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This thesis is concerned with young ‘South Asian’ and in particular Bangladeshi and Pakistani men, their new masculinities and experiences of racism. The thesis examines the life stories of young Bangladeshi and Pakistani young men aged eighteen to twenty-eight living in the North-East and North-West of England. The thesis contributes to research and theory on Bangladeshi and Pakistani masculinity by looking in detail at young men’s lives and how they understand and talk about these. This is a comparative piece of research which analyses and dissects the experiences of young Bangladeshi and Pakistani young men and realizes what configures their masculinity, it takes as axiomatic that ‘South Asian’s are not a homogenous category and there are various experiences, identities and masculinities at play. The thesis provides accounts of real experiences of how young men contend with their ethnicity, culture and masculinity in their lives and locality, and the tensions and strains they encounter in concealing their secret lives. The thesis is divided in to four chapters which offer a detailed literature review, a discussion of the life story research method and my own personal experiences, and the final two chapters analyse recurring themes in the young men’s interviews and what ‘makes’ masculinity. The thesis concludes that young Bangladeshi and Pakistani men are not very different to young men of other ethnicities in relation to their use of violence and aggression, their form of protest, their defence and offence tactics, the occupation of space, and acts which display and confirm masculinity. What distinguishes young Bangladeshi and Pakistani men apart from other men is their cultural and religious heritage and the related understandings of ‘man’.
INTRODUCTION

As a woman, I have always been intrigued about men and their masculinities, their behaviours and self-representations concerning ‘being a man’, and especially their uses of violence, aggression and assumptions regarding the articulation of patriarchal power. And as a ‘South Asian’ woman, with that particular cultural and religious upbringing, I was from a young age well-aware of the position subscribed for me and the existence of powerful expectations of my gender and social role, and in this context I often wondered about the social demands on ‘South Asian’ men and speculated that their position was one to be enjoyed. I resented the gender binaries that existed, the freedom that the men in my life seemed to enjoy, and their apparently effortless unchallenged articulation of power and control over women. However, while I made these observations and thought these thoughts from being quite young, I had little opportunity to develop my interests until my undergraduate degree at Northumbria University (1997-2001), where my undergraduate dissertation researched rape, male power and masculinity.

At Masters level also at Northumbria University (2001-2002), my dissertation researched local Bangladeshi masculinities and was entitled ‘Bangladeshi Masculinity and the Tolerance of Racism’ (Razak 2002). This was triggered by the events of summer 2001, when young Pakistani and Bangladeshi men took to the streets in response to their perceptions of the racist violence and abuse they had experienced. I too have had numerous experiences of physical and verbal racial abuse and have experienced both anger and resentment at the powerlessness and
worthlessness felt in such circumstances, so I could empathize with the young men and the emotions they expressed.

At the time of the ‘riots’ I was startled that the young men were able to configure and express such a powerful and violent position, and consequently speculated about the behaviour of these ‘South Asian’ young men and their confidence in making public their sense of dissatisfaction. I wondered if this was because ‘South Asian’ young men had arrived at a more confident identity and position in comparison to men of the first generation, and if these violent acts were a sign of the changing nature of the masculinity of ‘South Asian’ young men. I also considered it possible that young ‘South Asian’ men from different localities, regions and communities might experience and enact somewhat different forms of masculinity, connected to the size, distribution and segregation of their respective community in a particular locality. I considered if young men of a similar background in the North-East would be able to act in such a violent and public way in the context of the comparatively smaller ‘South Asian’ community there with its fewer numbers and power networks. I also wondered how these men articulate their masculinity in response to racism and whether they felt as defenseless and insignificant as I did and do.

Some of these questions formed the basis of my Masters research, in which I investigated first and second generation Bangladeshi young men, their masculinities and their tolerance of racism. My data was collected through semi-structured interviews carried out in the North-East, used to compare and contrast their experiences of racism to try to understand how they saw and lived out their masculinity. Although I found this piece of research interesting and a useful starting
point for understanding Bangladeshi men's experiences of racism and theorizing on aspects of their masculinity, the research was limited, and I did not achieve a comprehensive understanding of Bangladeshi masculinity and how men envisage and articulate their masculinity. I was consequently unable to consider whether masculinity varies between 'South Asian' men and ascertain whether forms of masculinity are contextualized and differ across locality and region. Also the literature that I had come across in my Masters research did not attempt to dissect or understand variations in 'South Asian' masculinity and contained a tacit assumption and construction of one version of masculinity for all 'South Asian' or Muslim men. I believed that the category 'South Asian' suppressed difference and homogenized cultural, religious, class differences and masculinity and that this needed to be investigated and conceptualised. These questions remained unanswered and they spurred me on to design and research these and related ideas in my PhD thesis.

At the initial stages of my PhD design, I still very much wanted to research and understand 'South Asian' masculinity and how racism interplays with this and how they live their lives, particularly how young men negotiate their behaviour and move about within their locality. I wondered if 'South Asian' men negotiated their loss of power around racism through oppressing women and whether attitudes to women and the gender binary had changed. I wanted to investigate and deconstruct 'South Asian' masculinity or masculinities by focusing on how Bangladeshi and Pakistani young men express, practice and embody their masculinity. I also wondered if there had been a shift in this, whether 'South Asian' men had become more aggressive and were emulating Afro-Caribbean masculinity (Goodey 1998, Archer 2001, Connolly 1998). In looking at this, I hoped to research and provide
comparable data between two spatially located formations of 'South Asian' masculinity and identity. I also wanted to explore the power and ability of racism to control and define behaviour and the connections of masculinity to this and to territory. Living some of my childhood years in the North-West, where there is comparably larger 'South Asian' communities than in the North-East, I was aware of the divisions existing between different 'South Asian' ethnic groups and territory, and I wanted to investigate the impact of rivalry and segregation and whether there is a masculine hierarchy amongst Bangladeshi and Pakistani young men.

However, as with all research, once a study is started the focus of it can change because responding to the social realities. Through my Masters research, and other research activity I was involved in, I had gained extensive experience of the semi-structured interview method as one which allows the collection of data around specific research interests. While I was contemplating the choice of research methods to employ, I came across the life story research method. This method appealed to me because it would allow the young men to select and tell stories of what they deemed to be important about their life, and this in turn would help illuminate the processes and practices that the young men are involved in which they see as central to 'being a man'. Designing the investigation and collecting data through this method was relatively unproblematic, although I was made more aware than I had been previously of the need to be conscious about and sensitive to my own safety and security in the research process (see Chapter Two). However, in the analysis stages at times I lamented my choice - although this was only because of the masses of data that was produced, and certainly not the quality of data that resulted. The life story research method is an invaluable tool for learning and understanding
about social and local processes, although with hindsight I would probably have opted for fewer interviews of a longer length and carried out on more than one occasion with each young man.

The life story research method altered the focus of what I had initially set out to investigate. The stories I collected pointed me to what the young men represented as important to them and their masculinity, their sense of being a man. My thesis then took shape around the young men’s experiences and how these inform and influence their lives. These included school and further education experiences, racism, friendship networks, religion, family, community, intra-Asian conflict, violence and criminal activity, and marriage and intimate relations. Analysing the data was also a great learning experience. Initially I was unable to separate myself from the emotion of the young men’s stories and often straightforwardly accepted some experiences as ‘fact’, failing to realize the self-representation and dramatization and what the young men were trying to achieve in telling the things they did. Here I found work on stories and accounts particularly helpful (Sykes and Matza 1957, Scott and Lyman 1968, Mills 1940, Goffman 1959, Coates 2003). I became interested in analysing the stories people tell as accounts, and the justifications and motives which are deployed in people’s explanations of what they have done and why. Much of what young men say is ‘masculinity talk’, and this approach in reading and conceptualising the stories told was invaluable in discerning what the young men were attempting to achieve through their story-telling and its connections to masculinity.

Researching and writing this PhD has been a momentous and laborious task. However, it has been a rewarding experience and one which I have enjoyed. The
skills and intellectual development achieved along this journey are invaluable and I believe that I have reached some interesting new insights and understandings, in particular that ‘South Asian’ masculinity is varied and contextually-specific, is indeed to be seen as masculinities, in which differences in experiences, ethnicities and the practices and self-representations associated with these are crucial to reaching an understanding of these young men’s lives.

In presenting the detailed evidence and arguments which support this conclusion to my thesis, in Chapter One I discuss various literatures (and this list is not exhaustive) relating to ethnicity, identity, masculinity, racism and territory, while Chapter Two discusses the methodology used in the research, Chapter Three analyses some common themes which recurred across the interviews I carried out, and Chapter Four is a detailed analysis of the social construction of ‘South Asian’ masculinities. The key contributions to knowledge which this thesis makes are presented in a succinct way in the Conclusion, and are that it deconstructs and provides a comprehensive understanding of the key requirements of ‘South Asian’ and more particularly Bangladeshi and Pakistani masculinities. In doing so, it makes clear that there are many diverse forms of masculinity at play and which young Bangladeshi and Pakistani men draw on, and these are formed and enacted in close relation with each other. It demonstrates that ‘South Asian’ masculinities are contextually-located and specific, and are formed around the young men’s responses to a complex inter-mingling of perceptions of racism, inter-ethnic competition, violence, rivalry and social and cultural gendered expectations. It also demonstrates that these young men to an extent live ‘secret lives’, in the sense that their behaviour and self-representations between each other are to a large extent
managed and kept separate from their home and family lives and behaviours, although with sometimes stressful consequences for them.
Chapter One

YOUNG ‘SOUTH ASIAN’ MEN, ETHNICITY, IDENTITY AND MASCULINITY

INTRODUCTION

‘South Asians’ in Britain were once portrayed and perceived as unproblematic, unthreatening, law abiding, peaceful and successful communities (Rattansi 1992, Modood 1994, Alexander 2000, Archer 2003). But in recent years, Britain’s ‘South Asian’ communities have come to the attention of media, policy makers and practitioners. Their now spasmodically high profile has included concerns about marriages practices, the educational attainment of young men, violence, drugs, social disorder and, most recently, religious fundamentalism and terrorism. Such concerns, however, have mainly been focused on ‘South Asian’ men, who were once stereotyped as law abiding and victims of racial crime but are now frequently portrayed in ‘folk devil’ terms (Alexander 2000, Cohen 2002, Goodey 2001, Archer and Yamashita 2003, Samad 1996, Back and Keith 1999, Webster 1997, Ramji 2007, Archer 2003). The visible, and perceived as aggressive and threatening, presence of ‘South Asian’ young men has been and remains of critical interest for the media, the police and also policy-makers, and it is specifically young Muslim men who have come to occupy a demonised position in British popular imagination. This concern over Muslim young men and their behaviour has brought attention to the public performances of masculinities, something which
signals a shift in the perception of Asian masculinities from passive and hyper-feminised towards violence and hyper-masculinity (Alexander 2000).

Academic interest, however, has largely failed to explore if there has actually been an emergence of a ‘new’ masculinity amongst ‘South Asian’ young men and its relationship with racism, or whether such concerns are media and popular ‘inventions’. My research contributes to filling the gap concerning ‘South Asian’ masculinity (Archer 1998, 2001, 2003 Alexander 1996, 2001, Goodey 1998, 2001, Mirza 1999, Webster 1997). It investigates the interplay of this ‘new’ masculinity with racism specifically as young Pakistani and Bangladeshi men articulate and represent this, including how racism is presented as impacting upon the lived, embodied, and performed experience of masculinity, thereby legitimating behaviour which otherwise might be seen as unacceptable. My research also investigates how ethnic identities and masculinities are localised, dispersed, classed and gendered and how Bangladeshi and Pakistani young men live their lives in local, cultural arenas. In seeking to understand how the discourse around racialised masculinity is understood and practiced by groups of young men, this first chapter will discuss literatures of critical interest in understanding forms of ‘South Asian’ masculinity, while my own research building on this is presented in subsequent chapters.

IDENTITY MATTERS

"Identity is about belonging, about what you have in common with some people and what differentiates you from others. At its most basic, it gives you a sense of personal location, the stable core to your individuality. But it is also about social relationships, your complex involvement with others” (Weeks 1990, p88).
Identity helps set apart one person or group from another, and provides a way of understanding the interplay between people's subjective experiences and the cultural and historical settings in which subjectivity is constituted. Identity is formed at national, racial, ethnic, regional and local levels, and people have multiple identities. Discovering, possessing and taking pride in an identity is a means to understanding where and how people place themselves; and it contributes to inclusion and exclusion from particular collectivities regarding race and ethnicity. Identity can be used to create uniformity or to subordinate those that are different; difference is unequally weighted according to specific social status. Insider/outsider binaries are, however, problematised because of the possibility that a person can be an insider on the basis of one social category, but also an outsider regarding another (Gilroy 1997, Phoenix 1998, Woodward 1997, 2000, 2004). To identify with a nation or a group is to take up a collective identity, with this sharing of identity suggesting an active engagement by people (Woodward 2004). Group identity is the product of collective internal definition and without commonality there can be no collectivity, no community of shared understandings or of response to external pressures.

'Community' is a powerful term around which people organise their lives and understand the settlements and localities in which they live; it is one of the most important sources of collective identity. The ability to identify individuals by reference to the social categories they 'inhabit' provides ideas about what to expect of them. Though people may be aware that they are categorised by others, they may not always be aware of the precise content or the implications of the grouping concerned (Jenkins 1996). This may be particularly important for young Bangladeshi and Pakistani young men, as they may not be fully aware of the
implications of being identified as 'aggressive', 'criminal', 'fundamental' or 'terrorists'. Jenkins also argues that collective identities are not internally homogenous, because they can and do change and vary from context to context, from person to person and in relationships with others; also, people mobilise identities of similarity and difference and it is at the boundary of an identity or a collectivity that people discover what they are and what they are not (Jenkins 1996). Boundaries can provide security and comfort, while boundary consciousness can be heightened by periods of moral panic, with moral panics frequently accompanied by the perceived need to control a threatening minority (Sibley 1995, Cohen 2002).

Woodward (2004) points out that people are not born with an identity, but rather this emerges in a number of different forms through an emergent sense of identification which develops in a number of ways, so there is never one, fixed, entirely coherent identity but several at play. Identity construction involves using the resources of history, language and culture in the process of becoming; identity is not who we are in any fixed sense, but where we come from and are going to. How people are represented of course bears on how they might represent themselves, and identities are therefore constituted both within and outside representation by others (Hall 1996). Hall (1996) describes identity as constituted and in a never-ending process of becoming, so identities are never achieved but are continuously constructed, negotiated, contested and asserted. A person constructs and asserts their identity in different ways across different contexts and time in relation to shifting social structures and race, gender, class and so on, and this makes various forms of identity and forms of masculinity available to an individual and these are reflected and formed in relation to social position and discourse. Within-group symbols and
representations are also important in the production of identities, because these signal other people with shared characteristics. People to an extent choose the image they want to present to others, and have some degree of agency with the ability to visualise and represent them although such symbols are limited by the culture they inhabit (Williamson 1986). And it is through appearance, clothes, and gestures and so on, that people give off information about the identity they are presenting.

Identity is neither transparent nor unproblematic; it is a process, never complete and always in process. Also identities are not unified, but fragmented and fractured; and they are never singular but multiple. Identities are constructed across different discourses, practices and positions, and are always in the process of change and transformation. But even so, people always act and speak from a particular place and time in history and culture which is specific; self-presentation is always in context and positioned through histories, cultures, language, community and class (Hall 1990, Westwood 1990). Hall (1990) argues that cultural identity by definition involves shared culture, a collective in which many people share a sense of common history and ancestry. Cultural identities in this sense reflect the perception (accurate or not) of common experiences and shared cultural codes, which provide seemingly stable, unchanging and continuous frames of reference. People undergo transformations subject to the play of history; culture and power, while identities are at basis the names given to the different ways people are positioned and position ourselves.

The basic idea of identity suggests an inclusive sameness without significant internal differentiation, but identity is also certainly constructed through and outside difference. Identities function as points of identification and attachment because of
their capacity to exclude and leave out 'the Other' (Hall 1996). The most significant difference between the individual and the collective within identity groups is that the former emphasises difference and the latter similarity (Jenkins 1996), but it is important to recognise that those who, for example, are in the same racial or ethnic group do not necessarily share the same identities. How people understand terms such as race, ethnicity, affect the way people or things are seen and understood and how people see themselves. Also the meaning of terms can change over time, as identities are dynamic and not static, so that what Black, Asian, white, is will shift because definitions about being such become disputed; and also who should be included or not shifts over time (see here the later discussion of the term 'Black', with Black people in the UK having successfully taken greater control of shaping how they define Black identities). Changes in who should be included and excluded show that people are not entirely free to choose their racial identities: identities are produced from a negotiation between those identities which people adopt, and those that other people ascribe to them. Ethnic and racial identities are ascribed on the basis of things that are 'read off' about people, with the result that constructed categorisations of people are often assumed to be normal and natural, with this in turn preventing people from realising the extent of shared cultural practices across groups (Lewis and Phoenix 2004).

Differences in identities are closely connected to the way they are imagined; for instance, western culture has imagined and produced a set of assumptions and representations about the East which see it as source of fascination and danger, as exotic and threatening. Current constructions of the East have included Islamic fundamentalism, which is construed, and sometimes demonised, as the new main
threat to western liberal traditions. This discourse, which Said (1985) calls Orientalism, has over time resulted in people of the East seeing and experiencing themselves as the ‘Other’. The relationship between the Occident and the Orient has been one of power and domination, and Orientalism has identified Europeans ‘against all those’ who are non-Europeans. The accompanying institutions, vocabulary, and doctrines assume and project a sense of fundamental difference between the West and the East, with Said suggesting that the new electronic post-modern world has helped to reinforce stereotypes about the Orient. Firstly, perceptions of Arabs and Islam have been changed into a highly politicised form, with the history of popular anti-Arab and anti-Muslim prejudice in the West reflected in the history of Orientalism. Secondly, the struggle between Arabs and Israelis has affected the liberal population and culture at large. And thirdly, the absence of a neutral cultural position makes it impossible to identify with or dispassionately discuss the Arabs or Islam.

However, while “Said can be praised for his illumination of the fact that many forms of Western scholarship have been nowhere nearly so ‘objective’ as they have claimed to be, and for alerting us to the dangers of perpetuating images of non-Western cultures that represent them in damaging ways” (Mellor 2004, p100), his work has been found to be extremely problematic because it is selective and only partially engages with Western and Middle Eastern history. Mellor criticises Said for condemning generations of Orientalist scholars as racist, imperialist and ethnocentric while failing to be reflective about his own highly partial elite position. Mellor also points out that Said’s approach sees human beings as overly powerless in the face of discourses such as Orientalism that define their lives and fails to see
contrary ideas and developments. Said highlights how Orientalism has failed to acknowledge the heterogeneity of Middle Eastern societies, with a related problem being that he homogenises the West as anti-Islamic. Said also presents the reader with little information about Islam other than how it appears in Orientalism, and this works to reinforce the image of Islam as having little power to challenge imperialist hegemony. Jalal al-'Azim (1981) argues that powerful representations of other cultures are not confined to the West but occur in all societies, and because Said fails to acknowledge this possibility, all contact between Islam and the West is erroneously seen as occurring exclusively in Western terms. And lastly here, Said has also been criticised not only for addressing Orientalism to the Western reader, but specifically to the Western male reader, paying little attention to the central issue of gender (Kennedy 2000).

Recent theoretical work on identity has enabled more complex conceptualisations of race and ethnicity, with these now seen as fluid, multiple, relational, socially constructed and interacting with other social positionings. This allows for better analytical understanding of societies, subjectivities and of course masculinities. Identities are not unified; there are mismatches between the collective and the individual level (Woodward 1997), and these can often be in conflict, not only between different communities but between individuals themselves (Weeks 1990). For example, the meaning of 'Black' not only varies between contexts but can also be contested within one context (Aziz 1995). There can be an internal insistence, for instance, that Black people should be and act in a particular way, and this gives rise to insults such as 'coconut' (brown exterior, white interior), suggesting that identity is more than just skin colour and that it is possible to fail to be 'Black
enough’ which suggest that ‘Blackness’ is an achieved and ascribed status (Phoenix 1998). Similarly contradictions arise for ‘South Asians’ because migration produces plural identities: the dispersal of people gives rise to identities shaped and located in and by different social and spatial places (Woodward 1997). Similar to the insult of ‘coconut’, terms such as ‘Bounty’ and ‘white wannabe’ are used by ‘South Asians’ to label and taunt those who are deemed to fail to be ‘Asian’ enough. This can also be true of masculinity, of course, so while people can fail to be Black enough, men can fail to sufficiently embody and enact forms of masculinity specific to their cultural identities. Concepts such as diaspora, hybridity (Werbner 2000, Anthias, 2001), the ‘third space’ (Bhabha 1990) and the ‘nomad’ (Braidotti 1998) have been devised and utilised to explain and signify new forms of identity constructed through migration and movement and the joining together of distinct entities to produce new hybrid identities and these are helpfully used to think about new forms of masculinities.

The transgression of national and ethnic borders allows the possibility of a double perspective: a person can speak from two places but inhabit neither, and this has been identified as a freer space of liminality, of ‘no place’ (Bhabha 1990), again acknowledging that identification is an enactment, not a ‘thing’ that is fixed or permanent. However, although diaspora and hybridity as concepts can help understand migration and dislocation as grounded phenomenon, they do not work to empower those who are dislocated, being more related to culture and consciousness, rather than with ameliorating social inequality and exclusion. Despite this, the condition of hybridity allows the formation of new identities that have trans-ethnic and trans-national characteristics, such as British-Muslim (Anthias 2002), because
the dispersal of people through migration produces identities which are shaped by as well as located in place (Woodward 1997). Caglar (1997), for instance, writes about fused identities as hyphenated identities, as with British-Pakistani, with such hyphenated identities argued to equate culture, nation and community, and privilege nationality and religion over other identifications, while also highlighting the problematic nature of collective attachments and interests. Alexander (2000) also found in her research that young Bangladeshi Muslim men constructed distinctly ‘new’ Muslim masculinities in which they defined themselves as primarily in terms of their religion and Bengali roots.

Like identity, multiracialised masculinity draws upon a range of locally-grounded diasporic discourses to construct particular forms of masculinity and can cross-cut ethnic and national groupings, combining various social, historical, geographical and cultural elements to produce a shifting masculinity created and recreated across times and contexts (Archer and Yamashita 2003). Consequently, the ideas discussed above are useful when considering if Bangladeshi and Pakistani young men have fused elements of ‘other’ masculinities to form their own construction, which might perhaps be specific to their locality, a boundaried territory. Concepts such as hybridity are also important in understanding that minority ethnic identities are flexible and diverse and that some young ‘South Asians’ simultaneously see themselves, for example, as Pakistani and British. But, as Anthias (2001) argues, while being positioned as a hybrid, people can draw on any available cultural identity, but a fusion of cultural elements does not necessarily signify a shift in identity as such. Variations in labels do not necessarily change how people live their lives, or what their cultural practices are.
It has been suggested that ethnic minority boys and young men negotiate between a range of ethnic, racial and national identities, but these negotiations are not value-free, because they are laden with meanings and part of the power struggles between men over the symbols of masculinity. Consequently, Mac an Ghaill (1999) suggests that in order to understand racialised and ethnic identities, the dispersed, localised and shifting nexus of social power has to be understood, including the dynamics of how ethnic identity is simultaneously classed, gendered and sexualised. Also a group can be both powerful and powerless, with social relations of race speaking of both gender and sexuality, as shown in insults such as paki, poof and so on. However, little research has been done to understand how these inter-relationships are lived in local, cultural arenas. For example, for young Black men, distinctions are made between the authentic/cool Caribbean masculinity and ‘other’ African masculinity, and African boys who identify themselves as ‘Black’ are often ridiculed by Caribbean-identified boys for possessing an identity which is less desirable and cool (Archer and Yamashita 2003). It is possible that there are similar divisions and hierarchies constructed by Bangladeshi and Pakistani young men. In understanding their views of masculinity, it is crucial to understand which discourses Bangladeshi and Pakistani young men draw upon, whether the two are positioned and position themselves differently, and whether any such distinctions are made within both groups. And as part of this, how such young men feel about labels/categories of ‘South Asian’ and ‘Muslim’, which are frequently used to describe their identity, also needs to be explored because these categories can be homogenising, denying difference, experience and other forms of identity.
DECONSTRUCTING CATEGORIES: ETHNICITY AND IDENTITY

‘Black’ as an identity is a term borrowed from the Black Power Movement (Brah 1992, Lewis and Phoenix 2004), denoting a specific dimension of racialised identity based solely on skin colour differences between ‘Black’ and white people. ‘Black’ was first used as an attempt to reclaim the African heritage which had been denied by racism (Brah 1992, Britton 1999), and soon began to be used to politically incorporate ‘South Asians’ and ‘South East Asians’ around similar experiences of racism. However, this also worked to deny ‘South Asians’ their own exclusive identity by ignoring cultural differences and experiences between people of Afro-Caribbean and Asian origin. ‘Black’ was actually meaningless for many ‘South Asians’, who did not perceive themselves as ‘Black’, and also many Afro-Caribbeans did not see them as such either (Brah 1992, Modood 1990). By prioritising differences based on skin colour rather than cultural or religious differences, the interests of ‘South Asians’ were subordinated to those of Afro-Caribbean people. For instance, the emphasis on discrimination against ‘Black’ people has worked to obscure the cultural antipathy of many Black people to ‘South Asians’, and ‘South Asian’ cultures and religion have been racialised in a way that involves discrimination from other non-white groups (Modood 1990). Modood (1990) rightly argues that, if colour was the sole basis for racial discrimination, then it is impossible to explain what are often higher levels of prejudice against ‘South Asians’. ‘Black’ creates a sense of false essentialism, that all non-white groups have something in common, something in addition to how people treat them. The result of this growing awareness was that by December 1998 the Commission for Racial Equality had ceased to recommend that Black be used as an ethnic monitoring
category encompassing 'South Asians'. Soon the concept of 'South Asian' began to be used to identify people of 'South Asian' origin, although this has its problems as well.

