of localised hegemonic masculinity in the social interaction of the young men and their male peers.

7. 3 Male Conflict Resolution and Offending Behaviour

Chapter five discussed how the young men's consumption of alcohol is seen by YOT practitioners as problematic, predominantly when this consumption occurred in the context of offending behaviour. It also shows that the way practitioners understand young men to cope with their emotions and conflict situations is through the display of aggressive and violent behaviour. While the dominant explanation for young men's offending behaviour is identified as their motivation for gaining a reputation among their peers and the majority of offences are seen to have been committed as a result of that and in association with their peers, the main rationalisation for offences committed by individuals is linked to the consumption of alcohol. In turn, the consumption of alcohol is strongly associated with the young men's inability to cope with situations:

They have been kicked out or they are struggling at school or at home, and they are being excluded more. There are a lot more external factors putting pressure on them to the point where they can't manage their emotions or their feelings. They are going out and they are using it, they are using alcohol and they are fighting, and they are not able to think. They are not resilient, they are not able to kind of manage those things [...] so they are kind of reacting in an offending way and become involved in negative behaviour (F15).

As elaborated on in chapter five, the consumption of alcohol has been identified as a coping mechanism associated with particular masculinities (Featherstone et al., 2007), and Winlow (2002) has emphasised the role alcohol plays in the attainment of masculinity in the locality of the YOT. Similar to associations made between the consumption of alcohol and the display of aggressive and violent behaviour earlier, alcohol is clearly understood as a central factor in individual offending behaviour. This unfolds in two ways in the data, namely alcohol increasing risk-taking behaviour while lowering impulse and temper control (Ruxton, 2009), and the young men's reaction to emotionally stressful situations as a coping mechanism (Featherstone et al., 2007) and the resulting offending behaviour.

The mentioning of alcohol in relation to young men's offending behaviour and their inability to control their temper resulting in violent and aggressive behaviour is the most dominant theme emerging from the data as explanation for individually committed offences:

He did admit that previously alcohol, in particular cider and vodka, has impacted on his ability to control his temper resulting in him going on 'a war path' […] he could not give any reason for his [offending] behaviour, but informed me that during the course of the day he had consumed half a litre of vodka, 2 litres of wine and one litre of cider. YP2 maintains that due to the amount of alcohol he consumed, he had no recollection of the offence, because he 'was drunk' (Asset YP2).

Featherstone, Rivett and Scourfield (2007) and Ruxton (2002) underline the link between substance use and mental health issues. This connection is largely absent from the way YOT practitioners explain young men's offending behaviour, as is evident through the lack of information about identified mental health issues as pointed out in chapter five, but the consumption of alcohol emerges either as part of the masculine culture in the area or as a coping mechanism.

However, that alcohol is seen as coping strategy is particularly emphasised through the number of Assets, which described the young men as having had an argument with their mother or girlfriend, then consuming alcohol and consequently committing an offence:

He had an argument with his girlfriend, and during the argument he consumed a full two litre bottle of wine [...], resulting in her slamming the door in his face. He walked away from his girlfriend's house, and advises that he was feeling quite angry. He states that as a consequence of his anger, he punched a bin, which was located near the shop which the victim of this offence owns (Asset YP3).

This is to say that practitioners at this YOT see offending behaviour by young men as the result of a chain of reactions. Emotionally stressful situations, in particular arguments with either mothers or girlfriends, causing the consumption of alcohol as a coping strategy, which in turn initiates aggressive and violent behaviour, resulting in offending behaviour such as criminal damage and assault. Similar to some of the academic literature, young men are understood to consume alcohol as a coping mechanism to deal with emotional stress and anxieties (Featherstone et al., 2007), in the absence of alternative coping strategies (Boehnisch and Winter, 1993; De Keseredy and Schwartz, 2005), and as a legitimate masculine response to conflict situations (Adams and Coltrane, 2005), as socially learned (Bandura, 1973; Bandura and Walters, 1963) and 'validated' reaction in the wider frame of localised male culture (Winlow, 2002). What has been termed 'male habitus' thereby becomes central to this behaviour, and the enacting of violence became both a utilisation of normative masculine behaviour as well as the only resource available to deal with disconfirming experiences (Hatty, 2000).

However, while the majority of YOT practitioners acknowledge the extensive violence experienced or witnessed by these young men had, violent responses to emotionally stressful situations are not comprehended in the context of abuse experience of the young men, resulting in offending behaviour (Day et al., 2008; Egeland, 1993; Johnson et al., 2010; Malamuth et al., 1993), but as a situational

response and as the result of the consumption of alcohol, lowering the young men's impulse and temper control as discussed in chapter five. Equally, in conflict situations with mothers and girlfriends, this behaviour is not explicitly linked to issues around confirming masculinity but seen as the most frequent expression of anger in those young men (Crick et al., 1996). The same aggressive, violent and offending behaviour in peer settings is overtly set in the context of gaining kudos and reputation in order to gain and verify masculinity and create the image of being a 'hard man' (Asset YP4). As such violence and aggression are understood as omnipresent in the lives of those young men and the most central element of localised hegemonic masculinity (Mullins, 2006). As a result, violence, offending behaviour and localised hegemonic masculinity become synonymous in YOT practitioners' construction of the masculinity of the young men with whom they work: doing masculinity means being violent and committing crime. In essence, while numerous authors (Day et al., 2008; Lamb, 2000) link the experience of violence of young men in their family settings with their engagement in violent and aggressive behaviour with peers, this connection is not made by YOT practitioners.

7.4 Individual Needs and Working with Masculinity

Chapter five identified the ideas through which YOT practitioners make sense of and construct the masculinity of the young men they work with. Central to this construction is the element of violent and aggressive behaviour as a distinctly male feature, the consumption of alcohol as a coping mechanism and the role families and peers are assigned in this construction. Chapter six set what has been termed male habitus into the context of the performance and monitoring of the young men's masculinity in relation to their families and peers, while the earlier part of this chapter discussed how these elements are understood as equally central to explanations around young men's offending behaviour. Despite the assignment of distinct characteristics to the young men, the majority of YOT practitioners do not believe that gender plays or should play a substantial role in their work with young men. This emerges particularly in the interviews, where a common thread emerges: 'individual needs':

It's all about individual needs, you know, but I think the approach [to young women and young men] is the same. I mean obviously, you are addressing behaviours, you are addressing values, you are addressing attitudes, you are not addressing something that's gender-fixed or something like that. So, you don't go, like 'oh, I got a girl today, I get assessment tool B out' [...] you are considering values and attitudes more than actually sort of gender, I think [...] (M12).

The majority of YOT practitioners initially do not link their understanding of the young men with whom they work with a specific approach or differences in assessment. Instead of seeing gender as a fundamental feature in their work, with the distinct characteristics assigned to young men as identified in previous chapters, gender is interpreted as an addition to 'individual needs', not as a basis for resulting differences in needs in young men and women. Scourfield (2002) gives importance to the tension between treating clients as individuals, on the one hand, and acknowledging gendered practices of individual clients in social work practice, on the other. This tension is highly visible in YOT practitioners' approaches to young men, though not directly articulated; YOT practitioners identify clear distinctions between the work with young men and young women, but insist that they treat young people individually rather than through a gender lens. In contrast to the academic literature outlined in chapter two (Buckley, 1996; Dominelli, 1992; Scourfield, 1998; Taylor, 2003), YOT practitioners do not articulate that the work with young men required a gender- specific focus. However, as Cowburn and Dominelli (2001) argue, using the example of sex offenders, the lack of consideration of the role masculinity plays in relation to violence in offending behaviour may have resulted in inaccuracy in terms of identified needs in the assessment in young men who have been identified as having offended. One YOT practitioner points out that gender dimensions are absent from the Asset as a risk assessment tool:

I mean it's quite difficult, because every young person is different, but I think it's about getting all the facts. Obviously, the assessment is prompt for the author and the person that's doing the assessment, and because it's so general it's down to the

skills and experience of the author and the assessor. I think, if things are maybe a bit more like specific, it would get you to start thinking in a different way [...] so gender does not really play into it [...] but I think there could be more specific kind of prompts (F9).

While this statement underlines the lack of gender considerations in the Asset as an assessment tool, it also acknowledges that the experience of the author or assessor has an impact on how the assessment is completed. Baker and Baker, Kelly and Wilkinson (2005; 2011) consider the importance of professional discretion in the completion of Assets. While some YOT practitioners emphasise that the experience of the assessor plays a role in how young people are assessed, they also underline the restrictions of Asset as a tool for assessment and how it does not allow for the consideration of gender (Scourfield, 2003):

Asset [...] pays no attention to equality and diversity whatsoever [...] it asks you to define ethnicity, it asks you to define gender [...] and then they are all ticked boxes , it never actually invites, encourages, it's not in the planning, it's not in anywhere asking you to do anything with what you have learned [...] surely, if we are to look at the gender issue and his role model and his role in the family [...] the fact that he is male and he is now the dominant person in the household had some bearing [...] so why do we ask, why tick the box on gender, if we then go on to do absolutely nothing with it? (F17).

Phoenix (2009) argues that the way risk is identified in young people in youth justice services has as much to do with the language around risk provided by assessment tools as with how practitioners make sense of the young persons' offending behaviour, but that this language restricts professionals in expressing their own views. A number of YOT practitioners reference the absence of their thinking about gender-specific assessment and intervention to the limitations of the Asset as the core assessment tool:

I think it's generic. I think the whole way the Youth Justice Board have set out their stall […] they've realigned things so that you are not allowed[…] things which can't be fixed, like class and gender […] and what have you have been pushed into the background and we deal with the things very much focused on the things that you can action […] if you had someone who was particularly alert to gender issues [and] has training and skills…but the assessment certainly doesn't just say, is class an issue here, is gender an issue …people don't really think outside of those parameters, so that's quite a difficult thing to imagine (M13).

In other words, the lack of issues around masculinity being articulated in the context of assessment and the work with young men is explained through both the absence of specific knowledge and training in the area of gender and the limitations of the assessment and intervention tools in youth offending practice as it unfolds at YOTs. Here, the 'repertoire of responses' (Smith, 2011a: 197) from the Asset focuses on the assessment of risk without consideration of gender, and the wider 'occupational discourse' (Scourfield, 2003: 31) around offending behaviour was seen to limit YOT practitioners' interpretations of the young men's actions. This is despite the fact that, since being female was identified as a 'protective factor', being male has been categorised as a risk factor (Youth Justice Board, 2005a). Nevertheless, gender remains absent as a lens through which to assess young people from the Asset. While the majority of YOT practitioners construct localised hegemonic masculinity along discrete lines of gender specific behaviour and offending behaviour, only the senior practitioner at this YOT linked specific assessment categories in the Asset to gender:

We are clearly […] concerned about young people's experimentation with substances. So what I want to know is are there different patterns to female substance users as to male substance users? Do boys go for certain combinations and cocktails of substances and girls do something different? What are the physical effects, do they know the physical effects? There is a realm of things to be explored in gender that actually link to the key elements of Asset. I have talked about the emotional and mental health and changes to the body, but I see other elements as well (F17).

Dimensions considered important in relation to assessing the risk of a young person's offending behaviour are viewed without the consideration of gender, and in particular masculinity, but the necessity to link gender as a category into the different areas of assessment is recognised by only one YOT practitioner. However, the absence of direct considerations of masculinity in relation to the assessment of young men is evident throughout data collected from Assets. Ruxton (2009) places importance on men and boy-friendly approaches to work with men on education and health, and other authors have argued a similar case in relation to working with men and boys on issues such as domestic violence, alcohol misuse, mental health and health and disability (Featherstone et al., 2007; Hearn and Kolga, 2006). The majority of YOT practitioners do not actively explore the possible dimension of masculinity in relation to discrete assessment categories, and 'individual needs' are assessed without any explicit consideration of the young person's gender.

Caulfield (2010) argues that assessment measures in criminal justice are 'based upon male –oriented measures of risk and need' and that it is 'crucial to accurately assess women's need, so that programmes, interventions, and resources […] can appropriately target areas of need with the eventual aim of reducing the risk of offending' (Caulfield, 2010: 322). Like Cowburn and Dominelli (2001), Caulfield (2010) stresses the importance of assessing individuals in the wider framework of considerations of masculinity and femininity and potentially associated gender-specific risk factors and needs. While she argues that criminal justice assessment tools are inherently male-orientated, there is a need to translate ideas around femininity into intervention programmes. In the context of this study, it appears that the assessment of young men by YOT practitioners is not male-orientated in the sense that it considers specific 'male needs' or makes any distinct and overt association between ideas around masculinity and offending behaviour. Chapter two pointed out that research commissioned by the YJB itself has identified distinct gender differences in risk factors in offending behaviour (Youth Justice Board, 2005a), but those differences are not accommodated by YOT practitioners nor translated into a gender differentiation in the needs analysis of young men and

women. This is despite the fact that a large number of characteristics of the construction of localised hegemonic masculinity of the young men by YOT practitioners largely overlaps with characteristics which have been identified as offending behaviour by YOT practitioners themselves. Localised hegemonic masculinity is associated with offending, but does not spark an awareness by practitioners of specific needs of those young people in relation to their gender. Further, this construction of a specific localised hegemonic masculinity consequently lacks assessment of issues around, for example, vulnerability which was not associated with localised hegemonic masculinity. Hence, implicit ideas of masculinity of YOT practitioners in combination with the lack of awareness around how masculinity could potentially be linked to specific assessment categories could be understood as having resulted in an inaccurate assessment of the young men's needs due to the absence of considerations of masculinity (Cowburn and Dominelli, 2001).

Here it is appropriate to return to some of the issues mentioned around the restrictions of set responses (Smith, 2011a) and 'occupational discourse' (Scourfield, 2003: 31) as briefly discussed in chapter two. While there is evidence that specific connections are made by YOT practitioners between issues the young men with whom they work have and their aggressive and violent, and offending behaviour, what is identified by practitioners as sources of 'problem behaviour' does not seem to be explicitly associated with distinct categories provided by Assets. Although, for example, the categories 'family', 'neighbourhood', and 'alcohol' are preformed categories in the Asset through which to assess the young men's behaviours, the clear identification of 'male' behaviours is constructed beyond the explicit structure of the Asset. This poses some questions around the idea that the occupational discourse (Scourfield, 2003) and the language of risk (Phoenix, 2009; Smith, 2011a) restrict YOT practitioners to expressing their own 'professional opinions' (Phoenix, 2009: 129). While YOT practitioners understand the young men's masculinity as closely linked to their offending behaviour, particularly evident in interviews and the focus group, this connection remains absent from Assets, pointing out the restrictions of set responses in Assets.

However, their construction of the young men's masculinity suggests that YOT practitioners have some scope as to how they make sense of the young people with whom they work. If the Asset document itself can be seen as a reflection of the 'occupational discourse' at this YOT, then a number of elements in the YOT practitioners' construction of masculinity could clearly be linked to this document such as 'impulsiveness and temper control' as discussed in chapter five. Although YOT practitioners engage with notions of the Asset in making sense of the young men's law breaking in interviews and the focus group, such as its relationship to family, neighbourhood and the consumption of alcohol, specific explanations of their aggressive and violent behaviour and indeed their masculinity cannot be linked directly to explicit categories in the Asset. In other words, while those explanations embraced some of the categories set in the Asset, and indeed in the wider academic literature as outlined in chapter three in relation to socialisation and sex-roletheory, some more specific associations are made by practitioners themselves. Issues around male displays of behaviour, coping strategies, problem solving skills and role models, to name but a few, cannot directly be attributed to the format of the Asset, despite its implicit link to issues around masculinity as discussed by the literature. Thus, while some YOT practitioners articulated that the Asset was restrictive in the way they could make sense of and assess the young people with whom they work, most of the data deriving from interviews and the focus group indicates that practitioners indeed used their own views and opinions in their work with young men, specifically in relation to masculinity and offending. However, their explicit focus on negative connotations of masculinity (Collier, 1998) suggests this sense-making and connections made between issues of masculinity and offending still takes place within the language of risk (Phoenix, 2009) and a view onto offending behaviour, implicitly excluding positive ideas around masculinity, and indeed recognising heterogeneity amongst the young men with whom they work.

Sheppard (1995) distinguishes between three main components of knowledge social work practitioners possess in relation to their practice: 'knowledge gained from everyday life […], knowledge gained from social science, […] and knowledge gained from the conduct of social work practice' (Sheppard, 1995: 279). He distinguishes

between knowledge accumulated from assessment and practice, and knowledge gained from specific knowledge areas (such as mental health, medicine etc), which can be translated into the particular cases and into specific areas of practice, such as youth justice (Sheppard, 1995). This is relevant here precisely because of his notion of 'combined knowledge', which contests the idea that the knowledge produced by YOT practitioners is only to be seen as the result of a restricted set of explanations and responses available to them (Phoenix, 2009; Smith, 2011a), and thereby adds weight to the role of YOT practitioners and the way they make sense of young men and their law-breaking. While the format of the Asset introduces specific categories through which to explain and assess the young person's offending behaviour without drawing explicit attention to masculinity or offering it as an explanation, YOT practitioners themselves draw very clear links between the young men's masculinity and their offending behaviour. Equally, it is evident through some of the findings from interviews (for instance on mental health or the sexual abuse experience of young men as touched on in chapter five and six), that specific expertise of practitioners in a multidisciplinary team (Dugmore, 2006a; Dugmore, 2006b; Pickford and Dugmore, 2012) draw on particular aspects of their work with and the issues of young people, which are mainly absent from the Asset document. This reinforces the idea that YOT practitioners at this YOT indeed make sense of the young men with whom they work, albeit within the language of risk (Phoenix, 2009) and the dominant occupational discourse (Scourfield, 2003), and beyond some of the static categories (Smith, 2011a) in Assets. While Assets, as a reflection of the way young people's behaviour is made sense of in youth justice practice, may encourage particular ways of explaining young people's offending behaviour, the specific connections made between masculinity and offending appear to be made by YOT practitioners. This is to say that, while, for instance, an inclusion of family and neighbourhood factors in the explanation that offending behaviour bears theoretical notions of socialisation and social learning theory, and a long standing connotation of families as the source of socially deviant behaviours (Blair, 2006; Farrall and Hay, 2010; Mooney, 2003), connections between coping strategies and the consumption of alcohol or aggressive behaviour are made beyond the set categories in Assets by YOT practitioners.

Although the occupational discourse in youth justice practice plays a vital role in the way YOT practitioners make sense of the young men with whom they work, YOT practitioners do make sense of young men, their masculinity and their offending behaviour beyond explanatory categories offered by Assets. This sense-making takes place within their professional role and the function of YOTs, namely the assessment of the risk of reoffending. On the other hand, although there is some evidence of what Sheppard (1995) describes as 'combined knowledge', 'organisational limits' (Scourfield, 2003: 33) restrict the possible number of constructions of masculinities of YOT practitioners as does the practitioners' focus on risk.

7.5 Youth Justice Practice and Masculinity

Caulfield (2010) argues that gender-specific assessment and intervention assist in addressing specific needs and may help in reducing the risk of offending. Similarly, Ruxton (2009) points out how specifically male-targeted intervention may have a positive impact using the example of health interventions and also considering men's and boys' gender-specific patterns of help-seeking (Brigid et al., 2005; Galdas et al., 2005). Numerous other authors (Buckley, 1996; Burnham et al., 1990; Cowburn and Dominelli, 2001; Johnstone, 2001; Scourfield, 1998; Taylor, 2003) have highlighted the importance of gendered practices in work with men and young men involved with criminal justice services. However, intentional male-targeted interventions are absent and largely seen as unnecessary in the work with young men. As one senior YOT practitioner explains:

The YJB have established what's important and it's all based on what works and what doesn't, but it's interesting that some issues aren't addressed in the things they provide us with, and the staff don't necessarily have the skills or the inclination to think along other lines…so, I wonder how many staff actually do think 'is gender identity, is gender an issue here?' We are not trained to have that kind of critical thinking around those issues anymore – it's just like a canon, a literary canon […] it's not overtly visible that gender is there as defining way of doing things, changing the

way we work […] it's certainly not on the radar […] it's not in discussions on the corridors about gender issues and things like that and it's not something , I think people necessarily think about. Why that is, I don't know (F17).

As discussed above in relation to gender dimensions in the assessment of young people, intervention is not thought about in the context of gender, and what Baker (2005) has called 'professional discretion' is seen by YOT practitioners as restricted (Phoenix, 2009; Smith, 2011a) by the guidance provided through the YJB, not only in the assessment of but also the practice with young people. While this senior practitioner identifies the reasons why gender-specific interventions are not accommodated in their work with young people, the majority of practitioners at this YOT do not express that specifically male-targeted intervention is necessary. Here the idea of 'individual needs' reemerged as a category from the interview and focus group data, and those 'individual needs' are not understood as being directly linked to gender:

What we do is more centered around the individual needs, the whole person, around the behaviour rather than gender really […] so whatever the needs of the young person are, they are kind of in their plan, and sometimes there will be some gender-specific thing, like support around pregnancy, or whatever […] but generally we're just addressing behaviours (M12).

Despite a large number of YOT practitioners having identified very clearly distinct behaviours of young men and women with whom they work (see chapter five), behaviour and individual needs are not seen in the wider context of gender, or indeed masculinity. This corresponds to what has been described as the tension between social work ethics around working with individuals and embracing wider structural explanations, which incorporate ideas around masculinity and femininity (Scourfield, 2003). However, when gender specific work is identified as important by YOT practitioners, it is in relation to young women rather than young men. Here different needs based on young women's issues around pregnancy and all-female group work are central.