"Black people are treated as similar to other Black people whose ancestry lies roughly in the same region" (Phoenix 1988, p159, (my emphasis)). 'South Asian' as a group includes people from different countries, cultures, religions and ethnicities. Despite this, the category 'South Asian' is used frequently to group together these people, regardless of how they choose to perceive or describe themselves: it is an imposed category. Practitioners and academics alike have failed to acknowledge multiple forms of 'South Asian' identities, communities, cultures and genders, instead grouping people under this common heading. This has meant that the different experiences, individual voices, identities, religions, cultural differences of Bangladeshi, Indian and Pakistani groups has in effect 'vanished' and it also denies the existence of conflict and competition that may exist between these differing communities/groups. The highly restrictive and homogenising category of 'South Asian' consequently needs to be deconstructed to allow disassociation and the separation and identification of its composing groups. This is critical not just for recognising multiple 'South Asian' identities, but also for allowing 'South Asian' people to choose how they describe themselves. 'South Asian' also masks the fact that the concern with 'South Asians' is actually more with Pakistani and Bangladeshi communities than Indian, and even more so with their young men (Archer 2001). As Goodey comments, "regardless of the fact that only some members of the Asian community were engaged in aggressive actions against Rushdie, images remained in the popular consciousness that aided the shift in (white) perception that all Asians
from that of passive bystander to that of aggressor” (Goodey 2001, p443); and this provides an example of how the failure to recognise that ‘South Asian’ is not a homogenous category and that only Bangladeshi and Pakistani (Muslim) communities have experienced this shift in perception.

The Rushdie Satanic Verses controversy was a primary event in the demonisation of Bangladeshi and Pakistani communities. A section of British Muslims saw the book as a public symbolic violation which defaced and mocked Islam and its sacred symbols. Violent responses from some British Muslims to the author and the book fuelled a moral panic which essentialised local British Muslims in folk devil terms (Werbner 1997). This new widespread public preoccupation with fundamental Islam was one which constructed Muslim young men as militant and aggressive, and was strengthened through media reporting of fundamentalist and extremist more generally (Gardner and Shukur 1994, Archer 2001, Goodey 2001). It is important to note that the concern over Muslims and fundamentalism is specifically understood as a male issue and as a reaction to racial hostility and loss of patriarchal control and as a way of gaining self-esteem (Alexander 2000, Gardner and Shukur 1994). Following the Satanic Verses episode came the Gulf War, with many British Muslims openly supporting Saddam Hussein. This added to their demonisation, even though many white activists also protested against the war (Werbner 2000). The Rushdie controversy and the Gulf War demonstrated the possibility of disloyalty from British Muslims, and for the western world this represented the danger of Islamic fundamentalists.

More recent events - such as the urban unrest of 2001 in Oldham, Bradford and Burnley, September 11th 2001, the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq, the July 7th
2005 bombings and other national and international terror attacks - have further contributed to and confirmed the fear of Muslim fundamentalists and terrorists. Indians (Hindus and Sikhs) strategically disassociated themselves from Bangladeshis and Pakistanis, quickly forgetting their own experiences of racism, and presenting their image as an unproblematic, unthreatening, law-abiding community. Even the British National Party presented the uprisings of 2001 as a Muslim problem and not an ‘Asian’ one. By January 2002, Sunrise Radio (a leading ‘South Asian’ radio station) banned the use of the word ‘Asian’, which seemed to have become more synonymous with ‘Muslim’, after the culmination of long campaigns by Hindu groups in the UK who wanted to disassociate themselves from Muslims in the public mind. Although the term ‘Asian’ was problematic anyway, this campaign was seemingly based on the idea that racists could be persuaded to exclude Hindus and Sikhs and focus on Muslims instead (Kundnani 2001, 2002).

The problematisation of specific ‘South Asian’ communities has been exacerbated by the hyper-visibility of ethnic minorities in policy discourse as objects of concern, tacitly assuming that race is only a minority group issue (Phoenix 2000). However, this hyper-visibility in policy has not been matched by academic concern, where Black masculinity is not a high profile matter (Mirza 1999, Alexander 2000b, Archer 2001). Alexander, for instance, argues that Black masculinity has largely been taken for granted or ignored and that Black feminism has placed race and gender blinkeredness at the forefront of debates about identity and politics, while Black masculinity (and white femininity/masculinity) have “remained unscrutinised ironically marginalized in their assumed dominance” (Alexander 2000b, p132). Alexander further argues that the continuing conflation of gender with women by
default defines masculinity as homogenous and essentialised norm, while the public visibility and dominance of men as a collectivity naturalises male identities at the expense of subjectivity and difference. Issues around Black masculinities can be silenced, as it is assumed that male hyper-visibility reflects a position of power and dominance. Also Black experiences are racially coded in specific ways, which prevents a more complex understanding and theorising of masculinity. The lack of academic debate about ‘South Asian’, Muslim or Black masculinities needs to be addressed, because popular discourses are produced and reproduced which deny Black agency and which in turn create stereotypical constructions of deviant Black identities (Alexander 2000b). The fascination and concern with ‘Muslim’ men leaves young men of Indian, Pakistani and Bangladeshi invisible in the academic literature on Black masculinity (Archer 2001, Mirza 1999, Alexander 2000) and has served to remove Muslims from the history of Black/Asian struggle, while the particular focus on religion works to fix boundaries and absolute identities in which religion, ethnicity and cultures are naturalised and essentialised and become synonymous with ‘race’ (Gilroy 1992, Alexander 2000). Alexander (2000b) argues that this equation of Black male identities with ‘race’ places the focus of concern on violence, criminality and control, which presents a hyper-visibility of Black masculinity and positions them as subordinate to hegemonic ideals and as failing masculinity (hooks 1992), with violence and criminality as the alternatives to achieving patriarchal ideals and power.

The broad failure to recognise that Bangladeshi and Pakistani cultures, communities and identities differ means that, from being classified as ‘South Asians’, people are often re-grouped under religious classification as ‘Muslims’.
There is a common assumption that Muslims ‘stick together’, although the cultural heterogeneity of Muslims is in fact fractured by linguistic, national and doctrinal loyalties, as between Sunnis and Shiahs (Samad 1996, 1998). Although Islam can be a significant vehicle for collective mobilisation, it is in fact far less homogenous than outsiders commonly suppose and solidarities tend to be short-lived, for example, during the Satanic Verses controversy. In the UK, Bangladeshi and Pakistani communities actually had rather different responses to the Satanic Verses controversy, although they briefly identified together with a general Islamic standpoint (Ballard 1994, Samad 1996, 1998). A shared observance to Islam cannot overcome vast cultural differences; also racialised and cultural boundaries separate one group from another and are relatively fixed and movement is limited (Baumann 1996, Britton 1999). For example, marriage between Bangladeshis and Pakistanis is highly problematic and is avoided by most people and Muslims do not expect that “a bond of shared faith should render their multiplicity of cultures mutually intelligible or even compatible let alone the same” (Baumann 1996, p125). Bangladesh, Pakistan and India have all experienced serious inter-ethnic violence, and there is no reason to think that these divisions are not represented among the ‘South Asian’ communities here in the UK (Lyon 1997).

Webster (1997) argues that categories such as Muslim, Asian, ‘South Asian’ and so on contribute to the construction of stereotypes of victimisation and criminality in public discourses, because these categories rest on cultural essentialism of one form or another and deny the fluidity and range of cultural identity and human behaviour. Like the term ‘South Asian’, I think it is necessary to understand and be aware that differences can and do exist within categories and, as ‘South Asian’
denies the possibility of conflict and differences between groups within the category, so too does ‘Muslim’. As cultural differences exist, so do religious ones, so that, although a group may collectively describe themselves as ‘Muslim’, there are still variations in traditions and practices and interpretations of Islam can and do differ. This is particularly important when considering the masculinities of Bangladeshi and Pakistani men and how they perceive one another as ‘men’. In this thesis, ethnicity is used as a pragmatic means for referring to the young men, so in general discussions the terms ‘South Asians’ and ‘Asians’ are used to describe people from the South Asian sub-continent, but also these terms as employed by various academics are used to signify the lack of consensus and consistency amongst academic literature in describing people from the ‘South Asian’ sub-continent. In my own analysis, I use the ethnic-specific categories of Bangladeshi and Pakistani in discussions about the two groups of young men, firstly, because this allows the possibility to consider the similarities and differences between the two groups and secondly, because the young men varied in their descriptions of their identities from ethnic identity to sometimes religious.

**MASCULINITIES AND THEIR DISCOURSES**

If culture can be a source of conflicting identities, it can also be source of conflicting masculinities. Modood et al comment that “it is quite possible for someone to be torn between the claims of being for example, ‘Black’, Asian, Pakistani and Muslim, of having to choose between them and the solidarities they represent or having to rank them, synthesize them or distribute them between different areas of ones life and then possibly having to reconcile them with the
claims of gender, class and Britishness” (Modood et al 1994, p5), and a similar stance can be taken regarding masculinity. Masculinity for ‘South Asian’ men in western society involves a negotiation between different discourses of masculinity, discourses which are of course grounded in culture and are crucial elements in the social contexts out of which masculinities emerge (Frosh, Phoenix and Pattman 2002). Hence, it is important to explore if there are competing versions of masculinity at play, and, if so, how Bangladeshi and Pakistani young men negotiate and create their own version of masculinity. Ethnicity, identity and their relationship with masculinity needs to be considered here. O’Donnell and Sharpe (2000) argue that ethnic identification plays a powerful part in the way youthful masculinity is articulated and expressed in different contexts. Boys’ identities are not just formed in relation to girls, but by many factors including the ethnic differences existing between them. And as part of this, it is necessary to unpick themes of commonality and difference between Bangladeshi and Pakistani versions of masculinity, to identify various ways of doing masculinity and to explore struggles between competing masculinities. Because masculine identities are gendered practices which are relational, contradictory and multiple, there is a need to understand how Bangladeshi and Pakistani young men ‘do’ masculinity and ‘are’ men in specific contexts, requiring investigation of whether there are multiple forms of ‘South Asian’ masculinity. Central to understanding this is recognising how young Bangladeshi and Pakistani men negotiate a masculine identity and how they practice this masculinity in the particular places and environments they live.

Stereotypes of people play an important part in the organisation of social space, because of the way people distance themselves from others who are
represented negatively, and because of the way images of group and place combine to create patterns of exclusion (Sibley 1995). Stereotypes operate to naturalise ‘races’, genders, actions and motivations in ways that elide complex realities through simplification (Westwood 1995), but can also be a means of coping with instabilities which arise in people’s perceptions of the world (Sibley 1995). In addition, stereotypes can work to objectify others and define them as different, inferior and unacceptable. One effect is that popular discourses on race and masculinity tend to position ‘South Asian’ men as effeminate, weak, passive, hard working, eager to please and non-physical (Connolly 1998, Archer 2001). Such stereotypes are racist and part of a complex pattern of racial thought and behaviour (O’Donnell and Sharpe 2000). These discourses, which are exaggerated, influence and shape peer-group relations and interactions and can lead to victimisation, especially when such things are the basis on which members of the stereotyped group are treated (O’Donnell and Sharpe 2000).

Many academics have commented on the feminisation of ‘South Asian’ men and boys (Nayak 2001, Haywood and Mac an Ghaill 2003, Mac an Ghaill 1994, Archer 2001, Goodey 1998, Frosh and Phoenix 1999) and the noted sexual connotations attached to racist taunts such as ‘paki’ (Nayak 2001, Haywood and Mac an Ghaill 2003). However, there has been little exploration of how this impacts upon ‘South Asian’ men and boys, how it helps configure their lived experiences and enactments of masculinity and constructions of self.

Schools have been described as a site productive of racial and gendered identities via the curricula and pedagogical beliefs, values and practices and these shape and inform acceptable and non-acceptable forms of racial and gendered
behaviour (Nayak 2001). In schools with a majority ‘South Asian’ population, it has been found that the dominant representation of them still tends to be negative, but when there are significant numbers of Afro-Caribbean students, who are perceived as low ability and aggressive, then ‘South Asian’ students are seen more positively (Haywood and Mac an Ghaill 2003). Furthermore, ‘South Asian’ boys are found to be excluded from football and other masculine activities because of the stereotypical belief that they are not strong enough to engage in such activities, while to be seen to associate and play with supposedly effeminate ‘South Asian’ boys undermines other boys’ status and reputation (Connolly 1998). The effect of exclusion from processes which allow the building of a ‘normal’ masculine profile means that a self-fulfilling prophecy has been at work, where a masculine identity is built on competence in sport or being tough, and exclusion from this means that other boys’ racialised perceptions of ‘South Asian’ boys as effeminate are reinforced (Connolly 1998). An additional racialisation of ‘South Asian’ boys as ‘nice’ boys has occurred primarily because of their religious commitments, which provides them with the potential to be described as and admired for being responsible and mature (Frosh, Phoenix and Pattman 2002), although this religious commitment can of course now lead to them being represented as aggressive, fundamentalist and terrorist.

Teachers’ participation in these discourses has worked to reinforce the feminisation of ‘South Asian’ boys. ‘South Asian’ boys are generally not regarded as those who challenge authority, but seen as hardworking and helpful students. Connolly (1998) argues that the central processes that operate to produce and reproduce the masculine status of boys in the classroom are largely denied to ‘South Asian’ boys. When order and control is challenged in the classroom, then teachers
are more likely to single out Black boys as aggressive and troublesome and to overlook ‘South Asian’ boys. This allows for ‘South Asian’ boys to have a masculine identity which can go unnoticed and be rendered largely invisible (Mac an Ghaill 1994). Back’s (1999) research on boys in youth groups found that masculinity is a common register around which friendships can be built, but that a minority presence can lead to exclusion; and here Back argues that young Black boys can gain access to the insider position and castigate others through the Orientalist discourse which attacks and excludes certain other groups such as ‘South Asians’, Chinese and so on.

Racist attacks on ‘South Asian’ boys in schools are also different from those experienced by Black boys. Thus it has been suggested that white boys tend to have a reluctant respect for Black boys and attack them in public spaces to reaffirm their masculine identity, while attacks on ‘South Asian’ boys tend to be quick and out of contempt, giving ‘South Asian’ boys little chance to defend themselves and prove themselves as ‘men’. Attacks on ‘South Asian’ boys may be part of a broader process whereby Black and white boys actively police their masculine identities, because part of their identity is developed through distancing themselves from ‘South Asian’ boys’ versions of masculinity (Connolly 1998). Racial name-calling is important in this: “Black children wanting to call racial names back faced several problems. First the white racist vocabulary was much richer, as many children recognised . . . Second, white children knew that there was no social sanction against white skin . . . The third problem concerns the issue of ‘nation’. There was no reverse equivalent to the racist name calling of ‘paki’” (Troyna and Hatcher 1992, p158). Derogatory terms such as ice cream and milky-way, do not carry the same
weight as anti-Black terminology, which is saturated with ideological power (Nayak 2001). Being tough is effective in responding to and deterring racist name calling and so it is important to consider how Bangladeshi and Pakistani young men deal with verbal attacks, including that the failure to hurt racists verbally may lead to more physical methods being used.

The feminisation of ‘South Asian’ men/boys has given away with the recent transition to stereotyping Muslim communities and especially men as aggressive and troublesome. This will undoubtedly have a further future effect on masculinity and its enactment, as gender constructions and practices is highly influenced by such expectations. And in understanding if and how a new masculinity has developed and emerged, the possible effects of racism on constructions of masculinity need to be taken into account. Webster has proposed that “a new discernible shift has taken place whereby Asian masculinity has come to be associated with the criminal other, demonstrating how racial stereotypes and their mode of operation shift over time” (Webster 1997, p74). Fascination with Islam, Islam-phobia and fundamentalism has worked to dislocate earlier views of Muslims and portray them as the ‘new black’, with the association of cultural deprivation, alienation and danger. Like ‘Black’, the term ‘Muslim’ “is imagined as primarily a male identity. And at the same time, masculinity has become synonymous with a racialised ethnicity, which precludes the possibility of agency and transfixes ‘Muslim’ men as the new dangerous ‘other’” (Alexander 2000a, p236). Alexander argues that the religo-ethnicisation of ‘South Asian’ young men leaves ‘Muslim’ youth as triply disadvantaged and doubly dysfunctional with no space for difference, re-imagination and contestation. Consequently in understanding the impacts of demonisation and criminalisation on
Bangladeshi and Pakistani masculinity, it will be important to explore where young people place religion and culture in their lives and if it is central to young men’s identity and masculinity as is perceived.

‘South Asian’ cultures have been described as having rejected the liberal attitudes of British culture. Although there has been some change in individual families and social structures, overall there is still substantial adherence among ‘South Asians’ to traditional cultural customs, behaviour and upholding the community’s moral and religious identity. Islam has been found to be an effective way for migrants to maintain and control their distinctive culture and social structure (Shaw 1994), with Muslim cultures exercising a relatively high degree of control over their young and with parental and communal control being particularly strong in the areas of sexuality, marriage and career matters (O’Donnell and Sharpe 2000, Shaw 1994, Salway 2008). As Shaw comments “...it is striking that on a whole range of issues – ranging from attitudes at work through to expectations about family and marriage and to the maintenance of a Muslim identity – most members of the second generation adopt positions still broadly in line with those of their parents” (Shaw 1994, p55). ‘Adopt’ may not necessarily mean agree with, and so it is crucial to ask if upcoming generations do still have similar views as older generations. Certainly Archer (1998) argues that ‘South Asian’ identities are positioned as relational within the family structure with an unquestioning acceptance of patriarchal values, and these values are presented as both positive and as ways of constructing and enacting Asian masculinity. Archer also suggests that young men’s assertion of powerful, patriarchal ‘Asian’ masculinity could therefore be seen as attempts to distance themselves from stereotypical notions of effeminacy and victims. In
contrast to western conceptualisations of the male provider role as individualised, for ‘South Asian’ males this extend to one’s parents and Archer continues that young men may be redefining western masculinity based on autonomy, doing so around Islamic values of collectivity and relationality, which are traditionally defined as feminine values.

Some researchers have suggested that young ‘South Asians’ are torn between two cultures and have an identity crisis which rises from their location and that ‘South Asian’ young people are particularly “confused and culturally ambiguous” (Hiro 1991, p151), although Muslim young people usually in practice justify their views with reference to Islamic rather than western values, suggesting that the ‘torn between two cultures’ idea is actually false. The strength of religious and cultural continuities and the commitment to a Muslim identity provides young ‘South Asians’ with a powerful and ideologically effective justification for the maintenance of the family and solidarity (Shaw 1994). And the large majority of both Pakistani and Bengali young people who identify themselves as Muslim suggests that ‘South Asian’ is largely an externally imposed term utilised by the dominant culture (Saeed, Blain and Forbes 1999, Gardner and Shukur 1994). Indeed, in the early 1990s, Gardner and Shukur (1994) argued that the increasing commitment to Islamic values among British Bengali youth was born out of contemporary circumstances, a response to the experience of racial and ethnic exclusionism which their parents had to face but which the rising generation is not prepared to tolerate. Some years on, Alexander’s (2000) work has supported this view, arguing that Islam acts as a psychological barrier behind which Bangladeshi and Pakistani young people can hide their lack of self-esteem and gain strength, with Islam providing a positive identity
and solidarity and an escape from being identified in negative terms (Dwyer, Shah and Sanghera 2008). Vertovec (1998) has also suggested that identification as Muslim can also be seen as a form of resistance to anti-Muslim sentiment.

Archer’s (2001) research on ‘Muslim’ and Black masculinity found that young men identified themselves as ‘Muslim’ as opposed to their parental country of origin, supporting previous findings and mirroring media concerns with the rise of ‘militant’ Islam. Archer suggests that this is not just a reaction or resistance to racism and she agrees with Gardner and Shukur that: “The adoption of a Muslim identity does not preclude some degree of allegiance…; rather it reinforces it, it also implies rejection of Western culture” (Gardner and Shukur 1984, pg 163). Young men reject British culture and identity through identification with a religion that unites Bangladeshi and Pakistani groups, and this identification contains the potential for a global brotherhood in which a ‘Muslim’ identity is asserted strong and unified and British culture as weak and divided (Archer 2001). Archer (2003) suggests that the strong Muslim brotherhood can be read in terms of intertwining racial and patriarchal themes and young men are able to resist the stereotypes of ‘weak’ and ‘passive’ masculinity and associate with Muslim masculinity which denotes strength. However, this particular discourse of masculinity renders women invisible and implies a common vision and interest for all, constructing men as authentic speakers and ‘proper Muslims’ and women as ‘other’ to this (Archer 1998, 2001). The image of the strong committed Muslim man that young Bangladeshi and Pakistani young men have been found to project is perhaps an illusion, as young men have been found to be lax in their participation in Islamic activities such as prayer and there are discrepancies between young men’s commitment to their Muslim identity and
behaviours which breach both cultural and religious codes (Vertovec 1998, Macey 1999, Ramji 2007), such as drinking alcohol. However, their lack of religious knowledge or indeed observance does not reduce their pride in a Muslim heritage nor their desire to be associated with Muslim causes (Vertovec 1998).

Islam and other cultural matters, such as close family ties, have been thought to provide people with a cohesive and supportive community, something which is supposed to inhibit criminal acts (Goodey 2001, Webster 1997, Mawby and Batwa 1980). Consequently the occurrence of criminal behaviour has been attributed to inter-generational tensions brought about by the breakdown of family control over young people. For example, the police identified the roots of disorder in Bradford in 1995 as a widening cultural and generational gap within the ‘South Asian’ community, with community leaders having difficulty in controlling ‘their’ young: “Anecdotal evidence suggests that the police in their operational decisions are constructing Asian criminality, with the co-operation and collusion of Asian community elders who wish to tighten their rein on what are seen as ‘uncontrollable’ and ‘disruptive’ elements among Asian youth” (Webster 1997, p67). Police-community co-operation is meant to solve an alleged crime problem while also solving the cultural and religious control problems for the leaders, especially for Pakistani and Bangladeshi Muslim communities. Mawby and Batwa (1980) have also stressed the cultural and religious attributes of Muslim communities as inhibiting law-breaking as compared to white communities, suggesting that despite similar experiences of economic and social deprivation to other communities, there is still a relatively low crime rate amongst ‘South Asians’ due to the strength of support and control. Such controls rely on community enforcement and family prestige
through mechanisms of ‘sharam’ (shame) and ‘izzat’ (honour), with deviance having repercussions on family honour both in the UK and the country of origin, which in turn impacts on future prospects such as marriage (Webster 1997, Shaw 1994, Werbner 2007, Alam and Husband 2006, Thakar 2005, Gangoli, Razak and McCarry 2006). O’Donnell and Sharpe (2000) found that ‘Asian’ boys often referred to parental and family influence in their lives which occurred in a negotiated rather than authoritarian way, with these boys seeming to be motivated by respect for their parents and concern not to hurt their feelings rather than fear (Yip 2004, Hopkins 2006). However, Webster (1997) points that though reinforcements of family support and community policing are evident in ‘Asian’ communities, the conditions which sustain these cultural attributes may not last. Alexander (2000a) notes that in the mid 1990s there was a concern that the country was on the verge of outbreaks of disorder by Asians which would shatter the belief that Asians are more law abiding than white or Black people.