It's all generic work, it wouldn't make sense not to. At times a number of female staff have tried to get a female only group […] they obviously felt that girls would benefit from having a group, to do group work sessions on their own [to do] what's best for the girls. Somehow girls are not the norm, the majority of offenders are male, so therefore we are having a minority group. You have a minority group, so they must have minority needs and therefore we should tailor those things to meet those minority needs […] must we do something different for boys, are boys specifically targeted? I think not […] but then I think about all the posters on knife crime, they are all pictures of males (M13).

While there is some evidence of awareness by YOT practitioners that, in particular, crime prevention materials are aimed at young men, it is not deemed important to adapt a male-specific approach to their work with young men by most practitioners. However, all female group work emerges as the only category from the findings from the focus group data in the context of which YOT practitioners understood the gender-specific work relevant and at times necessary. A focus here is the work with young women in a 'safe-space', in which they would not be exposed to male exploitation or inappropriate sexual behaviour, or in other words be vulnerable. This is particularly interesting against the backdrop of the discussion around the lack of identification of vulnerability in young men (chapter five). Moreover, one senior practitioner points out that there is a distinct difference in how females and males are understood through needs, consequently dealt with differently, and how this is reflected in youth justice practice:

So I actually think that society's and youth justice's response to boys is a killer. No one gives a shit, when you try and express yourself [as a boy], your body is shaking and your hands are going, and you are almost so close to tears and you don't know who you are. With a girl, we go 'oh well', and it's her time of the month, and her periods have started, and we give her Paracetamols, cuddles and hot water bottles. She can get out of gym at school, she can lay down anywhere she wants. What do we do with boys? We treat them as if they are not undergoing any change at all […] boys go

through exactly the same anxieties, but I do know we treat them socially differently […] they kick off, and we lock them up (F17).

Messerschmidt (2012b) and Drummond (2003) argue that the role the body plays in the construction of masculinity and the enactment of aggression of violence of boys and young men remains underexplored. Drummond (2002), in particular, illustrates the interplay between changing body shape and masculine identity in adolescent boys and the lack of health practitioners' understanding of boys suffering from concern about their body image. The interview extract above accentuates how issues around the body are seen in relation to boys rather than girls.

The way in which issues around the vulnerability of young women are articulated most frequently by YOT practitioners is around the theme of sexual health and pregnancy. As one YOT practitioner puts it:

I think, it only goes with the sexual health thing […] when we discuss it with the lads, it's always about, you know 'are you taking responsibility? So that you don't end up getting a girl pregnant' […] whereas with the girls, it's like 'are you protecting yourself against, you know are you being protected?' It's like that kind of thing, look after women, look after girls when it comes to that and almost try and constrain the lads […] so it's a whole kind of different grasp of things that you would actually cover, if you know what I mean (M13).

This is to say that, while the majority of YOT practitioners do not appear to think that their work with young men does or should incorporate a male-specific approach to address gender-specific needs, they frequently mention how they adapt a different approach with girls, in particular on the example of sexual health. Young women are not only understood as a minority group with specific needs, some of them understood through ideas around female bodies within the dichotomy of male-female bodies and discreetly assigned features (Butler, 2011; Foucault, 1992), but also identified as being vulnerable, a characteristic that is largely absent from the YOT practitioners' construction of the localised hegemonic masculinity of the young

men with whom they work. The young women's gender is understood as generating specific needs and justifying at least some differential treatment in practice, while young men are seen as the norm and similar characteristics which have been identified by YOT practitioners as young men's display of masculinity (see chapter 5) are implicitly ascribed to them by practitioners, most obviously the seeming absence of vulnerability.

Chapter five briefly discussed how some YOT practitioners appear to accommodate the young men's perceived inability to articulate their feelings and vulnerability, and chapter six touched on how fathers and peers of those young men are understood by practitioners to have a 'working consensus' (Goffman, 1990), while mothers are seen as complicit in the display and the performance of masculinity (Krias and Marston William, 2000). In relation to at least some YOT practitioners, it emerges that similar elements entered into their work with young men in the sense that negative masculinity was reinforced (Wright and Cowburn, 2011) through an understanding of the young men as 'sexual aggressor', and the complimentary portrayal of young women as needing 'to be protected'. While chapter five emphasised how some practitioners adapted to the young men's unwillingness or inability 'to talk about' their issues, the understanding of young men here as aggressors reaches beyond 'letting men off' (Featherstone et al., 2007: 44) because of that unwillingness, inability, or potential trauma.

Hearn (2010) argues that the lack of discussion of gender in social policy further contributes to the gendering of individuals in practice and policy. Using the example of this YOT it becomes evident that the lack of discussion and awareness around issues of masculinity result in the young men being portrayed largely along distinct lines of specific displays and a discrete performance of localised hegemonic masculinity. The initial lack of discussion and awareness of issues around masculinity (and masculinity and offending) leads to the failure to incorporate such issues in practice with young men. Hence, young men are not only constructed along those lines of localised hegemonic masculinity, but are also worked with accordingly, which means as 'normal' and thereby with an absence of specific (gendered) needs.

Numerous authors (Featherstone et al., 2007; Good and Brooks, 2005; Kiselica, 2005; Ruxton, 2009; Wexler, 2009) emphasise the importance of male-friendly approaches in group and individual work with men across a range of services and criminal justice services in particular (Buckley, 1996; Burnham et al., 1990; Dominelli, 1992; Johnstone, 2001; Scourfield, 1998; Taylor, 2003), but a conscious consideration of issues in association with masculinity appears to be largely absent from the work of young men, based on the example of this YOT.

This absence is particularly striking when considering the intervention activities offered to young people. Data on these activities was mainly collected from the case diaries held on young people. These case diaries are filled in by staff on the ISS team as those are responsible for organising such activities. The vast majority of these activities consist of 'gym sessions' and 'boxing', namely physical exercise. Other activities are described as 'fishing', 'paintballing', 'golf' and 'playing pool'. Gill, Henwood and McLean (2005) discuss how for the young men and boys in their study 'going to the gym' serves to regulate normative masculinity and assists men in policing 'their own and other men's bodies and identities (Gill et al., 2005: 23), and Anderson (2012) underlines the central role sports and team sports play in the construction of masculinity. These authors echo what Parker (1996) has discussed as the exercise of hegemonic masculinity through 'sex-appropriate sports participation' (Parker, 1996: 127). In other words, despite the lack of inclusion of aspects of masculinity in the assessment and intervention work with young men at this YOT, it appears that a high number of intervention activities are designed around values of hegemonic, or what Anderson (2012) would call 'orthodox', masculinity with very specific and gender-segregated intervention activities with a focus on disciplining the body (Parker, 1996), and regulating (Anderson, 2012) and policing masculinity (Gill et al., 2005). Here a strong element of monitoring masculinity recurs (as discussed in chapter six), though not in the form of peers but the individual young men themselves. At the beginning of chapter six, YOT practitioners describe using the examples of two young men how 'dancing' and 'drama' are dropped as hobbies by those young men out of fear that they would be marginalised by their male peers. This is identified as similar in the case of interventions as one YOT practitioner

explains:

Recently I took them paintballing, took a couple of lads, again no females are looked at, it was an all male group. Sometimes badminton, but that's quite unusual because most of the lads when I suggested badminton, it was kind of like ' I am not playing badminton, that's for fairies' (F22).

Localised hegemonic values of masculinity are thereby confirmed through 'male-specific' focus on the body and with an inherent element of aggression through sports such as the gym, boxing and paintballing. There is a profound contrast of not consciously including (or being aware of) issues around masculinity in association with specific needs, on the one hand, and the organisation of intervention activities around central values of this localised hegemonic masculinity, on the other. Intervention activities continue to assist in policing and monitoring masculinity, rather than challenging it or addressing issues associated with it in terms of both needs and offending behaviour, and thereby aid to reinforce localised hegemonic values of masculinity. Scourfield (2002) suggests that challenging masculinity may be at odds with mainstream social work ethics and values, whereby the focus is on respecting and accepting the client. However, this discussion of tensions between practice and social work values and ethics is absent from YOT practitioners' explanation why gendered activities are on offer, rather focusing on the capacity to engage young men. One YOT practitioner explains:

I think […] we have to work with what the young person wants to do. So if you are going to fill their week, fill it with activities, it can't just be things they don't want to do, otherwise you lose them, they won't be interested (M13).

This is also evident in activities with young women, which mainly focus around 'hair and beauty' and 'cross-stitching' (F20). While YOT practitioners acknowledge that there are a few examples of young women wanting to do boxing and one young man wanting to do 'hair and beauty', intervention activities remain largely gendered.

Summary

Chapter seven has highlighted the centrality of YOT practitioners' constructions of masculinity in the way they understand young men to commit crime. These constructions of YOT practitioners of localised hegemonic masculinity are deeply tied up with their explanation for the young men's offending behaviour. While this offending behaviour is understood as equally learnt as masculinity from families, and in particular fathers, peers provide the arena for this behaviour to be encouraged through the performance of localised hegemonic masculinity. Individual offending behaviour of the young men is thereby explained by YOT practitioners as resulting from an emotionally stressful relationship with the young men's mothers or girlfriends and the consumption of alcohol as a coping strategy, whereby lowered impulse control and aggressive and violent behaviours result in offending. Offending amongst peers, however, is understood by YOT practitioners as a result of the young men wanting to prove their masculinity and gain peer respect. Chapter seven summarises the findings of chapters five and six and concludes that, although YOT practitioners identify distinct practices of masculinity as central to the young men's offending behaviour, they do not consider the inclusion of ideas of masculinity in their intervention work or the assessment of young men as necessary. In spite of intervention activities being centered around young men's bodies and the regulation, policing and thereby reinforcing of localised hegemonic masculinity, YOT practitioners do not explicitly understand ideas of masculinity as necessary to consider when working with young men. Chapter eight will discuss the findings of this chapter and chapters five and six.

Part III

Chapter 8:
Constructions of Masculinity and Youth Justice Practice-
Key Findings, Discussion and Reflections

Introduction

Chapters five, six and seven present the findings of this study and use the sociological theories presented in chapters two and three to explore the ways young men are made sense of in relation to their masculinity and their masculinity and law breaking by YOT practitioners. This chapter summarises key elements of the findings of this thesis and discusses underlying assumptions and potential implications. It concludes with theoretical and personal reflections as well as reflections on research methods.

8.1 YOT Practitioners' Constructions of Masculinity: Key Themes

Gender Display and Habitus

The behaviours through which masculinity is constructed have here been explained through the framework of Goffman's (2007) idea of gender display as a distinct set of characteristics associated with one gender rather than another. The display of distinct behaviours of masculinity is one of the most dominant themes in this study; Goffman's has been particularly helpful in theorising the way in which YOT practitioners construct masculinity as it allows the association of distinct behaviours with masculinity, on the one hand, while potentially being able to accommodate seemingly contradictory characteristics through the idea of front and back regions as outlined in chapter three, and put in context of the data analysis in chapter five. Elliot (2003) and Lawler (2008) have pointed out how Goffman's (1990) theory and the idea of 'impression management' (Lawler, 2008: 107) and the ability of social agents for 'strategic manipulation of impressions' (Elliott, 2003: 32) allow for agency of individuals. However, the idea of agency of the young men with whom practitioners work at this YOT is largely absent from the data collected for this study, despite their YOT practitioners' implicit association of masculinity and autonomy discussed in chapter five. Masculinity of these young men is dominantly constructed

alongside very discrete gendered behaviours. In particular chapter five identifies these characteristics.

The display of specific gendered behaviour and resulting practices of masculinity has been captured as *male habitus*, whereby the young men are understood as drawing on their masculine capital as cultural and social resource and currency in social interaction (Anderson, 2012). The use of Bourdieu's (1986; 2001; 2005) concept of habitus and social and cultural capital is useful as it stresses the way in which YOT practitioners understand the young men's behaviour as a very specific 'durable manner of standing, speaking and thereby of feeling and thinking' (Bourdieu, 2005: 93-94). The idea of reference groups (Bourdieu, 2001; 2005; Clausen, 1968; Goffman, 1990; 2007), which appears throughout the literature of chapter two plays a key role in both the way practitioners understand the young men to have learnt masculinity and the way they perform it, and will be discussed below in regard to the reference groups of families and peers.

Similar to criticisms articulated in chapter three in relation to Bourdieu's concept of habitus, social structure is implicitly ascribed to the young men as unreflectively reproduced (Webb et al., 2002) without consideration of their individual agency. Moreover, utilising the idea of male habitus, masculinity of the young men is constructed by YOT practitioners within the frame of discrete cultural rules in a specific social and geographical context (Connell and Messerschmidt, 2005) whereby distinct features associated with masculinity are naturalised in the young men's practices (Bourdieu, 2005; Goffman, 1990) and their performances of masculinity (Butler, 1988; 1990; West and Zimmerman, 1987). The relevance given to the locality and socio-economic position by YOT practitioners implicitly links their construction of the young men's masculinity to a wider social structure. However, the explicit discussion of other structural elements is not only absent in relation to ideas around patriarchal structures and the young men's practices of masculinity (Bourdieu, 2001; Connell, 1987; 2005a; 2005b), but also with regard to their law-breaking (Hobbs, 1994; Messerschmidt, 1997; Muncie, 1999b; Newburn, 2007; White and Cunneen, 2006).

Policing Localised Hegemonic Masculinity

As discussed in chapter five, Connell and Messerschmidt (2005) stress the importance of understanding masculinities in their cultural and geographic context, and Wedgwood (2009) stresses the main strength of this contextualisation to be the capacity to account for different masculinities and understand masculinities in the context of one another. The young men's performance of localised hegemonic masculinity is the second key theme in this study. YOT practitioners' constructions of the young men's masculinity are closely linked to the young men's socio-economic position and geographical location. The performance of localised hegemonic masculinity here is not understood as optional, but compulsory and closely policed by peers. It is not understood as one possible form of masculinity available to the young men, but seen as the only form of masculinity these young men have at their disposal. The term *localised hegemonic masculinity* (Messerschmidt, 2012b) has been employed as it captures the very distinct behaviour associated with masculinity by practitioners at this YOT in relation to its close tie to the locality of the young men and the hegemonic status it is understood to possess among young men.

Three elements are central here in allowing the application of Connell's concept of hegemonic masculinity: (A) the young men's performance of masculinity in reference to their mothers, which help to uncover the inherent power relations and subject positions created along gendered lines and implicit ideas around the patriarchy; (B) the strong element of one particular of masculinity being hegemonic, evident in the way it is policed by peers and understood as the only form of masculinity culturally accepted and legitimised ; and (C) the idea of having to fight actively against this form of hegemonic masculinity to create space for other forms of masculinity (Connell, 2005b).

The prominent explanation for aggressive and violent behaviour of young men at this YOT lies in the context of their performance of localised hegemonic masculinity and the policing of the same by male peers. Aggression and violence are understood as performances of 'legitimate' masculinity with their peers monitoring and policing

these performances and acting as reference group (Goffman, 1990). Hence, the 'working consensus' (Goffman, 1990: 97) on performing masculinity of the young men and their peers is translated by YOT practitioners as the young men being aggressive and violent as part of being tough and expressing masculinity. In turn, displaying masculinity along the lines of toughness, aggression and violent behaviour is understood by YOT practitioners as an attempt by the young men to gain kudos and respect amongst their peers, while the non-compliance with this form of localised hegemonic masculinity is not seen as being an option.

The elements of aggression and violence form a further key element in YOT practitioners' construction of masculinity (discussed in more detail below) and are linked to two specific aspects within this understanding of localised hegemonic masculinity: the geographical location of the young men (as mentioned above), that is the concomitant importance of the consumption of alcohol as further part of 'normative' masculinity linked to the young men's geographic and socio-economic locality. This is particularly interesting as 'social class' is not explicitly associated by YOT practitioners with the young men's masculinity (Morgan, 2005), but their environment of 'council estates' and their geographical position in the North East of England are given importance throughout the data collected. In other words, structural dimensions to the YOT practitioners' construction of masculinity are visible in the data, and masculinity is constructed within the local context of the young men with whom they work.

Although YOT practitioners acknowledge that they work with some young men who do not entirely conform to this particular form of localised hegemonic masculinity, these young men's non-conformity is allocated to 'back regions' (Goffman, 1990). It is not seen as part of the young men's masculinity, nor does it appear to cause YOT practitioners to widen their construction of masculinity or acknowledge multiplicity of masculinities of the young men with whom they work. Indeed, divergences from this particular localised hegemonic masculinity in the young men's practice are seen as 'feminine' by male peers. Not only mean that the young men's practices are clearly defined in opposition to femininity (Bourdieu, 2001), but also that the

construction of the young men's masculinity derives from an association with their heterosexuality (Butler, 1990). Hence, being masculine is constructed within the binary of heterosexual subject positions and hetero-normative masculinity (Ingraham, 2002; Wittig, 2002), and the young men are understood by YOT practitioners as associating deviations in practice from this masculinity as 'feminine' or 'homosexual'. This is to say that the young men's subordination of homosexuality and femininity are central elements in the way YOT practitioners understand the young men's masculinity.

Violence, Aggression, and Conflict Resolutions

The omnipresence of violence (Mullins, 2006) in the lives of the young men with whom they work is central to the YOT practitioners' construction of masculinity, whereby aggressive and violent behaviour is largely understood as either the result of distinct gendered behaviour or the source for it. The young men's expression of violent and aggressive behaviour is identified as associated with masculinity (Cohn, 1991; De Keseredy and Schwartz, 2005; Hanmer and Maynard, 1987; Hatty, 2000; Heiliger and Engelfried, 1995; Mooney, 2000; Morgan, 1987; Wilson and Daly, 1985) and their inability to control their temper and impulses is cited as an explanation for aggressive and violent behaviour as a gendered reaction to frustration (Berkowitz, 1989; Boehnisch and Winter, 1993; Hatty, 2000; Malamuth et al., 1993). Aggression and violent behaviour are understood by practitioners at this YOT as the main behaviour available to young men in reaction to conflict situations. Hatty (2000) stresses how violence and aggression are utilised by mainly disempowered young men as their gendered response to conflict situations and sets this response in the context of structural inequalities. However, structural inequalities do not explicitly enter YOT practitioners' explanations for aggressive and violent behaviour. Aggression and violence are rather seen as the only responses available to young men without practitioners giving explicit importance to class or differentiating between masculinities. Equally, the expression of aggression and violence in conflict situations is not explicitly associated with the lack of access to alternative coping strategies (Boehnisch and Winter, 1993; De Keseredy and Schwartz, 2005), but as integral to it (Crick et al., 1996; Lui and Kaplan, 2004). While the bodily practices

young men may bring to this YOT are discussed in more detail below (and in the reflections) there is the question of how similar the stories of young men at this YOT in relation to both socio-economic background and the utilisation of violence are for YOT practitioners not to differentiate between them. The idea of agency, again, does not surface in connection with aggression or violence as a response to conflict situations.

Young Men and their Families

Key reference groups in the learning and the performance of masculinity are the young men's families and their peers. Although YOT practitioners identify mothers as the prime guardian of the young men with whom they work, mothers only become visible in interviews and Assets in relation to the performance of masculinity and not the attainment of male identity. This means that the role of mothers in how the young men attain masculinity (Robb, 2010) is largely lacking from interviews, the focus groups, Assets and case diaries. This is particularly surprising since fathers are predominantly absent from the young men's lives. Central to the way in which YOT practitioners understand the young men to have learned masculinity is their experience of violence perpetrated by fathers and the transfer of violent and aggressive behaviour as male capital from father to son (Marsiglio and Cohan, 2000). Similar to the discussion of locality of the young men and their socio-economic situation as enacted in their masculinity, this learning of masculinity by sons from fathers appears to lack any attribution of the ability of the young men to reflect and possess active agency, and the process of transference of male codes of behaviour (Harris, 1995a) emerges as 'relatively shallow' (Parke, 2000: 48). Moreover, YOT practitioners seem to understand fathers, like the young people themselves, without accounting for multiplicity and heterogeneity (Featherstone, 2009; Lamb, 2000; Lupton and Barclay, 1997; Parke, 2000) and indeed the attainment of masculinity by young men in families not as the result of the coproduction (Robb, 2010) of masculinity by mothers and fathers, but solely as a one-way process between fathers and sons. The 'gender codes' (Harris, 1995a: 9) which are seen as learnt from fathers almost exclusively cluster around negative connotations of masculinity (Collier, 1998), and the learning of masculinity is implicitly set into a social learning (Bandura,

1973; 1977; Bandura and Walters, 1963) and socialisation context (Clausen, 1968; Parsons, 1951).

Mothers of the young men become most visible in this study in the context of the performance of masculinity of the young men. While little evidence derives from interviews, the focus group, Assets and case diaries as to the attainment of masculinity of the young men through their mothers (Robb, 2010), the main element emerging from the way YOT practitioners describe the interaction between mothers and sons or comment on the role of mothers is through their 'complicity' (Krias and Marston William, 2000: 58) in the young men's performance of masculinity. It is here that the element of structural gendered relations of power (Bourdieu, 2001; Connell, 1987; 2005b) surfaces and gendered dimension of power allow the practice of localised hegemonic masculinity. Gendered power as a male asset becomes central to how physical altercations between mothers and sons are interpreted and clear subject positions are assigned (Krias and Marston William, 2000) to mothers and sons, whereby the young men are predominantly understood as perpetrators and mothers as victims. Elements of social agency on the part of the young men remain absent.

8.2 YOT Practitioners' Constructions of Masculinity:

Occupational Discourse and YOT Practitioners' Sense-Making

Chapter two briefly discusses the circumstances in which social work and YOT practitioners are understood to construct their clients' masculinity, in particular in the context of social work and the masculinisation of risk. Before elaborating on the potential implications of YOT practitioners' constructions of masculinity for youth justice practice and the young men themselves, it is important to return to this discussion, and embed the findings of this thesis within it.