Gender is of course performative and relational; amongst other things, masculinity exists in relation to femininity and is constructed through everyday discourses in various contexts to produce different versions of masculinities. There are popular and culturally-specific ways of positioning boys and men, and girls and women (Frosh and Phoenix 1998). The construction of a ‘Muslim’ identity in practice is specifically a male one, as with reference to ‘Muslim brothers’ and the positioning of men as authentic ‘Muslims’ and women as less inauthentic. Muslim women in the west are particularly positioned as less inauthentic around their ‘Britishness’, because a western life is seen to be incompatible with Islam particularly for women (Archer 2001). Interestingly, Archer (2001) found that
women negotiated and argued for a British-Muslim identity eliminating race, but men actively took up race by using religion as the defining feature of race, and she suggests that this enables men to assert themselves as powerful in relation to by controlling the boundaries and definitions of gendered ‘Muslim’ identities. Culture is used here to present the sexual division of power as natural and intrinsic of ‘South Asian’ culture as well as masculinity and patriarchy and therefore not in any regard problematic. However, other research has also found that young men mobilise a particular interpretation of Islam as a power resource against women (Macey 1999) and it appears that Muslim men exercise patriarchal power partly through curtailing women’s freedom by invoking laws on modesty and shame to regulate women’s movement and lifestyle choices (Ramji 2007, Nagel 1998, Werbner 2007, Meetoo and Mirza 2007). This suggests that an interconnected web of discourses around race, gender and heterosexuality are used by men to construct a notion of manhood. Consequently, ethnic minority resistance to racism through masculinity may be grounded in the subordination of femininity (Alexander, 2000).

However, while young men may develop an aggressive masculine identity around their perceptions of racially-based exclusion, it has been suggested that women have not developed a similar identity (Macey 1999). Nevertheless, the behaviour of women as well as the control of women are important cultural markers distinguishing ‘South Asians’. Through religion and culture, women are constructed as cultural carriers through their embodiment of collective honour; women in their ‘proper’ behaviour, clothing and so on embody and signify the community’s boundaries (Yuval-Davis and Anthias 1989, 1997; Lyon 1997, Werbner 2007, Meetoo and Mirza 2007). Questions of women’s dress and demeanour are really...
questions about purity and male honour: “Honour is seen more as men’s responsibility and shame as women’s . . . honour is seen as actively achieved while shame is seen as passively defended” (El Sohl and Mabro 1994, p8). Through asserting ownership and placing themselves as the protectors of ‘their’ women and culture, ‘South Asian’ men do not represent themselves as needing protection for themselves (Wetherall in Archer 2001); through the control of ‘their’ women, men control their culture and identity, part of which means that feminist ideas and western culture are resisted. Through cultural patriarchal discourses, the community’s gender relations are reified as natural and unchangeable because of culture and tradition. Ramji’s (2007) findings evidence that Muslim men’s masculinity is directly related to their ability to provide and their duty of enabling Muslim women to observe modesty, and this is connected to men’s ability to provide the conditions for women to do so, which is also a reflection of how successful they are as men. Indeed, Alexander has proposed: “the ability to control and exploit another group’s women is seen as the ultimate expression of power” (Alexander 1996, p157).

**RACISM, MASCULINITY AND TERRITORY**

Racism is perceived to be more a masculine trait, although in practice women can be equally racist, because racism is related to male aggression and identity and not just vulnerability. As Goodey (1997) rightly points out, the literature on racist violence often neglects to articulate how being male is part of the way racist violence works, but experiences of racism are likely to be important in appreciating young ethnic minority men’s fear of and responses to crime and racism. In thinking in particular about the relationship between Bangladeshi and Pakistani masculinities
and racism, it is useful to draw on work concerning ‘Black’ masculinity, where some writers argue that ‘Black’ masculinity is a form of resistance to racism. Majors and Billson (1992) suggest that ‘Black’ young men construct a particular masculinity characterised by specific styles of dress, speech and appearance combined with a ‘walk’: the ‘Cool Pose’. Frost (2003) argues that it is these patterns of consumption which play a role in constructing and securing group membership and work to reinforce group boundaries and it also involves a symbolic demonstration of hardness in some working class and ‘Black’ cultures (Cohen 1986). And symbols those identify and promote a masculine cultural display, such as handshakes, hairstyles, walks, stance, clothing, jewellery, are constructed to signify membership and loyalty (Majors and Billson 1992).

The Cool Pose is said to have originated during slavery as a way for Black males to express their bitterness, anger and distrust toward dominant society. Coolness is the ability to maintain face under pressure and to be detached during intense encounters and it minimises threatening situations and earns respect from others. Cool, then, is a constructed public persona based on power and control for the male who has limited control or resources to empower. The cool of Black men has been seen as the epitomy of control, strength and pride; if a Black man does not conform to certain sub-cultural expectations of behaviour then he risks not being cool; and if the cool pose fails, then so does masculinity, because both are intertwined, or rather coolness is the core of masculine identity. Outlets for achieving a masculine identity are argued to be more available to white men than Black, and violence can be a form of achievement when everything else has failed (Majors and Billson 1992). hooks (2004) argues that Black men are born into a
culture that condones violence as a means of social control and are taught that 'real men' are fearless, insensitive, egocentric, and invulnerable. The 'Cool Pose' performance as discussed by Majors and Billson is an act of empowerment, a performance to render the Black male visible and powerful and a 'real man' as well as a way of responding to racism. However, it is important to note that Majors and Billson have been heavily criticised for over-rationalising and romanticising Black male expressive styles and reducing these to compensation for racism (Archer and Yamashita 2003, Mirza 1999).

Excessive focus on racism deflects attention from other explanations. hooks (2004), for instance, argues that Black men have found new sites and ways to assert a patriarchal style of manhood. A new generation of Black males have emerged who are only concerned with making money; older men believe that it was possible to ignore racism and swallow your pride for survival’s sake, but now money has become the marker of successful manhood both for poor and professional men. hooks, continues that the 'gangsta' culture of hustlers has become a high profile version of Black patriarchal masculinity, where only the predator survives. And although some violent actions can be explained as a response to racism and economic oppression, powerful males with good jobs still act violently towards women and children. In this context, hooks suggests that, whatever the roots of Black male rage, sexist thinking and practice teaches them that it is acceptable to express that rage violently: "As long as white males can deflect attention from their own brutal violence onto black males, black males, black boys and men will receive contradictory messages about what is manly, about what is acceptable" (hooks 2004, p66). Black male violence mirrors the style of white violence, it is not unique:
however, what is distinctive is that Black violence receives disproportionate attention from the dominant culture.

Other studies have regarded Black masculinity as an alternative to social status rather than as an extension to or expression of it. Alexander’s (1996) work on British Afro-Caribbean men, for instance, has challenged the construction of Black masculinity as merely a reaction and resistance to white racism and powerlessness engendered by racism. For her, Black masculinity is “best understood as an articulated response to structural inequality which enacts and subverts dominant definitions of power and control rather than substituting for them” (Alexander 1996, p137). Black masculinity is, then, a search for control within the symbolic constraints in traditional and racialised identity construction and is an aspect of social location; and Archer (2001) argues that this theory can be equally applied to young Muslim masculinity.

Afro-Caribbean boys are viewed as super-masculine by many other boys and as possessing its most popular attribute, toughness (Frosh, Phoenix and Pattman 2002). Many white working class boys relate positively in favour of Afro-Caribbean subcultures for their macho style (Nayak 1999), while research has found that elements of Black macho style have been adopted by some ‘South Asian’ young men too (O’Donnell and Sharpe 2000), with ‘Black’ young men seen to embody high status characteristics of a particular style of masculinity. The attraction of Black identities and masculinities may not necessarily result from a political opposition to racism, but be a way of exercising power in relation to other ‘South Asians’ and women (Archer 2001), although Back’s (1994) research suggests that not all ethnic minority young men admire Black masculinity. To what extent have
Bangladeshi and Pakistani young men adopted forms of Black masculine style, and are Bangladeshi and Pakistani masculinities constructed as a response to racism?

Alexander (1996) has found that for some Afro-Caribbean young men the boundaries of the Black community were seen to include all ethnic minorities who shared experience of a common enemy. However, they also felt ‘South Asian’ young men were in a tenuous position, occupying a space between Black and white extremes, and therefore their loyalty could always not be guaranteed. Related to this, Modood (1990) argues that most ‘South Asians’ do not identify themselves as ‘Black’, although many of the young men in this research did use a discourse of Black identity when referring to their experiences of racism. Relatedly, O’Donnell and Sharpe comment that “In general, young Asian men seem resourceful in using their own cultures and their experiences of the dominant culture to build viable masculine identities. Given the racism and the provocation and discrimination that Asian boys routinely experience, it is perhaps a tribute to their traditions of restraint that self defence and self help, rather than revenge and resentment, seem to be their preferred patterns of response” (O’Donnell and Sharpe 2000, p86). ‘South Asian’ young men have tended to be perceived as victims of crime and especially racial crime, but recently a macho culture has developed among some ‘South Asian’ boys, and certainly there were more ‘Asian’ youth gangs in the 1990s than in earlier decades, so that “The stereotype of the passive, uncomplaining Asian withdrawing into his or her tight-knit community has been replaced by militancy. East London, especially the Bengali community, has long learned to defend itself physically, after 100s of attacks” (Brake 1985, p142). From the 1980s, then, ‘South Asian’ youths have formed groups, and these are in part aspects of a stance against racism, around
forming networks to protect themselves and their communities from attack, something they saw the police as failing to do (Brake 1985).

The perceived need for men and boys to be tough penetrates the experience of many boys, but toughness for ethnic minority young men can be a display of a particular kind of masculinity, which involves race, but age and physical vulnerability can also be important, as toughness is more important to fighting and vulnerability than race. But although toughness is a reflection of young men’s age and physical strength, it has also been related to race by white and Afro-Caribbean young men who have spoken of Pakistani young men’s reputation for aggression (Goodey 1998). Alexander (2000a) also found in her study that Bangladeshi young men enact a tough and aggressive stance towards racism and in response to other Black young men and this turns the earlier victim stereotype on its head, for it evidences that inter-racial crime adds layers of complexity when interpreting and analysing racism, and masculinity definitely has a role to play. Goodey argues that “if some Asian boys are acting ‘tough’ their actions are legitimated, to an extent, by the racism ‘they’ (as representatives of the Asian community) have suffered to date” (Goodey 1998, p412). However, while this may explain Pakistani and Bangladeshi young men’s behaviour to white boys, it is not an adequate explanation for their behaviour to Afro-Caribbean boys. Goodey (1998) suggests that the explanation lies in the recognition of hierarchies of oppression, with those near the bottom of the hegemonic hierarchy ‘picking’ on those at the bottom. It is of course important to determine whether Pakistani and Bangladeshi young men have developed a racist streak and are getting tougher, as Afro-Caribbean and white boys have argued. Many Black men explain the decision to become the ‘beast’ as a surrender to realities
they can not change: if they are going to be seen as a beast, they might as well act like one, and some Black men have spoken of the satisfaction they gained from being able to create fear in others and especially white people (hooks 2004). If Pakistani and Bangladeshi young men are labelled as aggressors and treated as such, then in accordance with labelling theories, they may try to live up to their negative images, but this does not remove their role in their own criminalisation (Goodey 2001).

Webster (1997) has defined five different categories of ‘South Asian’ young men around criminality. The ‘conformists’ are the majority of young Asian men who generally avoid trouble. These young men identify with and defer to community elders and traditions, subscribe to mainstream Muslim culture and remain distant from secularised British culture. Like their parents they blame other Asian young people for their involvement in crime and inter-racial violence. ‘Experimenters’ are those who have some independence from their parents’ control and from cultural norms, with their preferences split. They are more likely to be involved in fighting and disputes over territorial claims and resources than the other young men. The ‘Vigilantes’ are older Asian youths; they are respected by those younger than them for providing protection and defence of Asian territory. They have doubts about the ability of the police to tackle problems and they prefer to take direct action against racism, but also drunkenness and prostitution, and in turn they are chastised by their elders for bringing dishonour upon the community. The ‘Islamists’ are sometimes seen to identify with Islamic fundamentalism, but most identify themselves as merely ‘Muslim’, and this group is rejected by community elders. The ‘Islamists’ join the ‘Vigilantes’ in their fight against drugs, prostitution and so on. Finally, the ‘Ethnic Brokers’ are those associated with forms of
occasional criminality, such as drug dealing. These young Asian men are involved in delinquency and crime and are likely to receive corporal punishments from family members.

Masculinities are given context by specific locations, for example the street, and such settings are crucial to understanding the variants of masculinity (Westwood 1995). Spaces are grounded in the specificities of particular locations, wherein identity is fractured by locality (Alexander 2000a). It is in these spaces that social identities are constructed, affirmed, contested, rehearsed and reworked (Hall, Coffey and Williamson 1999). A territory is the ground on which the practices of masculinity are enacted. The defence of territory is related to gendered notions of strength and physicality, with (some) boys performing masculinity by gaining status and capital through violence and talk of violence (Connolly and Neil 2001). Social relations in an area will influence and shape the ways in which young people think and behave, with this social space providing a locale for drawing together elements of identity construction, including social representations and masculinity (Kirby 1996).

Young Afro-Caribbean and ‘South Asian’ young people have been argued to live a local lifestyle, rarely leaving the area where they live. This localism can arise from the fear of racial harassment and attachments to the area, as well as to parochialism. Young people have been found to divide geographical areas into perceived safe and unsafe locales, keeping close to familiar locations and surroundings (Westwood 1990, Salway 2008), suggesting that the local area is crucial in constructing identities as well as boundaries. Being streetwise involves handling the dangers of the street and is seen as intrinsically linked to masculinity
and defence, while it is actually intimate knowledge of the locality and the protections of the area which makes it ‘safe’ (Westwood 1995, Alexander 2000a). Young men are much more fearful about the possibility of racial victimisation when they travel outside their own area than within it. O’Donnell and Sharpe (2000) suggest that this is understandable in terms of perceptions of danger and security, although statistics suggest that they are equally likely to suffer violence from a friend or neighbour as from a stranger. Women construct strategies in public to protect themselves from men’s potential violence, a fear which is rooted frequently in anxieties about rape which reduce feelings of safety. Consequently women learn a particular geography and presentational strategies within it to avoid violence and feel relatively safe (Stanko 1993), with such coping strategies helping to dispel feelings of fear (Matthews, Limb and Taylor 2000). It is interesting to consider whether ‘South Asian’ young men learn such travel tactics and geographies in response to racism and form mental maps of the distribution of racial harassment (Rai and Hesse 1992). The streets are also places of social inclusion and can provide geographies of social belonging (Matthews et al 2000) and define territories: “Territoriality can be best understood as a spatial strategy to effect, influence or control resources and people by controlling area” (Sack 1986, p172).

Control over space can take place on the basis of social markers such as religion or residence which are used to define boundaries of inclusion and exclusion. Certain vicinities are chosen as areas to ‘hang out’, allowing young men to establish themselves locally, to make their presence felt and to publicly assert collective identities through their occupation of territory (Hall, Coffey and Williamson 1999, Alexander 2000a). This can work to deter incursions into ‘their’ areas, a defensive
street masculinity which has, for instance, been developed by Afro-Caribbean and ‘South Asian’ males against racist attacks, especially in inner city areas (Watt and Stenson 1998, Alexander 2000a). In this regard, ‘South Asian’ youngsters too have been found to be increasingly proficient in forming, maintaining and extending safe areas through loosely organised self-defence groups (Webster 1997). The threat of racism makes the practice of travelling in groups a defensive necessity as well as a social preference (Keith 1995). Inter-ethnic friendships do exist, but ‘South Asian’ males have been found to go around in exclusively Asian male groups for self-defence purposes (Watt and Stenson 1998). The Black peer group is seen as entirely a response to racism, with the individual turning to a male sub-culture so as to create an illusion of status and power while dealing with social rejection (Alexander 1996).

Group-orientated masculine street strategies allow Asian males to move into other hostile areas, and is definitely connected to safety in numbers (Watt and Stenson 1998). On this, Webster comments that “Asian territorialism, however, also had the effect of creating white perceptions of these areas as ‘no-go areas’ for whites, and that any white on Asian attack would invite swift retribution” (Webster 1997, p75), creating a situation where white people can perceive themselves as victims of violent racism. Where the ‘colour coding’ of areas becomes reinforced, white people may develop a growing resentment and hostility towards ‘South Asians’, providing a discourse in which white people define racism in terms of their own status as victims and see themselves surrounded by ‘South Asian’ hostility. On the whole, there has been a growing perception from the police and local agencies of association between

Kundnani has commented that “By the 1990s, a new generation of Asians, born and bred in Britain, was coming of age in the northern towns, unwilling to accept the second-class status foisted on their elders. When racists came to their streets for a fight, they would meet violence with violence” (Kundnani 2001, p108). The uprisings during the summer of 2001 earned ‘South Asian’ and particularly Muslim young men the reputation of being criminals, militants, ungrateful immigrants. This image was reinforced by media selectively reporting stories of drug dealers, militants, car cruisers and criminals. The uprisings were an attempt by young ‘South Asian’ males challenging those who wanted to keep them in minority spaces, unsettling the idea that minorities should behave in certain ways in public: “They want more than ethnic cultural recognition that was sought by their community leaders in recent decades. Their actions in Summer 2001 were about claiming the public space as bona fide British subjects” (Amin 2002, p965). Following the uprisings, local leaders blamed a lack of discipline, a decline in Muslim voters and the influence of western values for the actions of their young men and accompanying threats to their own authority (Kundnani 2001).

Cohen’s (1988) ‘Nationalism of the Neighbourhood’ involves the defence of the locale and is pertinent to the events of 2001. Territory is about politics of space and a sense of belonging; and the politics of space and nationalism of the neighbourhood are played out in relation to masculinities and identity: “You become an ‘Eastender’ by demonstrating that the ‘East End’ belongs to you” (Cohen 1988, p33). This focus on defence/offence creates a strong bond between young men and
their local area, but at the same time this heightens threats of violence and vulnerability if they venture out of it (Connolly and Neill 2001). Territorial pride involves strategies of social closure which excludes those that do not have the right ‘credentials’, as outsiders and so potential threats, and this can lead to both local and regional rivalries. Cohen (1988) argues that a distinct body politic is constructed which allows working class groups to exercise forms of local jurisdiction over and against each other, and this also supports seeing themselves as a local ruling class. However, Cohen proposes that “popular nationalism of the neighbourhood is ethnicist rather than racist in orientation” (Cohen 1988, p35) and this is applicable to the lives of young men who often organise around ethnic differences and compete with each other for power, status and territory.

Gang violence across neighbourhoods is often sparked by threats or violence to an individual, group or community, but also “Youthful pride is at stake when your faith is being attacked, or, worse, where there is a perceived threat to ‘your women’” (Kundnani 2002, p75). The macho defence of an area or territory or possessiveness over women can aggravate a situation, especially if the aggressor belongs to another ethnic or social group (O’Donnell and Sharpe 2000). Boundaries between territories and gangs can be represented and reinforced by the consuming of certain goods, fashion and style, which helps identify with others and secures group membership (Frost 2003). The uprisings of June 1995 in Bradford are an example of Pakistani young men managing and reclaiming an area as ‘their territory’. Some commentators argued that this was an attempt by youths to use violence as a means of empowerment, while others suggested that the actions of the young men in these disturbances were indicative of a macho religo-cultural identity which socialised
them into believing they are more important than women and exclusively in charge of community honour (Burlet and Reid 1998). However, these Pakistani young men’s campaign against the sex trade demonstrated their ability to organise and manage over a wider geographical area through using Islam as a motivating force (Macey 1999). Violence can be organised and structured through ethnic male networks, and Macey (1999) argues that these networks have been used by Pakistani young men to target violence and also to threaten people who offend on religious grounds.

Race can be a unifying factor and perceptions of similarity and difference can be created and maintained through a range of associated social practices (Alexander 1996). Racial difference divides and establishes boundaries between Bangladeshi and Pakistani communities, but few explanations have been offered for intra-Asian violence, although tensions and gang violence attributed to machismo, drugs and employment and also conflict based on religious differences have been pinpointed (Goodey 2001, O’Donnell and Sharpe 2000). Fights between rival Bangladeshi gangs in London also exist, so a racialised link between Bangladeshi masculinity and ‘the streets’ is clearly too simple (Alexander 2000a). Intra-ethnic rivalry ensures that masculinity displays flourish and also such rivalry and conflict sharpens ethnic differences, which in turn can intensify masculine aggressiveness. Alexander (2000a) writes of the dual relationship of peer group and brotherhood which operates in Bengali gangs in London, and this can help resolve inter-group tensions and enable people to buy into a network of protection. Being able to summon up and trade resources is itself a mark of status and power, and is demonstrated by the range of favours owed to any one man (Westwood 1990). In this context, it is interesting
to consider whether Pakistani and Bangladeshi young men in the UK have also established such networks and what the distribution of power and status might be in them. Clearly aggression and conflict amongst ‘South Asians’ is heavily concentrated among young men and boys; for example, throughout the 1990s, there were a stream of incidents between Sikh and Muslim youths but tension between these communities is not new. And whether these young men took religion seriously or not, religion clearly operated as a significant unifying aspect of collective ethnic identity, and young men with different religious identities took up an aggressive position towards one another (O’Donnell and Sharpe 2000).

Other ‘Black’/ethnic men are often the desired audience for the performance of ‘Black’ styles, with music, speech, and clothes integral to the construction and demonstration of an identity couched in the discourses of visibility and locality (Archer and Yamashita 2003). Dressing in a certain way is symbolic, self-conscious and ritualistic and embodies a particular regional notion of masculinity (Nayak 1999). For example, similar to the young Afro-Caribbean men in Alexander’s research (1996), young Sikh men in Southall were organised around a ‘hard style’, signalled by their consumption of certain clothes, jewellery, leather jackets and gold, which announced and helped claim territorial power on the streets (O’Donnell and Sharpe 2000). The idea of ‘nationalism of the neighbourhood’ is potentially important in understanding how Bangladeshi and Pakistani young men organise themselves around ethnic differences and establish and defend territories, especially given evidence of rivalry between Asian youths from different neighbourhoods and between Pakistanis and Bangladeshis (Watt and Stenson 1998, Vertovec 1998, Alexander 2000a). This is also a useful way to think about how Bangladeshi and
Pakistani youths (or groups within) respond to particular situations, including whether territories and gangs exist and the extent to which these are defined and performed through styles of consumption.

CONCLUSION

'South Asians' living in the UK were once perceived as unthreatening and law-abiding, but recently these communities, and more specifically Bangladeshi and Pakistani young men, have become re-stereotyped as aggressive, fundamental and extremist. The research presented in the chapters which follow explores forms of masculinity amongst Bangladeshi and Pakistani young men, investigating whether there has been an emergence of a new more confident version of masculinity amongst these young men, and if so what it consists of. Among other matters, ideas about performances, enactment and the embodiment of local, culturally and ethnically specific masculinity are helpful to thinking about the issues involved.

The research will involve deconstructing the category 'South Asian' in relation to young men and masculinity, instead focusing on two of its composing groups, specifically Bangladeshi and Pakistani young men. Homogenising different groups of people as 'South Asian' makes invisible the cultural, ethnic, religious, educational and other differences that exist, and it also denies the existence of conflict and competition between these communities, which also inevitably impacts on styles of masculinity. And although Bangladeshi and Pakistani communities have Islam in common, as I have noted, Muslims are divided along linguistic, national and doctrinal lines. Consequently, it is important to take into account such variations
between cultures, nationalities and religions when exploring the versions of ‘South Asian’ masculinities constructed and performed by young men.

Bangladeshi and Pakistani men were once perceived as passive or feminised, but more recently younger generations have been viewed as aggressors, and so it is important to ask how this impacts on young men’s perceptions and enactments of masculinity. Given that religion, or rather fundamentalism, has been part of the shift of public perception of their masculinity, how important Islam is in these young men’s lives, and how Islam impacts upon performance and expectations of masculinity, needs to be explored. At the same time, my research will also consider if and how ‘other’ forms of masculinity may have been appropriated by these young men to form their own ‘hybrid’ and local forms of masculinity.

The research literature indicates the impact of racism on styles of masculinity. Territory, geography and locality all seem to be important in how young men cope and respond to perceptions of racism. Territorial and local boundaries are also important when considering that boundaries between Bangladeshi and Pakistani groups may be relatively fixed or may be more shifting given particular local circumstances and also that there is a possibility that there are competing versions of masculinity between Pakistani and Bangladeshi young men. Furthermore, it is important to consider the effects of locality in producing territorial and different conceptions of masculinity, the roles of gangs in this and the construction of hybrid forms of masculinity and in particular the influence of ‘Black’ and notions of ‘cool’ on performances of masculinity. The school has been identified as an important site where different versions of masculinity meet and where young men can learn and rehearse their masculinity and compete against each
other; my research considers the impacts of this on young men. Identity and masculinity for ‘South Asian’ young men is deeply influenced by religion but is also cross-cut by many other factors including the age of an individual, social class, education and other intra-community differences such as doctrinal, regional or linguistic variations which inform their understandings of ‘man’ and also of ‘woman’ in relation to young men’s masculine styles and behaviour.

Overall, my research aims to contribute to research and theory on Bangladeshi and Pakistani masculinity by looking in detail at young men’s lives and how they understand and talk about these. It takes as axiomatic that ‘South Asians’ are not a homogenous category, and also that there are different experiences, identities and masculinities at play. These need to be explored, particularly concerning whether young Bangladeshi and Pakistani young men are developing a more aggressive masculine style and any possible areas of conflict and competition between the young men from these different communities and this is explored in later chapters.