Occupational Discourse

Scourfield (2003) attributes importance to the 'occupational discourse' (Scourfield, 2003: 31) and 'organisational limits' (Scourfield, 2003: 33) in relation to how social

workers construct their clients' gender. In relation to youth justice practice, Phoenix (2009) and Smith (2011a) stress how set responses and the pre-occupation with risk and the assessment of risk of young people restricts the ways in which practitioners can make sense of young people with whom they work. On the other hand, both Baker (2005) and Phoenix (2009) suggest that there is some professional scope as to the way in which YOT practitioners assess young people and make sense of their offending behaviour.

Restrictions in relation to how YOT practitioners construct the masculinity of young men with whom they work become most obvious in Assets. The set format of those documents and their purpose of assessing risk limits the ways in which YOT practitioners can make sense of the young people and their offending behaviour, and leaves restricted scope for their own professional understanding of the young person who is being assessed. The format of Assets restricts the explanation of offending behaviour and the assessment of risk links their behaviour to clear categories such as families, the criminal histories of family members, neighbourhood, living arrangements, personal relationships, education, substance and alcohol misuse, attitudes to offending and so forth. In particular, the reliance on families in explaining offending encourages ideas of socialisation and social learning as outlined in chapter three, and forms a vital part in explanations of offending behaviours of young people by YOT practitioners. Equally, the implicit importance given to fathers in relation to offending behaviour (Youth Justice Board, 2005a), resurfaces in YOT practitioners' construction of masculinity, and masculinity and offending. This is to say, it is evident in the data analysis and the discussion of the findings in relation to interviews and the focus group in the foregoing chapters that some of these categories build the main pillars of YOT practitioners' construction of masculinity, and masculinity and offending. In particular, families, personal relationships and substance and alcohol misuse play a vital part in how practitioners understand young men's offending, and highly influence YOT practitioners' own sense making of the young people with whom they work beyond the assessment of risk. Moreover, as discussed in relation to the masculinisation of risk in chapter two, the implicit links made in Assets between risk and offending and masculinity infiltrate the way in

which YOT practitioners themselves link masculinity and offending in interviews and the focus group. Here the relationship between what are understood to be key behavioural factors of offending, such as aggression, hyperactivity, impulsiveness, lack of impulse control and the need for excitement (Youth Justice Board, 2006), which in the academic literature have clearly been linked to masculinity, are deeply embedded in the ways YOT practitioners construct offending behaviour, and in turn link offending behaviour and masculinity.

Smith (2011b), among others, comments on the tensions between welfare and punishment approaches in youth justice practice and policy, and these tensions are particularly visible in Assets completed by YOT practitioners. With its main focus being on assessing the risk of a young person for subsequent sanction and intervention, issues around vulnerability and mental and emotional health are given little consideration. This is in spite of knowledge available on the traumatic histories of some of these young people as assessed individuals, and research that indicates the extent to which young people in contact with youth justice services have experienced abuse (Day et al., 2008). This makes the limitation of work practices (Scourfield, 2003) within youth justice particularly obvious, and highlights again its main purpose as assessing risk within a particular narrative.

It has been argued that the youth justice system fails vulnerable young offenders (Nacro, 2011; O'Hara, 2013), and the focus on risk (Nacro, 2011) and the concentration on a particular discourse of offending can be seen as one of the ways in which issues of vulnerability do not appear to be explicitly incorporated by YOT practitioners in the work with young people who are in contact with the youth justice system. If Assets are understood as reflecting the main elements of the discourse on offending behaviour, then the absence of such discussion can be seen as the result of a particular occupational discourse restricting practice, rather than the lack of consideration of individual YOT practitioners. However, as pointed out in chapter five, issues around vulnerability and mental health appear to receive fairly little explicit attention in the ways in which YOT practitioners construct the masculinity of the young men with whom they work as a result of the gendered roles (Fineman,

2010) through which young men are understood, whereby masculinity is associated with autonomy and disassociated from vulnerability. So, while it is clear in the data collected mainly from interviews that the occupational discourse within YOT practice restricts the way masculinity and indeed young people who are in touch with the YJS can be constructed, the construction of one particular set of homogeneous male practices may also be linked to the practitioners' own perceptions of gender and masculinity.

'Organisational limits' (Scourfield, 2003: 33) also emerge in relation to issues around mental health and vulnerability of young people in contact with youth justice services. Although YOTs may be multi-disciplinary agencies and thereby have access to a diversity of services (Dugmore, 2006b) to support young people who have been identified as having committed a criminal offence, their main purpose is to reduce youth offending and prevent re-offending. As explained by the discussion on the discourse in youth justice practice (chapters two, seven and above), and reflected in the way Assets make sense of offending behaviour, their reliance on specific behavioural traits which are seen to be linked to offending, limit the scope of YOT practitioners' assessment of and dealing with young people. This is to say that unless mental health issues and the idea of vulnerability are directly incorporated in the way offending is understood, it will remain difficult for practitioners to assess and consequently address those issues in their work practices. Equally, the exploration of gendered conceptions in relation to vulnerability as a whole, and specifically mental health issues and learning disabilities can assist in opening up ways for practitioners to deconstruct gendered dimensions to their ideas of dependency, autonomy and vulnerability. In particular, one YOT practitioner points out the restrictions in assessing mental health issues in the YOT's practice and clearly links those restrictions to issues around masculinity.

Tensions between occupational discourse and work practices in which practitioners find themselves also become visible in relation to other aspects of their work. Chapter seven emphasises the YOT practitioners' resistance to articulating young people's needs and the assessment of young people through issues around gender,

on the one hand, while clearly attributing specific characteristics of offending behaviour to masculinity, on the other. Scourfield (2003) elaborates on the difficulties of YOT practitioners in accepting distinct gendered behaviours in their practice, while treating each client as individual. The initial focus of YOT practitioners on individual needs rather than through a stereotyped understanding of them as belonging to a homogeneous group such as 'young men' or indeed 'offenders' reflects how deeply practitioners at this YOT incorporate traditional social work values (Scourfield, 2003), and indeed care about the young people with whom they work. The subsequent allocation of discrete characteristics in relation to offending, and in particular male offending behaviour, however, underlines the internalisation of the very specific occupational discourse and work practices of YOT practitioners, and the ways used to explain offending behaviour within this discourse. As discussed in chapter two and throughout this thesis, the occupational discourse on offending in youth justice practice implicitly associates discrete behavioural traits with offending, and these specific characteristics are widely linked in the academic literature with issues around masculinity. So, while practitioners at this YOT may set out to treat and assess young people as individuals, work practices, the occupational discourse, and, not least, the purpose of YOTs and the practitioners' roles within them highly restrict the way they assess and deal with young people not only in relation to individual needs but also in regard to gendered needs. Particularly the focus on assessment categories such as neighbourhoods and families, the underlying assumption in intervention of personal agency and the possibility to change and influence offending behaviour by the young person create an ideological contrast.

YOT Practitioners' Sense-Making

Within these limitations, however, is evidence of YOT practitioners' own sense making (Phoenix, 2009) and their professional discretion (Baker, 2005). Although YOT practitioners apply set categories (Smith, 2011a) in their constructions of young people within the occupational discourse, work practices and organisational limits (Scourfield, 2003), specific connections between those categories are made by

practitioners themselves at this YOT. This is particularly obvious in the way YOT practitioners engage in a narrative of offending behaviour and the reason for its occurrence. The most dominant of these narratives revolves around masculinity and the way in which young people engage in offending behaviour as a result of wanting to prove their masculinity among peers, and as the result of their inability to cope with emotionally stressful situations.

Great importance is given to the function of peers as a reference group (Bandura and Walters, 1963; Block, 1976a; Bourdieu, 2005; Butler, 1990; Clausen, 1968; Goffman, 1990) and their role in monitoring the performance (Bourdieu, 1986; Goffman, 1990; Lemert and Branaman, 1997) of legitimate masculinity (Butler, 1990; Ingraham, 2002; Wittig, 2002). As discussed in chapter six, the quest for kudos and respect is seen as central to why young men engage in aggressive, violent and offending behaviour among and with peers. This means that while aggressive, violent and offending behaviour are understood in the context of socialisation in the family and from family members with a history of criminal involvement in line with the discourse offered by Assets, the expression of such behaviour by young men is directly set into the context of offending and their wanting to prove their masculinity among peers. As stressed throughout this thesis, although being male is implicitly understood as a risk factor for offending (Youth Justice Board, 2005a), no explicit connection is made between offending and issues around masculinity in Assets. YOT practitioners link the ideas of low self-esteem and the necessity of the young men to prove their masculinity to offending. Here the young men's low self-esteem is understood as the source of their wanting to prove their masculinity, embedded in a wider local culture of masculinity in which fighting and the excessive consumption of alcohol are seen as normative working class masculinity (Canaan, 1996; Mullins, 2006; Winlow, 2002).

The construction of offending behaviour of young men on their own and away from peers illustrates how YOT practitioners link specific categories within the discourse and connect those to issues around masculinity which are not explicit in this discourse. The narrative by YOT practitioners here begins with an emotional stressful

situation for the young man in the form of either an argument with a girlfriend or mother, and the young man's lack of coping mechanisms beyond the expression of anger through aggression and violence (Adams and Coltrane, 2005; Hatty, 2000) and in response to frustration (Berkowitz, 1989; Malamuth et al., 1993; Malamuth and Thornhill, 1994) as male coping strategy (Boehnisch and Winter, 1993; Hatty, 2000). The consumption of alcohol again plays a central role in how YOT practitioners understand the lead-up to offending behaviour, and is seen as both a coping mechanism in the absence of alternative strategies and as responsible for lowering impulse and temper control. Both narratives in which YOT practitioners construct the young men's offending behaviour bear distinct elements of the occupational discourse of youth justice practice as evident in Assets and discussed above. However, the ways in which these elements are connected and form two distinct narratives of male offending can be seen as the result of the practitioners own sense-making. This is particularly evident in the explicit role masculinity plays in those narratives. While the first narrative directly appoints masculinity as the explanation for offending behaviour, the latter explicitly holds issues around masculinity, here the lack of alternative coping strategies other than the consumption of alcohol and the display of violence and aggression, as key to explaining young men's offending behaviour.

Although the ways in which practitioners at this YOT construct the masculinity of the young men with whom they work has to be seen through the lens which the occupational discourse provides, their work practices and organisational limits (Scourfield, 2003), the functions of YOTs and the practitioners' role within it, YOT practitioners do construct particular narratives within this discourse. In this, construction of narratives issues around a very specific form of masculinity play a key role, albeit not explicit in the discourse itself. Although masculinity is appointed centrality in these constructions, issues in connection with masculinity, or indeed masculinities, are not linked into the various aspects of assessment or the actual intervention work with young people, the potential effects of which will be discussed in more detail below.

Essentialised Practice and Gender Ideologies

It is at the intersection of the dominant occupational discourse and practitioners'
own sense-making where the key arguments of this thesis are best illustrated. The
underlying gender ideologies of Asset categories, whereby offending is associated
with behaviours which in the literature have been linked to boys and men rather
than to girls and women, result in 'essentialised gendered concepts' in the
assessment of young people. Through these essentialised concepts homogenous
gender identities of the young men are socially constructed by practitioners along
the lines of stereotypical male traits, and result in essentialised gendered practice. It
is here where the highly gendered nature of youth justice (Dominelli, 2002b)
becomes obvious, and the lack of explicit discussion around masculinity contributes
to the gendering of young men (Hearn, 2010) in youth justice practice at this YOT.

The dominant occupational discourse in youth justice, represented through specific
Asset categories, appears to have filtered through into practitioners' own sense-
making. It becomes difficult to disentangle exactly how much of practitioners' own
sense-making is the result of this dominant discourse and how much it is linked to
their own non-professional understanding of gender identities (wright and Cowburn,
2011). The tension between set categories (Smith, 2011a; Phoenix, 2009) and
practitioners' professional discretion (Baker, 2005) in how they explain young men's
offending behaviour appears to remain to some extent. However, the great overlap
between gendered categories in Asset and practitioners' sense-making suggests that
it is these categories from which essentialised gendered practice derive rather than
from the practitioners themselves.

The constraints in how practitioners are able to construct the young men with whom
they work within Asset documents are particularly obvious in the discussion in
chapter 7.4. Here practitioners state both how Assets dictate the way in which they
assess the young men with whom they work and how the lack of professional
training around gender issues leaves them with little awareness of how to
contextualise gender in the assessment of and the work with young people. While
the apparent strengths of such set categories enables practitioners to assess the

young men with whom they work along the lines of what has been identified as being associated with offending by government agencies, the dominant discourse on what causes offending behaviour has been met with much criticism in relation to the criminalisation and the pathologising of both young and disadvantaged people (Armitage, 2012; Creany, 2013; Dominelli, 2002b; Garside, 2009; Pitts, 2001; Robins et al., 2008). The weaknesses of this approach, however, appear to be plentiful in the context of this thesis and its discussion on masculinity and youth justice practice. These weaknesses have been identified as resulting in essentialised gendered practice, the reinforcement of hegemonic gender ideologies, and the exclusion of gender-specific practice, whereby gendered needs of individuals go unaddressed in assessment and intervention. On a broader scale, it has emerged from the interview data that other potentially relevant areas in assessment and practice are equally neglected through the set discourse and its implicit exclusion of alternative explanations of offending, assessment and intervention, such as mental health. Although the currently piloted revised version of Asset, AssetPlus (Youth Justice Board, 2013), has been restructured to allow more space for practitioners' professional discretion in the assessment of young people, it is difficult to see how this will change the way in which young people are assessed more generally and in relation to issues around gender in particular. Data from this research project suggests that practitioners rely on training around issues which are not inherently part of the assessment process, such as gender, to increase their awareness, and have worked within the restrictions of the old Asset document for eight years now. Without more training in issues around gender and practical guidance on how to accommodate identity markers such as gender, ethnicity, social class and many others into both the assessment of and the intervention work with young people, there is likely to be little change as the result of the re-structured assessment framework.

8.3 Young Men's Bodily Practices

Scourfield (2003) stresses, using the example of gender constructions in child protection, that 'one would not expect an infinite number of gender constructions, since social workers are responding to material reality and men's actual bodily practices' (Scourfield, 2003: 88). This idea of men's bodily practices poses some interesting questions as to how much the construction of young men's masculinity by YOT practitioners is a reflection of the practices of the young men themselves.

Studies on the construction of gender in the wider arena of social work, such as those by Scourfield (2003; 2001; 2002) and Cowburn (2005; 2010; 2001; 2011), have taken place from the perspective of social workers and the ways in which they construct masculinity in a particular institutional setting and within a specific role. While they have informed this research and provide a great insight into how masculinity, and indeed gender, are constructed in these settings, less attention is paid to the actual practices of the men whose masculinity is constructed by practitioners. Similarly, the focus of this thesis is on YOT practitioners' construction of masculinity, rather than on the practices of the young men with whom they work. However, the relevance given to the bodies of young men by some YOT practitioners (see chapters five and six), and the discrepancy between how their bodies were constructed and the researcher's observation of the young men and their bodies, suggest that at least some elements of YOT practitioners' constructions are not simply an unfiltered reflection of the young men's practices. Instead, YOT practitioners within a particular discourse, an institutional function and specific professional role interpret those practices, whereby some elements of the behaviour and practices of young men are given more relevance than others.

Evidence of YOT practitioners' attribution of importance to certain elements rather than others runs through this thesis. This is particularly relevant in the way aggressive and violent behaviours are ascribed great importance in the context of the young men's offending behaviour, while their potential vulnerability and these biographies and experiences as a whole are less attended in these constructions. This

becomes most obvious when considering the profiles initially created on the young people in this study at the end of chapter four, and reflecting on which elements of these stories have filtered through into the constructions of their masculinity, and which elements have not. The profiles of young people whose documents were analysed for this thesis suggest that their stories are much more complex than implied by the construction of their masculinity by YOT practitioners, especially in Assets and case diaries.

Indeed, while some studies have considered the experiences of young people in contact with youth justice services (Voice, 2011), there is much more scope for research on the young men's constructions of masculinity or indeed masculinities in the YJS, their actual practices and their experience with and of masculinity or masculinities and the integration of other research which highlights the ambiguous relationship young men have with masculinity and masculinities (Pollack, 2000; 2006; Seidler, 2006; Smiler, 2013). This new research and the integration of already existing research on young men and boys is necessary in order to determine to what extent the actual practices of masculinity of young men are similar to or different from the way in which YOT practitioners construct their masculinity. Although there may not be an infinite number of possible constructions of masculinity given the very specific geographic and socio-economic position of those young men and the limitations practitioners meet in their constructions of masculinity as discussed above, it is hard to imagine that all the young men with whom YOT practitioners work construct masculinity along the same lines and exclusively around discrete male practices. Indeed, De Viggiani (2012) argues on the example of prisons that the performance of particular masculinities is deeply embedded in which masculinities men are able to perform in particular institutional settings. Practitioners need to be enabled to both understand wider issues of masculinities as well as creating a space in which young men feel that 'both their strengths and vulnerabilities are good […] and that they are genuinely accepted 'for being just the boys they really are' (Pollack, 2006: 195).

8.4 Implications for Youth Justice Practice

Masculinity, Masculinities and Power

What does this mean in relation to the work of YOT practitioners with young men? The most profound implication for youth justice practice in relation to the findings of this study lies with the singularity with which masculinity is constructed and what the elements of this construction mean for the intervention work with young men. The lack of heterogeneity in the construction of masculinity and its close relationship with what practitioners describe as normative masculinity for the area in which the YOT is located generates a number of questions:

If young men in this area are seen as not having access to masculinities other than what has been described here as localised hegemonic masculinity, and this masculinity is deeply tied up with the reasons for young men's offending, then how effective can any intervention be through working only with individual men? Furthermore, the paradox of practitioners identifying direct connections between the young men's masculinity and their offending behaviour, yet the lack of explicit intervention targeting those issues around masculinity stand in stark contrast to one another. If the performance of alternative forms of masculinities by the young men would meet the 'disapproval' of their peers, there is little room left for designing intervention that could address their offending behaviour constructively. If indeed this form of localised hegemonic masculinity is so dominant in the young men's lives, then any intervention on the level of individual young men would not be fruitful as their practices are understood to be embedded in the wider frame of their socialisation within families and their performances amongst peers. This would mean that any intervention with the aim of reducing offending behaviour would not only need to have issues around masculinity as its prime focus, but also necessitate an integration of individuals from whom the young person is understood to have learnt socially to embody a particular kind of masculinity, and with whom the young men are understood to engage in performances of this localised hegemonic masculinity. This kind of intervention would need to reach far beyond the assessment of risk of re-offending of the young men, and would address much wider issues around coping

strategies, role models and aggression and violent behaviour, while at the same time being able to integrate the actual experiences of young men (Seidler, 2006) and allow room to understand them as perpetrators as well as victims (Smith, 2009). Essential to such an approach is an understanding of masculinities and their potential heterogeneity by both practitioners and young men, and an inclusion of ways in which young men can engage positively in the performance of masculinities through the incorporation of male friendly approaches (Featherstone et al., 2007; Good and Brooks, 2005; Kiselica, 2005; Ruxton, 2002; Ruxton, 2009; Wright and Cowburn, 2011). This, of course, would require the integration of a welfare approach into the work of youth justice as suggested by Smith (2009; 2011a; 2011b) and could be informed by some of the work around young men that is already taking place on a very small scale such as the work of the Geese Theatre Company around young men and fatherhood (see: http://www.justice.gov.uk/youth-justice/effective-practice-library/geese-theatre-company).

Additionally, the absence of heterogeneity in YOT practitioners' constructions of masculinity neglects any dimension of hierarchies of masculinities and does not contextualise masculinities and power-relations in terms of both interaction between men and men, and women and men (Connell, 2005b). Anti-oppressive and feminist social work (Dominelli, 2002a; 2002b; Morgan, 1992; Pringle, 1995) can assist here in informing the work with men as men and addressing their specific issues within an understanding of the role masculinity plays with regard to their mental and physical health (Featherstone et al., 2007; Galdas et al., 2005; Hearn and Kolga, 2006; White et al., 2011), their education (Alloway and Gilbert, 2010; Martino and Berrill, 2003; Weaver- Hightower, 2004), their coping strategies (Boehnisch and Winter, 1993; Gadd, 2000; Hatty, 2000), and not least, their offending behaviour (Dominelli, 2002b).

Agency and Youth Justice Policy and Practice
More directly in relation to youth justice practice, however, is the need for integration of not only concepts of masculinities in the work of YOT practitioners, but more fundamentally the necessity of an integration of ideas around social agency of

the young men. Throughout YOT practitioners' construction of masculinity of the young men with whom they work, the idea of reflective agency appears little. Since current youth justice practice focuses on the work with the individual (Smith, 2009) and the individual's 'motivation to change' (Youth Justice Board, 2006), the absence of an understanding of agency in the YOT practitioners' constructions of masculinity is highly surprising. Any work with young men that aims to change their offending behaviour, implicitly relies on their capacity for, and thereby the idea of social agency. Consequently young men have to be seen as capable of reflectivity and thereby as actively engaged in shaping their own practices of masculinity despite or in line with, social expectations. On the part of YOT practitioners, this requires a multi-layered understanding of not only the young men's masculinity, but also their identity as a whole. Here, Goffman's (1990) frame of back and front regions as well as the active role of the social agent is one of the ways in which young men could be understood in their complexity and how possible heterogeneity and contradictions in their own constructions of masculinities can be acknowledged and thereby integrated in work practices with young men.