Chapter Two discusses the methodology used in the research. This chapter discusses the usefulness of the life story research approach and the quality of the data which can be obtained, also considering the limitations of such data and associated ethical considerations. The chapter also considers my role as a researcher and discusses in detail the research process I engaged in, including difficulties encountered along the course.

Chapter Three discusses the research content and the participants involved in the research for both the North-West and North-East. It also analyses common
themes which recurred across the interviews I carried out. These themes include religion, school and further education experiences and friendship networks.

Chapter Four is a detailed analysis of the construction of 'South Asian' masculinities, drawn out of the earlier analysis those themes most closely associated with this. The chapter begins with a brief discussion of masculinity in general, this is then followed by analysis of each of the themes that recurred in the young men’s interviews and which directly informed and constructed their masculinity. These include family, roles and responsibilities, community, intra-Asian conflict, marriage and intimate relations, and crime and violence. Throughout I explore similarities and differences among the North-East and North-West interviews.
Chapter Two

BIOGRAPHICAL RESEARCH: TELLING STORIES AND NARRATIVE ANALYSIS

INTRODUCTION

Qualitative research methods have closely been associated with feminist values and research ethics (Stanley 1990, Oakley 1998). And although it has sometimes been claimed that feminist methodology insists upon a distinct feminist method which only women can use, this is incorrect for what makes research ‘feminist’ is not the specific methods used but the way in which they are used and the frameworks in which they are located (Letherby 2003). The accompanying idea that different understandings of social life might be structured by gender among other factors rejects the existence of a single ‘objective’ view of social life; and also feminist methodologists have been concerned with the presuppositions, methodological procedures and epistemological claims of the research process and not just its knowledge products (Stanley, 2004). In addition, the methods used in a piece of practical research can often be almost independent of the theoretical position adopted, because research “involves a researcher being responsive to the dynamics and circumstances of the research context and those in it, and this may result in procedural and operational changes which actually clash with the body of formal theoretical ideas which the research is intended to explore” (Stanley 2004, p17). Given that methods are often chosen because they are the most appropriate within the research design, it is wrong to assume that a theoretical position will utilise only one
specific method of research. In addition, there has been a growing recognition that methodological and theoretical issues have cross-disciplinary significance, and that researchers will utilise knowledge from numerous sources and across disciplinary borders (Roberts 2002).

It is often argued that the best way to investigate elements of the social world is by asking people to talk, to gather and construct knowledge by listening to and interpreting what people say and how they say it (Mason 2002). Quantitative data may provide a large amount of good quality and easily analysable material, but it does not easily allow for exploring in-depth the details of how people understand their lives and experiences. In contrast, qualitative interview research is seen to have much greater interest from the participant’s point of view, and it also allows a focus on what the participant sees and wants to talk about as most relevant and important. From this perspective, the best way to find out about the details of people’s lives is through a non-hierarchical research relationship in which the researcher too invests aspects of their identity, by answering and not just asking questions, and also by sharing knowledge: a shared interaction which invites a degree of closeness and understanding. In qualitative research, participants are not objectified and placed in a passive role, because it allows scope for the participant to be involved and make clear the issues which they feel are important, and also because the emphases of the inquiry can be adjusted as a result of significant issues that emerge through the course of the research (Oakley 1998, Letherby 2003, Phoenix 1994, Mason 2002).

Qualitative methodology investigates the social by listening to and interpreting what people say and how they say it, by observing what people do and how they do it (Mason 2002). There are various kinds of qualitative methods such as
interviewing, ethnography, and also different styles of interviewing, including structured and semi-structured interviewing, the collection of life histories and so on. The chosen method for a piece of research will be influenced by the type of data a researcher wishes to retrieve and the amount of autonomy they want to give the participant in telling their stories. I have chosen to use a form of biographical methodology, a broad life story approach, and will now move on to discuss my reasons for this.

Structured interviewing consists of a set of pre-determined ordered questions which sometimes also include sections for open response, whereas semi-structured and unstructured interviewing differ in that they allow a much freer interaction between the interviewer and the participant which is often described as being similar to a conversation (Kvale 1996, Warren 2002, Robson 2002). As a method, interviewing offers researchers access to people’s accounts and memories as formulated and told in their own words, something which has been argued to be particularly important for the study of women, as a way of learning from women’s experiences by giving them a voice (Reinharz 1992). Semi-structured interviews are a commonly used tool, where the interviewer has a set of questions or topics they wish to cover, but the participant still has considerable flexibility in how they respond and not all questions on the schedule will necessarily be asked, although a similar format is used for all the interviews undertaken (Bryman 2004, Fielding and Thomas 2001, Minichiello et al 1990, Robson 2002). However, although this method ensures consistency between how a group of interviews are conducted and the collection of comparable data, it does not allow the participant to present and discuss their experiences, thoughts and feelings in a free-flowing way, for they are
guided by the interviewer’s questions to provide the particular data which is of specific concern to the research. Because of this, I concluded this method was not entirely suitable for my purposes, because I wanted the young men I was researching to freely select and talk about which experiences they felt were most significant in their lives, both generally and in relation to their identity and masculinity.

Focus groups or group interviews are useful for studying a specific topic with several people, and are particularly useful in exploring how people respond to other people’s views and how they interact concerning a common experience or view on a topic defined by the researcher (Gilbert 2001). This method has more recently been favoured by feminists because it facilitates the possibility of studying an individual within a group context, while it also allows the participants considerable freedom as to what is discussed. However, although this method can be useful in collecting large amounts of data relatively quickly, I decided against using focus group and group interviews precisely because discussions would be chosen in common, with participants unable to discuss in-depth their personal experience on topics where they might possibly feel discomfort about the presence of others. There is also a tendency for more vocal participants to take control over such research situations and also it would be difficult to tease out what people’s personal views were and what had been said because of group effect.

Ethnography, like interviewing, is an important tool in making people’s lives and voices visible and heard. Ethnography is often described as a multi-method form of research because it includes observation, participation, interviewing and analysis. Ethnography allows the researcher to understand behaviour in the social context in which it takes place and to explore the perspective of those being researched through
engaging in their understandings of social reality and this is important because adequate knowledge of social behaviour cannot be fully grasped until researchers understand the symbolic world in which people live (Reinharz 1992, Gilbert 2001, May 2001). Nonetheless, I decided against using ethnography, given the particular focus of my research. This was because I wanted to compare and contrast the experiences of Pakistani and Bangladeshi young men living in the North-West and North-East, and doing this would involve my trying to gain access to four different social groups, which would be extremely time-consuming. In addition, I knew that trying to gain access to groups of South Asian young men to do ethnographic research would be difficult, because of my gender, while they would also be very concerned about my ethnic links to their respective communities, and I would be anxious about my own personal safety.

Because a research interview would be easier to negotiate and conduct across two regions and different communities, I opted to use a broad life history approach. The stories, histories and life experiences of an individual can be retrieved relatively easily while only temporarily invading a person's life, while the participant has a great deal of choice regarding what to talk about and how to discuss it, and people narrating their salient experiences in a focused life history provide richly detailed accounts of their lives as they understand them.

**BIOGRAPHICAL RESEARCH AND LIFE STORY**

With the recognition that people narrativise their experiences of their world and their role within it, social scientists have reconsidered the use of the interview method and in recent years biographical methods of research have come increasingly
into use (Bruner 1990, Denzin 1989, Fielding and Thomas 2001, Plummer 2001, McCormack 2004). Biographical research as a broad methodological approach aims to understand the life experiences, changing understandings and outlooks of individuals in their daily lives and what they deem as important by providing their interpretations and accounts of their past, present and their outlook for the future. Biographical research is appealing to me because it explores how individual accounts of life experience can be understood within contemporary cultural and structural settings, permitting researchers to explore major social shifts by looking at how experiences are interpreted by individuals, families or small groups. Biographical research rests on the view that people create the meanings which form the basis of their everyday lives; through these meanings, they make sense of their social existence (Roberts 2002, Atkinson 1998, Miller 2000, Mishler 1991).

The term ‘biographical research’, however, encompasses a family of different terms, including autobiography, biography, life story, oral history, with the different methods shading into each other (Denzin 1989, Plummer 2001). The various methods involved demonstrate the numerous ways in which a life can be told. When a researcher chooses a method, they also choose a particular type of control ranging from minimal to considerable, over the subject-matter and focus of what people talk about. Autobiographies are the telling of a personal story written or spoken by and about a self, while a biography is the writing or speaking of a life by another person. Life history involves the collection, interpretation and writing of an individual life, and can be topic-based, by focusing on a particular portion or aspect of a life and not the totality of it. Life story is the particular biographical approach I decided to use because it produces the story a person chooses to tell about their lives, what they
think is significant, and is a story of personal experience albeit facilitated by some guidance from the interviewer. Life stories are stories of personal experience, either of a life or a segment of a life, and this method allows the participant to become the author who brings the story into existence, because they are present in the shape as well as content of their stories through the words and conventions they use (Reinharz 1992, Denzin 1989, Atkinson 1998, Roberts 2002). What people include in their stories tells researchers who they are in a very direct and powerful way (Atkinson 1998).

The appeal of the biographical approach has increased together with the wider interest in agency and context in social life (Bryman 2004, Haglund 2004). Roberts (2002), for instance, argues that the increase in biographical methods is due to the increased focus on the personal and intimate. Biographical research can rectify the neglect of research into women, minority groups and injustices, because it enables people to tell their stories (Reinharz 1992, Plummer 1992, Goodey 2000, Riessman 1993). Stories can be carriers of fact and are not ‘just stories’ they are social products (Lawler 2002, Atkinson 1998) and we “need to hear the life stories of individuals from those underrepresented groups to help establish a balance in life” (Atkinson 1998, p19). Riessman (1993, 2002), however, argues that life stories do not necessarily give ‘voice’ to silenced groups but rather that researchers record and interpret and release a representation of this experience, although at the same time access to people’s subjective world can be gained through biographical research, which elicits the sense of reality that human beings have about their lives. Life is ambiguous and complex and fascinating, and through biographical research a researcher can move away from studying abstractions and get to grips with the

Mishler argues that “telling stories is a significant way for individuals to give meaning to and express their understandings of their experiences” (Mishler 1991, p75) and I agree that the meanings of experiences are best provided by the people who have experienced them (Denzin 1989, Atkinson 1998). Consequently the life story approach is particularly useful for my research because it evolves around a thematic topic, usually in outline set by the researcher but very much structured by the participant. The life story is mediated by the researcher’s interaction with the participant who facilitates the telling of the story (Minichiello et al 1990, Atkinson 1998), but nonetheless each interview is a product of mutual interaction between the participant and the researcher. The participants do not simply produce stories regardless of the situation, but rather create their stories within this social process (Bruner 1990, Rosenthal 1993), by being asked to narrate relevant situations, contexts and events. Knowledge in this context is usefully seen as a co-production, dependent on the combined efforts of researcher and participant in the construction of a story that the participant is happy with (Atkinson 1998, Mason 2002), again something which appeals to me. Atkinson (1998) also argues that there are clear benefits for participants in life story research, because this enables people’s voices to be heard and recognised, while also providing them with an opportunity to tell a story the way they choose to tell it. Also “a person’s story is essentially an expression of his or her self understanding. There is no stronger, clearer statement of how the person sees and understands his or her own life than his or her own narrative of it” (Atkinson 1998, p65); however, the telling of life stories is not necessarily
therapeutic, but it can help a person understand and clarify experiences and feelings (Atkinson 1998, Miller 2000).

Atkinson comments that “a life story is the story a person chooses to tell about the life he or she has lived, told as completely and honestly as possible, what is remembered of it, and what the tellers want others to know of it, usually as a result of a guided interview by another” (Atkinson 1998, p8). The topics discussed in a life story project usually centre on certain periods of time, specific events or single biographical strands such as education or relationships, with these topics providing a framework for the participant’s selection of stories (Rosenthal 1993). The collection of stories incorporates the participant’s experiences and allows the researcher to explore and examine changes over a period of time or the whole of someone’s life. Life story participants actively remember and reconstruct their lives through the telling of stories, and this process gives great insight and evaluation into how past events and relationships might influence current experiences and the lived life, which allows researchers in turn to better understand how human beings understand their lives from an insider perspective (Atkinson, 1998, Ben-Ari 1995, Haglund, 2004, Gilbert 2002, Cotterill and Letherby 1993). Through the collection of life stories, researchers can access the deeper meanings that people assign to their life processes by reflecting on their experiences and feelings through telling stories. The resultant stories may sometimes be fragmented and partial, but they can still tell the researcher a great deal about the person and the social world he/she inhabits (Lawler 2002). This is because life stories connect cultural history with personal biography, because people live their lives through culture and use culture to write who they are (Plummer 2001), and what is important to an individual is told and retold in their
stories: “Clusters of individual lives make up communities, societies and cultures. To understand some of the complexities, complications and confusions within the life of just one member of one community is to gain insights into the collective” (Cole and Knowles 2001, p11). The telling of stories can give coherence to and understanding of what is important to a life, and it can also work to inform others and to illustrate the workings of a community, society or group and to explain their understanding and experience of certain events as stories are grounded in structures of race, class, gender and age (Mishler 1991, Atkinson 1998, Plummer 2001, Roberts 2002, McCormack 2004). Life stories explore cultural values and traditions and help us to understand commonalities and differences with others, through the telling of events a persons beliefs, what they deem to be important and identity are illustrated (Atkinson 1998).

However, at the same time a life story is always selective because it speaks of particular experiences and entails memory and recall and all telling is an interpretation. Life stories can only be told if a framework exists in which these stories can be told. Plummer (2001) discusses this by referring to gay and lesbian stories, stories which began to be told once a social and political framework emerged for them to be organised and accessible. Local communities and cultures, then, can shape memories and stories because they provide much of the language in which stories make sense (Bruner 1990, Atkinson 1998, Gilbert 2002). To tell a story that is heard as valid or true, the speaker needs to know how to present themselves in ways which conforms to a group’s conceptions of validity and truthfulness. The stories that are told are those that are culturally available, and they reflect and reproduce existing social relations and, for example, stories about race and racism.
illustrate cultural assumptions and perceptions of the world (Plummer 2001, Bell 2003, Denzin 1989). However, to be bound by a set of culturally connected stories does not necessarily represent consensus (Bruner 1990). Stories are told to particular people and groups and may take a different form if told to other people or in other circumstances. Stories are arguments, not just descriptions, and efforts at justification and persuasion; and amongst other things are a way of claiming that one construction of experience should be privileged over another.

Coates comments that “Every aspect of story-telling contributes to our presentation of self: it is only first-person accounts of our lives which do this” (Coates 2003, p7). The telling of an experience has strategic interests, people create a representation of themselves, it is a constructed performance in what they want people/listener to know about, and thereby seek to persuade themselves and others that they are, for example, a good person or to justify what they have done with their lives and experiences (Mishler 1991, Riessman 1993, Ochberg 1994, Kehily 1995, Atkinson 1998, Holloway and Jefferson 2000, Cole and Knowles 2001, Denzin 1989, Bell 2003, Coates 2003, Sykes and Matza 1957, Mills 1940, Goffman 1959, Scott and Lyman 1968). Once a story is heard as true, then for the hearer it becomes part of the speaker’s public biography, for in a sense they ‘become’ the stories that they tell; however, it is the response of the audience which determines the success of the story and the identity of the speaker.

Stories of experiences, then, are justified by how they are received (Ochberg 1994, Denzin 1989). Stories that people tell are also a way of reclaiming some measure of agency, because the speaker can take charge of how the story is told, what is told and the organisation of good and bad, meaning and legitimacy, within it.
This allows them to validate their experiences and their representation of self (Ochberg 1996, Kehily 1995, Goffman 1959, Sykes and Matza 1957, Scott and Lyman 1968), gaining an element of power as well as agency as they decide which experiences are told and which are not and how. Atkinson (1998) argues that the telling of life stories is a way of owning, and of course, reflecting values and attitudes acquired over time. Life stories help to structure and organise experiences and create a version of identity (Kehily 1995, Gilbert 2002, Riessman 2002, Coates 2003, Goffman 1959), because it is through talk that we construct who we are. How men construct a presentation of themselves and the importance of masculinity in this is a part of how their stories are told, although these stories must be read in the knowledge that story-telling (and identity formation) is not an activity done in isolation, but rather a wider circle of people are woven into narratives and self-constructions. Also, the self is closely connected with others (Bruner 1990, Plummer 2001, Cotterill and Letherby 1993), because “self does not exist in isolation from interrelationship with other selves and other lives is grounded in the material reality of everyday life” (Stanley 1993, p206).

Plummer (2001) argues that all life stories are composed, constructed and in this sense ‘fabricated’: stories are told from different perspectives which have their own truth at the time of telling. There is often no way of assessing most aspects of a story regarding its general ‘in the outside world’ reliability and truthfulness; the absolute truth of a life remains elusive and only the bare ‘facts’ as these are represented are available to researchers. Denzin (1989) too argues that stories are fictionalised and that all accounts of events and tellings of stories are versions or interpretations of the actual experience. Bruner (1990) comments that the participant
does not just tell the past in past tense but decides what to tell and interprets the past at the time of telling, while Stanley (1993) similarly states that constructions of events are different from how they were first experienced. Gilbert (2002) similarly argues that narratives are representations of lived experiences and not reproductions of actual events and that, “stories are coloured by experience and part of that experience is the ongoing retelling and re-experiencing of the story” (Gilbert 2002, p3). Experiences then are reinterpreted in and will change with each telling; and as new knowledge is gained, later tellings will be influenced by deeper understanding and interpretation. However, truths are inherent in personal stories, although not ‘truths’ in the positivist sense, but as stories which provide access to people’s worlds, as they tell about passions, desires, ideas and the conceptual systems that underlie their lives (Atkinson 1998, Lawler 2002, Josselson 1995). Constructing, listening to and analysing a subjective truth is just as important as revealing as objective truth (Ben-Ari 1995). As Stanley and Wise (1993) argue about feminist research, this kind of approach does not uncover the pure and uncontaminated truth about the world or people’s experiences, but should be respected for what it does do, which is provide an in-depth way of understanding the world.

Those working from a more positivist perspective, however, would argue that researchers should aim to get the life told as close as possible as to factual events and then try to match or verify these against actual events in the outside world. This may be possible for a narrow range of events, but the life story is essentially about subjective feelings and experiences which cannot be checked using externalist criteria. Interpretivists therefore argue that it is up to the researcher to discover what is true and how it is true, for ‘truth’ can refer to a multiplicity of ways in which a
story reveals and reflects experience (Plummer 2001). Positivists and realists argue that stories need to reflect a lived material reality and so what is real in a story can be established by scientific means and an objective reality can be brought to the surface. Interpretivists see this as over simplistic, because stories are never directly referential of experience: both the story and its interpretations are shaped by conventions, performance and also by collaboration with the researcher. In research practice, however, many researchers take a pragmatic stance, that stories are central to this type of research (and methods), and stories can be collected and used in different ways for different methodological and theoretical purposes (Stanley 2004, Roberts 2002). Concomitantly, the emphasis should be on gaining insights into lives which reflect wider cultural meanings of society (Atkinson 1998), rather than dwelling narrowly on differences in methodological and theoretical assumptions. Distinctions between methods and approaches can be drawn too rigidly, because in practice the boundaries between them become blurred as researchers borrow concepts to produce a mix of ideas, issues and perspectives (Roberts 2002).

**NARRATIVE ANALYSIS AND STORIES**

Stories do not ‘speak for themselves’, but have to be interpreted (Widdershoven and Smit 1996). Regarding this interpretive role, Riessman comments that narrative analysis is key as it asks why stories are told in certain ways: “Narrative analysis allows for the systematic study of personal experience: how events have been constructed by active subjects” (Riessman 1993, p70). Chase (1995) argues, however, that the significance of narrative is rarely focused on in the
interview context, with most researchers paying little attention to the narrative character of the talk produced in interviews.

‘Narrative’ notoriously has various meanings and it is difficult to define (Polkinghorne 1995). Letherby (2003), for instance, suggests that narrative is just a posh word for stories, while Gilbert (2002) argues that narratives and stories are synonymous. However, Roberts (2002) suggests that narrative refers to the emphasis of the plot of the story, its structure, the way in which events and happenings are configured into a story, and for Riessman (1993) it is the way a story is told, with the overall narrative making meaning from individual stories. Both narratives and stories have a beginning, middle and end; they can take various forms; and they can be told in different ways to different audiences (Denzin, 1989, Atkinson 1998, Gilbert 2002) depending on the values and interests of the individual and the context of telling. Different stories and narratives may be constructed about the ‘same’ event, because tellers may exclude experiences that undermine and include ones which promote the current identities and meanings they wish to represent. And also plots have agendas which are hidden in the way that stories are shaped to exclude and include particular experiences and self-representations (Riessman 1993, Atkinson 1998).

Narrative analysis, then, is “an effort to approach the understanding of lives in context rather than through a prefigured and narrowing lens. Meaning is not inherent in an act or experience, but is constructed through social discourse” (Josselson 1995, pp32). Analysing narratives directs research attention to embeddedness and embodiment, and to understanding how narratives are culturally shaped and what narrators accomplish as they tell their stories. Narrative analysis
points up how speakers impose order on the flow of experience to make sense of events and actions in their lives. Narration is a complex process, as a form of social action that symbolises the relation between the narrator and culture, with narratives being social products produced by people within their specific social, historical and cultural locations (Chase 1995, Lawler 2002, Riessman 1993, Atkinson 1998, Gilbert 2002). The aim of analysing narratives is to bring to sight the usually taken-for-granted cultural processes which are embedded in the processes of storytelling (Chase 1996), and what is not said is as important as what is said (Gilbert 2002, Riessman 2002).

Cotterill and Letherby state that “The narrative technique allows respondents to ‘tell the story’ in whichever way they choose, and, importantly, validates individual experience and provides a vehicle through which this experience can be expressed to a wider audience” (Cotterill and Letherby 1993, p74). Individuals construct their narratives according to their experience of socio-cultural contexts, both those of experience and of telling; and a focus on narrative can help empower people by giving them more structured understandings of their lives as well as helping researchers better to understand individual meaning and experience and how stories are communicated within specific cultural discourses and linguistic practices (Chase 1996, Roberts 2002, Bruner 1990, Atkinson 1998). It has been commented that “A narrative can make us understand how people give meaning to a concrete situation and why they respond to it through a specific action. Narratives are not just descriptions of feelings and actions; they present these feelings and actions as part of practice” (Widdershoven and Smits 1996, p285-6). Stories, then, are not just interpretive devices through which people present themselves, but are also of and
about the social world in which they live (Lawler 2002). Meaning is constructed through the making and telling of narratives, because narrative helps to organise, interpret and create meaning of experiences (Bruner 1990, Gilbert 2002). Stories that are selected by the speaker to represent their life story cannot be regarded as simply a series of isolated experiences, for these experiences as well as the stories about them are always embedded in a coherent, meaningful context which is constructed through the telling. Also the research context itself shapes what the subject considers to be biographically relevant, how they develop links between various experiences, and how past, present or future realities influence their narration (Rosenthal 1993, Cotterill and Letherby 1993). Narratives are filled with multiple stories and stories are frequently organised around epiphanous moments, that is, a major event or a turning point which has left permanent marks on a life which can help researchers to understand the particular routes that people’s lives take (Denzin 1989). So, for example, young Pakistani and Bangladesh young men’s stories and the epiphanies present in these could help in understanding the particular choices these young men took and the ways in which their gender, race and class had to be contended with or adapted. And of course several of these processes might well be reflected in other young men’s biographies who share similar histories and contexts (Goodey 2000).

Stories and narratives are contextualised culturally as well as situationally and this limits what can be said, heard, what is considered to be meaningful and what is nonsensical (Lawler 2002). Also a story can connect a person to a particular community through the telling of a history within the ‘descriptions’ and ‘facts’ that a community favours (Ochberg 1996, Denzin 1989, Atkinson 1998). In this regard,
Plummer (2001) argues that marginal voices can be transformed into more powerful ones through the processes of telling stories; a personal tale can become the story of a whole. Local cultures are diverse and provide a set of understandings that provide meaning to life experiences, because cultures mark, shape and constrain the way a story can be told (Chase 1995, Gubrium and Holstein 1995, Denzin 1989, Bell 2003). Through the analysis of stories and narratives, which narratives are possible or impossible for particular groups of people to articulate are likely to come to light, because stories are grounded in a cultural context in which notions of truthfulness are established, shaped by ‘local’ ideological forces which help establish the possible stories that different kinds of people can tell (Chase 1995, Gubrium and Holstein 1995, Denzin 1989, Bell 2003, Ochberg 1994).

Riessman (1993) suggests that culture ‘speaks’ through individual stories, so that it is possible to examine gender inequalities, racial oppression and other power practices that may be taken for granted through them. For example, feminist research has shown that the stories which women tell about their lives may be constrained by frameworks shaped by cultural understandings and practices which legitimate stories (Ochberg 1994, Letherby 2003, Riessman 1993, Denzin 1989, Bell 2003), and Bangladeshi and Pakistani young men’s stories may also be similarly constrained. By studying the sequence of stories provided by a teller, connections between them can show how individuals tie significant events and relationships together. And stories can be examined for the word choice, language and narrative structures which are used by people to construct their individual stories and experiences (Riessman 1993).
Methodologically, the collection of and analysis of stories and narratives is invaluable because this approach does not fracture life experience but instead provides a way of evaluating the meaning ascribed to past, present and anticipated future, thereby challenging the more partial accounts of other approaches (Letherby 2003). Josselson (1995) and Liebich (1996) argue that narrative approaches bring the researcher into contact with their subjects as people engage in the process of interpreting themselves. This allows the researcher to work with what is said and unsaid in the story and the words chosen to represent people’s lives in their narratives, for the “point of life story is to give people the opportunity to tell their story the way they choose to tell it” (Atkinson 1998, p9).

Pamphilion (1999) advocates a framework for analysing life histories which I think can be usefully applied to the analysis of life stories. Pamphilion’s approach draws on multidisciplinary sources which acknowledge the multiple and contradictory perspectives within a life, a methodology which she refers to as the ‘Zoom model’. The Zoom model incorporates four layers of analysis. Firstly the Macro Zoom can help reveal culture specific processes that impact on all women (in my research, young ‘South Asian’ men). This is achieved by concentrating on the impact of dominant discourses by seeking to understand cultural prescriptions of the time. This is the view that a story is culturally specific and only allows certain relationships between self and society, so focusing on this level reveals the variable impacts of historical events on the lives on individuals. Secondly, the Meso Zoom focuses on the individual processes of storytelling; here researchers search for themes that have been constructed by the individual so as to create a coherent life history. Examination of the narrator’s style will reveal taken-for-granted
assumptions and also take into consideration what is not directly visible in the account. Thirdly, the Micro Zoom focuses on the oral dimension, because much can be lost when talk is transcribed into text, and so this focus can add depth by looking in detail at the exact words. Fourthly and finally, the Interactional Zoom requires the researcher to acknowledge their place in the research, including their role as active interpreters.

For Pamphilion, the analysis of stories will incorporate all aspects of these four Zoom levels and not just focus on one of them. This makes a great deal of sense to me: while it is important to understand the dominant discourses apparent in a story, researchers should also focus on the individual processes of telling a story and the meaning making embedded in it. Both are crucial and neither should be focused on to the exclusion of the other.

VALIDITY, RELIABILITY AND ETHICS

The methodological approach to stories and narratives sketched out above provides a way of conceptualising links between self and others, past and present, and emphasises the importance of telling in the narrative performance of identity. I now want to consider the quality, validity and reliability of such accounts and also their ethical aspects.

Reliability is best described as concern with the consistency of methods to ensure that on different occasions they produce the same results or findings, with this based on the notion that certain methods are standardised and non-biased. Mason (2002) argues that reliability is a difficult test of the quality of qualitative data, given the un-standardised forms of measurement regarding meaning and interpretation, and
proposes that researchers should be more concerned with the validity of the research (Plummer 2001), that is, concerning what researchers claim to do and what they actually do, with it being crucial that the logic of the method matches with that of the research questions. Mason states that: “you must be able to demonstrate accuracy of method, and validity of both method and interpretation, if you are going to have anything meaningful to generalise” (Mason 2002a, p196), because the quality of research and its outcomes are conditioned by how convincing researchers are about the method they choose and the appropriateness of these to the research.

Atkinson (1998) has argued that interpretation also impacts upon the validity of research, as does the quality of the researcher-participant relationship, the interaction during the interview and the theoretical perspective used to read and analyse the life story. However, given the nature of life story research, no two researchers will record or analyse in exactly the same way and interpretation will be based on specific selection criteria regarding a particular interview. Addressing issues of researcher presence, Stanley and Wise (1993) argue that all research is based on interaction, and the researcher’s presence as a person can not be removed from the research process and so should be capitalised upon; omitting the researcher’s presence from discussions of the research process is a failure to address something that has been central to its conduct. Similarly, Cotterill and Letherby (1993) argue that it is better to acknowledge researcher presence in the research and to explore it analytically rather than falsely claim detachment and objectivity. Despite any pitfalls, life stories are important tools for providing an insight into what people deem important through telling and retelling their experiences, with the aim
being to grasp unique experiences for what these can tell the researcher and not necessarily for purposes of wider generalisation (Plummer 2001).

Biographical research relies on people’s capacity to verbalise, interact and conceptualise, and life stories in practice always entail memory and recall. The informant may misremember, misrepresent or could simply lie about earlier events and will certainly sometimes rely on second-hand history. ‘Memory’ as it is told can present the life as something that it was not in a narrow factual sense, and memory can recall habitually-told stories, so that what is told the first time can become lost within the story (Plummer 2001), while researchers can only infrequently know if an individual makes up things about their life (Denzin 1989, Plummer 2001, Lawler 2002, Haglund 2004, Mason 2002(a), 2002(b), Roberts 2002). And as Mason (2002a,b) has noted, it is impossible to ensure reliability in the positivist sense, because on different occasions the participant is likely to recall experiences somewhat differently or even recall different ones.

This is not a problem for qualitative research alone, of course, and it exists for all styles, approaches and methods. Personal narratives are not meant to be an exact record of everything that has happened in a participant’s life, and what is important is not absolute truth but the point of view that is asserted, for stories are interpretations of experiences and lives (Atkinson 1998). Plummer points out that the researcher may hold prejudices and assumptions which structure the life story interview, and also the setting may not always encourage adequate response, and he argues that “to purge research of all these ‘sources of bias’ [and those suggested above] is to purge research of human life. It presumes a ‘real’ truth may be obtained once all these biases have been removed” (Plummer 2001, p156). This is clearly
impossible, because even if this were possible, researchers still would not have direct access to a person’s experiences, and also the meanings of these constantly shifts around the gap between experience, telling and re-telling (Riessman 2002). Questions concerning sampling and representativeness in relation to the wider population have also been usefully thought about (Bryman 2004), although as noted earlier, individual experiences can provide insight into the social worlds of groups and other collectivities. Overall, however, the aim of this approach is to work in-depth and meaningfully with individuals, rather than to generalise from partial understandings to the many or to the whole population (Cole and Knowles 2001, Plummer 2001).

Neither the researcher nor the researched can fully access a past which is gone, and narrative accounts (and also of course those provided through other methods) should not be read as providing straightforward descriptions of past social experience. When people have an experience, they actively construct the reality of it by thinking and reflecting on what happened and why and what this means. With the inevitable temporal gap between the experience and the telling of it, it will have already been ordered to some degree, a process taken further in relating a story about what happened around interpretations made at the time and subsequentially (Riessman 1993). All telling is an interpretation of ‘what happened’, itself already interpreted; and all stories are representations and never a referentially fully ‘accurate’ depiction. Also such interpretations are also likely to change over time, for stories are sifted through, abbreviated or condensed and can become well-rehearsed versions of the past. What is said comes to be true, because what is recalled the first time will then structure and shape what is told and turn it into ‘a
fact' although direct memory of the event is lost. No matter how long a researcher spends in conversation with someone whose life they are researching, what is said will be constrained by many factors including the relationship of the participant and the researcher, and anyway the speaker will tell only what they want the researcher to know or what they think the researcher would like to hear (Atkinson 1998, Plummer 2001, Mason 2002, Lawler 2002, Cole and Knowles 2001, Cotterill and Letherby 1993, Riessman 2002). However, when a story is repeated, its elements may be different but most often it will be composed mainly of the same things but organised in a new configuration of them, something which Stanley (1992) has compared to looking through a kaleidoscope.

Although in research situations people's aim is likely to be to tell the truth about their lives, the stories they tell are their creations and interpretations and the telling of them will be both selective and occasioned (Riessman 1993) "and all we have is talk and text that represent reality partially, selectively and imperfectly" (Riessman 2002, p228). Stories are inevitably told from a point of view which has its own truth at the time of telling and can inform researchers about what the speaker deems as important at that time. And although it has to be remembered that researchers can never get the absolute truth of a life (Plummer 2001), Atkinson has argued that the life story can be "deemed trustworthy more than true" (Atkinson 1998, p60). It is therefore important not to assume that people say precisely what they mean and only mean exactly what they say; things that are said sometimes have ulterior meanings and purposes. Although this may seem to negatively impact on the validity and reliability of an interview, it is the formal structure of a story's plot, the way in which speakers choose what events to tell and how these are constructed,
which help researchers to understand what speakers are trying to accomplish (Ochberg 1996, Atkinson 1998, Polkinghorne 1995). Consequently an examination of this is crucial to understanding and interpreting what participants say. Pamphilion (1999) argues that seeing participants as ‘speaking for themselves’ is an illusion because researchers select and interpret and then re-present the things articulated by the teller, so the life story interview is best seen as a co-performance.

Biographical researchers are likely to be faced with people’s interpretations that conflict with the academic ones being made, although this is of course true of all research. Mason (2002b) argues that the validity of interpretation is dependent upon the validity of the method, and that validity can only be reached and justified if researchers can chart and evidence how their interpretations were made. On this point, Chase (1996) suggests that the aim of narrative analysis is not to impose definitive interpretations of stories or to challenge meanings as relayed by participants, but instead to look for the taken-for-granted cultural processes embedded in everyday practices of story-telling. These arguments raise some extremely important points about ethics in connection with biographical research.

To behave ethically is to behave in ways that are deemed appropriate, in a situation and more generally, while evaluating and taking into the account the consequences of one’s own actions on the lives of others. Ethical issues in research cannot be ignored, because they relate directly to the integrity of the researcher and the outcomes of the research. All research raises practical and ethical issues, in different ways, and it is generally agreed that in researching young people, particularly children, special care and specific attention should be paid to issues of

The British Sociological Association (2002) and the Sociological Research Association (2003) both provide clear guidelines concerning how researchers should conduct themselves in research practice. These guidelines cover all aspects of the research process, from dealing with sponsors to dealing with research participants to the ethics of language use in writing. Researchers have a responsibility to safeguard the interests of those being researched and to consider the consequences of their research on those involved and also those who may be affected by it. It is not always possible to anticipate when harm is likely to occur, but researchers should seek to protect participants from what can be anticipated. Here the BSA (2002) states that researchers should anticipate and guard against the consequences of harm to the participant in a number of ways. In particular, researchers should strive to protect the interests of those they study, their privacy and to guarantee confidentiality, and participants should be fully informed of the purposes of the research and be aware that they do not have to take part in it (Plummer 2001, Kvale 1996, Babbie 1998). Likewise, the SRA (2003) argues that participation should occur only with fully informed consent and participants must not be given the impression that they have to partake. The idea of informed consent asserts that participants have the right to be fully told about the research and that they are being researched, although it is also recognised that there are issues in deciding how much to tell people without influencing research results, and also whether participants are able to fully understand all the possible consequences (Minichiello et al 1990, Williams 2003, Kvale 1996, Babbie 1998). The reality of informed consent is that it can never fully
cover the dynamic processes of interpretation and authorship, not least because agreeing to participation is not necessarily agreement to all the (anticipated as well as unanticipated) consequences that may follow, including the interpretational aspects of research (Chase 1996, Price 1996). However, the BSA and SRA are both certainly clear in stating that researchers should not abuse the trust and power of the research relationship, and special care should be taken where participants may be vulnerable due to factors such as age and disability, and in such cases informed consent should be sought from a guardian. In addition, confidentiality and privacy must be upheld and disturbance to the participant and their environment should be minimised. And last but by no means least, while researchers should remain at all times concerned of the role and agency of their research participants, they also have a professional as well as personal duty to ensure their own safety.

Both the BSA and SRA stress the need for professional integrity. Research should only be conducted by those with the necessary skill, with researchers having an obligation to report their findings accurately and truthfully while considering the practical as well as intellectual consequences of their work. Researchers are encouraged by both the BSA and SRA to be ethically and morally motivated, both for its own sake and so that the status and standing of social research does not suffer. However, although the BSA and SRA stress the need for researchers not to abuse power and trust, nevertheless the power positions existing between researcher and participant are of course not fixed dichotomies and will shift between interviewers and participants over the course of a study. At the outset, of course a participant has the power to refuse to be involved, while during the research process power can shift in a variety of ways between the interviewer and participant. However, it is the
researcher who holds and exercises most power in the analysis and write-up stages (Phoenix 1994, Reynolds 2002).

Feminist methodologies challenge the conventional hierarchy of the researcher and participant relationship and try to resist the exploitative aspects of this by raising issues about authorship and ownership, including in relation to narrative stories (Chase 1996). Relatedly, the life story method is orientated to placing the speaker’s interpretations and meanings at the centre, although it remains the researcher’s interpretations which dominate, particularly when these differ from those of speaker, (Minichiello et al 1990) and also in writing up and publication. Gilbert (2002) asks, whose story is it? Has the interpretation shifted from the participants’ intended meaning? Similarly McCormack (2004) argues that stories undergo a series of representations; the initial reconstruction is given by the participant, the researcher then reconstructs this through transcription, and lastly this is reconstructed by the reader. Knowledge is then situated and characterised by multiple perspectives, truths and meanings, and the bottom line is that researchers generally exercise control over the interpretive process rather than share this control with participants, including by selecting which features of a narrative will be the subject of what kinds of analysis and interpretation (Riessman 1993, Chase 1996, McCormack 2004).

Josselson (1996) argues that narrative researchers have generally paid little attention to how what is written about participants might affect them longer-term, losing sight of the authority that printed words and ideas carry. Some researchers (Riessman 1993, Chase 1996, Bar-On 1996, Miller 2000, McCormack 2004, Gilbert 2002) advocate giving interview transcripts to participants, for them to check
whether they still want to be involved in the research and to ask for permission to use certain passages, because this gives a degree of control to participants and reduces any vulnerability they might feel from their stories being publicised, while it can also provide more credibility to the research. In this respect, BSA (2002) has recommended that researchers should make it clear if participants will be allowed access to their transcripts and have the option to alter the content or withdraw parts or the entirety.

However, there is the danger that participants may wish to remove material that with hindsight they find too revealing or simply do not like having said (Miller 2000). At basis, it is the researcher’s responsibility to decide when to show what to whom, and to exercise ultimate authority over the research process, which is often very different from how subjects imagine it to be: “If a participant expects that the researcher will capture fully who she is, then it must be disconcerting to have her story analysed for the social purposes it reveals rather than preserved in its uniqueness” (Chase 1996, p50). Atkinson (1998) also advocates that participants should have a role in the process of analysis and writing, because participants own their stories and researchers have a responsibility to protect them. However, sharing work in progress with participants does not necessarily mean that agreement will be reached on the interpretations made, what is deemed significant from this and what should be published. Miller suggests that the researcher-participant relationship can be considered as exploitative, because the “truth doesn’t necessarily set one free” (Miller 2000, p104) and also the collection of life stories is generally a one-way process with interviewing, the end of each interview generally means an end to all contact between the researcher and participant; and although it is possible to give
participants access to analysis and interpretation and this can be empowering, this can actually be more invasive than the interview.

This raises further questions concerning authorship and publication of research (Plummer 2001). Riessman (1993) points out that while it is ethically desirable to take work back to the participant, intellectually it is questionable whether they can affirm the validity or otherwise of academic interpretations. At the least, it is difficult for participants to evaluate academic theories, and researchers have to take responsibility for the analysis and the interpretations that emerge. Here Chase (1996) contends that although researchers control the interpretive process, this does not necessarily make it any less feminist, because it is still possible to describe and make visible how interpretations are producing accountable knowledge and making research data available to other researchers (see also Riessman 1993, Stanley 2004).

Narrative research requires paying special attention to a participant’s vulnerability and also the researcher’s interpretive authority, and both the BSA and SRA stress that the anonymity and confidentiality of participants should be upheld. The extensive use of stories in narrative research is likely to leave participants more vulnerable to exposure than quantitative methods, because the focus on individual stories means that participants can easily recognise themselves even when pseudonyms are used, and other people who know them may be able to guess this as well (Chase 1996). Certainly the stories that are told are personal and participants will be able to recognise themselves because of the detail provided. And Josselson comments that: “Language can never contain a whole person, so every act of writing a person’s life is inevitably a violation” (Josselson 1996, p62) and writes explicitly about her apprehension in putting stories of people’s private lives into print. She
sees this as intruding into their lives in a powerful way and she asks what right she has to impose her meanings on their narratives. Although of course all research inevitably involves some form of interpretation and so is unavoidable, and anyway these feelings did not stop Josselson from publishing her research. Josselson also comments on how people's lives are used to service the purposes of the researcher, for example, to show analytical skills or cleverness. Josselson concludes by arguing that to be uncomfortable with the way researchers work can prevent things from going too far and encourage self-awareness, with keeping a journal also helping keep self-awareness at a heightened level (Cole and Knowles 2001). Lieblich too expresses concern about the research process, because even if a participant is paid for co-operation or thanked profusely, their stories are still 'taken' for the benefit of the researcher. However, Lieblich rationalises her own work by arguing that: “Sympathy and flexibility in interviewing always pays, and when people find a sincere listener, they profit from sharing their experience, even if painful” (Lieblich 1996, p77). Overall, both Josselson and Lieblich fail to acknowledge that research is not just about furthering academic ambitions, and can bring to the fore issues and experiences that might otherwise be marginalised and made invisible.

THE ROLE OF THE RESEARCHER

Discussions of the research process need to take into consideration the relationship between the researcher and the researched. Feminist sociology has argued that awareness and understanding of oppression is best done by people coming together to share and analyse their experiences (Stanley and Wise 1993); and research participants have been found to respond more favourably when there is an
overlap of concern and experience by both parties (Phoenix 1994, Oakley 1998). Feminist work has demonstrated that gender is not an invisible element in the research process, and woman-woman research situations can produce a less-hierarchical setting in which the researcher can relate to and understand feelings expressed by the participant and which will produce more valid data (Oakley 1998, Hall 2004).

Similarly, it has been argued that with Black on Black research, there will be more emphatic understanding (Johnson-Bailey 1999), and also white researchers may silence or misrepresent participants due to a lack of shared interests and understandings between them (Archer 2002). Researchers here have pointed out that the race of the interviewer is the only characteristic which research has shown to significantly affect response to questions to race (Rhodes 1994, Schuman and Converse 1971, Hyman et al 1954, Anderson 1993). For example, Essed found that “Doing research among one’s own group has the advantage of making it easier to discuss negative views about an ‘outgroup’ . . . I was in an advantageous position as a black researcher of experiences of racism” (Essed 1990, p3). Egharevba (2000) notes that cultural understandings can impact on interpretation and suggests that her outside status in terms of ethnicity could have affected her research data. Rhodes (1994) also argues that mistrust of white people by Black people will in general be extended to the white researcher, although of course not all people react in the same way. However, when this happens it will inhibit access and communication. A Black interviewer is more likely to share the experience of racial prejudice and discrimination and participants may feel more comfortable discussing these issues with them. Thus in classic studies such as those by Hyman et al (1954) and Schuman
and Converse (1971), race was found to be a factor when talking to Black respondents, with both studies finding that responses were restrained with white interviewers but people expressed more freely to Black interviewers.

Johnson-Bailey comments that her ethnicity and knowledge of living in a race-conscious society was a factor that her participants and she shared and there was an underlying assumption by some women that she would understand racial difference, with this common ground allowing for “silent understandings, culture-bound phrases that did not need interpretation, and non-verbalised answers conveyed with hand gestures and facial expressions” (Johnson-Bailey 1999, p669). However, research experience has shown that Black on Black research does not automatically produce ‘better’ data. Also, Phoenix’s (1994) research on Black mothers found that being a Black researcher did not even guarantee her access to all Black respondents that she approached to participate. And in Hall’s (2004) research, although she shared gender with her participants, her ethnicity led her to be identified as an outsider by most ‘South Asian’ respondents, and in a small number of cases she found access easier because her whiteness symbolised that she was neutral and had no links to the local community. Views vary on how close a researcher should be matched to the researched community; studies have shown both positive and negative effects of characteristic matching, and also of course race is not the only characteristic people have, with class, gender, sexuality, education, national origin and manner all playing a part, and it is impossible to match researchers and participants exactly on all criteria.

It has been proposed that minority ethnic researchers researching their own communities are less likely to pathologise and stereotype. This is based on the
assumption that minority ethnic communities are more likely to give reliable accounts where there is similarity between the research and the researched. However, this position has been criticised for risking marginalising minority issues and minority researchers (Egharevba 2001, Johnson-Bailey 1999, Rhodes 1994, Hall 2004, Archer 2002). In addition, any assumption of a good research relationship based on similarity of factors such as race can be misleading. While race and gender can provide common ground and tacit understandings, albeit in complex ways, it seems that class can be an impediment to the process of understanding and hamper the flow of conversation. Age is also a factor that enters the research process, for power relations are complex and multidimensional (Mason 2002a, Egharevba 2001, Hall 2004). McDowell (2001), who researched young men, comments that who researchers are and how they present themselves affects a participant’s ability and willingness to tell their stories. In her case, she found it quite hard to get the young men concerned to open up, because they were unused to talking about their lives to adult strangers and assumed that she would not be interested in them. Also Kelly et al (1994) point out that, when research involves men, then the power of the researcher can shift quite dramatically, and rather than trying to share power, female researchers should be aware that power can be used against them by antagonistic participants. Often female interviewers have to listen to sexist views in order to complete interviews and this situation is oppressive because, firstly, the female interviewer is unable to express alternative views and, secondly, the interview situation is typical of male-female verbal exchange (Smart 1984). The nature of interaction between men and woman is affected by attitudes and expectations brought to the interview; these are not left behind, (McDowell 2001) and men have
the power to impact on the process in major ways, including the power of men to make women fear attack, so that female interviewers should be realistic about the potential trouble that interviewing men presents (Lee 1997) (further discussions of this follow later).

Race and gender and other characteristics such as nationality, sexuality, education and so on, and the power positions these entail, enter into the interview situation and the impact of such characteristics cannot be easily predicted because such impact is highly variable and all interviews are chancey, in the sense that the outcomes cannot be controlled by the researcher (McDowell 2001). Archer (2003) argues that both the immediate and local context and the wider social relations within which an interview occurs will play a role in the production of the research and both the context and the audience will influence what is said by the speaker. Each interview situation will be different and different power dimensions can come into play and it is important, for instance, that I do not assume that on the basis of my ethnicity I will be regarded as an insider and will be allowed access into the lives of young Bangladeshi and Pakistani men, because I am also an outsider on the basis of my gender, and there is the possibility of other factors such as culture, class, education and age coming into play with multiple insider/outsider positionalities (Merriam et al 2001), and anyway, the young men’s narratives may not be ‘more true’ or more ‘valid’ because I have shared ‘insider’ knowledge.

Previous research on ‘South Asian’ masculinity (Goodey 1998, 2001, Archer 1998, 2001, Alexander 1996, 2001, Webster 1997) in my view offers a limited understanding and view because these researchers have not allowed young men the opportunity to freely talk about their significant life experiences which can then be
unpicked to theorise young men’s masculinity. I have chosen a broad life story approach because this provides the opportunity to explore and understand the life experiences, changing experiences and outlooks of young men in their daily lives and what they deem to be important, by providing their interpretations and accounts of their experiences. Although all story-telling is a selective interpretive process, such narratives can tell me a great deal about the social world young men inhabit and the meanings they ascribe to their experiences. The life story approach is useful because the stories, histories and life experiences of young men accessed while only temporarily invading on their life, and focusing on a thematic topic provides structure and focus for the participant. In order to access the young men’s stories related to ‘South Asian’ masculinity I set a general thematic topic of ‘growing up in the neighbourhood’ where pointers were used to encourage the young men I interviewed to think about and tell their experiences, and importantly stressed to them that they were free to explore any part of their life from their experiences with the family, friends, school or work, so as not to limit the stories that they thought could be told.

The life story is a story about personal experience and these experiences are selected on the basis of what the teller wants others to know, and in a very direct and powerful way this tells researchers who the person is and the character they are constructing through their talk. So for example, listening to young men’s stories and experiences enables me to understand the social world of young ‘South Asian’ men by interpreting what they said and how they said it, for example, the young men’s stories of racism may reveal vulnerability but also provide insight into what they perceive to be masculine behaviour and how they enact this. This is not something
that is possible through, for example, semi-structured interviews as they do not allow for the discussion of experiences in a free-flowing manner but the discussion is guided by a set of pre-determined questions.