Greener (2002) underlines the importance of the role of agency in social policy, and Smith (2009) elaborates on the role of agency in relation to youth justice practice. If Assets are seen as a reflection of the discourse on youth justice, then the absence of ideas of agency in youth justice practice highlights some of the paradoxes inherent in youth justice policy. While explanations of youth offending are understood through factors such as families, neighbourhoods, and care histories (among others), in other words factors over which the young people themselves have little influence, then an approach to target only individual behaviours to address offending behaviour seems ironic. If youth offending in youth justice policy is largely comprehended through factors out of the young person's control (Creany, 2013; Smith, 2011a), then putting emphasis on the young person's ability to change his or her offending behaviour and thereby individualising offending implies profound ideological and theoretical difficulties (Creany, 2013), which YOT practitioners inherited through those policies rather than because of their own lack of inclusion of ideas around agency. The most obvious issue here is that, although reasons for offending behaviour lie largely

outside the control of young people, they are given responsibility in relation to changing their offending behaviour, whereby the picture that emerges with regard to agency is that of 'correcting behaviour' rather than critical agency (Smith, 2009). Chapter one mentions how the use of terminology such as 'youth justice system' and 'youth justice practice' in this thesis is not to imply a coherent ideology or a homogeneous way in which youth justice practice is exercised across the spectrum of services which fall under the umbrella 'youth justice system', and this lack of coherent ideology (Fergusson, 2007; Fionda, 2005; Graham and Moore, 2006) becomes most obvious when considering the role of agency of young people in contact with youth justice services in relation to the way their offending behaviour is explained and made sense of through set categories as discussed above. Moreover, evidence of this lack of coherent ideology is highly visible with regard to issues around masculinity and masculinity and offending as discussed in the next section of this chapter.

Individual Needs and Masculinity

Considering the ways in which practitioners at this YOT construct masculinity and set the offending behaviour of the young men with whom they work in direct context of their masculinity, the lack of consideration of masculinity in the assessment of young men and the integration of male-friendly approaches (Ruxton, 2009) in intervention work with them is striking. Chapter two discusses the implicit masculinisation of risk in youth justice, and chapter seven highlights how this masculinisation restricts the number of possible constructions of masculinity by YOT practitioners within a particular discourse, while the earlier part of this chapter discusses how these constructions are limited by occupational discourse, the role of YOT practitioners and the function of YOTs. Yet, despite this implicit focus on male behaviour in relation to offending, issues of masculinity are neglected in the assessment of and the work with young men who have been identified as having offended (Dominelli, 2002b). On the other hand, however, intervention work with young men who are subject to ISS orders heavily relies on activities putting male bodies at their centre, and which are linked in the literature to the regulation and policing of masculinity (Gill et al., 2005), the centrality of sports in the construction of masculinity (Anderson, 2012), and the

exercise of hegemonic masculinity through gender-appropriate sports participation (Parker, 1996). Here the lack of a coherent ideology in youth justice (Fionda, 2005; Graham and Moore, 2006) becomes obvious once more. This is to say that, although the vast majority of young people in contact with youth justice services are young men, an implicit association of the risk of offending and masculinity, and intervention activities which put the bodies of young men at their centre, any explicit discussion of masculinity, and masculinity and offending is absent from youth justice policy and practice.

As a result it is not surprising that no explicit attention is paid to issues of masculinity, or indeed masculinities, in relation to assessment categories, and that YOT practitioners struggle to accommodate explicitly such issues in their work with young men in contact with youth justice services, despite their clear identification of offending behaviour being linked to their constructions of masculinity of the young men with whom they work. The narrative of their work practices, their professional roles within the function of YOTs, and the occupational discourse of youth justice restricts the ways in which they can construct the gendered identities of their clients (Scourfield, 2003). Furthermore, the individualisation of risk (Smith, 2009), yet the dominant explanations for offending as set out by, for example, Assets paints a confusing picture as to the relevance of social agency, which is reflected in the absence of the discussion of agency in relation to their constructions of masculinity, and masculinity and offending. This means that without the explicit discussion of masculinity and its potential relevance to offending behaviour, the assessment of young people neglects the dimension of gender in relation to these 'individual needs'.

Cowburn and Dominelli (2001), referring to male sex offenders, argue that risk-assessment tools in male sexual offending are inadequate if they do not incorporate the role of masculinity in offending behaviour. If 'the manner and degree of intervention is [to be] appropriate to their welfare needs and/ or their risk of re-offending' (Goldson: 2008, 383), as one of the core objectives set out by the YJB, and their offending behaviour is linked directly to their practices of masculinity, whereby

specific behavioural issues are identified as 'male issues', then the neglect of these issues of masculinity, it can be argued, leads to an inaccurate assessment indeed (Cowburn and Dominelli, 2001; Creany, 2013).

As discussed in chapter two, much of academic literature suggests the potential relationship between offending behaviour and masculinity, and the findings of this thesis emphasises that YOT practitioners clearly link masculinity and offending, attributing great importance to ideas around masculinity and offending behaviour. Yet, the assessment of young men who have offended does not allow room for practitioners to incorporate this potential connection into their assessment or practice. Caulfield (2010) argues for the relevance of gender-specific assessment in criminal justice, and how it can assist in addressing gendered needs and help to reduce re-offending. This thesis has shown how issues of masculinity are highly relevant in the work with young men who have been identified as having offended, evident in the central role masculinity implicitly occupies in relation to risk in youth justice, and explicitly in YOT practitioners' explanations of the offending behaviour of young men. It has linked the literature on masculinity and masculinities to specific categories deemed relevant in the assessment of young men in contact with youth justice services, and thereby offers a way into assessing individual needs through the inclusion of aspects of masculinity in relation to education (Alloway and Gilbert, 1997; Alloway and Gilbert, 2010; Connell, 1996; Gurian, 2001), health (Featherstone et al., 2007; Galdas et al., 2005; Hearn and Kolga, 2006; White et al., 2011), and highly relevant in relation to YOT practitioners' constructions of masculinity; aggressive and violent behaviour (Berkowitz, 1989; Campbell, 1994; 1998; 2006; Crick et al., 1996; Crick and Grotpeter, 1995; Lui and Kaplan, 2004; Malamuth et al., 1993; Malamuth and Thornhill, 1994) and coping strategies (Boehnisch and Winter, 1993; Featherstone et al., 2007; Hatty, 2000; Ruxton, 2009).

Practitioners at this YOT distinguish between reasons for young men's individual offending and the role of peers and masculinity when offending occurs whilst the young men are with their peers. The literature has highlighted how the work with young men should take a different approach depending on whether it takes place

with groups of young men (Benstead, 1994; Featherstone et al., 2007) or with individual young men (Featherstone et al., 2007; Good and Brooks, 2005). Here lessons can be learned from this literature and male-friendly approaches could be incorporated into these different understandings of offending behaviour. Dominelli (2002b) argues on the example of probation practice that

> […] it has to gear its activities to the specific needs of individual offenders by situating them within specific contexts that integrate them into the broader social order in which they live and ensure that practitioners acquire the range of skills necessary for making the links between personal and structural conditions that impact upon their behaviour (Dominelli, 2002b: 159).

This is equally relevant to the context of youth justice and, while this thesis strongly argues for incorporation of issues around masculinity into youth justice practice, this incorporation needs to be able to account for both the similarities and the 'extraordinary diversity occurring in men's practices' (Pringle and Pease, 2001: 247).

8.5 Reflections

Theoretical Reflections: The Patriarchy, Essentialism, and Men and Power

A number of authors (Acker, 1989; Fuss, 1990; Hood-Williams, 2001) have been cited in this thesis in relation to how helpful ideas around the patriarchy are in relation to studying men, and here the construction of masculinity by YOT practitioners. As Pringle summarises: 'we cannot explain the dominant structures associated with hegemonic masculinities purely in terms of patriarchal relations, important though they are' (Pringle, 1995: 200). The difficulty of theorising ideas of the patriarchy in relation to how young men's masculinity is constructed by YOT practitioners has permeated this thesis for a number of reasons.

While it is acknowledged that such ideas have assisted in theorising masculinity and femininity on a wider structural level, it is difficult to see how exactly the young men whose documents have been analysed for this study fit into this concept in the

context of youth justice in general and against the backdrop of their individual experiences in particular. The idea of male power over women only explicitly surfaced in the data collected from interviews and in relation to how YOT practitioners talked about the relationships between the young men and their mothers. Even there such clear subject positions were allocated to both the young men and their mothers, despite some data from Assets indicating that the allocation of roles such as 'perpetrator' and 'victim' was not as straightforward as suggested by practitioners. Especially the discussion on most practitioners' apparent reluctance to identify the young men with whom they work as vulnerable (chapter five) emphasises the limited scope through which their masculinity was constructed with a specific focus on risk and in accordance with the dominant discourse of young men in the field of youth justice.

Morgan (1992), Pringle (1995) and Messerschmidt (1993) discuss how the domination of men is both a question of the domination of men over women and the domination of men over other men. It is for this reason that Connell's (2005b) framework of hegemonic masculinity has been adapted in this thesis potentially to account for the diversity amongst the construction of the young men's masculinity and the interplay of masculinities. However, while this concept has assisted in stressing the hegemonic status of the masculinity constructed by practitioners, diversity and the element of male hierarchies are largely absent from how YOT practitioners make sense of the young men with whom they work. This absence reflects two issues: firstly, issues around the practical application of the concept of patriarchy, its lack of integration of the way in which masculinity plays out in the individual lives of men (Seidler, 2006), and henceforth the difficulty of translating ideas around the patriarchy into the context of this lived experience of individual men; secondly, it emphasises how deeply entrenched is essentialist understanding of men and women, and that not only is 'a considerable amount of substance of society [is] enrolled in the staging of [gender]' (Goffman, 2007: 83), but also that practitioners are just as much part of this gendered world (Pringle, 1995). Here the element of essentialism in the way YOT practitioners construct the masculinity of the young men with whom they work particularly surfaces in the way in which they are

allocated very specific male practices, while their potential position of power in relation to women only emerges with regard to their relationships with their mothers. It is because of the absence of heterogeneity in understandings of masculinity in much of literature on masculinity and offending (Collier, 1998) as well as in the YOT practitioners' construction of masculinity of the young men with whom they work that the term 'masculinity' has been employed dominantly in this thesis, rather than masculinities. Within the particular discourse of youth justice practice and its limits (Scourfield, 2003), the role of YOT practitioners and the function of YOTs, young men are implicitly associated with power through the association of masculinity, aggression and violence. However, the *powerlessness* of those young men shines through, in particular in relation to the profiles created from Assets on the young men presented in chapter four, and demonstrates that not all men are powerful (Hearn, 2004; Messerschmidt, 1993; 2012b).

Also, the lack of social agency in the construction of the young men's masculinity and their offending behaviour as discussed above indicates that practitioners understand young men to have little power in both desisting crime and the way they are seen to adopt masculine identities directly and unreflectively from their fathers and in interactions with peers. A specific form of masculinity is seen as being strongly policed (Butler, 1988; 1990; 2011; Ingraham, 2002; Steinberg et al., 1997; Wittig, 2002) and monitored (Bourdieu, 2001; 2005; Goffman, 1990; 2007), leaving little room for their own traumatic experiences (Seidler, 2006), not only of the abuse and the witnessing of violence so evident in their Assets, but also in the way they construct their masculinity and the challenges they meet.

Personal Reflections: Men Researching Men and Masculinities

Both Pringle (1995) and Morgan (1992) emphasise how their own experiences of being a man have informed their awareness of the relevance and importance of masculinity and influenced their research. The relevance of masculinity as experienced by men who research and write about masculinity and masculinities surfaces little in the research on masculinity (Baumgartner, 2013), particularly in research on masculinity and crime. Anderson (2012) and McCormack (2012) have

given some examples of how a discussion of one's own masculinity can be integrated in academic writing and inform research. Chapter one briefly discusses my own starting point in relation to this study. My personal experience of being on the receiving end of social welfare services provided by social workers, the experience of aggression and violence, and the interplay of those and the construction of my own masculinity have provided a personal framework in which to contextualise the 'stories' of the young men in this study as extracted from Assets. While this 'insider knowledge' (Morgan, 1992: 191) may not be of academic value, and indeed the 'stories' of the young men are constructed by YOT practitioners rather than the young men themselves, it has created room for reflexivity and helped the author to remain critical in relation to how elements of these stories do or do not re-surface in YOT practitioners' constructions of the masculinity of the young men with whom they work.

Numerous authors have highlighted the role of reflexivity in social research (Bryman, 2008; Burton, 2000; May and Perry, 2011). Bourdieu (2007) describes how this process of self-reflection and integration of one's own experience can assist in critically confronting this experience in research rather than imposing subjective experiences on it. In this study, my personal experience has also helped to analyse critically some of the findings, identify which parts of the biographies of young people in Assets were set in relation to the constructions of their masculinity, and most importantly contextualised why some of these elements did not surface in these constructions. I recognise that those personal experiences to which I refer are not solely the result of subjectively lived experience, but also the product of power relations (Butler, 2005). However, the understanding of knowledge produced by men on men and masculinities through men's patriarchal position only in terms of the way they exercise power (Morgan, 1992; Pringle, 1995) neglects the possibility of including their potential powerlessness. Just as the inquiry into the possible relationship between men, masculinities and crime has to include ideas around the availability of and access to specific subject positions in the life-course (Carlsson, 2013), men, masculinities, and men producing knowledge on men and masculinities have to be understood through their different experiences of power and

powerlessness at different stages in their lives. My personal experience of powerlessness in early life, and when engaging with social and welfare services, has generated the interest in studying the constructions of men and masculinity by practitioners with a focus on how masculinity or masculinities are constructed and which relevance is given to those constructions and their behaviours as men.

Coming Out in a Study on Masculinity

Initial worries when starting the research were (a) that I am not only not local, but actually from another European country, which can be identified by my accent, and (b) how and whether I would need to position myself in terms of my sexuality. I have lived as an openly gay man for 20 years, professionally and privately, and was somewhat surprised that this question even crossed my mind. My main worry was that by being openly gay, I may experience difficulties when interviewing male staff at the YOT about masculinity and masculinity and crime, whereby my own sexuality could either potentially shift the focus to sexuality and masculinity or 'close doors' with male interviewees (Kosofsky- Sedwick, 1990). Friendly chats with YOT workers soon reached into personal lives and relationship status, on the one hand, and I also experienced the attempt of some male YOT workers to bond with me over some topics considered traditionally male, such as football.

The fact that I am German immediately became an entry point to conversations about Germany and German culture as some of the YOT practitioner had either been stationed in Germany in the army or had experience of it as a spouse or sibling. However, my ambiguity around my sexuality had the effect that informal friendly chats turned awkward for me, and raised questions around my own authenticity. This question about my authenticity as the researcher was not simply relevant to me in terms of verbally conveying information about my sexuality and relationship status and because the wealth of personal information most YOT workers shared with me, but also in relation to my larger practice in the field (Butler, 2005: 130), likes and dislikes, opinions and viewpoints, perspectives and my own subjectivity (Ellis and Flaherty, 1992).

While my sexuality may have provided me with a dimension that enabled me to question concepts of hetero-gendered masculinity, the interest in and some of the motivation for this study lay in my own experience (Van Maanen, 1988) of having been in care as an overtly aggressive, white, working-class boy with experience of abuse- information which is much less likely to be conveyed in day-to-day conversations. As a consequence of the genuinely open and trusting way in which the staff at this YOT welcomed me and my own observations, I felt awkwardness when conversations came to touch on the subject of relationships; and following a consultation with my supervisors, I decided to 'come out' by mentioning my partner in conversations, and deal with potential issues with male staff in interview situations with discussing the motivation for this research project as they arise. This ensured that I, my experience and my motivation for the research did not distract from the focus of the research (Coffey, 1999). Thereby, I not only confirmed that I 'belonged' to the YOT team by being as authentic as members of staff were when dealing with me, and demonstrate that I have 'a feel for the place' and its social dynamics, but I also 'positioned' myself by expressing the 'capacity to act' appropriately within it, acknowledging that 'the practice of social research should be a systemisation of links between personal and self-identity and the enacted environment' (May and Perry, 2011: 121).

Embedded in my wider, 'authentic' approach to the research field, it subsequently emerged during interviews and day-to-day conversations that my initial worries about my 'otherness' in relation to my nationality and sexuality in fact became a 'distinct advantage'(Hammersely and Aktinson, 2006). While my nationality often provided an initial talking point for conversations and getting to know the team, it seemed that my being openly gay in conjunction with the research topic on masculinity created a less prejudiced environment for discussions about masculinity and staff members' experiences. It was particularly interesting here that I hesitated to 'come out' with consideration to the potential effect on this study and the willingness of male staff to talk to me about masculinity or, in other words, the fear that my masculinity and male practices could be questioned or monitored on the grounds of my sexuality.

In relation to the possible male practices which the young men may bring to this environment and their case workers, this raised the question of how far it was indeed possible to express a diversity of masculinities in the setting of a YOT. If I, as a grown man and a researcher, felt that my sexuality could mean being subjected to the monitoring of my male practices, then perhaps the young men engaging with the services of this YOT felt similarly. Perhaps it is then not only the specific organisational discourse, organisational limitations, the role of professionals and the function of YOTs which restrict the way YOT practitioners construct the masculinity of the young men with whom they work, but also the sort of male practices young men feel able to bring to this setting (De Viggiani, 2012; Messerschmidt, 1993; Scourfield, 2003).

Analysis of Documents of Young People in Contact with Youth Justice Services

I had given little consideration to the impact the field and conducting this kind of research would have on me (Coffey, 1999; Hammersely and Aktinson, 2006). Coffey (1999), on the example on ethnographic field work, advocates openness of the researcher in relation to emotions about the fieldwork. Although I used a multi-methods approach for the data collection, the vast majority of my time was spent on analysing Assets produced within this YOT on young men who had been identified as having offended. These Assets revealed a wealth of personal information on the young people from their living arrangements to their childhood and adolescent experiences. This included accounts of physical, sexual and emotional abuse as well as the generally disadvantaged situation in which most of these young people found themselves. I was familiar with the some of the circumstances and economic situations surrounding these young people through reading extensively about young people who have offended (Day et al., 2008; Egeland, 1993; Howe, 2005; Johnson et al., 2010; Morgan, 2002; Youth Justice Board, 2005b; Youth Justice Board, 2007; Youth Justice Board, 2009b; Youth Justice Board, 2012), but did not anticipate the emotional impact this would have on me as a researcher (Hammersely and Aktinson, 2006; Wray et al., 2007). The traumatic stories of those young men on the one hand, and the lack of contextualisation of those in the way YOT practitioners constructed their masculinity, on the other, was disheartening and highlighted some of the

serious issues around the tension between welfare and justice approaches in youth justice policy and practice (2009; Smith, 2011a; Smith, 2011b). If indeed, young men's offending behaviour can be linked to their masculinity and coping strategies available to them, then any work with young men on developing alternative coping strategies would have to be addressed not only in relation to their aggressive and violent behaviour, but also their traumatic experiences as evident in their Assets.

Reflections on Research Methods

Although the aims of this thesis, its findings and further research possibilities in the area of youth justice and masculinity will be discussed in more detail in the final chapter of this thesis, it is worth commenting on two themes which have occurred in relation to how YOT practitioners construct the masculinity of the young men with whom they work: (A) the occupational discourse in which the masculinity of young men is constructed, and (B) the actual practices of young men in contact with youth justice services. Scourfield (2003) emphasises their importance with regard to construction of gender in child protection work, and they too become visible as relevant in the construction of masculinity, and masculinity and offending in the context of this study. The lack of work around how masculinity is constructed in youth justice settings and what relevance is given to masculinity and offending (see chapter two), however, has been one of the starting points of this study (chapter one). One of the aims of this study was to make visible the relevance of ideas around masculinity and masculinity and offending in youth justice practice. Although YOT practitioners' constructions of masculinity and masculinity and offending are shaped by the occupational discourse of youth justice and may be influenced by the practices of masculinity the young men with whom they work bring to them, a deeper analysis of either would have been a very different study altogether, and indeed one that would go beyond the scope of a PhD research project. While this study has made the relevance of ideas around masculinity and masculinity and offending visible in youth justice practice, it is recognised that some key elements in the way YOT practitioners construct masculinity give scope for further investigation, which will inform the recommendations made in the final chapter of this thesis.

Part III

Chapter 9: Conclusions

Introduction

The final chapter of this thesis draws together the conclusions. It will do so by firstly returning to the research objectives of this study and summarising the main findings. It will then consider the research aims and discuss the relevance of masculinity and masculinities in youth justice practice and implications for wider social work practice. Chapter nine will conclude by proposing recommendations for both youth justice and social work practice.

9.1 Returning to Research Objectives and Aims

The research objectives and research questions of this study were:

1. To investigate, describe and analyse the ways in which YOT practitioners make sense of masculinities of the young men and boys in the youth justice system.

   Research Questions:

   - Which, if any, behaviours do YOT practitioners associate with masculinities, and how far do these reflect stereotypical and/or essentialist notions of masculinity or how do they differ from those notions?
   - How do YOT practitioners understand young men to have obtained their male identity?
   - What is the role that, if any, reference groups play, and who constitutes these reference groups?
   - To what extent, if any, do practitioners at this YOT understand young men to exercise agency in relation to how they obtain their gendered identity?
   - How is the way in which YOT practitioners understand young men to obtain their gendered identity linked to structural elements?

2. To consider, describe and analyse what, if any, role criminal behaviour plays in the way YOT practitioners understand the masculinities of young men and boys in the youth justice system.

Research Questions:

- In what ways, if any, do YOT practitioners link ideas around masculinities to offending behaviour?

- How do practitioners at this YOT explain the offending behaviour of young men?

- What, if any, role do reference groups play in the offending behaviour of young men?

3. To explore, describe and analyse what, if any, relevance is given to issues of masculinities in relation to YOT practitioners' work with young men and boys in the youth justice system.

Research Questions:

- What, if any, relevance do practitioners at this YOT attribute to ideas of masculinities?

- How, if at all, do practitioners at this YOT explain the absence/presence of ideas around masculinities in their work with young men?