I am aware that in the life story approach the researcher's interaction with the participant facilitates the telling of a story. However, it is the participant who holds the power and has the flexibility to tell a story which they are happy with, and they decide what the researcher will learn about them. So even if a young man tells stories that may seem insignificant to the research, they are crucial in identifying what is important to that young man. My experience is that participants enjoy an opportunity to tell stories about their experiences which they think I will be interested in, because they are able to relive by telling of an experience. Often telling, or more likely re-telling, an experience can help clarify feelings and provide understanding, and importantly it allows young men to talk in a free-flowing manner about the epiphanous moments in their life, how they interpret these experiences and the impact of them. I am aware that the telling of an experience in a research context is different from how it was first experienced and can change with each retelling. However, I am not interested in accessing the 'truth' of an experience in a narrow sense, but with how and what is told, because this is important in providing an insight into, for example, what 'South Asian' young men consider to be masculine behaviour and how this then informs their story-telling and presentation of self.

The life story approach is valuable in understanding the story-telling of young men in their interviews and the masculine pose they try to achieve through their stories. For example, giving a young man an opportunity to talk about life in his neighbourhood may uncover processes of masculine performance, his perception of
masculinity, the impacts of racism on masculinity, and the position and role of women. And although this will be a particular and perhaps situational version of events, it enables me to access how a young man, for example, conceptualizes his experiences, understands his own life, his identity, and gender role, for what is important to a young man will be told and retold in his stories. Through their stories, young men provide an understanding of how they give meaning to a situation and their response to it, and through studying the sequence, selection of stories, word choice and language of young men it is possible to examine how they construct their experiences, conceptualise ‘South Asian’ masculinity and how this in turn informs their particular way of telling a story.

Collecting and analysing stories can moreover provide an insight into what the experiences of a social collective might be, by illustrating the discourses and practices that people from particular groups subscribe to. This enables exploration of culturally-bound experiences and the kinds of narratives which are possible for young men, including the extent to which their narratives are impacted upon by cultural or community influences and their connections to other communities and the young men in these. My interviews provided me with young men’s stories across two communities in two regions in the UK and gives an insight into the commonalities and differences between different groups of young ‘South Asian’ men on a range of matters from values, attitudes and traditions acquired over time, gender, identity, cultural and social processes. Exploring such a diversity of cultures, experiences and performances of masculine behaviour and variations in the representation of identity would not be possible from the more restrictive data collected by semi-structured interviews or through quantitative methods.
I commented earlier about the concerns around the validity and reliability of life story research. However, as pointed out by Mason (2002b), it is important to ensure that the method matches with the research questions and that accuracy is demonstrated in method and analysis. Consequently I feel that the life story method was best suited for my research purposes, for all the reasons discussed above. It is impossible to ensure strict reliability, because I can never be completely sure whether the participant is telling the truth. However, my research is concerned more with conceptualizing ‘South Asian’ masculinity and I believe that exploring two groups of young men’s experiences can provide an insight into understanding and theorizing ‘South Asian’ masculinity by analysing what these young men aspire to and try to enact or project through their stories. With regards to interpretation and analysis, no two researchers will record or analyse such rich and complicated data in the same way. In my case, the analysis is based on my selection of thematic topics and areas of interest, and because of this I cannot remove myself from the analytical and interpretive processes. Instead I acknowledge my presence in these processes and also in the researcher-researched exchange. It has been suggested that the researcher-researched relationship can be exploitative, in the sense that participants’ stories are taken and then subjected to the researcher’s interpretations (Miller 2000, Chase 1996, Gilbert 2002, Riessman 1993, Josselson 1996, Lieblich 1996). I think that this is unavoidable; researchers collect life stories for the purpose of understanding and theorizing a groups social world and in order to do this stories need to be analysed and interpreted. And although ideally I would like my participants to be involved in this process, this is impractical as undoubtedly their interpretations will differ from mine. I also surmise they would be offended, firstly,
by the dissection of their stories for the social processes that these reveal, and secondly, for the interpretations that are reached. However selfish it may appear, I believe it is best to 'protect' the participant from these processes. I offered them the opportunity to receive a copy of their transcript, and assured them that my research was devoted to exploring the complexities of the lives of young men like them, as indeed it is.

I am aware that my interaction as a 'South Asian' female researcher with 'South Asian' young men brings to fore issues concerning the collection of 'quality' data. Some academics have argued that an overlap of concern and experience between both parties (Oakley 1998, Phoenix 1994) can generate favourable responses and data, however, I do not assume that sharing like-ethnicity will produce more valid data, because this data is impinged on by structural and cultural processes of gender, age and education and possibly doctrinal and linguistic differences; and I can only acknowledge these and never really know the full impact of them. Of course I hope that the young men that I interviewed found a level of rapport with me as a 'Black' researcher, because I was more likely to understand experiences of racial prejudice and discrimination. However, I am aware that on the discussion of other topics such as violence I was probably considered an outsider on the basis of my gender.

THE RESEARCH PROCESS IN PRACTICE

My interest in 'South Asian' young men, their lives and their masculinity was triggered around the unrest in the Northern towns of England in 2001. The first 'riot' took place in Oldham and I was shocked at these events and speculated about the
behaviour of these young ‘South Asian’ men and their confidence in making public their dissatisfactions. People of my father’s generation would probably not have attempted to protest, so why did these young men feel able to object so violently? Was it because of their power in numbers? Was it because identities had developed which demanded inclusion and non-discrimination, something not available for their fathers? I had numerous questions and speculated that identities and masculinities had shifted in comparison to first generation migrants, and that young ‘South Asian’ men were more confident about their identity, masculinity and place in society. I also considered it possible that young ‘South Asian’ men from different localities, regions and communities might enact slightly different forms of masculinity connected to the distribution and segregation of their respective community in a particular locality. Hence I chose to interview Bangladeshi and Pakistani young men, firstly, because both Bangladeshi and Pakistani young men were involved in the ‘riots’, and secondly, because they are very often subsumed into all-encompassing categories such as ‘Muslim’ or ‘South Asians’. As is noted in Chapter One, this fails to recognise that, while they have similar cultural and religious beliefs, their different identities, cultures and interpretations of religion may inform different experiences and different understandings and performances of masculinity.

West-Town (pseudonyms for places as well as people have been used as part of ensuring the anonymity of the participants) in the North-West was chosen as one location for my interviews, because of its large Bangladeshi and Pakistani communities, and East-Town in the North-East for its relatively smaller ones,
because of wanting to ascertain the impact of size and power of communities on the identity and masculinity of these young men.

At a local research dissemination conference in East-Town, I was successful in negotiating contact with Dilshad (pseudonyms are used for all individuals), who was involved in compiling a sample of young Bangladeshi people for a research project by the local university. Discussions about my research took place with Dilshad and his colleague Shabaz, who both agreed to participate in my pilot interviews and also to assist in the recruitment of research participants from local football teams, involving young men aged eighteen to twenty eight. In preparation for the interviews I did with them, Dilshad and Shabaz were both given an information letter detailing my interest in young men living and growing up in East-Town and some possibilities for how the interview could be structured but also stressing that the choice would lie with the young men themselves in selecting and telling experiences they thought important. These interviews took place on separate occasions, both were very different and produced stories about very different experiences, and they were a great learning experience and source of insight for me into how to approach the rest of the interviews.

I decided to continue with the method of approach I had used in the pilot interviews, because the process of providing written instruction and information had helped generate a less daunting and intimidating interview situation, while also empowering the person being interviewed by encouraging them to make decisions about the interview and what they said about the focus of their life. However, my aim to recruit participants from local football teams failed to materialise, because Dilshad took leave from his job. He did, however, put me in contact with and
negotiate an interview with a local youth worker named Mansoor. At this point I had completed three Bangladeshi interviews and was conscious I needed to recruit some Pakistani participants. Mansoor negotiated contact with the manager of the local football team, but I was discouraged from pursuing this route because Ramadan was approaching, and instead he put me in contact with some local young Pakistani men who fell within the sample criteria. Through this, I interviewed Naser and then using the snowball sampling method I came into contact with Waqar and Amar. The second young Pakistani man that the football team manager put me in contact with fell outside the sample criteria, but he kindly negotiated contact with another participant; when I contacted him, I found he was Bengali, which fulfilled the need for a final Bengali recruit. At this stage the snowball technique had been successful, but recruitment then came to a standstill and for my final Pakistani interview I contacted a Pakistani male friend, who kindly agreed to take part. At this point I had completed four interviews with Pakistani young men and four with Bangladeshi young men in the North-East.

In a conversation with Mansoor after all the interviews had been conducted, he commented that tensions had run high that summer (2005) between Pakistani and Bangladeshi young men in East-Town. Around my interest in masculine competitiveness and conflict, Mansoor agreed to negotiate an interview with the key participants involved in these tensions. As a consequence Bilal was interviewed, and he then introduced me to his friend Imtiaz, who he described as a ‘drug dealer’ and who agreed to be interviewed. I was excited at this opportunity of exploring crime and masculinity; however, Imtiaz failed to appear at the scheduled time. On re-contact, Imtiaz re-confirmed his interest, but three hours after our scheduled
appointment he once more had failed to arrive and I went home feeling like a fool. He had seemed enthusiastic about taking part, and either he was acting in a very juvenile way and just playing me along, or else he had got cold feet; and I am inclined to think the reason was the former. This experience indicated that the research process and the behaviour of participants can be volatile and the consent of individuals can be retracted at any point. This was further evidenced when a local Bangladeshi young man who had been in conflict with Bilal during that summer initially agreed to meet me and then retracted by rejecting my calls to his mobile. At this stage I decided to end data collection in the North-East, having interviewed a total of five Pakistani and four Bangladeshi young men aged eighteen to twenty-eight.

Achieving a set of interviewees in the North-West took a rather different form. Initially I made contact with an organisation in West-Town whose activities involve building bridges between young people of different communities. I was particularly disappointed that my attempts here in kindling interest in my research were ineffective because this organisation could have negotiated access to disaffected Bangladeshi and Pakistani young men. However, time was dwindling away and I felt considerable pressure to complete data collection, and in this context my brothers offered to negotiate contacts with their Bangladeshi and Pakistani acquaintances. This was successful in that I was assured that some young men involved were willing participants, but the obvious limitations were that participants were selected for their suitability and safety for me to approach. Three of my brothers were involved in the recruitment process; Shofiqul negotiated interviews with Qutuz, Rafiq and Safi; Hashan negotiated interviews with Rahman and Jafar;
and Emdadul negotiated the interview with Yasin. Rafiq then negotiated an interview with Idris and I recruited Mahir. On reflection, I should perhaps have persisted with the strategy of contacting local organisations. By doing this I might possibly have recruited a more varied sample, because once having had met and interviewed the young men my brothers had enlisted, I found that they were mainly acquainted with each other, and I would have preferred to speak to young men from a range of social networks and different social backgrounds.

The data collected from the interviews with this last group of young men is affected by the fact that their management and initial reception of me as a researcher was influenced by the knowledge that I am Shofiqul’s/Hashan’s/Emdadul’s sister, and this will inevitably have informed their selection of stories and experiences. However, I am not too concerned about this ‘corruption’ of data, because everyone selects and tells stories which they want to be known, and through the stories that these young men told me it is possible to interpret the presentations and constructions of self they were trying to achieve, and I do not think that the data collected in the North-East is ‘better’ or ‘worse’ in quality and content to that collected in the North-West.

After conducting each interview, and especially in interviews conducted with Shahin and Rafiq where they disclosed deep emotional feelings, I went away conscious that I was indebted to these young men for allowing me access to their time and their stories of their experiences, for without their co-operation the research would not have been possible. As a gesture of my appreciation, I gave them each a thank you card and a box of chocolates.
The interviews I carried out in the North-East were conducted in various venues and I think it is necessary to document the processes and events that took place, as this brought to fore important issues about safety and security. Locations for interviews were co-negotiated with the participant and five of the nine interviews had to be conducted at the participant’s places of work. Of these five, Amar’s and Naser’s interviews took place at their business premises during opening hours, and although they had identified quiet periods for this, they were not, and it was extremely difficult to keep a flow in the conversation amidst constant interruptions. These settings impinged greatly on my thought processes and what I was aiming to achieve from the interview in question, and of course also disrupted the thought processes of the young men being interviewed, and I believe Amar and Naser would have been more forthcoming in a more private environment. However, researchers often have to make best of the research situation and also of the data collected in difficult circumstances, which is what I did.

In the negotiation of venues for interviewing, I was clear that I could not compromise my safety; however, there were two incidents where ‘safe’ interview situations became of concern. As noted above, Naser’s interview was conducted at his business premises, which I presumed would be a relatively safe place to meet him. With constant interruptions from customers and the need to suspend and restart the interview, I was with Naser for longer than I anticipated and soon his business day came to an end. Naser proceeded to ‘shut up shop’ and partially pulled down his shutter and locked his door. I immediately felt uneasy and at this point he inquired if this was appropriate. However, I felt unable to protest because he had been friendly, approachable and not the least bit intimidating; a very naïve attitude for me to take.
For the remainder of the ten or fifteen minutes of this interview I remained conscious that ‘anything’ could happen and when I left I promised myself that I would not put myself at risk again, but it was not long before I inadvertently compromised my safety again.

Naser was helpful in negotiating contact with Waqar and I arranged to meet Waqar in the city centre. When I met him, Waqar said he was ravenous and we proceeded to a café. Considering that we had scheduled to meet in town, I assumed that the interview would be conducted somewhere like this café, but Waqar insisted on talking in a more private environment and suggested we should relocate at his office, which for recording purposes was more suitable than a busy café. Foolishly, I assumed other people would be present at his office, but once there found it to be completely empty and I was very conscious that I was completely alone with a stranger and my whereabouts were unknown to others. The interview was completed successfully but both these situations confirmed the necessity of assessing and adequately questioning an interview setting before entering it, and if interview circumstances change then contact should be made with someone under some guise such as checking on my child. I can be rather too trusting at times, and I made assumptions that I could relate to my participants on the basis of common ethnicity and/or religion to guarantee my welfare; a very naïve attitude which compromised my safety.

In contrast to interviewing in the North-East where issues of safety and security were important, interviewing in the North-West brought to fore issues of culture and honour which impinged on the research process. As a woman of Bangladeshi and Muslim descent, I am aware of and required to conform to cultural
codes of female conduct and I try to be vigilant in following such codes especially so as not to offend the men in my life.

Two such interviews, on separate occasions, were conducted in the early hours of the morning, because this was the only time that the participants were available. My brothers were reasonably happy for me to conduct interviews at such inappropriate times as they too are aware of the need to follow etiquettes of behaviour and, firstly, they were present in the house as it would be improper to leave me alone with a man especially at such a late hour, and secondly, they had negotiated the interview so it was only polite for them to wait until the interview ended. I was quite happy to conduct interviews under such conditions, because I had compromised my safety in East-Town and felt secure within the home and in the knowledge that these were not 'strange' men. On the first occasion I informed my father that I was to conduct an interview late at night, however, he happened to find me alone with Qutuz and my father's anger was visibly marked and clear but he chose to verbalise his discomfort via my brother, possibly not to offend Qutuz. His non-interaction with me was to also impress on me his anger at my dishonourable behaviour. Although I am very much aware of cultural and religious mores as a Bangladeshi and Muslim person and how these inform gender-based conduct, I assumed that there was a tacit mutual understanding between my father and myself that I would have to present myself in certain necessary situations for my research. However, in his eyes I had broken rules of honour and shame concerning sitting alone with a man, especially with one that he suspected did not have a decent character. One might assume that it was the timing of the interview which brought my own character into disrepute, but I can firmly say that my father's reaction would
not have been different whatever time of day it was, and because of this the remaining interviews were completed in a discreet manner with my mother holding a nervous knowledge of my whereabouts. I will now comment on my experience of using a life story method in these interviews.

Unlike semi-structured or structured interviews, the life story method does not follow a pre-determined set of questions and I found this approach in my own research to be enlightening, in that it can be an empowering process for the participants because they decided the focus of the interview and which experiences they chose to disclose, and hence the data collected from each and every interview varies in detail, length and subject. Learning through experience, I found it crucial to ensure that the young men I spoke with had ample opportunity to reflect on their lives and the possibilities for discussion, because those individuals who failed to read the information-sheet required more guidance and prompting to ‘kick-start’ the interview. Each and every interview was different and although I prompted the start of the interview in a similar fashion by requesting them to tell me of their life experiences in the locality they lived in, the individual starting-points were varied, indicating what the individual concerned thinks is significant and of interest to a researcher and also what they most want to say. However, the power thus attributed to the participant in selecting and telling stories is only one aspect, for I had a definite part to play in the structure of the interview and the production, selection and telling of stories. As a listener to stories being told, it is impossible not to interact with the participant and ask questions about what is being said, and this inevitably means that the story told will be produced and structured accordingly. And concerning key themes of interest to me, I found when listening to the interviews that
I had, usually without meaning to, subtly encouraged participants to expand on or select such stories of interest, and my presence in and influence on the production of the stories is I think clear and unequivocal.

Life story interviews are significant in indicating the type of character that a person wants to portray or perform, for stories are not just descriptions of events and experiences but also an attempt to persuade the listener that they are, for example, a good person, as in Bilal’s interview, Bilal’s particular aim was to be perceived as a person with power and authority in his locality but also as having a good character. Similarly Idris presented a ‘tough’ image through his stories of conflict and violence, and he spoke negatively about the local drug culture while admitting to drinking alcohol and so seemed to assume success in presenting a good character through his rejection of drugs. I am aware that the stories told to me by these young men in the interviews may be told differently to other people, depending on levels of knowledge, trust and confidence and also on the particular type of character they want to portray to whoever they are speaking to. It is also possible that the participants will have omitted parts of their experiences which are private or which may spoil their presentation of themselves. Mansoor in fact specifically chose to tell me that he had selected stories concentrating on identity, community and racism – areas which he believed researchers were interested in due to the nature of his ethnicity, and he also stated he had withheld his private experiences. However, this could have been Mansoor asserting his power in the interview situation, because he had discussed many experiences with me and possibly needed to confirm or re-assure himself that I had not accessed his inner-most experiences and feelings.
The West-Town participants in particular are likely to have been more vigilant about the stories they told. Safi, for example, was somewhat apprehensive about discussing his childhood experiences for fear that he might disclose something about my own brother’s activities, and his comments quickly veered away from things that might have included my brother. Qutuz was initially very tense and needed some probing and prompting to talk about his experiences and I was conscious that this was influenced by his perception of me, as not a researcher but as Shofiqul’s sister. My role and my presence as a researcher in all the interviews was also influenced upon by other factors, such as my age, class, nationality and gender. With Idris, initially I found it hard to encourage him to talk more than one or two line descriptions about his experiences. However, with time he relaxed but still required constant probing and direction and this I related to his age and also his perception of me as someone somewhat older than him could have compounded this. I found differences in gender and power between myself and the participants to be particularly evident when some of the young men expressed prejudiced attitudes and due to the nature of the interaction I was unable to protest but only listen. Many of the young men were selective about the language they used, but some chose to use expletives and whether this was their general use of language or to shock me was unclear. It is also possible that the Pakistani young men refrained from discussing certain attitudes or experiences in the knowledge that I was Bengali, or that the Bangladeshi young men may have withheld talking about some experiences because of our common ethnicity. It is impossible to know exactly what factors will have affected the researcher/researched relationship and to eliminate these, although it is important to be aware of such possibilities and to approach the data in the knowledge
that the stories collected should not be read as necessarily a true description of events, but rather that each story is told to present a certain character and detail a particular version of their life, and this is significant in understanding what the participants were trying to achieve but also what they believed would interest me.

Rosenthal (1993) points out that people's present perspectives will shape what they think is biographically relevant and their interpretations of their previous life. This was evident in many of the interviews I carried out, with Shabaz's interview being a clear example. Shabaz talked of his return to religion and the changes in his lifestyle which were made as a result, and as he did so it was clear that his interpretation of his past behaviour was now translated through a clearly religious discourse. For example, he spoke about his earlier lack of religious duty and his involvement in deviant activity when a teenager; and it was with his change in perspective that he recognised and acknowledged his religious deviancy and possibly at the time he was unfazed by it. It is impossible of course now to access his feelings and experiences as they were regarding something which has gone, compounded because his perspective on his life has dramatically changed, informing his present reflections on his past behaviour and experiences. Similarly Qutuz and Rafiq displayed feelings of guilt about their past behaviour and now emphasised that they needed to spend more time with their families, their changes in perspective also having been triggered by life-changing events. For Qutuz this was deaths in the family, and for Rafiq it was the separation from his wife and children; and it is apparent for both men that these events inform their present perspective on life, their experiences and the way their stories about the past are re-lived and told.
Through the analysis of life stories it is possible to identify embedded cultural discourses and which stories are possible for particular groups of people to tell (Ochberg 1994, Letherby 2003, Riessman 1993, Denzin 1989). Thinking about Pamphilion’s (1999) ‘macro zoom’ layer of analysis in analysing the Pakistani and Bangladeshi young men’s stories, it is clear that there are certain cultural constraints and boundaries in which stories and lives are constructed and told, and there are cultural specific processes that impact on these men. For example, these young men have an understanding of what is expected of their roles as young men, and most of them described events where honour and shame influenced and informed their behaviour and presentation of themselves to others. Stories of deviancy can only be told in situations where they can be ensured their role in the protection of honour of the family will not come into jeopardy. Naser committed acts of deviancy beyond the bounds of acceptance in his community and family, and he was clear in protecting his family from knowledge about his behaviour because of possible repercussions for family honour. Naser was able to share these stories with me because he identified me as having no links to his community or family.

Continuing with Pamphilion’s approach to and her ideas about the ‘meso zoom’ layers of analysis, this focuses on the processes of story-telling and the identification of themes, and from this point it is possible to identify how individuals tell stories in ways that make their lives seem coherent and planned. For example, Shazad’s life story interview told the story of a young man who progressed through a private school education, university, who lived away from home, but who eventually returned to the responsibilities of his family and parents and is now planning to marry. Shazad’s life story was told in a way which represented him as confident and
in control of his life. And although he seemed to make light of his earlier struggles with his roles, responsibilities and his family, a closer analysis of his word choice and language suggests that he is actually rather uncertain about his future and he struggles with the demands of the family and his needs.

In carrying out detailed, focused research, particularly where the subjects are entirely male, there are potential risks to the female and feminist researcher: “It isn’t possible for feminists to do research on sexism in such a way as to leave ‘us’ untouched by this” (Stanley and Wise 1993, p160), and the same is true of stories, of not just racism, but also emotional life experiences. Narrative analysis involves in-depth exploration of often emotionally charged texts (Gilbert 2002) and it is not possible to research in a way that we can fully separate ourselves as researchers from what we experience as people. It is impossible to do research and not be a part of the process, and so researchers need to clarify and reflect on our experiences and how this affects our activities, assumptions and interpretations. Life stories are the result of a relationship between the researcher and participant, in which the researcher actively chooses what to elicit, highlight and make visible, and the participant actively chooses what to make heard and what to keep silent about, and so the researcher/researched relationship is an important one. Speaking to and listening to the stories of the participants in my research was often difficult, especially where they disclosed deep emotional feelings, such as in the interviews of Shahin and Rafiq. But also Bilal, Shazad, Qutuz and Safi told stories which I was affected by and felt hurt and anguish for them, not only for them having had these experiences but also for asking them to re-live them; and often their stories would stay with me for days as I listened to them and analysed them.
It was impossible for me to distance myself from the participants who I interviewed, having built a rapport with each of them. I did not expect to be able to approach these interviews in a detached manner, and this did have some effects on the analytical process. The difficulty in distancing myself as a researcher also initially impacted upon the analysis of the stories, as I found myself reading the stories and accepting them at face-value. It was through engaging with the ideas of Sykes and Matza (1957), Scott and Lyman (1968) and Goffman (1959), as well as many of the ideas mentioned in this chapter, that helped me to read these stories with more distance and to identify what the young men were trying to achieve through telling their stories in the way they did. Although this may seem a cold-hearted approach, especially when the young men disclosed deep feelings, this allowed me to recognise factors important in their lives, including cultural discourses and motives in telling me such stories. Issues around the role of interpretation are something which Pamphilion (1999) identifies as the 'interactional zoom', commenting that researchers should acknowledge this role. I felt somewhat uncomfortable with collecting the stories of the young men and then subjecting these to analysis and interpretation in the end result for the benefit of my education and career. However, although I could have shared my interpretations with them, I felt that agreement would not be reached and there would be the possibility that offence might be taken because and as Riessman (1993) points out, it is difficult for participants to understand and evaluate academic theories.

The reality of the life story approach as I have experienced it is that, although it allows the participants some power in the research process, particularly regarding the selection and structure of stories, overall power still lies with the researcher in
deciding which stories are most important and in need of analysis. For example, Mansoor relayed stories of youth exchanges and activities he was involved in, but I was more interested in, for example, his stories of bullying, racism, and conflicting identities and it was these stories which I selected for analysis and interpretation. The reality is that participants can never fully be aware of what aspects of their stories will be found most interesting or how they will be analysed. And particularly with regard to publication, ultimate power lies with the researcher.