- In what ways, if any, are issues around masculinities visible in YOT practitioners' work with young men?

- How are or could issues around masculinities be integrated in YOT practitioners work with young men at this YOT?

The investigation into the ways in which YOT practitioners make sense of masculinities of the young men with whom they work as discussed in detail in chapters five and six leads to the following conclusions:

1. Despite the diversity of YOT practitioners' backgrounds and their different roles at this YOT, one particular way in which practitioners construct masculinity (rather than masculinities) emerges from this study. This

construction of masculinity is surprisingly homogeneous and does not accommodate a great deal of diversity in relation to the young men's practices, whilst dominantly relying on negative connotations of masculinity (Collier, 1998). Masculinity is reduced to a set of very discrete male practices, whereby clear behavioural traits are associated with the way in which young men perform masculinity. Key elements in the practices which have been captured by the term *male habitus* are:

- The display of aggressive and violent behaviour.
- Low temper and impulse control.
- The inability to react to and deal with conflict situations other than with aggressive and violent behaviour.
- The consumption of alcohol as both conflict resolution and proof of masculinity.
- The avoidance of any display of weakness.

These behaviours are associated with the young men's masculinity, rather than their masculinities, and are very closely associated with stereotypical notions of masculinity, and particular masculinity and offending, as emerged from chapter two of this thesis. Their masculinity here is closely linked with their social class and their (assumed) heterosexuality. Possible heterogeneity, deviations from this type of heterosexual masculinity or indeed the interplay of different forms of masculinities (chapter three) are largely absent from the ways in which YOT practitioners construct the masculinity of the young men with whom they work. Indeed, YOT practitioners understand the young men as (consciously) performing masculinity along essentialist heterosexual male practices. These practices are seen along essentialist understandings of masculinity on more than one of the levels developed in chapter three. Discrete gender specific behaviours are directly allocated in accordance with the (assumed) biological sex of the acting individual, and essentialist notions of male- female interaction as 'oppositional' with a strong notion of structural influences are evident in the ways in which men and are differentiated from each other. Here the notion of heterosexual practices of men emerges

strongly and practices which could be seen as effeminate or gay would be adjusted by the young men to correspond to these heterosexual practices. This means that not only is an integration of what are considered to be feminine traits in their performance of masculinity not seen as possible, but masculinity is performed in contrast to what is considered feminine or gay. Any enacting of practices which are in contrast to heterosexual masculinity are seen as consciously avoided by the young men and as policed by their peers.

Practitioners explain these practices of young men with whom they work as:

- Embedded in the wider local culture of 'being a man', what has been termed here as *localised hegemonic masculinity*.
- Attempts of the young men to prove their masculinity in front of their peers resulting from low self-esteem and in order to gain social status.
- Socially learnt in their families, especially from fathers.
- Mothers playing a key role in the validation of this masculinity.
- Performed amongst peers, and monitored and consequently validated or condemned by peers in relation to how 'manly' they are.

This is to say, male identity is understood as socially learnt in families, and fathers act as the main reference group in relation to how this form of masculinity is obtained. However, peers and mothers are understood to act as secondary reference groups, accommodating the performance of masculinity in form of the discrete practices described above and, especially male peers, as policing discrete male (heterosexual) practices. Peer reference groups, as YOT practitioners identify them, are solely constituted of male individuals and play the most central role in how masculinity is both learnt and enacted.

Young men themselves are not seen as possessing personal agency to resist from this particular type of masculinity, and, in fact, are understood as having access to this form of masculinity only. There is no evidence emerging from the data that indicates that YOT practitioners see the young men as actively resisting the localised form of hegemonic masculinity. Instead, numerous YOT practitioners give examples of how young men identify how some aspects of their lives (hobbies) do not fit into this format and adjust these aspects to fit with the localised form of hegemonic masculinity and its practices. There is no indication of YOT practitioners understanding young men to desist from this form of masculinity, but rather see them as passively submitting to it. It is this submission and the way YOT practitioners explain how the young men have uncritically learnt this form of masculinity from their fathers which allows me to conclude that they do not understand young men with whom they work to possess any critical agency. This is particularly concerning as intervention strategies which aim to reduce the offending behaviour of young men are designed on the basis of their ability to change, hence their social agency in implementing these changes.

The picture is similar around discussions of how young men have obtained their masculinity from the social structure of the council estates in which they live. Wider structural elements are seen as determining the young men's access to particular forms of localised hegemonic masculinity and geographical location of the young men are keys in the formation of their masculinity. Young men are not seen as being able to desist these social structures, but rather to passively submit to them.

2. Key elements in practitioners' constructions of masculinity of the young men with whom they work are very closely linked to how practitioners explain the offending behaviour of the young men. The dominant explanations for the offending behaviour of the young men are:

- The young men's performance of localised hegemonic masculinity with key elements identified as drinking and fighting.
- 'Individual' offending as the result of conflict situations with mothers or girlfriends, the consumption of large quantities of alcohol as a coping mechanism, and consequent expression of aggressive and violent behaviour due to low impulse and temper control.
- Offending whilst among peers as the result of wanting to prove masculinity in a show of bravado and an attempt to gain kudos, respect, and a reputation as 'hard'.

Similarly to YOT practitioners' construction of masculinity, criminal behaviour is understood as learnt through families, and its performance is seen as validated in peers as both the performance of localised hegemonic masculinity and the subsequent criminal behaviour. Consequently, offending behaviour of young men is explained by YOT practitioners through the young men's performance of masculinity and wanting to gain respect and a reputation as well as their inability to react to frustration and conflict situations other than by enacting violent and aggressive behaviour.

While YOT practitioners understand individual offending behaviour as the result of the latter, offending behaviour among other young males is closely linked to those peers as a reference group. The performance of masculinity using discrete male practices as described above thereby serves to prove masculinity and its aggressive and violent connotations result in offending behaviour.

3. That ideas around masculinity are highly relevant in the work with young men at this YOT becomes obvious through their central position in YOT practitioners' explanations of offending behaviour. Paradoxically, although

the constructions of masculinity of the young men with whom they work and the ways in which YOT practitioners explain offending behaviour of these young men are deeply tied up with issues around masculinity, practitioners at this YOT do not explicitly attribute the integration of work approaches around issues of masculinity as relevant in their work. Explanations for this are:

- That young people should be treated as individuals rather than through a gender lens.

- That their practice guidance as set out by the YJB does not consider gender a relevant category in the assessment of young people who have been identified as having offended, and practitioners therefore are restricted in their accommodation of gender in the assessment and their work with young people.

- The lack of provision of professional training in which gender is made relevant in relation to assessment and offending behaviour.

Issues around masculinity are highly visible in YOT practitioners' work with young men at this YOT. Although YOT practitioners do not see issues around masculinity as relevant, some evidence emerges in this thesis that a number of practitioners have adapted to the perceived inability of young men to articulate their feelings (which is seen as part of their masculinity) and consequently alter their approach to young men with whom they work. Equally, some male practitioners at this YOT explained that:

- The ways in which they build rapport with young men with whom they work includes a reliance on their own experience as young men and the engaging with young men by talking about their hobbies, such as football etc.

- They would alter their approach depending on whether they worked with a young man or a young woman.

This is to say that while YOT practitioners may not explicitly include gendered-approaches in their work, some of the data collected from interviews suggests that they do indeed differentiate their approach to young people with whom they work depending on gender.

It is evident in the data collected from case diaries that a substantial number of intervention activities planned around young people who are subjected to ISS orders are indeed gendered as they heavily rely on sport activities not only centred around the male body, but which also are associated in the literature with masculinity (see chapter seven). This is to say that while gender may not be made explicitly relevant in youth justice practice, 'gendered perspectives' (Dominelli, 2002b: 156) are visible throughout the work of YOT practitioners at this YOT. Despite the lack of relevance given to the integration of gendered approaches in their work with young men by YOT practitioners those intervention approaches and the adaption of some practitioners to the young men's inability to articulate their feelings already make the relevance of masculinity visible in the practices at this YOT.

The great paradox here is that although key elements of YOT practitioners' constructions of masculinity of the young men with whom they work are identified as linked to the young men's offending behaviour, YOT practitioners do not understand the inclusion of interventions or assessment categories which deal explicitly with issues of masculinity as necessary. While they remain absent from other areas of work with young men, in particular their assessment, this thesis has demonstrated through the findings of chapters five, six and seven, how specific assessment categories can be linked to issues around masculinity. On the basis of the findings of this study and the issues articulated by YOT practitioners as relevant to the young men's masculinity, specific issues such as coping strategies and the consumption of alcohol, the expression of violence, and the relationship between low self-esteem and the enacting of discrete male practices present good starting

points for the attempt to integrate issues around masculinity and masculinities in the work with young men.

The absence of explicit discussions and the possibility of inclusions of ideas around masculinity and indeed masculinities in youth justice policy and in youth justice practice thereby result in further gendering boys and young men (Hearn, 2010). This is to say that the lack of awareness of issues around masculinity is accompanied by the absence of male- friendly (Good and Brooks, 2005; Kiselica, 2005; Ruxton, 2009) approaches, which, in turn, causes at least some YOT practitioners to adapt their work approaches to young men and accommodate their (perceived) inabilities (as men) to communicate. Equally, the lack of problematisation of issues around masculinity and masculinities of young people and practitioners (Christie, 2001; Hearn, 1987; Morgan, 1992; Pringle, 1995; Wright and Cowburn, 2011), especially around the ways in which some male YOT practitioners build rapport with young men, could, in the worse case scenario, reinforce already existing notions of stereotypical and negative connotations of masculinity, or at least validate the same. Weight here is given to that the gendering of boys and young men takes place within the wider 'oppressive power relations that structure our society [and] also tend[s] to structure the systems of social welfare that operate within the terms of that society' (Pringle, 1995: 206), and both young men and male and female practitioners need to be critical and reflective of the ways in which they reinforce gender stereotypes and thereby create room only specific practices. Interactions between YOT practitioners and young people do not simply reflect those power-gendered relations, but contribute to them (Morgan, 1992), in the context of this study at the potential cost of the young men and boys who engage with youth justice services.

However, while YOT practitioners' own experiences and practices of gender and the absence of problematisation of gender in their work may influence the ways in which they construct the masculinity of the young men with whom they work, another dimension emerged which restricts the ways in which practitioners can make sense of young men. Chapter eight discusses in detail how the professional discourse within this YOT and specific work practices limit the number of ways in which YOT

practitioners construct masculinity. Within the masculinisation of risk in youth justice (as discussed in chapter two) and the linkage of specific behavioural traits to offending behaviour the constructions of particular types of masculinity are implicitly encouraged in (or made possible) or excluded from the institutional settings (De Viggiani, 2012; Messerschmidt, 1993; Scourfield, 2003) of the YOT . Equally, the emerging lack of focus on issues around mental health and vulnerability in criminal and youth justice (Lord Bradley, 2009; Nacro, 2011) enter into YOT practitioners' constructions of certain kinds of masculinity rather than others, and largely cause the exclusion of issues around vulnerabilities and mental in their constructions. This is to say while the focus of this study has been on the ways in which practitioners make sense of the masculinity and the offending behaviour of young men with whom they work, these constructions take place within wider organisational practices and ideological frameworks. Consequently, the responsibility for problematising their own perceptions of gender and for integrating gender specific work practices only partially lies with practitioners themselves. The relevance of gender in their work with young people in general, and men in particular, needs to be addressed in the wider ideological context of social and youth justice and crime policies, and it is here where interventions and assessment tools can be enabled and developed to take account of gender-specific needs and issues.

Dominelli argues that 'to respond to a given man's needs, a social worker has to conceptualise his situation as one of a whole person with multiple dimensions to his identity and living in a particular context' (Dominelli, 2002b: 93). The constructions of masculinity by YOT practitioners in this study embrace a rather static idea of masculinity with clearly identifiable behavioural traits, which in turn are linked to the young men's offending behaviour. While the explanations for this behaviour by practitioners are heavily based on ideas of social learning and socialisation (as outlined in chapter three) and without the acknowledgement of social agency of the young men themselves, their intervention work and the assessment of young people centres around individual risk (Creany, 2013)and implicitly relies on the young men's ability to change as an individual, in other words their agency. While it is necessary to understand the young men's masculinity and the inherent power relations

(Dominelli, 2002b) in working with them, it is also vital to understand the individual dimensions and experiences of their masculinity (Seidler, 2006; Smiler, 2013) to address their offending behaviour as men. It is here that traditional social work values and the focus on individuals (Scourfield, 2003) in work with young men can intersect with sociological dimensions of development of gender identity as both linked to structural inequalities and individual experience and place 'gender on the map' (Dominelli, 2002b: 8) in youth justice practice.

9.2 Essentialising Masculinity in Social Work

The issue of inherent essentialism when talking about men runs through this thesis and is summarised in chapter three. As a result of the specific narratives told by much of the literature on masculinity and offending behaviour and the singularity with which YOT practitioners construct the masculinity of young men with whom they work, this thesis has dominantly employed the term 'masculinity' rather than masculinities.

Both Morgan (1992) and Pringle (1995) comment on the issue of acknowledging plurality while not being distracted from the common themes which are associated with the practices of men and their position in society. The absence of multiple constructions of masculinity, hence masculinities, in the context of this study has been linked to the professional discourse in which YOT practitioners operate and its limits. However, the absence of any explicit discussion of masculinity in YOT practice must also be held responsible for this singularity. In a context in which YOT practitioners are neither encouraged nor trained to make sense of masculinity in relation to their work with young men, it is not surprising that when asked about 'masculinities' and their relevance in their work, their initial responses focus on commonalities rather than differences. In order to enable practitioners in youth justice as well as the wider profession of social work to contextualise masculinity in their work practices, masculinity itself first needs to be made visible at every stage of the work with young people. Rejecting the categories 'men' and 'women' obstructs making gender a relevant category in the assessment of and the work with

individuals (Scourfield, 2003). However, it is also evident in chapter three, and the summary of levels of essentialising gender in sociological discussions shows how difficult it is to discuss masculinity and femininity without elements of essentialism, and this difficulty transcends into the ways in which YOT practitioners construct the masculinity of the young men with whom they work.

This study has highlighted numerous ways in which masculinity can be linked to, for example, specific assessment categories in youth justice practice. This is the first step towards making masculinity and its relevance visible in youth justice practice, and a starting point from which to explore issues related to masculinity beyond the commonalities of men and in men's practices. It is here where some of the sociological dimensions of this study can help to make sense of both commonalities and differences in men's practices. However, perhaps it is more appropriate in the context of social work and youth justice practice to start the discussion around masculinities by firstly uncovering (assumed) commonalities in men's practices as practitioners identify them and then, when masculinity as a relevant concept has been highlighted, progress to discussions around the diversity of men's practices and issues around masculinities. In any case, the importance is placed here on how issues around masculinity and masculinities can be linked into practice to create not only male friendly but male appropriate approaches. These approaches have to incorporate both the diversity and the commonality in men's practices as they play out in specific contexts.

The Place of Sociological Dimensions

Morgan argues: 'while the concept of hegemonic masculinity does not resolve issues of stereotyping, it does begin to appreciate the dynamic and interconnecting characters of masculinities within a particular society' (Morgan, 1992: 45). This study has employed a number of sociological concepts such as Connell's (2005b) idea of hegemonic masculinity, Goffman's ideas of front and back regions (1990) and particular gender displays, as well as Bourdieu's concepts of habitus, practice and capital (Bourdieu, 1986; 2001; 2005). Such ideas have been employed in previous research on masculinity (Coles, 2007; De Viggiani, 2012; Stahl, 2012), and the

combination of these theoretical concepts has here been used to make sense of the complex elements through which YOT practitioners construct the masculinity of the young men with whom they work. While these concepts derive from different paradigms within sociology, their commonalities have been utilised in this study to make sense of the ways in which gender and a specific set of behaviours and attributes associated with gender can assist in identifying some of the issues as well as the underlying assumptions of the ways in which practitioners construct the masculinity of the young men with whom they work. In this sense, they shed light on structural dimensions to practitioners' constructions of masculinity and male practices (Bourdieu, 1986; 2001; 2005; Connell, 1987; 2005a; 2005b), underlying assumptions of social learning and socialisation (Bandura, 1973; 1977; Bandura and Walters, 1963; Clausen, 1968; Dollard, 1939; Lytton and Romney, 1991; Park, 1939; Zigler and Child, 1973), interactional factors (Goffman, 1990; 2007), the role of performativity (Butler, 1988; 1990) and hetero-gendered norms (Ingraham, 2002; Wittig, 2002), the relevance of the body (Butler, 2011; Turner, 2008), highly visible issues around essentialism (Acker, 1989; Fuss, 1990; Hood-Williams, 2001), and the question of agency in the construction of gender (Anderson, 2012; Greener, 2002; Lovell, 2003; McNay, 2000; Smith, 2009). While they do not help to resolve issues inherent in YOT practitioners' constructions of masculinity, they make assumptions underlying those constructions and the parameters of those constructions visible, and thereby offer a way into theorising masculinity in youth justice practice by starting to appreciate the different dimensions to the constructions of masculinity.

9.3 Recommendations

> *Why the heck do we bother asking about their gender, if we*
> *then go on to do absolutely nothing with it?!*
> (Senior Practitioner, 2011)

This study has highlighted the importance of issues around masculinity and the connections made between the young men's offending behaviour and YOT practitioners' construction of masculinity. At the same time it has emphasised the lack of explicit accommodation of issues around masculinity the work practices at one particular YOT. While YOT practitioners construct the young men's masculinity

by associating very discrete behaviours with the young men with whom they work, and, in turn, use these behaviours to explain the young men's offending, their awareness of how issues around masculinity and masculinities can be accommodated in their practice is limited. In order to enable YOT practitioners to both explore and integrate issues around masculinity in their work practice the following recommendations are made:

- A direct integration of issues around masculinities into the assessment framework. This could be facilitated by exploring issues around the consumption of alcohol and the use of substances of young men (in the already existing section), their access to education, the role of employment for young men, the investigation of their relationships with their peers, their fathers and exploring the role of their role models.

- Training workshops which raise awareness around the potential role of masculinity and implications for youth justice and criminal justice practice. The researcher has already delivered such workshops in the context of probation practice. While these are only a small step in the direction of raising gender awareness, they can assist in creating space for discussion in which theory can inform practice, and practice can shape theory.

- A detailed examination by practitioners and academics of how exactly issues around masculinity could be explicitly integrated into intervention with and assessment of men and young men identified as having offended. This examination could start by exploring the attempts made in this thesis to connect issues around masculinity and specific assessment categories.

- Further, and as pointed out by a number of academics with a professional background in social work (Burnham et al., 1990; Christie, 2001; Cowburn and Dominelli, 2001; Dominelli, 1992; 2002a; 2002b; Morgan, 1992; Pease and Pringle, 2001; Pringle, 1995; Pringle and Pease, 2001; Scourfield, 2003; 1998; 2001; 2002; Wright and Cowburn, 2011), this examination needs to analyse critically the ways in which practitioners construct masculinity across the spectrum and the role they play (both male and female practitioners) in challenging and reinforcing particular types of masculinity.

- An exploration into the ways in which social work practitioners themselves make sense of their own gender (and masculinity) and what relationship this might have to their practice as social workers.

- Drawing together from existing literature (Featherstone et al., 2007; Good and Brooks, 2005; Kiselica, 2005; Ruxton, 2002; 2009; Wexler, 2009) how ideas around masculinity and masculinities can help in designing male friendly approaches in youth and criminal justice approaches as well as in wider social work practice.

- An inclusion of the experiences of men who engage with youth and criminal justice services as well as welfare services and an exploration of the role or roles masculinity plays in their actual lived experience (Seidler, 2006) not only in relation to the singled-out issue of violence, but also in their wider practices as men.

- In relation to not only social work and practice oriented teaching, but also sociology and criminology, an expansion is needed in teaching curricular and resources to reach beyond the obligatory mentioning of gender and explicitly connect aspects of men's and women's lives to specific issues as done in this thesis (for example; consumption of alcohol, coping strategies, health) and set them in the wider frame of social and criminal justice policies.

- Training of youth justice practitioners to raise awareness in relation to issues around gender identity, how these issues can be linked to specific assessment categories and be more integrated into practice. The starting point for this could be the literature utilised in this thesis which explores potential links and discusses specific male issues. Here the knowledge and experiences of social workers and practitioners across the field of social service provision can inform the way in which these issues can be integrated into practice. Equally, a review and analysis of programmes such as the Geese theatre programme (Baim, Brookes and Mountford, 2002) and research currently conducted by the Open University (Robb, 2013) on male role models could provide more concrete ideas for a realistic integration of the issues discussed in this thesis into practice.

Further Research

Some of the above recommendations obviously imply the need for further research in their specific context. However, there are a number of very explicit themes emerging from this thesis, which indicate the need for further research in the following areas:

- An exploration of whether the findings of this thesis are replicated in other YOTs in both the local area and on a national level.

- An investigation into the ways in which practitioners in youth justice translate policies into practice.

- A detailed analysis of the occupational discourse, work practices and organisation limits (Scourfield, 2003) of YOT practitioners and practitioners in other fields of youth justice.

- An inquiry into the experiences of young men engaged with youth justice services.

- An investigation into the practices young men bring to the setting of youth justice, and, of course, the relevance young men attribute themselves to their masculinity or masculinities.

- An examination of the views young men who engage with youth justice services themselves have of masculinity and how their masculinity is expressed in their relationships with practitioners and their experiences in YOT institutions.

- An investigation and evaluation of already existing programmes which accommodate, address and/or problematise issues around masculinity beyond the context of offending and criminal justice. This thesis has made visible the many areas into which issues of masculinity play, such as coping strategies, mental health, substance use, aggression and (domestic) violence. Programmes in these individual sectors of intervention can greatly benefit youth justice practice in relation to integrating issues around gender.