My own previous research experience is with the use of semi-structured interviews which followed a set of pre-defined themes and which produced results which are easily comparable amongst the members of the sample. But this is not the case with life story interviews. I did find that life story interviews do not always induce ‘good’ data. For example, the interviews with Mansoor and Shazad were longer than the other interviews, and stories were told that did not fit with my interests. However, life story interviews are a valuable tool in collecting detailed and extensive data from people but only when researching small groups of people, and with benefit of hindsight I should have completed fewer interviews and analysed them in more depth, as data collected from life story interviews requires much time and commitment in the analytical stages.

The transcription of interviews is a long and time-consuming task, and I transcribed some of the interviews myself but I also employed a professional whose transcriptions I then fully checked. Gail Jefferson’s (1984a, 1984b) transcription conventions are widely used to document interaction in conversation analysis. However, Jefferson’s ideas were too detailed for my purposes and so I selected and modified Jefferson’s transcription techniques to provide insight into how the
participant presented themselves but without over complicating the resulting analysis. A glossary of the conventions I used is as follows:

... Each dot indicates a second in the pause of speech.

[ ] Square brackets between adjacent lines of concurrent speech indicate the onset and end of overlapping talk.

Under Underlined fragments indicate speaker emphasis.

CAPITALS Words in capitals mark a section of speech noticeably louder than that surrounding it.

(inaudible) Indicates speech that is difficult to make out.

Once the interviews were transcribed, the margins of the document were reduced and line numbers were assigned to enable the easy identification of extracts taken from interviews in the analytical process. This was followed by a thorough analysis of each interview and the stories told and themes presented were identified in and across the interviews. Through this process, I was able to identify important themes for the young men, and particularly school and further education, family, community, marriage and intimate relations, violence and criminal activity, intra-Asian conflict and violence, religion and friendship networks. However, it is important to note that these themes are not definitive and often a single story cut across a number of the themes. Once these themes had been identified, an overview was written of background information for each young man and these can be found in the Appendices. A discussion of themes of school and further education, religion and friendship networks is presented and discussed in Chapter Three. The data and
experiences of the family, community, marriage and intimate relations, violence and criminal activity, intra-Asian conflict and violence can be identified as specifically informing and constructing their enactments of masculinity and are analysed and discussed in Chapter Four.
Chapter Three

'SOUTH ASIAN' YOUNG MEN: STORIES, ACCOUNTS
AND LIFE IN THE NORTH

ACCOUNTS AND LIFE STORIES

This chapter analyses a set of the themes that recurred across the young men’s interviews in the North-East and North-West. It reports and analyses the young men’s experiences at school, their friendship networks, and the impact of religion on their life experiences. These experiences are understood as informing masculinity and providing an arena where masculinity is enacted and can also be ‘tested’ by them. Additional themes which my analysis shows to be critical to the young men’s perception and enactment of masculinity are analysed in Chapter Four.

The broad life story approach I used resulted in the collection of large amounts of interview data and the analysis then carried out involved a lengthy process. Reading various sociological literatures influenced my decision to analyse the interviews on two levels: firstly, as a starting point this literature threw up ideas and concepts around identity, ethnicity, masculinity, religion, community, family and racism which I used to consider, extract and group the young men’s stories into key recurring themes for comparative analysis; and secondly, the interviews were read informed by the sociological literature on accounts to understand the connections between the young men’s stories and masculinity.

Key theoretical ideas around identity, ethnicity and religion were used in analysing the interviews for how these young Pakistani and Bangladeshi men
perceive themselves, how identity is thought of and which particular identities are available for young Pakistani and Bangladeshi young men, whether they identify and engage with a collective (Woodward 1997, 2000, 2004, Hall 1990, Westwood 1990), and how they construct and ‘perform’ their cultural and ethnic identity (Aziz 1995, Phoenix 1998). Connected to this, the ideas of diaspora and hybridity (Werbner 2000, Anthias 2001) were also helpful when analysing the stories they told comparatively across regions and communities as to whether forms of identity and masculinity are fused, localized, and territorial. Identity was also especially significant when considering how these young men consider and position themselves when categorized as ‘South Asian’ or Muslim, as this is critical when conceptualizing ‘South Asian’ masculinity.

Academic writings on the feminization of ‘South Asian’ men and masculinity (Haywood and Mac an Ghaill 2003, Mac an Ghaill 1994, Archer 2001, Goodey 1998, Frosh and Phoenix 1999, Connolly 1998) were valuable for analysing the experiences of the young men in their social world, and particularly in understanding how Pakistani and Bangladeshi young men typecast each other as men and also in forming my own theories on ‘South Asian’ masculinity. Theorizing ‘South Asian’ masculinity also involves considering if ‘South Asian’ masculinity is comparable to Black masculinity as a form of resistance to racism (Majors and Billson 1992), a search for control (Alexander 1996, Archer 2001), or whether ‘South Asian’ men assert their masculinity in other forms.

Theories on religion and Islamic identification were particularly useful in analysing the young men’s interviews and identifying if the experiences of these young men fit with what academics have suggested: for example, does Islam provide
a positive identity (Alexander 2001), provide resistance to anti-Muslim sentiment (Vertovec 1998), and does an Islamic identification unite Bangladeshi and Pakistani groups as one (Archer 1998, 2001)? Connected to these ideas of identity and community, the majority of the young men I interviewed live in predominantly Asian populated areas. Here I found the work concerned with territory, locality (Westwood 1990, Connolly and Neil 2001, Sack 1996, Hall, Coffey and Williamson 1999, Webster 1997, Watt and Stenson 1998, Kundnani 2001) and ‘nationalism in the neighbourhood’ (Cohen 1988) particularly valuable when analysing the experiences of the young men in their particular localities and asking if and how they are divided and along which lines; that is, whether these young men buy into territorial networks, and the impact of such behaviour on their masculine performance.

The stories that young men told were not simply accepted as unproblematic narrations of experience but analysed for their structure, purpose and meaning to achieve a comprehension of the young men’s masculine performance both within the interview and within social life. When people tell stories they give meaning to and express their interpretations of a particular experience, and significantly the way in which they convey their story reveals the identity and meaning which they want to represent. Ideas around narrative analysis (Riessman 1993, Chase 1996, Denzin 1989) were key in this process and it helped me to focus on how events were constructed by the young men, highlighting their values and interests, what they were trying to promote, and if their stories are communicated within specific cultural discourses. The life story approach enlightened me to the fact that stories are structured by frameworks and these are embedded in young men’s stories which can shape cultural understandings and practices (Ochberg 1994, Letherby 2003,
Riessman 1993, Denzin 1989, Bell 2003). So, for example, a story told by a young man of wrong-doing such as alcohol consumption is embedded in his understandings of religion, culture and his masculine role in conforming to family expectations, and it is approaching these young men’s stories in this way which allowed me to achieve a greater understanding of ‘South Asian’ masculinity and identity. The work of Coates (2003) on ‘Men Talk’ complimented the life story research method because it helped me to realize that young men’s stories are actually masculinity in construction and that through the analysis of these stories I was able to identify how they position themselves in relation to hegemonic masculinity, to recognise the emphasis of particular stories, especially those giving prominence to typical masculine attributes such as, aggression, conflict, ambition, achievement, and also and significantly, to understand that the pressure to present masculine traits can restrict young men’s stories in terms of what they feel they can say and do concerning how they are with others.

Researching young ‘South Asian’ men using a life story approach has been an immense learning experience and I am now conscious that all stories account for things, and so a life story which is told by young men accounts for how their life has developed in a particular way, telling what young men say they have done and not done, and why. Although such stories may appear to be mere descriptions, they are actually explanations of life experiences which are told from a perspective, and they are specifically constructed to explain what has happened or the choices that have been made, and so stories can be understood as motivated and moral accounts. Because of this I am interested in and make use of the sociological literature regarding accounts. These theories on accounts have been used in conjunction with
the various conceptual and theoretical ideas discussed above which informed the structure of analysis of the young men’s stories on two levels. One concerns the specific content, which I analyse thematically; and the other concerns to analyse them as motivated moral accounts, something which is also used as a broad framework for thinking about the interviews as a whole.

The sociological literature on accounts drawn upon includes the works of Sykes and Matza (1957), Scott and Lyman (1968), Goffman (1959) and Mills (1940). Sykes and Matza are specifically concerned with accounts of delinquency, but both they, Scott and Lyman, Mills and Goffman are at basis interested in social accounting for behaviour more generally, because all social behaviour, conforming as well as deviant, is ‘called to account’ and people routinely explain and justify in motivated moral accounts what they have done or not done. It is in this sense that the idea of accounts is used in interpreting what the young men were trying to achieve in relation to masculinity from the stories they told me. Succinctly, theirs were motivated moral accounts and I have analysed them as such.

Sykes and Matza’s (1957) ideas of techniques of neutralisation is useful in understanding how people in general rationalise and justify their behaviour to themselves and others, and in the process shield themselves from self-blame. Sykes and Matza discuss five main techniques of neutralization, all of which I found the young men I interviewed to employ in telling their stories\(^1\). Similarly Scott and Lyman’s (1968) ideas around modal excuses and justifications are useful in

---

\(^1\)These are ‘denial of responsibility’, where an individual defines himself as lacking responsibility for his actions; ‘denial of injury’, which proposes that others are not hurt by the actions the individual engages in such as vandalism; ‘denial of victim’, which insists that injury to the victim is not wrong and is instead a justifiable form of punishment or revenge; ‘condemnation of the condemners’, which involves attacking those who disapprove of the behaviour, which shifts the focus of attention from themselves; and lastly, an ‘appeal to higher loyalties’, which addresses the conflict between friendship and the law, where individuals claim that they deviate only in order to uphold loyalty to friends or family.
understanding how individuals are likely to use excuses as a means of saving face or to justifying their behaviour, something which occurred across all the interviews I carried out. In addition, in order to understand a person’s justifications and excuses the motives provided for an act also needs to be considered. Here Mills’ (1940) ideas about motives are useful in recognising that people justify their actions and also try to secure the empathy and acceptance of an audience. The work of Goffman (1959) on the ‘presentation of self’ adds further insight, in particular that accounts, excuses and justifications are all attempts to present the self in a way that is ‘required’ in a situation, in the sense of someone achieving the purposes they have, “so that it will convey an impression to others which it is in his interests to convey” (Goffman 1959, p16). These ideas around accounts, excuses, justification, motives and the ‘presentation of self’ have helped me to comprehend how stories can often engage in ‘impression management’ to produce acceptance or approval from an audience, and also to realize what the young men were trying to achieve through their stories and more specifically those regarding their masculine performance.

In the remaining part of this chapter and the next, I move on to analyse the key themes that recurred during the interviews with both of the groups of young men I interviewed, and these include school experiences, family, community, religion, marriage and intimate relations, violence and criminal activity, intra-Asian violence and conflict. These are broad themes which can and do encompass other topics, such as friendship circles, territory and racism. I analyse the young men’s experiences by theme and by comparing and contrasting to find similarities or differences between

---

2 There are four modal forms of excuses; these are the ‘appeal to accidents’, the ‘appeal to defeasibility’, the ‘appeal to biological drives’, and ‘scapegoating’, which are used either to mitigate responsibility, to deny intent and consequence, to defend their behaviour or to rationalise behaviour as occurring only in response to the behaviour or attitudes of others.
ethnicity, community and region. This chapter explores the young men’s experiences at school, friendship networks, their views and experiences of religion. The analysis of their accounts of family, community, marriage and intimate relations, and intra-Asian conflict, and violence and criminal activity are in Chapter Four, where I analyse the young men’s experiences together, because these experiences are fundamental to how these young men constructed and presented their interpretation of ‘men and masculinity’. Each of the participants has been given an alias to ensure anonymity, and an overview of each interview is provided in the Appendices.

Bilal, Naser, Waqar, Amar and Shazad are Pakistani residents of East-Town. Dilshad, Mansoor, Shahin and Shabaz are of Bangladeshi origin and also live in East-Town. Qutuz, Rafiq, Jafar and Yasin are of Pakistani origin and live in West-Town. Mahir, Idris, Rahman and Safi are of Bangladeshi origin and also live in West-Town.

**SCHOOL EXPERIENCES**

‘Education, Education, Education’

The ‘South Asian’ family is considered to place a significant value upon education and the educational system and ‘South Asian’ young men are seen as typically well behaved and geared towards achieving educational success (Archer 2001, 2003, O’Donnell and Sharpe 2000). These young men are considered to be motivated by the deep respect that they have for their parents and concern not to hurt their feelings (O’Donnell and Sharpe 2000, Archer 2001, 2003, Hopkins 2006, Yip 2004, Gangoli, Razak and McCarry 2006), and with religion encouraging young men to study and be successful (Dwyer, Shah and Sanghera 2008). The community and
family are considered to support achievement and produce good pupils and simultaneously blamed for restricting and oppressing their children (Archer 2003). Many of the young men that I interviewed began their interviews by discussing their school experiences. This may have been because they considered this topic to be a safe place to start without revealing their private experiences. Whatever their motives, it was clear from the stories that the young men told me about school that their sense of masculine self and identity was informed by their school experiences and for some their masculineness was also shaped by the pressure of expectations from the family.

As other academics (Archer 2001, 2003, O'Donnell and Sharpe 2000) have noted, and my research also shows, Pakistani and Bangladeshi young men face a certain amount of pressure from their parents and family to succeed in education. However, my research also indicates that some young men resent the strains and demands of the family to achieve educational success. For example, Waqar resents the significance placed on education by his parents and generalised all Asian families as having an obsession with “education education education” (line 47). Similarly, Naser commented on the importance of education as an ‘Asian thing’. And although minimising the pressure he personally felt, “they weren't pressurising us just Asian mentality right” (lines 29-30), he still felt he had to conform to his parent’s expectations and succeed in order to prove his capability to his mother, and he clearly resents his elder brother for being held in such high esteem:

[...] I only got the degree just so I could prove that I could do a degree. my older brother got a degree, my sisters have got degrees, my mother worships the floor my brother walks on. just to prove that I could do it erm I got the degree right. I even said to them this is for you. (lines 26-29)
Waqar could not comprehend the tacit assumption that a good education would guarantee happiness and money, and money is clearly highly motivational and important to him as an intrinsic marker of success and masculinity:

[...]
it's not going to promise me happiness it won't definitely promise me money. after I hear stories from people about these wonderful jobs. doctors n that fair enough but they still get taxed. they're getting damaged there. if you get a taxi job making one n a half thousand pounds a week. that's 50 grand a year and then you get a lawyer making 40 grand n half of that taken off. where's the education left anybody now. (lines 32-56)

[...] teachers who were riding bicycles telling me that education's going to get you places. when you studied [...] where have you studied. oh Oxford. where else have you studied. Cambridge. why the fuck you riding a bike for then (lines 716-719)

Waqar’s rejection of education parallels a keenness to succeed in it: he failed his GCSEs, re-sat them at college and when I interviewed him, he was enrolled on a degree course. This contradictory behaviour was justified around the pressure to succeed and the importance his parents attach to him completing his degree. Waqar suggested his mother’s attitude to education came from being an immigrant from Pakistan: “my ma she's very clever but very backward n all. cos she's. I don't blame her she's from the country. that country [laughs] she's from Azad Kashmir. Pakistan so I don't blame her” (lines 131-133), and his ‘hillbilly’ mother is invoked in an explicit attempt to explain away his own contradictory behaviour.

Waqar presents his commitment to achieving financial success as budding at an early age; for example, he took a part-time job in a club when he was fifteen. However, his claim that his parents wanted him to have a good education does not fit with their encouragement to work which would inevitably jeopardise his school performance. Indeed, he first commented that his parents “really weren’t bothered at
the end of the day” (line 87), but then went on to rationalise their motive as instilling a good work ethic in him:

They wanted me to somehow get an education, but they were really serious about my education. I was only young and they wanted me to make money at the same time they didn’t want the money. They just wanted me to make money (lines 89-91)

It is also strange that his parents would consciously allow a fifteen year old to work in a club with late hours and the threat of violence, so it is possible that Waqar did not disclose the real nature of his employment to me nor perhaps to his parents either.

Revealing similar financial aspirations as Waqar, Naser stated that “I’m going to be rich by the way” (line 136), and his many references to becoming “rich” (line 136, 137, 285, 286) conveys that, like Waqar, financial success is intrinsically connected to his sense of achievement of masculinity. When I met Naser he had recently set up his own business and came across in the interview as determined to succeed as an entrepreneur and with confidence or even arrogance about this: “[...] I got a degree but I always knew that I was going to work for myself [...] I was going to work for myself no matter what it was. whether it was property. I don’t know I would do anything. I was going to work for myself” (lines 30-33). Naser positions himself securely as an accomplished man both in the family and in the community, around the belief that financial success elevates a man’s status. Given Naser’s certainty of his success, it came as quite a shock when I passed his shop some months after this interview to find that his business was no longer there.

Shazad was another young man who commented on the influence of his parents on his education. However, he spoke of this in a positive fashion and
connected his success to their support in encouraging him to apply for a private school scholarship.

Yasin too commented on the pressures to excel at school but this pressure was inflicted primarily by his brothers which were often physical:

[...] I’ve got older brothers who, you know, who’ve got, one of them got chucked out of school, and you know he made a big, he’s studying now, he left it late but he’s studying now, he realises the wrong thing. I think having them, having older brothers helped a lot, because they taught me, you know, they said to me that, they took me off the streets basically, they explained to me and everything you know. I used to get, and I used to be a lot scared of my brothers, you know. If I get involved in a fight or in trouble, whatever, really scared of my brothers, but I think just their guidance and the, their experience and stuff that stopped me (lines 133-140)

Yasin is with hindsight grateful for the guidance and he appreciates that his education has given him a different perspective and start on life. For example: “You know that it’s not worth it, you know, oh petty little things like partying and, you know, causing trouble and all that” (lines 151-153).

At the time of his interview, Bilal was being pressured by his parents to leave university to marry and settle down. Bilal had not enjoyed school and had not continued with his education, but recent events and particularly his involvement with the Criminal Justice System had encouraged him to return to college and when we met he was at university. It is clear that education has importance in his family, as his sisters had both gone on to further education, so his parent’s stance is perhaps a response to Bilal’s past lifestyle, with an awareness of similar young men who had through this married, settled down and were financially supporting the family. In ‘South Asian’ communities, marriage is often seen as a solution to the perceived deviancy of young adults, such as crime, alcohol, drugs, gambling, or pre-marital sex (Samad and Eade 2003, Gangoli, Razak and McCarr 2006, Uddin and Ahmed 2000,
see also Chapter Four), as marriage is considered to instil responsibility and secure good behaviour. However, Bilal is resisting marriage:

BA: he's like you've got to get married [...] they want us to drop out of university you see[...]
AR: to get married?
BA: aye. to get a job and sort my own life out. but I'm like just give me a few more years (lines 300-303)

Jafar truanted from school on a regular basis and he excused this by reference to his involvement in local gangs and violence. As a result of his bad behaviour his parents told him to leave home on a number of occasions and apparently from the age of thirteen he had to fend for himself. Jafar provided an account of managing school and two jobs at this age of thirteen, which I found difficult to accept given his job descriptions. Jafar may have been trying to elicit sympathy in an effort to divert attention from his behaviour and the grounds for which his parents disowned him:

JH When I did go to school right. and come back about three o'clock I used to come back. I used to come a bit earlier. right. get ready and then I used to go to takeaway for about half four. that was in Stepwest and that. and I used to go to there till erm. eleven o'clock. come back. get an hours kip. an hour or two then go taxi rank. I used to work in a taxi rank.
AR Oh right.
JH Yeah till six in the morning and then get a bit sleep and go back to work. just do my money home and all that (lines 271-278)

Jafar now regrets his failure at school and is now enrolled on an accountancy course and he endeavours to be a role model for his children: “And I want them to see me like. you know. doing something and they can do something as well. and all that” (lines 155-56). Jafar described difficulty in balancing the demands of studying and his family, and he has little faith that he will continue with his course.
None of the Bangladeshi young men commented on their parent’s influence, involvement or expectations around education, although some of them had been in or were in further education. I do not think the lack of discussion around education with Bangladeshi young men is a general feature but a happenstance of the priorities of the young men’s story-telling.

My research echoes the findings of other researchers in that young men experience parental pressure to succeed in education, however, these young men did not associate their educational aspirations with religion. Although these young men may resent the pressure to succeed in education, they still conform to such expectations motivated by respect and a need to please their parents, and in Yasin’s case his brothers. The important of the school and family is not diminishing (Dwyer, Shah and Sanghera 2008) and the family still plays a significant influence in shaping young men’s identities (see Chapter Four), and some young men recognise that education is related to both success and can enhance their performance of masculinity.

**Visibly Different: Racism, Bullying and ‘Paki-Bashing’**

‘South Asian’ men have tended to be perceived as victims of crime and especially racial crime and they have been praised for practicing restraint rather than revenge and resentment against racism (O’Donnell and Sharpe 2000). However, it has also been noted that ‘South Asian’ men are now enacting a more tough and aggressive stance against racism (Alexander 2000a, Goodey 1998, 2001). Being tough is effective in both responding to and deterring racism and racist name calling (Troyna and Hatcher 1992) and the prospect of racial danger makes the practice of
moving in groups a defensive necessity and a social preference (Keith 1995). A common theme cross-cutting all the young men's experiences at school concerned feelings of difference, racism or bullying.

Significantly, all the young men told stories and experiences of racism or an awareness of their differences around ethnicity, lifestyle, culture and financial background at school and often struggled to make friends, because white children "always put you down" (Dilshad, line 161):

They were living a different lifestyle. they were rich I weren't really rich I got a scholarship through the school [...] when I used to ask them your parents ever hit ya . my parents used to beat the crap out of me all the time. n right they never got touched or nothing like that (Waqar, lines 23-24)

[...] I've not got the material things that other people have . can't afford the school trips away . you know ... and obviously being Asian as well . you are judged for it it made it difficult to blend in (Shazad, lines 439-442)

YF So it's completely weird for me that . it was harder for me to make friends . you know . at first.
AR At West High?
YF Yeah yeah it's always . you know when you are only Asian person it's always harder you know . when you have to get into pairs and do teamwork (Yasin, lines 122-26)

This acute awareness of difference confirmed the sense of secondary-class status and lack of belonging:

[...] when you're in school or when you're in school growing up in predominantly well it was a mixed school but . the dominant . er young people were the white young people and er . so you knew for a fact that . it's the way your parents bring you up as well that you're always told that aw not told but always made to feel that this is not your country . back home's your country so that's one element of it another element of it is not being accepted by society . in school you know you're always like a second class citizens in school and honestly you felt it you didn't realise it . you didn't understand it but you felt it . (Dilshad, lines 29-35)
Shahin spoke of an awareness of ethnic difference and racism when he first attended a predominantly white primary school, which he likened to "Schindler's list... when that lady girl in red. Black n white. I felt like that. and er he's the only darkie here" (lines 666-67). Shahin described how he was bullied frequently until a white boy encouraged him to stand up for himself. After being threatened with a knife Shahin supposedly did as instructed and his bullies backed down:

[...] he told me tell them where to go or they'll keep coming back to you. I was only seven or eight. n he told me n they didn't come back. they came at me with a knife. n I just told them do something or piss off I don't need none of this. they were like aw we're kidding. I don't give a shit. if you wanna fight have a fight. if wanna fight don't use them knives. I was only nine years old. and er. so I had to grow up quick with the knives (lines 668-672)

It is impossible to know if this story is embroidered. I find it difficult to accept that seven or eight year olds carry knives, unless this was possibly a pen-knife, and I could not help wondering if Shahin was retrospectively constructing himself in this life story as a brave, confident, tough character. Shahin's difficulty at remembering whether he was seven, eight or nine adds to this suspicion. Shahin did not discuss secondary school and other school experiences in relation to racism and this was possibly because the interview had to be ended while we were still discussing this (see Appendix II).

Dilshad went to some lengths to gain approval and in his attempts to break into white friendship circles he tried to imitate white children and also often acted as a 'go-fer' to ensure acceptance. This suggests, as he comments, that initiation processes for approval are more stringent for Asian children than others:
we were like er... nobody so I tried to adapt with them. and I did actually I did. I didn’t adapt with them I tried to become like them but then to be accepted I had to do their certain things so I was like the guinea pig ‘aw Dilshad can you get this for us from the shop. can you steal this’ which I didn’t I didn’t steal anything but ‘can you get this from the shop can you do this can you do that’. to be accepted although I didn’t like it I had to be like them. but I had to do a lot more things to be accepted than what they would do (lines 72-77)

Amar and Shabaz commented on the sudden overwhelming exposure to racism with their transition to secondary school and “boom, you know about racism. big time do you know what I mean?” (Shabaz, line 271). Verbal racial abuse and ‘paki-bashing’ were a frequent occurrence for many of the young men and for some this clearly negatively affected their interest in and success at school:

“It was a well known rough school, at that time. basically because of that I didn’t want to study I didn’t wanna go to lessons and stuff. we used to skive away n stuff” (Amar, lines 39-41).