9.4 Closing Remarks and Contribution to Knowledge

This thesis started by focusing on the paradox of the high number of young men in the youth justice system, yet the lack of integration of ideas around masculinity and masculinities in youth justice practice. The prime aim of this study was to put masculinity and masculinities 'on the map' (Dominelli, 2002b: 8) of youth justice practice. This study subsequently discussed a high number of issues around masculinity and masculinities as well as youth justice and wider social work practice. This thesis did not set out to explain why young men engage in offending behaviour, the criminalisation of young men and young people, or to fully examine how social work or YOT practitioners construct their clients beyond issues around masculinity. However, its focus throughout remained on masculinity in the context of youth justice practice on the example of one particular YOT in England and its quest to highlight the importance of issues around masculinity and masculinities in that context. It is here where this thesis wishes to make a contribution to knowledge.

This research is the first to put masculinity on the map in the context of social work integrated in YOT practice. As a consequence, it has raised issues around masculinity (and masculinities) in that context, and identified a range of ways in which issues of masculinity are embedded in YOT practice. Although ideas around masculinity are discussed in the context of criminal behaviour in the academic literature, there is little evidence of this discussion having translated into actual social work and youth justice practice. While gender and crime are given obligatory space in many text books (Gelsthorpe and Sharpe, 2006; Heidensohn, 2002; Walklate, 2004) on both criminal and youth justice, the relevance of gender in actual criminal and youth justice practice remains widely underexplored. As Hearn puts it: '[…] many specific contributions still do not notice that men are gendered beings, socially constructed and reproduced, not just agendered asexual, neutral adults' (Hearn, 2004: 51). In particular, Dominelli (2002b), Cowburn (2005; 2010; 2001) and Wright and Cowburn (2011) have observed how issues around masculinity have an impact on the assessment of and the work with men and young men who have been identified as having offended, and incorporating these issues can potentially assist in addressing

their offending behaviour. Equally, while a number of authors have underlined the importance of considerations of ideas of masculinity in the work with men and young men in social work and social welfare settings (Cowburn, 2005; 2010; Cowburn and Dominelli, 2001; 2002a; Dominelli, 2002b; 2009; Featherstone et al., 2007; Pringle, 1995; Ruxton, 2002; 2009; 2003; Scourfield, 2001; 2002), there is little explicit evidence of these aspects being linked to direct categories relevant in the assessment of and the work with young men who have been identified as having offended. This thesis has made masculinity visible in youth justice practice and has started to link the above literature directly to categories relevant in the assessment of and intervention with young men, and thereby offered a way in which to potentially accommodate issues around masculinity into youth justice practice. One of the significant ways in which knowledge has been extended through this thesis is through the identification of the disjuncture between underlying assumptions of offending behaviour, the masculinisation of risk in youth justice, and the central position that ideas of masculinity occupy in how YOT practitioners explain offending behaviour, yet the complete lack of explicit gender-targeted practice.

This thesis concludes by borrowing Dominelli's words on the example of probation practice which:

> […] cannot treat all offenders as an undifferentiated mass. It has to gear its activities to the specific needs of individual offenders by situating them within specific contexts that integrate them into the broader social order by which they live and ensure that practitioners acquire the range of skills necessary for making the links between personal and structural conditions that impact upon behaviour (Dominelli, 2002b: 159).

This thesis argues that one of the most important signposts in both assessing and working with these specific needs in their structural and individual context is masculinity.

Appendix 1: Interview Guide

1. Introduction:

   - Introduce the researcher and his background.

   - Explain the structure of the interview and the purpose of this research.

   - Ask if there are any questions and whether the participant understands the explanations and is happy to participate in the interview.

   - Explain the research is confidential and names will be anonymised.

   - Read through the consent form with participants to ensure they understand and collect their signature.

   - Highlight the opt-out option before and during the interview.

   - Questions:

     How long have you worked at this YOT?

     Can you tell me about your current role and your background, please.

2. Gender-streamed questions

   - In your experience, what are the main issues of young men you work with?

   - Are they similar or different from the issues of young women in your work at this YOT? How?

   - What are these differences or similarities?

   - Why do you think these are different/ similar?

   - How do those similarities/differences affect your work with young people?

   - How do you try and deal with these in interactions with young people?

   - Are there any similarities/ differences in assessment of young people, intervention work, interaction?

   - How do you explain these differences/ similarities?

3. Gender and Offending Behaviour

- What do you think are the reasons young people become involved with youth justice services?
- Are those reasons similar to or different for young men and young women? How?
- How do you explain these differences/similarities?
- In your experience, what are the main factors surrounding the offending behaviour of young people?
- Are there any similarities or differences between young men and young women?

4. Youth Justice and Gender
- How many young people do you currently work with?
- What is the gender split?
- How do you explain this split?
- In your experience, are there any differences in kind of offences between young men and young women? How do you explain these?
- How, if at all, are these differences contextualised?
- Do you think there are any differences in treatment/ assessment/ intervention of young men and young women?
- Are there any guidelines in your work encouraging/ discouraging you from different approaches/ assessments/ intervention in regards to the gender of the service user? If so, what are they? If not, do you think there should be? Why?
- Are there any intervention or prevention programmes within your work which deal exclusively with young men or young women as their target group? If so, can you tell me about them? If not, do you think there should be? Why? If so, what is your opinion of them?

5. Interview Closure
- We have covered a wide range of topics. Is there anything you would like to return to or add?
- Thank you very much for taking the time to talk with me!

Appendix 2: Focus Group Guide

Objectives

- Explore staff perceptions of masculinities.

- Identify reoccurring themes (as staff perceive them) in the work with young male offenders in relation to their concepts of masculinities.

- Explore perceived relevance of concepts of masculinities in the work with young offenders.

- Explore relevance (as staff perceive it) of gender-targeted practice in the Youth Justice System

Questions *Focus Group (questioning route):*

1. **Introductions**

Introduce researcher (name, where from, age) , research topic (information sheet) and reasons for researching this topic. Take interviewee through information sheet and ensure that:

- The purpose of the research is understood.
- The research itself is understood.
- Explain that the research is confidential and none of the information provided is released to their parents or case worker.
- Reading through the consent form with participants to ensure they understand it and collecting their signature.

   1.1 **Introductory Questions**

- Name, length of employment in Youth Justice and Training/ Educational Background.

2. **Gender-streamed Questions**

   o   What does it mean to be a boy/man?

- What does it appear to mean from a young offender's perspective and how does that differ from the staff perspective?

- What does it mean in the YJS in relation to prevention, intervention and treatment of service users?

- What are the dominant themes/ issues in working with male young offenders? (for example: education, behavioural difficulties, etc.)

- How are those seen as connected to issues of masculinities?

- How does this compare to issues which girls in the YJS have?

- What are the personal views of staff on what issues of masculinities are of young men in the youth justice system?

- How relevant are concepts of masculinities in the work with young male offenders?

- How relevant is the practitioner's gender when working with young males?

- What is the function or importance of role models or the young males in the YJS and does that differ from young males who are not in the YJS?

- What are the main reasons- in your view- for young males to offend?

Gender-targeted Policy and Practice in the YJS

- Using categories of some of the assessment frameworks (ASSET) and main themes in the literature on masculinity and offending how, if at all, may the following categories differ between boys and girls:

1. housing,

2. care history,

3. emotional and mental health,

4. indicators of serious harm to others,

5. substance use,

6. perception of self and others,

7. education, experience of violence,

8. aggression and neglect

9. young person's view of victim?

o For those categories which differ, are there guidelines/ assistance in youth justice practice or policy as to how to address these differences?

o If not, how do you think these differences could/ should feed into policy and practice of the Youth Justice System in relation to prevention and intervention?

o Are there any incentive schemes within the work of the YOT? How do they differ between boys and girls?

o Are there any programmes within the YJS (intervention/prevention) that you are aware of which deal exclusively with boys or have boys as their main target group?

Ending the focus group:
We have discussed many topics, but I was wondering if there is anything else you wish to include in this?

Thank you!

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aboim, S. (2010). *Plural Masculinities: The Remaking of the Self in Private Life,* Farnham, UK: Ashgate Publishing.

Acker, J. (1989). The Problem with Patriarchy *Sociology,* 23**,** 235-240.

Adams, M. & Coltrane, S. (2005). Boys and Men in Families *In:* Kimmel, M. S., Hearn, J. & Connell, R. W. (eds.) *Handbook of Studies on Men and Masculinities.* London, UK: Sage Publications.

Alderson, P. (2004). Ethics. *In:* Fraser, S., Lewis, V., Ding, S., Kellett, M. And Robinson, C. (ed.) *Doing Research with Children and Young People.* London, UK: Sage.

Allen, R. (2006). *From Punishment to Problem Solving- A New Approach to Children in Trouble,* London, UK: Centre for Crime and Justice Studies

Alloway, N. & Gilbert, P. (1997). *Boys and Literacy: Professional Development Units* Australia: Carlton.

Alloway, N. & Gilbert, P. (2010). Boys and Literacy- Lessons from Australia. *Gender and Education,* 9**,** 49-60.

Alun, E. M. (ed.) (1997). *Tough on crime, tough on the causes of crime,* London, UK: Fabian Society.

Andersen, H. T. (2013). Against the wind: Male victimization and the ideal of manliness. *Journal of Social Work,* 13**,** 231-247.

Anderson, E. (2012). *Inclusive Masculinity: The Changing Nature of Masculinities,* London, UK: Routledge.

Armitage, V. J. (2012). *The Inbetweeners: Young people making sense of youth anti-social behaviour (unpublished thesis).* Durham, UK: Durham University.

Ashford, M., Chard, A. & Redhouse, N. (1997). *Defending Young People in the Criminal Justice System,* London, UK: Legal Action Group.

Audit Commission 1996. Misspent Youth. London, UK.

Audit Commission 1998. Misspent Youth. London, UK. .

Audit Commission 2004. Youth Justice 2004. London, UK. .

Baillargeon, R., Zoccolillio, M., Keenan, K., Cote, S., Perusse, D., Wu, H.-X., Boivin, M. & Tremblay, R. (2007). Gender Differences in Physical Aggression: A Prospective Population-based Survey of Children Before and After Two Years of Age. *Developmental Psychology,* 43**,** 13-26.

Baker, K. 2005. Assessment in Youth Justice: Professional Discretion and the Use of Asset. Oxford, UK. : Centre for Criminology, Oxford University.

Baker, K., Kelly, G. & Wilkinson, B. (2011). *Assessment in youth justice,* Bristol, UK: The Policy Press.

Bandura, A. (1973). *Aggression- A Social Learning Analysis* New Jersey, USA: Prentice- Hall Inc.

Bandura, A. (1977). *Social Learning Theory* New Jersey, USA: Prentice-Hall Inc.

Bandura, A. & Walters, R. (1963). *Social learning and personality development,* New York, USA: Holt Rinehart and Winston Inc.

Baumgartner, E. (2013). A refreshing take on masculinity studies beyond the ivory tower of academia: A book review of 'Inclusive masculinity: The Changing Nature of Masculinities. *Equality, Diversity and Inclusion,* 32**,** 120-122.

Bazeley, P. (2000). *The NVivo Qualitative Project Book,* London, UK: Sage Publications.

Bazeley, P. & Richards, L. (2007). *Qualitative Data Analysis with NVivo,* London, UK: Sage Publications.

BBC News. (14 March 2013). *Warning over 'needless criminalisation' of children in care* [Online]. BBC News. Available: http://bbc.co.uk/news/uk-politics-21773742 [Accessed 23 March 2013].

Bear, M. F., Connors, B. W. & Paradiso, M. A. (eds.) (2007). *Neuroscience-Exploring the Brain,* Lippincott Williams & Wilkins: Philadelphia, USA.

Beasley, C. (2008). Rethinking Hegemonic Masculinity in a Globalizing World. *Men and Masculinities,* 11**,** 86-103.

Beechey, V. & Donald, J. (1985). *Subjectivity and Social Relations,* Milton Keynes, UK: Open University Press.

Benstead, J. (1994). Men working with men in groups:masculinity and crime. *Groupwork,* 7.1**,** 37-49.

Berger, P. & Luckmann, T. (1991). *The Social Construction of Reality: A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge,* London, UK: Penguin Books.

Berkowitz, L. (1989). Frustration-Aggression Hypothesis; Examination and Reformulation. *Psychological Bulletin,* 106**,** 55-73.

Best, J. (2011). Constructionism in Context. *In:* Rubington, E. & Weinberg, M. S. (eds.) *The Study of Social Problems.* 7th Edition ed. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Blair, T. (2006). *Our nation's future* [Online]. London Home Office. Available: http://www.number10.gov.uk/Page9737 [Accessed 8 March 2009].

Blanchette, K. & Brown, S. L. (2006). *The Assessment and Treatment of Women Offenders: An Interactive Approach,* Chichester, UK: Wiley.

Block, J. H. (1976a). Debatable conclusions about sex differences. *Contemporary Psychology,* 21(8)**,** 517-522.

Block, J. H. (1976b). Issues, problems and pitfalls in assessing sex differences: A critical review of the psychology of sex differences. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly,* 22 (4)**,** 283-308.

Block, J. H. (1983). Differential Premises Arising from Sozialisation of the Sexes:Some Conjectures. *Child Development,* 54**,** 1135-1154.

Bloor, M., Jane, F., Thomas, M. & Robson, K. (2001). *Focus Groups in Social Research* London, UK: Sage Publications Ltd. .

Boehnisch, L. & Winter, R. (1993). *Male Socialisation, Issues with the Management of Male Identity throughout the Life Course (Original Title: Maennliche Sozialisation, Bewaeltigungsprobleme maennlicher Geschlechtsidentitaet im Lebenslauf),* Weinheim and Muenchen: Juventa Verlag.

Bourdieu, P. (1986). The Forms of Capital *In:* Richardson, J. (ed.) *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education.* New York, USA: Greenwood

Bourdieu, P. (2001). *Masculine Domination,* Cambridge, UK: Polity Press

Bourdieu, P. (2005). *Outline of a Theory of Practice,* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Bourdieu, P. (2007). *Sketch for Self-Analysis,* Cambridge, UK: Polity Press

Bowen, G. A. (2009). Document Analysis as a Qualitative Research Method. *Qualitative Research Journal,* 9**,** 27-40.

Bowl, R. 1987. Changing the Nature of Masculinity- A Taste for Social Work. *Social Work Monographs, University of East Anglia,* East Anglia, UK: University of East Anglia.

Breedlove, M. S., Rosenzweig, M. R. & Watson, N. V. (eds.) (2007). *Biological Psychology- An introduction to Behavioral, Cognitive, and Clinical Neuroscience,* Sunderland, USA: Sinauer Associates, Inc.

Brigid, D., Featherstone, B., Hooper, C.-A. & Scourfield, J. (2005). Why Gender Matters for *Every Child Matters British Journal of Social Work,* 35**,** 1343-1355.

Brod, H. & Kaufman, M. (eds.) (1994). *Theorizing Masculinities,* London, UK: Sage Publications.

Broude, G. J. (1990). Protest Masculinity: A Further Look at the Causes and Concept. *Ethos,* 18**,** 103-122.

Bryman, A. (2004). *Social Research Methods,* Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Bryman, A. (2008). *Social Research Methods,* Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Buckley, K. (1996). Masculinities, The Probation Service and the Causes of Offending Behaviour *In:* May, T. & Vass, A. (eds.) *Working with Offenders* London, UK: Sage Publications.

Burnham, D., Copsey, M., Cordery, J., Dominelli, L., Lambert, J., Smallridge, M., Whitehead, V. & Willis, S. (1990). Offending and Masculinity: Working with Males. *Probation Journal,* 37**,** 106-111.

Burr, V. (2003). *Social Constructionism,* London, UK: Routledge.

Burton, D. E. (2000). *Research Training for Social Scientists,* London, UK: Sage Publications.

Butler, J. (1988). Performative acts and gender constitution: an essay in phenomenology and feminist theory. *Theatre Journal,* 40**,** 519-531.

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

Butler, J. (2005). *Giving an Account of Oneself,* New York, USA: Fordham University Press

Butler, J. (2011). *Bodies that Matter: On the Discursive Limits of Sex,* London, UK: Routledge.

Campbell, A. (1984). Girls' talk: The social representation of aggression by female gang members. *Criminal Justice and Behaviour,* 11**,** 139-156.

Campbell, A. (1994). *Men, women and aggression,* New York, USA, Basic Books.

Campbell, A. (1998). *Psychology- Altruism and Aggression,* Leicester, UK: The British Psychological Society.

Campbell, A. (2006). Sex differences in direct aggression: what are the psychological mediators? *Aggression and Violent Behaviour,* 11**,** 237-264.

Campbell, A. (2008). Attachment, aggression and affiliation: The role of oxytocin in female social behaviour. *Biological Psychology,* 77**,** 1-10.

Campbell, A. & Muncer, S. (eds.) (1998). *The Social Child,* Hove,UK: Psychology Press Ltd.

Campbell, L. (1991). Influence and Involvement in Children's Discourse: Age, Gender, and Partner Effects. *Child Development,* 62**,** 797-811.

Canaan, J. E. (1996). 'One thing leads to another': drinking, fighting and working-class masculinities. *In:* Mac an Ghail, M. (ed.) *Understanding Masculinities.* Buckingham, UK: Open University Press.

Carlsson, C. (2013). Masculinities, Persistence, and Desistance. 51 (3)**,** 661-693.

Case, S. & Haines, K. (2009). *Understanding Youth Offending: Risk factor research, policy and practice,* Devon, UK: Willian Publishing.

Caulfield, L. (2010). Rethinking the Assessment of Female Offenders. *The Howard Journal of Criminal Justice* 49**,** 315-327.

Cavanagh, K. & Cree, V. (1996). Men, masculinism and social work. *In:* Cavanagh, K. & Cree, V. (eds.) *Working with men- feminism and social work.* London, UK: Routledge.

Celnick, A. (2000). Ethics in the field *In:* Burton, D. (ed.) *Research Training for Social Scientists.* London, UK: Sage Publications.

Charmaz, K. (ed.) (2000). *Grounded Theory: Objectivist and Constructivist Methods,* London, UK: Sage Publications Ltd. .

Charmaz, K. (2003). Qualitative Interviewing and Grounded Theory Analysis. *In:* Holstein, J. A. & Gubrium, J. F. (eds.) *Inside Interviewing: New Lenses, New Concerns.* London, UK: Sage Publications Ltd. .

Chodorow, N. (1974). Family Structure and Feminine Personality. *In:* Rosaldo, M. Z. & Lampere, L. (eds.) *Women's Culture and Society.* Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.

Chodorow, N. (1994). *Femininities, Masculinities, Sexualities: Freud and Beyond,* Kentucky, USA: University Press of Kentucky.

Christie, A. (ed.) (2001). *Men and Social Work-theories and practices* New York, USA: Palgrave.

Clark, A. (1995). The Struggle for the Breeches; Gender and the Making of the British Working Class. *Journal of Interdisciplinary History,* 27.

Clausen, J. A. (1968). A Historical and Comparative View of Socialization Theory and Research. *In:* Clausen, J. A. (ed.) *Socialization and Society.* Canada: Little, Brown and Company Inc.

Coffey, A. (1999). *The Ethnographic Self: Fieldwork and the Representation of Identity,* London, UK: Sage Publications.

Cohen, A. (1955). *Delinquent Boys: The Culture of the Gang.* London, UK*:* The Free Press.

Cohn, L. (1991). Sex Differences in the Course of Personality Development: A Meta-Analysis. *Psychological Bulletin,* 109**,** 252-266.

Coleman, W. (1990). Doing masculinity, doing theory. *In:* Hearn, J. & Morgan, D. (eds.) *Men, Masculinities and Social Theory.* London, UK: Unwin Hyman Inc.

Coles, T. (2007). Negotiating the Field of Masculinity: The Production and Reproduction of Multiple Dominant Masculinities. *Men and Masculinities,* 12 (1)**,** 30-44.

Collier, R. (1998). *Masculinities, Crime and Criminology: Men, Heterosexuality and the Criminal(ised) Other,* London, UK: Sage Publications.

Connell, R. W. (1987). *Gender and power* Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Connell, R. W. (1993). The Big Picture: Masculinities in Recent World History. *Theory and Society,* 22**,** 597-623.

Connell, R. W. (1996). Teaching the boys: new research on masculinity and gender strategies for schools. *Teachers College Record,* 98**,** 206-235.

Connell, R. W. (2005a). Globalisation, Imperialism and Masculinities *In:* Kimmel, M. S., Hearn, J. & Connell, R. W. (eds.) *Handbook of Studies on Men and Masculinities* London, UK: Sage Publications.

Connell, R. W. (2005b). *Masculinities,* Los Angeles, USA: University of California Press.

Connell, R. W. & Messerschmidt, J. W. (2005). Hegemonic Masculinity: Rethinking the Concept. *Gender & Society,* 19**,** 829-859.

Coote, A. (1993). Boys who can't grow up: men use crime to prove their masculinity because they have lost their role as breadwinner. *The Independent*, November 14th.

Corbin, J. M. & Strauss, A. L. (2008). *Basics of Qualitative Research: Techniques and Procedures for Developing Grounded Theory,* London, UK: Sage Publications Ltd. .

Corti, L., Day, A. & Blackhouse, G. (2000). Confidentiality and Informed Consent: Issues for Consideration in the Preservation of and Provision of Access to Qualitative Data Archives. *Forum: Qualitative Social Research* 1.

Cowburn, M. (2005). Hegemony and discourse: reconstructing the male sex offender and sexual coercion by men. *Sexualities, evolution and gender,* 7**,** 215-231.

Cowburn, M. (2010). Invisible men: social reactions to male sexual coercion- bringing men and masculinities into community safety and public policy. *Critical Social Policy,* 30**,** 225-244.

Cowburn, M. & Dominelli, L. (2001). Masking hegemonic masculinity: reconstructing the paedophile as the dangerous stranger. *British Journal of Social Work,* 31**,** 399-414.

Creany, S. (2013). Beyond pre-emptive criminalisation: towards a child-friendly youth justice. *Safer Communities,* 12 (3)**,** 101-110.

Crick, N. R., Bigbee, M. A. & Howes, C. (1996). Gender Differences in Children's Normative Beliefs about Aggression: How Do I Hurt Thee? Let Me Count the Ways. *Child Development,* 67**,** 1003-1014.

Crick, N. R. & Grotpeter, J. K. (1995). Relational Aggression, Gender, and Social-Psychological Adjustment *Child Development,* 66**,** 710-722.

Critical Research on Men in Europe (2005). Men, Masculinities and Europe. *In:* Kimmel, M. S., Hearn, J. & Connell, R. W. (eds.) *Handbook of Studies on Men and Masculinities.* London, UK: Sage Publications.

Cronin, A. (2006). Focus Groups *In:* Gilbert, N. (ed.) *Researching Social Life.* 2nd Edition. London, UK: Sage Publications Ltd.

Crow, G. & Wiles, R. 2008. Managing anonymity and confidentiality in social research: the case of visual data in community research. *In:* Methods, E. N. C. F. R. (ed.) *NCRM Working Paper Series.* London, UK: ESRC Centre for Research Methods.

Danneafer, D. (1984). Adult Development and Social Theory: A Paradigmatic Reappraisal. *American Sociological Review* 49**,** 100-116.

Day, C., Hibbert, P. & Cadman, S. 2008. A Literature Review into Children Abused and/or Neglected Prior to Custody, London, UK: Youth Justice Board.

De Keseredy, W. S. & Schwartz, M. D. (2005). Masculinities and Interpersonal Violence. *In:* Kimmel, M. S., Hearn, J. & Connell, R. W. (eds.) *Handbook of Studies on Men and Masculinities.* London, UK: Sage Publications.

De Viggiani, N. (2012). Trying to be Something You Are Not: Masculine Performances within a Prison Setting. *Men and Masculinities,* 15 (3)**,** 271-291.

Demetriou, D. (2001). Connell's concept of hegenomic masculinity: A critique *Theory and Society,* 30**,** 337-361.

Dollard, J. (1939). Culture, society, impulse, and socialization *American Journal of Sociology,* 45 (1)**,** 50-63.

Dominelli, L. (1992). Sex Offenders and Probation Practice. *In:* Woodhill, S. A. (ed.) *Gender, Crime and Probation Practice.* London, UK: PAVIC Publications

Dominelli, L. (2002a). *Anti-Oppressive Social Work Theory and Practice,* New York, USA: Palgrave Macmillan.

Dominelli, L. (2002b). *Feminist Social Work: Theory and Practice,* Hampshire, UK: Palgrave

Donaldson, M. (1993). What is hegemonic masculinity? *Theory and Society,* 22 (5)**,** 643-657.

Drever, E. (2003). *Using Semi-Structured Interviews in Small Scale Research- A Teacher's Guide,* Glasgow, UK, The SCRE Centre, The University of Glasgow

Drummond, M. J. N. (2003). The meaning of boys' bodies in physical education. *Journal of Men's Studies* 11 (2)**,** 131-143.

Dugmore, P. (2006a). Assessing Young People. *In:* Dugmore, P., Pickford, J. & Angus, S. (eds.) *Youth Justice and Social Work.* Exeter, UK: Learning Matters Ltd.

Dugmore, P. (2006b). Working within a Youth Offending Team and in the Youth Justice System. *In:* Dugmore, P., Pickford, J. & Angus, S. (eds.) *Youth Justice and Social Work.* Learning Matters.

Edwards, T. (2005). Queering the Pitch? Gay Masculinities. *In:* Kimmel, M. S., Hearn, J. & Connell, R. W. (eds.) *Handbook of Studies on Men and Masculinities.* London, UK: Sage Publications.

Egeland, B. (1993). A History of Abuse is a Major Risk Factor for Abusing the Next Generation. *In:* Gelles, R. J. & Loseke, D. R. (eds.) *Current Controversies in Family Violence.* London, UK: Sage Publications.

Elliott, A. (2003). *Concepts of the Self,* Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Ellis, C. & Flaherty, M. G. (eds.) (1992). *Investigating Subjectivity: Research on Lived Experience,* London, UK: Sage Publication Inc.

Farrall, S. & Hay, C. (2010). Not So Tough On Crime- Why weren't the Thatcher Governments more radical in reforming the criminal justice system? *British Journal of Criminology,* 50**,** 550-569.

Farrington, D. & Painter, K. 2004. Gender differences in risk factors for offending London, UK. : Home Office

Featherstone, B. (2009). *Contemporary Fathering- Theory, Policy and Practice,* Bristol, UK: The Policy Press.

Featherstone, B., Rivett, M. & Scourfield, J. (2007). *Working with Men in Health and Social Care,* London, UK, Sage Publications.

Feilzer, M. & Hood, R. 2004. Differences in discrimination? London, UK.: Youth Justice Board.

Fergusson, R. (2007). Making sense of the melting pot: multiple discourses in youth justice policy. *Youth Justice,* 7 (3)**,** 179-194.

Fielding, J. (2006). Coding and Managing Data. *In:* Gilbert, N. (ed.) *Researching Social Life.* 2nd Edition. London, UK: Sage Publications.

Fielding, N. G. & Fielding, J. L. (1986). *Linking Data,* London, UK: Sage Publication Ltd.

Fineman, M. A. (2010). The Vulnerable Subject and the Responsive State. *Emory Law Journal, Emory Public Law Research Paper,* 60**,** 1-41.

Fionda, J. (2005). *Devils and Angels- Youth Justice Policy and Crime.* Oxford, UK: Hart Publishing

Forth, C. & Taithe, B. (eds.) (2007). *French Masculinities: History, Culture and Politics,* New York, USA: Palgrave Macmillan.

Foucault, M. (ed.) (1980). *Power/ Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972-1977,* Brighton, UK: Harvester.

Foucault, M. (1992). *The Use of Pleasure: The History of Sexuality (Volume 2)* London, UK: Penguin Books.

Fox, D. & Arnul, E. (2013). *Social Work in the Youth Justice System: A Multidisciplinary Perspective* Maidenhead, UK: Open University Press

Fraser, S., Lewis, V., Ding, S., Kellett, M. & Robinson, C. (eds.) (2004). *Doing Research with Children and Young People,* London, UK: Sage.

Freud, S. (1923). *The Standard Edition of the Complete Works of Sigmund Freud,* London, UK: Hogarth Press.

Furstenberg, F. F. & Weiss, C. C. (2000). Intergenerational Transmission of Fathering Roles in At Risk Families. *Marriage and Family Review,* 29**,** 181-201.

Fuss, D. (1990). *Essentially Speaking - Feminism, Nature and Difference.* London, UK: Routledge.

Gadd, D. (2000). Masculinities, Violence and Defended Psychosocial Subjects. *Theoretical Criminology,* 4 (4)**,** 429-449.

Gadd, D. & Jefferson, T. (2007). Towards a Psycho-Social Subject: The Case of Gender. *In:* Gadd, D., And Jefferson, T. (ed.) *Psychosocial Criminology: An Introduction* London, UK: Sage Publications.

Galdas, P. M., Cheater, F. & Marshall, P. (2005). Men and health help-seeking behaviour: literature review. *Journal of Advanced Nursing,* 49**,** 616-623.

Garside, R. 2009. Risky people or risky societies? Rethinking interventions for young adults in transition. *Transition to adulthood* London: Centre for Crime and Justice Studies, King's College London.

Geary, D. C. (2000). Attachment, caregiving and parental investment. *Psychological Inquiry,* 11**,** 84-123.

Gelsthorpe, L. (2004). Girls in the youth justice system *In:* Bateman, T. a. J. P. (ed.) *The RHP Companion to Youth Justice.*, London, UK: Russel House Publishing

Gelsthorpe, L. & Sharpe, G. (2006). Gender, Youth Crime and Justice *In:* Goldson, B. & Muncie, J. (eds.) *Youth Crime and Justice* London, UK: Sage Publications.

Gerami, S. (2005). Islamist Masculinity and Muslim Masculinity. *In:* Kimmel, M. S., Hearn, J. & Connell, R. W. (eds.) *Handbook of Studies on Men and Masculinities.* London, UK: Sage Publications.

Giddings, F. P. (1897). *The Theory of Socialization* New York, The Macmillian Co.

Gilbert, N. (2006). *Researching Social Life,* London, UK: Sage Publications.

Gill, R., Henwood, K. & McLean, C. (2005). Body projects and the regulation of normative masculinity. *Body and Society,* 11**,** 37-62.

Gilgun, J.(2014). Social Work Specific Research and Theory Building. *In:* Wright, J., Beerry, J., and Dominelli, L. (eds.)*The Elservier Behavioural and Social Encyclopaedia.* Oxford, Uk: Elsevier Publications.

Gillmore, D. (1990). *Manhood in the making: Cultural concepts of masculinity,* New Haven, CT, USA: Yale University Press.

Glaser, B. G. & Strauss, A. L. (1967). *The Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for Qualitative Research,* Chicago, USA: Aldine Transaction.

Goffman, E. (1963). *Behaviour in Public Places: Notes on the Social Organisation of Gatherings* New York, USA: The Free Press.

Goffman, E. (1977). The Arrangement Between Sexes. *Theory and Society,* 4 (3)**,** 301-331.

Goffman, E. (1990). *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life,* London, UK: Penguin Books.

Goffman, E. (2007). Gender Display. *In:* Tiger, L. & Fowler, H. T. (eds.) *Female Hierarchies* London, UK: Transaction Publishers

Goldson, B. (ed.) (2008). *Dictionary of Youth Justice* Devon, UK: Willian Publishing

Good, G. E. & Brooks, G. R. (eds.) (2005). *The New Handbook of Psychotherapy and Counselling with Men: A Comprehensive Guide to Settings, Problems, and Treatment Approaches,* San Francisco, USA: Jossey-Bass.

Graham, J. & Moore, C. (2006). Beyond the welfare versus justice: Juvenile Justice in England and Wales *In:* Junger-Tas, J. & Decker, S. (eds.) *International Handbook of Youth Justice* Utrecht, Netherlands University of Utrecht.

Gramsci, A. (1971). *Selections from the Prison Notebook,* London, UK, Lawrence & Wishart.

Greener, I. (2002). Agency, social theory and social policy. *Critical Social Policy,* 22**,** 688-705.

Gurian, M. (2001). *Boys and girls learn differently! A guide for teachers and parents,* San Francisco, USA: Jossey-Bass.

Hammersely, M. & Aktinson, P. (2006). *Ethnography- Principles in Practice,* London, UK: Routledge.

Hanmer, J. & Maynard, M. (1987). Violence and Gender Stratification. *In:* Hanmer, J. & Maynard, M. (eds.) *Violence and Social Control.* London: Taylor and Francis.

Harris, I. M. (1995a). *Messages Men Hear-Constructing Masculinities,* London,UK, Taylor and Francis.

Harris, J. R. (1995b). Where Is the Child's Environment? A Group Socialization Theory of Development. *Psychological Review,* 102**,** 458- 489.

Harvey, J. (2007). *Young Men in Prison- Surviving and adapting to life inside,* Portland, USA: Willan Publishing

Hatty, S. E. (2000). Engendering Violence. *Masculinities, Violence and Culture.* London, UK: Sage Publications.

Hearn, J. (1987). *The Gender of Oppression: Men, Masculinity, and the Critique of Marxism,* Brighton, UK: Wheatsheaf Books Limited.

Hearn, J. (1996). Is masculinity dead? A critique of the concept of masculinity/ masculinities. *In:* Mac an Ghail, M. (ed.) *Understanding Masculinities* Buckingham, UK: Open University Press.

Hearn, J. (2004). From hegemonic masculinity to the hegemony of men. *Feminist Theory,* 5**,** 49-72.

Hearn, J. (2007). Masculinity/ masculinities. *In:* Flood, M., Kegan Gardiner, J., Pease, B. & Pringle, K. (eds.) *Encyclopedia of men and masculinities.* London, UK: Routledge.

Hearn, J. (2010). Reflecting on men and social policy: Contemporary critical debates and implications for social policy. *Critical Social Policy,* 30 (2)**,** 165-188.

Hearn, J. & Collinson, D. L. (1994). Theorizing Unities and Differences Between Men and Between Masculinities. *In:* Brod, H. & Kaufman, M. (eds.) *Theorizing Masculinities* London, UK: Sage Publications, Inc.

Hearn, J. & Kolga, V. (2006). Health. *In:* Hearn, J. & Pringle, K. (eds.) *European Perspectives on Men and Masculinities: National and Transnational Approaches.* Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Heidensohn, F. (2002). Gender and Crime. *In:* Morgan, R., Maguire, M. & Reiner, R. (eds.) *The Oxford Handbook of Criminology.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Heiliger, A. & Engelfried, C. (1995). *Sexual Violence- Males Socialisation and Their Potential as Aggressors (Original title: Sexuelle Gewalt- Maennliche Sozialisation und potentielle Taeterschaft),* Frankfurt, Germany: Campus Verlag.

Hester, M., Westmarland, N., Gangoli, G., Wilkonson, M., O'kelly, C., Kent, A. & Diamon, A. 2007. Domestic Violence Perpetrators: Identifying Needs to Inform Early Intervention. Bristol: University of Bristol.

Higate, P. & Hopton, J. (2005). War, Militarism, and Masculinities. *In:* Kimmel, M. S., Hearn, J. & Connell, R. W. (eds.) *Handbook of Studies on Men and Masculinities.* London, UK: Sage Publications Ltd.

Hobbs, D. (1994). Mannish boys: Danny, Chris, crime, masculinity and business. *In:* Newburn, T. & Stanko, E. A. (eds.) *Men, Masculinity and Crime- Just Boys Doing Business.* London, UK: Routledge.

Holter, O. G. (2005). Social Theories for Researching Men and Masculinities. *In:* Kimmel, M. S., Hearn, J. & Connell, R. W. (eds.) *Handbook of Studies on Men and Masculinities.* London, UK: Sage Publication.

Homan, R. (1991). *The Ethics in Social Research,* Harlow, Longman Group UK.

Home Office 1998. Crime and Disorder Act 1998. *In:* Office, H. (ed.). London, U.K.

Home Office. (2007). Gender differences in risk factors for offending. Available: http://www.homeoffice.gov.uk/rds/pdfs2/r196.pdf.

Hood-Williams, J. (2001). Gender, Masculinities and Crime: From Structures to Psyches. *Theoretical Criminology,* 5 (1)**,** 37-60.

Hopkins Burke, R. (2008). *Young People, Crime and Justice,* Devon, UK: Willan Publishing.

Howe, D. (2005). *Child Abuse and Neglect- Attachment, Development and Intervention* New York, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Howson, R. (2006). *Challenging Hegemonic Masculinity,* London, UK:Routledge.

Ingraham, C. (2002). The Heterosexual Imaginary. *In:* Jackson, S. & Scott, S. (eds.) *Gender- A Sociological Reader.* London, UK: Routledge.

Jary, D. & Jary, J. (eds.) (2005). *Collins internet-linked dictionary of Sociology,* Glasgow, UK: Harper Collins Publishers.

Jenkins, R. (ed.) (2002). *Pierre Bourdieu,* London, UK: Routledge

Johnson, F., Hogg, J. & Daniel, B. (2010). Abuse and Protection Issues across the Lifespan: Reviewing the Literature *Social Policy & Society,* 9**,** 291-304.

Johnstone, M. (2001). Men, Masculinity and Offending: Developing Gendered Practice In The Probation Service. *Probation Journal,* 48**,** 10-16.

Jung, C. G. (1933). *Modern Man in Search of A Soul,* London, UK: Routledge.

Jung, C. G. (1959). *The Archetypes and the Collective Unconscious,* London, UK: Routledge.

Jung, C. G. (1989). *Aspects of the Masculine* Princeton, USA: Princeton University Press.

Katz, A., Buchanan, A. & Bream, V. 2001. Bullying in Britain- Testimonies from Teenagers. Surrey, UK: Young Voice.

Kawulich, B. B. (2005). Participant Observation as a Data Collection Method. *Forum: Qualitative Social Research,* 6.

Kelan, E. (2009). *Performing Gender at Work,* London, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Ketterlinus, R. D. & Lamb, M. (eds.) (1994). *Adolescent Problem Behaviour - Issues and Research,* Hove, UK: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishing.

Kimmel, M. S. (2001). Masculinity as Homophobia: Fear, Shame, and Silence in the Construction of Gender Identity. *In:* Whitehead, S. M., And Barrett, F.J. (ed.) *The Masculinities Reader.* Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Kimmel, M. S., Hearn, J. & Connell, R. W. (eds.) (2005). *Handbook of Studies on Men and Masculinities* London, UK: Sage Publications

Kiselica, M. S. (2005). A Male Friendly Therapeutic Process wih School-Age Boys. *In:* Good, G. E. & Brooks, G. R. (eds.) *The New Handbook of Psychotherapy and Counseling with Men: A Comprehensive Guide to Settings, Problems and Treatment Approaches.* San Fransico, USA: Jossey- Bass.

Klein, M. (1975). *Love , Guilt and Reparation,* New York, USA: The Free Press

Klein, M. (1997). *The Psychoanalysis of Children,* London, UK: Vintage.

Klein, M., And Riviere, J. (1967). *Love, Hate and Reparation* London, UK: Hogarthe Press.

Kolb, B. & Wishaw, I. Q. (eds.) (2011). *An Introduction to Brain and Behavior,* New York, USA: Worth Publishers.

Kosofsky- Sedwick, E. (1990). *Epistemology of the Closet,* London, UK: University of California Press.

Krias, B. & Marston William, J. (2000). The Gender Relationship in Bourdieu's Sociology. *SubStance,* 29 (3)**,** 53-67.

Krueger, R. & Casey, A. (2000). *Focus Groups- A Practical Guide for Applied Social Research* London, UK: Sage Publications

Lamb, M. E. (2000). The History of Research on Father Involvement: An Overview. *Marriage and Family Review,* 29**,** 23-42.

Lawler, S. (2008). *Identity: Sociological Perspectives* Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Lemert, C. & Branaman, A. (eds.) (1997). *The Goffman Reader,* Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishing.

Litosselitili, L. (2003). *Using focus groups in research,* London, UK: Continuum.

Lord Bradley 2009. The Bradley Report- Lord Bradley's review of people with mental health problems or learning disabilities in the criminal justice system. London, UK: Department of Health.

Louie, K. & Low, M. (eds.) (2003). *Asian Masculinities: The meaning and practice of manhood in China and Japan,* London, UK: Routledge Curzon, Taylor & Francis Group.

Lovell, T. (2000). Thinking Feminism with and against Bourdieu. *Feminist Theory* 1**,** 11-32.

Lovell, T. (2003). Resisting with authority: historical specificity, agency and the performative self. *Theory, Culture & Society,* 20**,** 1-17.

Lui, R. X. & Kaplan, H. B. (2004). Role Stress and Aggression Amongst Young Adults: The Moderating Influences of Gender and Adolescent Aggression. *Social Psychology Quarterly,* 67**,** 88-102.

Lupton, D. & Barclay, L. (1997). *Constructing Fatherhood-discourses and experiences,* London, UK: Sage Publications.

Lykke, N. (2010). *Feminist Studies: A Guide to Intersectional Theory, Methodology and Writing.* London, Uk: Routledge.

Lytton, H. & Romney, D. M. (1991). Parents' Differential Socialization of Boys and Girls: A Meta-Analysis. *Psychological Bulletin,* 109**,** 267-296.

Mac an Ghaill, M. (1994). *The making of men: Masculinities, sexualities and schooling* Buckingham, UK: Open University Press.

McDermott, E. (2011) Multiplex Methodologies: Researching Young People's Well-Being at the Intersection of Class, Sexuality, Gender and Age. *In:* Taylor, Y., Hines, S., and Casey, M. (eds.) *Theorizing Intersectionality and Sexuality.* London, Uk: Palgrave MacMillian*.*

Malamuth, N. M., Heavey, C. & Linz, D. (eds.) (1993). *Predicting Men's Antisocial Behaviour against Women: The Interaction Model of Sexual Aggression*: Hemisphere.

Malamuth, N. M. & Thornhill, N. W. (1994). Hostile Masculinity, Sexual Aggression, and Gender-Biased Domineeringness in Conversations. *Aggressive Behaviour* 20**,** 185-193.

Marsiglio, W. & Cohan, M. (2000). Contextualizing Father Involvement and Paternal Influence: Sociological and Qualitative Themes. *Marriage and Family Review,* 29**,** 75-95.

Martino, W. & Berrill, D. (2003). Boys, schooling and masculinities: interrogating the 'right' way to educate boys *Educational Review,* 55**,** 99-117.

Mason, J. (2002). *Qualitative Researching,* London, UK: Sage Publications.

May, M. (2002). Innocence and experience: the evolution of the concept of juvenile delinquency in the mid-nineteenth century. *In:* Muncie, J., Hughes, G. & Mclaughlin, E. (eds.) *Youth Justice: Critical Readings.* London, UK: Sage Publications, Ltd.

May, T. (2001). *Social Research: Issues, Methods and Process,* Buckingham, UK: Open University Press.

May, T. & Perry, B. (2011). *Social Research & Reflexivity: Content, Consequences and Context,* London, UK: Sage Publications.

Mayer Hacker, H. (1957). The New Burdens of Masculinity. *Marriage and Family Living* 19**,** 227-233.

Mccormack, M. (2012). *The declining significance of homophobia: how teenage boys are redefining masculinity and heterosexuality,* Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Mcmahon, A. (1993). Male readings of feminist theory: The psychologization of sexual politics in the masculinity literature. *Theory and Society,* 22**,** 675-695.

Mcnay, L. (1992). *Foucault and Feminism* Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Mcnay, L. (1999). Gender, Habitus and the Field: Pierre Bourdieu and the Limits of Reflexivity. *Theory, Culture & Society,* 16 (1)**,** 95-117.

Mcnay, L. (2000). *Gender and Agency- Reconfiguring the Subject in Feminist and Social Theory,* Cambridge, UK: Polity Press

Mead, G. H. (1934). *Mind, Self and Society*, The University of Chicago Press.

Messerschmidt, J. W. (1993). *Masculinities and Crime: A Critique and Reconceptualization of Theory,* Maryland, USA: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

Messerschmidt, J. W. (1997). *Crime as structured action: gender, race, class and crime in the making,* Thousand Oaks, CA, USA: Sage Publications

Messerschmidt, J. W. (2000). *Nine Lives- Adolescent Masculinities, The Body, And Violence* Oxford, UK: Westview Press

Messerschmidt, J. W. (2010). *Hegemonic Masculinities and Camouflaged Politics: Unmasking the Bush Dynasty and Its War Against Iraq,* London, UK: Paradigm Publishers.

Messerschmidt, J. W. (2012a). Engendering Gendered Knowledge: Assessing The Academic Appropriation of Hegemonic Masculinity. *Men and Masculinities,* 15**,** 56-76.

Messerschmidt, J. W. (2012b). *Gender, heterosexuality, and youth violence: The struggle for recognition,* Plymouth, UK: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

Mills, M. (2001). *Challenging violence in schools: an issue of masculinities* Buckingham, UK: Open University Press

Mills, S. (2003). *Michel Foucault,* London, UK: Routledge.

Mooney, J. (2000). *Gender, violence and the social order,* Basingstoke, Hampshire, UK: Palgrave.

Mooney, J. (2003). It's the family, stupid: Continuities and reinterpretation of the dysfunctional family as the cause of crime in three political periods. *In:* Matthews, R. & Young, J. (eds.) *The New Politics of Crime and Punishment.* Devon, UK: Willan Publishing.

Morgan, D. (2005). Class and Masculinity. *In:* Kimmel, M. S., Hearn, J. & Connell, R. W. (eds.) *Handbook of Studies on Men and Masculinities.* Thousand Oaks, CA, USA: Sage Publications.

Morgan, D. H. J. (1987). Masculinity and Violence. *In:* Hanmer, J. & Maynard, M. (eds.) *Violence and Social Crime.* London: MacMillan Press.

Morgan, D. H. J. (1992). *Discovering Men,* London, UK: Routledge.

Morgan, D. L. (1997). *Focus Groups as Qualitative Research,* Thousand Oaks, CA, USA: Sage Publications Ltd.

Morgan, R. (2002). Imprisonment- A Brief History: The Contemporary Scene and Likely Prospects. *In:* Maguire, M., Morgan, R. & Reiner, R. (eds.) *The Oxford Handbook of Criminology.* 3rd Edition, Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Morrell, R. & Swart, S. (2005). Men in the Third World: Postcolonial Perspectives on Masculinities. *In:* Kimmel, M. S., Hearn, J. & Connell, R. W. (eds.) *Handbook of Studies on Men and Masculinities.* Thousand Oaks, CA, USA: Sage Publications.

Mouton, J. E. (2001). *The Practice of Social Research* Cape Town, South Africa: Oxford University Press.

Mullins, C. W. (2006). *Holding your square: Masculinities, streetlife and violence,* Devon, UK: Willan Publishing.

Muncie, J. (1999a). Institutionalised Intolerance: Youth Justice and the 1998 Crime and Disorder Act. *Critical Social Policy,* 19.

Muncie, J. (1999b). *Youth and Crime* London, UK: Sage Publications

Muncie, J. (2006). Governing young people: Coherence and contradiction in contemporary youth justice. *Critical Social Policy,* 26**,** 770-793.

Muncie, J., Hughes, G. & Mclaughlin, E. (eds.) (2002). *Youth Justice: Critical Readings,* London, UK: Sage Publications Ltd.

Murnen, S., Wright, C. & Kaluzny, G. (2002). If 'Boys Will Be Boys', Then Girls Will Be Victims? A Meta-Analytic Review of the Research of the Research That Relates Masculine Ideology to Sexual Aggression. *Sex Roles* 46**,** 359-375.

Nacro 2011. New responses to vulnerable children in trouble: improving youth justice. London, UK: Nacro Charity.

Newburn, T. (2007). Youth Crime and Youth Culture. *In:* Maguire, M., Morgan, R. & Reiner, R. (eds.) *The Oxford Handbook of Criminology.* New York, USA: Oxford University Press.

Newburn, T. & Stanko, E. (eds.) (1994). *Just Boys Doing Business?,* London, UK: Routledge.

O'Hara, M. (2013). Youth justice system is 'failing vulnerable young offenders'. *The Guardian* 5 February.

Oakley, A. (1972). *Sex, Gender and Society,* San Francisco, USA: Harper & Row.

Oakley, A. (1998). Science, Gender, and Women's Liberation: An Argument against Postmodernism. *Women's Studies International Forum,* 21**,** 133-146.

Oates, C. (2000). The Use of Focus Groups in Social Science Research. *In:* Burton, D. (ed.) *Research Training for Social Scientists.* London, UK: Sage Publications Ltd.

Ogburn, W. F. & Nimkoff, M. F. (1940). *Sociology,* Boston, USA: Houghton Mifflin Co.

Park, R. E. (1939). Symbiosis and socialization: A frame of reference for the study of society. *American Journal of Sociology,* 45 (1) 1-25.

Parke, R. D. (2000). Father Involvement: Developmental Psychological Perspective. *Marriage and Family Review,* 29**,** 43-58.

Parker, A. (1996). Sporting Masculinities: gender relations and the body. *In:* Mac an Ghail, M. (ed.) *Understanding Masculinities.* Buckingham, UK: Open University Press.

Parkes, J. & Conolly, A. (2013). Dangerous encounters? Boys' peer dynamics and neighbourhood risk. *Discourse Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education,* 34 (1)**,** 94-106.

Parsons, T. (1951). *The Social System,* Oxon, UK: Routledge.

Pease, B. & Pringle, K. (eds.) (2001). *A Man's World? Changing Men's Practices in a Globalized World,* London, UK: Zed Books.

Phoenix, J. (2009). Beyond Risk Assessment: The Return of Repressive Welfarism? *In:* Barry, M. & Mcneill, F. (eds.) *Youth offending and youth justice.* London, UK: Jessica Kingsley Publisher.

Pickford, J. & Dugmore, P. (2012). *Youth Justice and Social Work,* London, UK: Sage.

Pinel, J. P. J. (2009). *Biopsychology,* Boston, USA: Pearson Education, Inc.

Pitts, J. (2001). Korrectional Karaoke: New Labour and the Zombification of Youth Justice. *Youth Justice* 1**,** 3-16.

Plummer, D. C. (2001). The quest for modern manhood: masculine stereotypes, peer culture and the social significance of homophobia. *Journal of Adolescence* 24**,** 15-23.

Pollack, W. S. (2000). *Real Boys' Voices,* London, UK: Penguin Books.

Pollack, W. S. (2006). The 'War' *For* Boys: Hearing "Real Boys'" Voices, Healing Their Pain. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice,* 37 (2)**,** 190-195.

Popenoe, D. (2001). Life without father. *In:* Daniels, C. R. (ed.) *Lost Fathers: The Politics of Fatherlessness in America.* London, UK: Macmillan.

Pringle, K. (1995). *Men, Masculinities and Social Welfare,* London, UK: UCL Press Limited.

Pringle, K. & Pease, B. (2001). Afterword: A Man's World? Rethinking Commonality and Diversity in Men's Practices. *In:* Pease, B. & Pringle, K. (eds.) *A Man's World? Changing Men's Practices in a Globalized World.* London, UK: Zed Books Ltd. .

Punch, M. (1986). *The Politics and Ethics of Research,* London, UK: Sage.

Quinn-Patton, M. (2002). *Qualitative Research and Evaluation Methods,* Tousand Oaks, CA, USA Sage Publications Inc.

Rabinow, P. (ed.) (1991). *The Foucault Reader* London, UK: Penguin.

Reich, A. R. (2010). *Hidden Truth: Young Men Navigating Lives In and Out of Juvenile Prison,* Los Angeles, USA: University of California Press.

Richardson, R. (2007). *From Uncle Tom To Gangster- Black Masculinity and The US South* Georgia, USA: University of Georgia Press.

Ritchie, J. (2003). The Application of Qualitative Methods in Social Research. *In:* Ritchie, J. & Lewis, J. (eds.) *Qualitative Research Practice: A Guide for Social Science Students and Researchers.* London, UK: Sage Publications Ltd. .

Robb, M. (2010). Men wanted? Gender and the children's workforce *In:* Robb, M. & Thomson, R. (eds.) *Critical practice with children and young people.* Bristol, UK: Policy Press.

Robb, M. 2013. Beyond Male Role Models? Gender identities and work with young men. Available from: http://www.open.ac.uk/blogs/beyondmalerolemodels/ [Accessed 3 September 2013 2013].

Roberts, S. (2013). Boys Will be Boys...Won't They? Change and Continuities in Contemporary Young Working-class Masculinities *Sociology,* 47**,** 671-686.

Robins, P., Mohan, J. & Silver, E. (2008). Disorderly behaviour and the underclass culture: the emergence of the chav and NEET generation *Criminalising Social Policy: Anti-social behaviour and welfare in a de-civilised society.* London, UK: Willan Publishing

Robson, C. (2002). *Real World Research: A resource for users of social research methods in applied settings* Oxford, UK: Blackwell Wiley Publishing.

Rogowski, S. (2010). Young Offending: towards a radical / critical social policy approach. *Journal of Youth Studies* 13.

Rose, N. (1989). *Governing the Soul: The shaping of the private self,* London, UK: Free Association Books.

Ross, E. A. (1896). Social Control. *American Journal of Sociology* 1**,** 513-535.

Ruxton, S. (2002). *Men, Masculinities and Poverty in the UK,* London, UK: Oxfam.

Ruxton, S. (2009). *Man Made: Men, Masculinities and Equality in Public Policy,* London, UK: The Coalition on Men and Boys.

Scourfield, J. (2003). *Gender and Child Protection,* Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Scourfield, J. & Drakeford, M. (2002). New Labour and the 'problem of men'. *Critical Social Policy,* 22 (4)**,** 619-640.

Scourfield, J. B. (1998). Probation officers working with men. *British Journal of Social Work,* 28**,** 581-599.

Scourfield, J. B. (2001). Constructing Men in Child Protection Work. *Men and Masculinities,* 4 (1)**,** 70-89.

Scourfield, J. B. (2002). Reflections on Gender, Knowledge and Values in Social Work. *British Journal of Social Work,* 32 (1)**,** 1-15.

Seal, L. (2010). *Women, Murder and Femininity: Gender Representations of Women Who Kill,* Basingstoke, Hampshire, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Segal, L. (2001). The Belly of the Beast: Sex as Male Domination? *In:* Whitehead, S. M., And Barrett, F.J. (ed.) *The Masculinities Reader* Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Seidler, V. (2006). *Transforming Masculinities; Men, cultures, bodies, power, sex and love.* Oxon, UK: Routledge

Sheppard, M. (1995). Social Work, Social Science and Practice Wisdom. *British Journal of Social Work,* 25 (3)**,** 265-293.

Silverman, D. (1993). *Interpreting Qualitative Data- Methods for Analysing Talk, Text and Interaction,* London, UK: Sage Publications.

Skeggs, B. (1997). *Formations of Class and gender* London, UK: Sage.

Smart, B. (1985). *Michel Foucault,* London, U.K., Routledge

Smiler, A. P. (2013). *Challenging Casanova- Beyond the Stereotype of the Promiscuous Young Male,* San Francisco, USA: Jossey-Bass.

Smith, D. (2006). Youth Crime and Justice: Research, Evaluation and Evidence. *In:* Goldson, B. a. J. M. (ed.) *Youth Crime and Justice* London, UK: Sage Publications

Smith, D. & Mcara, L. 2004. Gender and Youth Offending- The Edinburgh Study of Youth Transitions and Crime, Number 2. Edinburgh: Centre for Law and Society, The University of Edinburgh.

Smith, R. (2007). *Youth Justice: Ideas, policy and practice* Devon, UK: Willan Publishing.

Smith, R. (1989). Diversion in Practice: A Study of Wellingborough Juvenile Liaison Bureau. Leicester, UK: University of Leicester (unpublished dissertation).

Smith, R. (2009). Childhood, Agency and Youth Justice. *Children & Society,* 23 (4)**,** 252-264.

Smith, R. (2010). Social Work, Risk, Power. *Sociological Research Online,* 15**,** 1-10.

Smith, R. (2011a). *Doing Justice To Young People: Youth crime and social justice,* Oxon, UK: Willan Publishing.

Smith, R. (2011b). Where now for Youth Justice? *British Journal of Community Justice,* 9**,** 69-80.

Solomon, E. & Garside, R. 2008. Ten Years of Labour's Youth Justice Reforms: An Independent Audit. London, UK. .

Spatz Widom, C. (1994). Childhood Victimisation and Adolescent Problem Behaviours. *In:* Ketterlinus, R. D. a. M. E. L. (ed.) *Adolescent Problem Behaviours: Issues and Research.* Hove: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.

Stahl, G. (2012). Habitus Disjunctures, Reflexivity and White Working-Class Boys' Conception of Status in Learner and Social Identities. *Sociological Research Online,* 18 (3)**,** 1-18.

Steffensmeier, D. & Schwartz, J. (2009). Trends in Girls' Delinquency and the Gender Gap: Statistical Assessment of Diverse Sources *In:* Zahn, M. (ed.) *The Delinquent Girl.* Philadelphia, USA: Temple University Press.

Steinberg, D., Eppstein, D. & Johnson, R. (eds.) (1997). *Border Patrols- Policing the Boundaries of Heterosexuality,* London, UK: Cassel.

Stephenson, M., Giller, H. & Brown, S. (2007). *Effective Practice in Youth Justice,* Devon, UK: Willan Publishing.

Sutherland , E. H. (1949). *White Collar Crime,* New York, USA: Holt, Rhinehart & Winston.

Sutherland, R. L. & Woodward, J. (1937). *Introductory Sociology,* New York, USA: J.B. Lippincott Co.

Taga, F. (2005). East Asian Masculinities. *In:* Kimmel, M. S., Hearn, J. & Connell, R. W. (eds.) *Handbook of Studies on Men and Masculinities.* Thousand Oaks, CA, USA: Sage Publications, Ltd.

Taylor, J. 2003. An Evaluation of Probation Practice in Relation to Masculinity and Offending Behaviour: Are We Addressing the Issue? unpublished MA dissertation: Northumbria University.

Tolson, A. (1977). *The Limits of Masculinity,* London, UK: Tavistock.

Tomsen, S. (ed.) (2008). *Crime, Criminal Justice and Masculinities,* Hampshire, UK: Ashgate.

Townend, D. M. R. (2000). Can the Law Prescribe an Ethical Framework for Social Science Research? *In:* Burton, D. (ed.) *Research Training for Social Scientists.* London, UK: Sage Publications, Ltd. .

Turner, B. S. (1991). Recent Developments in the Theory of the Body. *In:* Featherstone, M., Hepworth, M. & Turner, B. S. (eds.) *The Body: Social Process and Cultural Theory.* London, UK: Sage

Turner, B. S. (2008). *The Body & Society,* London, UK: Sage Publications.

Van Maanen, J. (1988). *Tales of the Field,* Chicago, USA: University of Chicago Press.

Voice, U. 2011. What's your story:" Young offenders' insights into tackling youth crime and its causes. London, UK: User Voice.

Walby, S. & Allen, J. 2004. Domestic Violence, Sexual Assault and Stalking: Findings from the British Crime Survey. London: Home Office Research Study 276.

Walby, S., Amstrong, J. & Strid, S. (2012). Intersectionality: Multiple Inequalities in Social Theory. *Sociology*, 46, 224-240.

Walklate, S. (2004). *Gender, Crime and Criminal Justice* Devon, UK: Willan Publishing.

Warren, M. Q. (1981). *Comparing Female and Male Offences,* London, Sage Publications.

Weaver- Hightower, M. (2004). The Boy Turn in Research on Gender and Education. *Review of Educational Research* 73**,** 471- 498.

Webb, J., Schirato, J. & Danaher, G. (2002). *Understanding Bourdieu,* London, UK: Sage Publications.

Webster, C. (2008). Marginalized white ethnicity, race and crime *Theoretical Criminology,* 12 (3).

Wedgwood, N. (2009). Connell's theory of masculinity: its origins and influences on the study of gender. *Journal of Gender Studies,* 18**,** 329-339.

Weiss, K. G. (2010). Male Victimization: Examining Men's Experiences of Rape and Sexual Assault. *Men and Masculinities,* 12 (3)**,** 275-298.

West, C. & Fenstermaker, S. (1995). Doing Difference. *Gender and Society,* 9 (1)**,** 8-37.

West, C. & Zimmerman, D. H. (1987). Doing Gender. *Gender and Society* 1**,** 125-151.

Weston, K. (2011) Me, myself and I In Taylor, Y., Hines, S. & Casey, M.E. (eds.) *Theorizing intersectionality and sexuality.* London, Uk: Palgrave MacMillian.

Wexler, D. (2009). *Men in Therapy- New Approaches for effective treatment,* London, UK: W.W.Norton& Co.

White, A., De Sousa, B., De Visser, R., Hogston, R., Aage Madsen, S., Makara, P., Richardson, N. & Zatonski, W. 2011. The State of Men's Health in Europe. European Commission & Directorate General for Health and Consumers.

White, R. & Cunneen, C. (2006). Social Class, Youth Crime and Justice *In:* Goldson, B. & Muncie, J. (eds.) *Youth Crime and Justice* London, UK: Sage Publications.

Whitebread, S. (1999). Hegemonic Masculinity Revisited. *Gender, Work and Organisation,* 6**,** 58-62.

Whitted, K. S., Delavega, E. & Lennon- Dearing, R. (2013). The Youngest Victims of Violence: Examining the Mental Health Needs of Young Children Who Are Involved in the Child Welfare and Juvenile Justice Systems. *Child and Adolescent Social Work Journal,* 30 (3)**,** 181-195.

Whyte, B. (2009). *Youth justice in practice: Making a difference,* Bristol, UK: Policy Press.

Wilson, M. & Daly, M. (1985). Competitiveness, Risk Taking, and Violence: The Young Male Syndrome. *Ethology and Sociobiology,* 6 (1)**,** 59-73.

Winlow, S. (2002). *Badfellas: Crime, Tradition and New Masculinities,* Oxford, Berg Publications.

Wittig, M. (2002). The Straight Mind. *In:* Jackson, S. & Scott, S. (eds.) *Gender- A Sociological Reader.* London: Routledge Student Reader.

Wood, W. & Eagly, A. (2002). A Cross-Cultural Analysis of the Behaviour of Women and Men: Implications for the Origins of Sex Differences. *Psychological Bulletin,* 128**,** 699-727.

Wray, N., Markovic, M. & Manderson, L. (2007). Researcher Saturation: The Impact of Data Triangulation and Intensive-Research Practices on the Researcher and Qualitative Research Process. *Qualitative Health Research,* 17 (10)**,** 1392-1402.

Wright, C. & Cowburn, M. (2011). What's Happening in Men's Work in the UK? Reflections on Policies and Processes. *In:* Ruspini, E., Hearn, J., Pease, B. & Pringle, K. (eds.) *Men and masculinities around the world: transforming men's practices.* Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Youth Justice Board 2005a. Risk and protective factors. Ministry of Justice. London, UK: Youth Justice Board.

Youth Justice Board 2005b. Youth Justice Annual Statistics 2004/2005. Ministry of Justice. London, UK: Youth Justice Board

Youth Justice Board 2006. ASSET. Ministry of Justice. London, UK : Youth Justice Board.

Youth Justice Board 2007. Youth Justice Annual Statistics 2005/2006. Ministry of Justice. London, UK: Youth Justice Board.

Youth Justice Board 2009a. Girls offending- patterns, perceptions and interventions. Ministry of Justice. London, UK: Youth Justice Board, .

Youth Justice Board 2009b. Youth Justice Annual Workload Data 2007/08. Ministry of Justice. London, UK: Youth Justice Board.

Youth Justice Board 2009c. Youth Rehabilitation Order with Intensive Supervision and Surveillance. Ministry of Justice. London, UK: Youth Justice Board.

Youth Justice Board 2010a. Case Management Guidance. Ministry of Justice . London, UK: Youth Justice Board.

Youth Justice Board 2010b. Exploring the needs of young Black and Minority Ethnic offenders and the provision of targeted interventions. London, UK: Ministry of Justice.

Youth Justice Board 2011. Advice on Information Management in Youth Offending Teams (England). Ministry of Justice. London, UK: Youth Justice Board.

Youth Justice Board 2012. Youth Justice Statistics 2011/12 London, UK :Ministry of Justice.

Youth Justice Board 2013. Youth Justice Statistics. Ministry of Justice. London, UK: Youth Justice Board.

Youth Justice Board 2013. Assessment and planning intervention- AssettPlus. London, UK: Ministry of Justice.

Yuval-Davis, N. (2006). Intersectionality and Feminist Politics. European Journal of Women's Studies 13, 193-209.

Zahn, M. A. (ed.) (2009). *The Delinquent Girl,* Philadelphia, USA: Temple University Press.

Zigler, E. F. & Child, I. L. (eds.) (1973). *Socialization and Personality Development,* Reading, Massachusetts, USA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.