Rafiq too reported limited options in dealing with racism, either running away, being physically beaten or like Amar resorting to truancy. Another preferred option reported by other young men was to take a physical stance. Bilal and his friends often resorted to violence in their efforts to carve their “own space” (line 355) in their struggles with white young men. Bilal recounted an incident where he and his friend were involved in a fight with a group of white boys. Seemingly, the fight started when a young white girl purposely pushed into Bilal and his friend Imitiaz and started giving ‘cheek’. Bilal and Imitiaz responded in a similar fashion and then a white boy initiated a fight, I assume because they had been rude to the girl. Bilal went on to state that a total of ten white young boys became involved and he used the ‘ten men versus two’ to justify his extreme violence towards one young boy, legitimating his own behaviour as self-defence and the boy as fully responsible for what happened to him. The events told of are extreme: “you know the outside of
the walls here [indicates corner of pillar] I just took this fellas head and smacked it. He needed thirteen stitches to his forehead" (lines 377-378). The possible exaggerations in Bilal’s story become apparent when he describes how he and his friend Imtiaz had to go to hospital and hastily adds “and obviously most of them went to hospital as well” (lines 368-369), implying that their fighting ability was more than match for ten others and presenting himself as a macho, tough man. Though elements of Bilal’s story may be true, its fictive elements are also evidenced by his declaration, that although he and Imtiaz “hit a few teachers” (lines 369), the case against them was dropped. Bilal uses his ethnicity and experiences of racism to excuse his behaviour, placing responsibility with the white young boys, firstly for being racist and secondly because there were more of them: “at the end of the day I’m sure we were the victims. cos we were Asian and there were ten of them” (lines 371-372). Bilal specifically presented a ‘tough guy’ image and the stories he chose supported this. His claims to a potent form of masculinity are further stressed by his claims he gained much respect both from white and Asian children for his ‘tough guy’ stance, reiterating comments such as: “I got respect from the white school know what I mean. I went to a white school and I used to fight them” (361-362), with his choice of language very battle-like: “there used to be loads of close encounters” (lines 389-390) and emphasising his confidence and macho-ness.

Bilal narrated a shift to social acceptance with the influx of Eastern European refugee children who became the ‘bottom of the hierarchy’ group, following which the attention of the white bullies withdrew from Bilal and his friends. Bilal and the other Asian children then joined in the ridicule and torment of the refugees, which
both deflected attention from them and provided a vehicle for confirming their masculinity:

[...] and I think Asians took advantage of it... they teamed up with the English lads and started taking the piss out of the refugees. I know what I mean. So we were socially accepted now. It'll be a matter of time before most of the refugees will become accepted as well. Africans will take over (lines 395-398)

Bullying is a mechanism for power and control, where bullies feel powerful over others and appear 'hard' and 'cool' in front of friends (Ma, Stewin and Mah 2001). Bilal is an intelligent young man and is able to discern that socially marginal groups find it easier to fit in when attention is deflected to another group. He clearly willingly meted out the same torments and violence to the new scapegoats as the Asian children had received, a vicious circle that is hard to eradicate. Bilal spoke of African people becoming the new alien other, disregarding the moral panic nationally and in the media about Islamic terrorists and Muslims. His apparent failure to recognise this national discourse interested me, suggesting as it does that local factors are the most important in shaping his views.

Mansoor and Amar also narrated methods of physical retaliation but specifically through the recognition of the strength in numbers. Amar had been pre-warned by previous students of 'Paki bashing' events, and experienced these as an initiation process in which he was able to deflect further attacks by demonstrating resistance, and social and support networks were built in which older Asian children protected the younger. According to Amar, 'Paki bashing' has been eliminated in that school with a now predominant Asian student population. However, he also took the credit for this, by stating that it was because he and his friends had taken an active stance against racism and protected the young, and others had followed suit:
[...] but now in that school today it's mainly majority Asians. erm and you don't get that. you don't. you hardly ever get that. I mean it's much easier for them now I think due to all of us in the past. because they used to be a group of us who would stand against them and not let them do stuff to the younger ones. know like stop fights and stuff happening (Amar, lines 72-76)

Mansoor similarly described himself and his friends as persistently having to prove themselves. However, it appears that they chose situations where their masculinity and ability to fight would not be questioned and they would have a fair chance of winning and situations where they avoided response, and overall he gave the impression that the abuse didn’t hurt:

[...] you’re always thinking that well you can’t really fight back cos there’s not enough of us (line 55)

[...] if we think we can fight them we’ll fight them if we think we can’t then you just sort of shout something back n run away or throw something at them or walk away just take what they give you (lines 226-228).

MR: [...] you just walk away sometimes you get hit and just walk on you ignore so you pick your moments just depending on how you feel
AR: why did you sometimes just walk on?
MR: I don't know sometimes its just tolerance I've always had tolerance and I've always told the other lads that it's pointless just fighting back all the time sometimes it's just worth walking away and seeing if that makes a difference so we often did we just walked away when they swore at us or threw things and stuff and sometimes we'd just stop and say 'lets beat the fuck today or lets fight them' [laughs] (lines 84-92)

Mansoor connects his experiences of fighting and tension with white boys as the product of racism, though this was possibly only one of the triggers. Struggles and tensions about power and status are common because fighting displays and confirms masculinity, and provides young men like these with a vehicle to prove their ability to fight and be socially ranked accordingly:
[... ] there was a few that had the big fight if y’know what I mean there was a few of the hard lads the white lads that fought with the hard Asian lads n they were the big fights n we sort of just were around n we had a few punches n then it stopped n everybody just watched the main fight . . its funny how the fight everybody has a fight n then the fight that looks the best gets all the attention yeah so obviously we weren’t the best fighters [laughs] (lines 257-261).

Naser too had experienced bullying at school and he indicated that this was principally because he did not fight back. However, he then told a story of how, after a racist attack in his local area, he found confidence in his strength and ability to retaliate, which was supposedly encouraged by his mother:

AR:  why did she hit you?
NG:  right because I think she knew that I was only scared of them . yeah she knew that I was only scared of them [ ... ]
AR:  what did she say when she slapped you?
NG:  she goes you go down that street . n fight them three boys and I want you to gut every single one of them . I says nah . and she smacks us again and she goes don’t come back without it . don’t come back without it [ ... ] it was good man it was good . it worked (lines 246-254)

These three boys were also those responsible for bullying Naser at school, and while this story may be rather dramatised and mythological, Naser appeared comfortable in telling it and giving his mother credit for forcing him to be ‘a man’ and ‘gutting’ them. I was interested in this, because it would have been more ‘manly’ if he had taken on his attackers without his mother’s involvement. Unfortunately, however, the batteries in my recorder ran out at this point and as a consequence I failed to probe this story and explore the importance of his mother’s role. Following this story, Naser described his regret in often watching other Asian children being bullied and he is certain that intimidation has to be fought with intimidation. However, he commented that Asians were “chicken shit” and “they’re just fucking all mouth and no action at all . they’re just full of shit” (line 263), all of which emphasised his own confidence, strength and masculinity by comparison.
Akin to Archer’s (2003) findings where the young men she interviewed spoke of the subtle racist attitudes expressed by teachers, often evident in their preferences for white boys and their unwillingness to tackle racist incidents, both Dilshad and Rafiq described their teachers as unhelpful and racist: “a lot of bullying used to go on a lot of racism bullying a lot. of young people used to take money off our group and er n you tell the teachers and the teachers won’t take any notice of that they won’t understand” (Dilshad, lines 58-61). Rafiq described a similar lack of support from his mother, who proposed his stories of racism were just an excuse to avoid going to school. However, Rafiq excused his mother for her lack of understanding and related this to her lack of experience of racism: “Like you know mums they don’t understand as much of what bad they do” (line 112). Some young men were also mindful that their teachers also assumed a different set of expectations: “you are judged for it it made it difficult to blend in but even then it made me more determined to get myself through it. and erm. get good marks which is the reason I was there. I didn’t want them to think and myself to think that I’ve come from a low class background and I was going to end up in the same type of job. low skilled. non professional job because of my background” (Shazad, lines 442-446). Similarly, Waqar was outraged by the obvious scorn of a teacher and the assumptions made about Waqar’s culture, ethnicity and lifestyle, and Waqar is jubilant that he has subsequently exceeded all expectation: “All I want to say to him now is fuck you you bastard where are you n where am I. I have done things I’ve got a shop. I’ve got this [where he works] n I’m happy” (lines 44-45). Achievement is important for Waqar, to prove his ability both to those who doubted him and to himself, and is tied to his notions of masculinity where successful achievement is equated to money and gains. Whether this nineteen
year old man is running a family business or in some other way has ‘got a shop’, success is clearly important to how he represents himself and accounts for his life thus far.

Stereotypes play an important part in the organisation of social space and the way in which people distance themselves from each other (Sibley 1995) and schools are a site where racial and gendered identities are shaped and informed. Stereotypes on race and masculinity (see Chapter One) have positioned ‘South Asian’ men as effeminate, weak, passive, eager to please and non-physical (Connolly 1998, Archer 2001) and these stereotypes combine with racism and racist assumptions to inform the basis on which young men are treated. Being excluded or absent from a masculinised space can reinforce a young man’s ‘otherness’ by being seen as inhabiting a space traditionally associated with femininity/girls (Sibley 1995, Renold 2004). For example, ‘South Asian’ boys are excluded from the hegemonic performance of football because they are believed not to be strong or agile enough to engage in these activities (Connolly 1998, Ashely 2003), and it is exclusion from such activities which reinforces the ‘effeminate’ image. Some of the young men commented on the evident racism and ethnic tension visible when playing sporting activities such as football: [...] just when you were doing PE or football n that competitive activities . and especially when you were a bit better on the same level as the gorae [white] . like for instance they never passed us the ball . like do you know when you were playing . like you know when we had the ball . we would not want to pass it to them either . know what I mean (Bilal, lines 382-386). Playing sports and football was an arena through which young men tried to gain acceptance, although, this acceptance was short-lived: “hey you’re different actually . you helped us win
the game but you’re still somebody else” (Mansoor, line 79). Dilshad also described temporary approval and acceptance with recruitment onto the football team but supposedly was taken off the team by his teacher for “hanging around with the wrong crowd” (line 81) and he felt that this was “blatant racism” (line 82).

All the young men relayed some form of being made to feel different, victimisation or racial abuse, by white students and teachers which compounded their experiences at school. Their experiences brought into sharp focus differences of identity, ethnicity and culture. For some it was the impressing of difference by the educational setting which gave some a drive to exceed expectation and most of them to feel a commonality with those like them in ethnic and religious terms. Through the need to defend and protect themselves, some young men found opportunities to prove, enhance and confirm their masculinity, but also some of them related their failures at school to racism and legitimated their violence to others.

NETWORKS OF IN/EXCLUSION

Researchers have commented on South Asian young people’s tendency to form a ‘South Asian’ friendship group, in part as an active stance against racism; these groups and networks enable young men to protect themselves and their communities from attacks (Brake 1985). However, the friendship group is also about the politics of space, power, territory and identity, which interlink and inform a bond between young men which is strengthened by the local area and its ties (see Chapter Four for further discussion), something which is ethnicist rather than racist in orientation (Cohen 1988). The ‘South Asian’ friendship group is created on the perception of similarity and difference and the ‘nationalism of the neighbourhood’
(Cohen 1988) is potentially important and useful in understanding how Bangladeshi and Pakistani young men organise themselves (see also Chapter Four). From my interviews with the young men, it is clear that ethnicity is an important factor in how some Bangladeshi and Pakistani young men define boundaries of inclusion and exclusion (see also “You’re a fish” later in this chapter), their perceptions of identity and masculinity and the behaviour which stems from this.

**Social Networks**

Waqar narrated feeling discomfort and rejection by white children at his private school and he chose to maintain his Asian friendship circles in the community. He simultaneously identified his Asian friends as partially responsible for his failures at school, but also saw these friendships in college as nurturing his success:

> [... ] in private school I failed my GCSEs there and then I went to college I passed know what I mean . I was with my own people and I passed . so that does kind of say something in a sense . know what I mean . you can’t do things unless you’re comfortable (lines 646-648)

By comparison, Shazad was content with his limited contact with Asian young people both at school and at university because this minimised the risk of peer group pressure: “it becomes easier to get distracted and want to spend time with them and do things . erm . fit in a way with the collective” (lines 480-481). Similarly, Yasin deliberately maintains minimal contact with people from his local Asian childhood networks because “certain people will influence you in a wrong way if you get involved with them” (lines 223-4). He spoke with relief that he works outside of West-Town, which allows him to focus, because otherwise “people
coming in, you end up talking to them, you are wasting time n all that” (lines 245-6).

Shazad has a rather contradictory set of views concerning the influence of Asian and white friendship networks. He identifies Asian social networks as exerting pressure to fit in. But at the same time associating with them is far less complicated because assumptions will be made by his family and others that he is not participating in deviant behaviour, while if he is seen in the company of white friends Asian people will conclude he is probably involved in immoral or deviant activity. Despite this, Shazad comments that in the presence of white friends there is less pressure to conform because they are more accepting of his beliefs and identity. Of course peer group pressure exists in all friendship groups, but I can appreciate why Shazad said this. For example, as a Muslim person it is often easier to tell a white person you do not drink alcohol, and hence they do not expect you to do so and are therefore unlikely to encourage you to. Interpreting Shazad’s confusing and contradictory arguments, it is possible that he has conformed in Asian friendship circles - for example, initially Shazad denied his involvement in pre-marital relationships or deviant activity such as drinking alcohol “cos that’s not me and I knew I couldn’t do that” (line 477), but further on he enunciated the ease of deviancy in the security of Asian friendship circles:

[...] it becomes easier to get distracted and want to spend time with them and do things. erm. fit in in a way with the collective. rather than be a different person. erm. kind of trouble just like. typical that you get seen with Asian people or er. typical Asian discipline basically about girls. about messing about with friends and coming home late. lying and things like that I wouldn’t have done it them stuff really with white people. I don’t think. I’d think twice if it was white people (lines 480-485)
Pressure to protect the image of a moral self also informs friendship networks. Shazad categorically distances himself from Pakistani networks, instead opting for Bengali friends, and this decision is fundamentally connected to the protection of honour. This distance allows him privacy and protection from the surveillance of the Pakistani community, and is a form of damage limitation because broken friendships with Bengalis are potentially less difficult. This is because, firstly, they would not have intimate knowledge of his family or the Pakistani community, and secondly and significantly, Shazad assumes that his Bengali friends do not possess influential links into the Pakistani community, so limiting the potential damage if friendships should be broken. His surface motives were presented as protecting his ‘inner feelings’, but other motives are also raised by his insinuations of deviant behaviour which could be harmful to the reputation and honour of his family:

[...] I don’t know his community he doesn’t know my community. we can talk about anything we want see what I mean. there’s less barriers there [...] in a way I’ve used the other community to protect myself from my community. does that make sense it sounds bad but it’s true. it’s true cos I know what Pakis are like (lines 761-768)

Similar to Shazad, Mansoor prefers to keep a distance from peers in his ethnic community. Although Mansoor’s network includes some Bangladeshi friends, the majority of his female friends are from white backgrounds. Like Shazad, Mansoor justified his selection of friendship networks through an implicit need to conceal his experiences from Asian-peer knowledge. He states that Asian girls will lack empathy and interpret his behaviour as validating certain activities, by which I assume he means (unspecified) deviant activities: “I don’t really have best female friends that are Asian mind just cos I couldn’t. you can’t tell them things you can’t. if you do tell them things they won’t understand you. some of the stuff might
encourage them it might. oh it's alright to do that say that" (lines 1292-1295). By avoiding Asian friends he was able to protect himself and his family honour, something which was clearly an issue around our participant-researcher relationship, because although I assured Mansoor of the strictest confidence, he seemed to remain threatened by the possibility of contacts I might have in the community, and implicitly also that I might talk about my interview with him: "I picked what I was going to tell you" (line 1316), "everybody seems to know somebody it's unbelievable" (line 1330).

Naser's friendship networks are comprised primarily of people of Pakistani origin, and although he spoke of contacts within the Bengali community these are comparatively limited. Also, he seemed to want to emphasise a wider friendship network and intimacy with Bengalis and avidly dropped the names of young Bengali men, also assessing my familiarity with them. Naser's eagerness here is possibly related to his his rejection of inter-ethnic tension (see Chapter Four). However, his 'close' friendships with Bangladeshis actually came across as people he hardly saw: "Mamun. Mamunur he does something totally different to what I do. but we see each other say every three months. once every year probably but we're close" (lines 527-528).

Bilal, Amar, Safi, and Idris did not discuss their friendship networks in any detail. However, it is clear form the stories that they narrated that their social networks are placed within their own community although, like Naser, Amar was also keen to emphasise his links with all Asian communities.

It is clear from the young men's stories that some of these young men tend to network with young men of a similar ethnic and religious background. And while
some of them speak of diverse friendship networks (see below), others selectively choose their friendship circles in order to distance themselves from their community; the effect is to protect the family honour and shield the family from knowledge of their behaviour.

"You're a fish": Intra-Ethnic Prejudice

While researchers have commented on the 'South Asian' friendship group and suggested various factors for its formation, such as racism, the politics of space, power, territory and ethnicity (Brake 1985, Cohen 1988), research has failed to acknowledge the factions that exist within the 'South Asian' community and amongst the young men which configure the friendship group. It is clear from my interviews that ethnicity is an important factor in how some Bangladeshi and Pakistani young men define boundaries of inclusion and exclusion, their perceptions of identity and masculinity and the behaviour which stems from this. And significantly it was the Bangladeshi young men in particular who suffer from these boundaries of inclusion and exclusion, firstly on the basis of their ethnicity, and secondly on the basis of their masculinity. Experiences of intra-ethnic tension appear to differ by region, with Bangladeshi young men in East-Town reporting a more powerless stance and Bangladeshi young men in West-Town having an understanding that factions have been resolved with the 'race-riots'.

Dilshad spoke intently about his experiences at school with Pakistani young men and his experiences of intra-ethnic prejudice. He had made attempts to break barriers with white children (see earlier), but meeting with resistance he returned to his Asian friendship networks. He commented that while the majority of his
Bangladeshi friends networked amongst themselves his own best friends were of Pakistani origin. At the same time, Dilshad found that Pakistani people perceive themselves to be superior projected through comments about height and fish-eating (part of the staple diet of Bangladeshis) used to ridicule Bangladeshi people:

"...sometimes they do put you down and because again they think they, even the adults they think they are more superior over you and it's a known fact, because they it's a cultural thing that they've always had that they are more superior than the Bangladeshis. Bangladeshis are always looked down upon because of the way they look their height what they eat fish n all that so they always looked down upon and that reflected on me but we still had a little bit more in common than the white young people (lines 174-179)"

Often Dilshad’s Bangladeshi friends complained about “the fish joke” (line 181) and other prejudiced remarks, but he said they refrained from protest because they were generally outnumbered, implying that he thought a protest would be made. However, Dilshad commented that he felt less awkward than his Bangladeshi friends in Pakistani company and agreed that Pakistanis did “make them [his friends] feel like nobodies” (line 187-88), and denied being in a similar position even though his ‘best friend’, a Pakistani, projected negative attitudes about Bangladeshis. Dilshad assumed he could deflect negativity through his own build and height, which is similar to Pakistani men, while many Bangladeshis are of a smaller frame: “I’m quite big and er. I don’t think people look at me as a B, I don’t think they look at me as a Bengali. but there’s some people who do look as Bengali” (lines 235-37).

Dilshad suggested that he had become accustomed to these tensions and hierarchical attitudes, living alongside a Pakistani community, and he had “kind of adapted to it from a young age so you grew into it” (lines 186-187). Through his rationalisations and acceptance of prejudices towards Bangladeshis, Dilshad projects a need to be acknowledged by the more powerful group, seeing acceptance as increasing his own
status and masculinity by being associated with its members. This seems similar to his attempts at school to ingratiate himself with white children, because here too he was willing to accept mistreatment in exchange for friendship, but this time with Pakistanis.

Like Dilshad, Mansoor socialised more with Pakistani and white friends than Bangladeshi ones while growing up in East-Town. However, Mansoor epitomised himself as more confident, open-minded and westernised in comparison to many other Bangladeshis, who he regards as more traditional, and reluctant to entertain cross-cultural friendships. Like Dilshad, Mansoor also narrated tension and fighting between Pakistani and Bangladeshis while at school, with similar bullying and torment by Pakistanis of Bangladeshis through culture-specific and ethnic-specific jokes. Mansoor rooted these tensions in the war of independence between Bangladesh and Pakistan, with young people adopting racist attitudes from the parent generation. Another explanation offered was that the local Pakistani community is comparatively larger and stronger and imposed this on a community smaller and weaker than it is, but Mansoor also added that the reasons were many and complex. Mansoor described escaping bullying by developing a network with Pakistani young men, but this was at the cost of his friendships with other Bangladeshi young men, who were unable and did not want to develop links with the Pakistanis.

Mansoor confessed to co-participating with Pakistani young men in the bullying of Bangladeshi children. Like Dilshad, Mansoor was resolute in achieving acceptance and he was willing to overlook Bangladeshi mistreatment and this in effect distanced him from other Bangladeshis and Bangladeshi masculinity. However, in contrast to Dilshad, Mansoor alleged that he was able to protest against
the abuse: "I used to start saying 'hey you're calling them a fish that makes me a fish too'" (lines 336-7), which apparently reduced the level of bullying. In saying this, it is possible that Mansoor was attempting to reconstruct his self-presentation after admitting to such behaviour. He went on to suggest that he helped forge relations between Pakistanis and Bangladeshis through the common experience of racism: "one of the main things that I used to try and sort of highlight is the fact that we had big enough fights fighting like the white young people I can't believe we're fighting amongst ourselves n I think we need to be sticking together n stuff n that was the message that came out strongest always a bit of sort of a preacher I used to try n make that understanding n say lads it's pointless fighting amongst ourselves n stuff" (lines 355-59). If Mansoor acted as a diplomat in this way, it was at odds with his descriptions of previous bullying behaviour and responding to difficult situations by increasing his own status through picking on those weaker than him:

[...]I did get a lot of bullying in school cos er cos er we went to schools were there wasn't that many ethnic minorities n we got a lot bullied n I went through a stage I think in Newton High where I became a bit of a bully cos I got a good circle of friends a big circle of friends strong erm we used to just find challenging things to do so we used to start bullying we bullied other Asian kids (lines 369-373)

And this also extended to girls, although the ethnicity of these girls is not clear from what he said. Even though Mansoor expressed some remorse for his behaviour, it is clear he found amusement (and still seems to) in the torment he and his friends inflicted: "we used to pull her bra straps n things like that n steal her bag n get a chase it's just so funny . . . know it's such a funny thing to say but ok I'm an adult now I can say it n it's a funny thing the sorts of stuff that we used to do silly things
not really to hurt people too much" (lines 442-445). Mansoor, however, rationalises his bullying by dismissing it as childhood antics with no intention of harm.

Shahin did not talk extensively about his friendship networks. He did comment that prejudice between Pakistanis and Bangladeshis was explicitly clear amongst the first generation but insignificant to his generation, drawing on as an example his relationship with his Pakistani girlfriend and the commonality of religion. Shahin made light of the culture-specific comments they used to tease each other: "we talked about having kids . talked about how they would look . she said they'll have oily skin cos you're a fish . n er I would er I hope he hasn't got a big nose n eat chapattis n that . we would laugh" (lines 535-537). At the same time and perhaps contradictorily, Shahin commented that his friends were quick to point to differences, suggesting that culture and background are still important to this generation. Shahin’s comments of harmonious relations between Bangladeshis and Pakistanis needs to be taken in the context of his relationship as when pressed about tensions between Pakistanis and Bangladeshis, Shahin said: "if they put me down I won't put them down . I will talk to them why . talk to them why do you think you're better than me . cos you've done this n I've done that . state our religion that we're all equal . that gets to them . that really gets to them" (lines 438-441), implying that he had suffered from such experiences.

Similarly to Mansoor, Dilshad and Shahin, Shabaz commented on the Bangladeshi-Pakistani divide and similarly stressed religion as a commonality, and he too saw the roots of tension originating in conflict between the two countries. Shabaz stated experience of this ethnic tension through negative views expressed
about Pakistanis by his family, and also those expressed by his Pakistani friends about Bangladeshis, but he did not expand on exactly what they said.

Intra-ethnic tensions was also commented on by the Bangladeshi young men in West-Town with the difference lying in the assumption that the ‘race-riots’ have helped diffuse tensions in West-Town.

Similar to the views of Shahin of East-Town, Mahir characterised Pakistani and Bangladeshi tension and conflict as an issue for first generation immigrants, while also constructing those of his generation as receptive to cross-ethnic friendships and relationships. Mahir utilised Islam and his Islamic education to stress commonality and equality with other Muslims, with this optimistic view clearly influenced by his relationship and eventual marriage to a Pakistani girl (see Chapter Four). Mahir suggested that his views would possibly have been different if he had continued to be schooled in West-Town in a predominantly Bangladeshi environment, suggesting that people living sheltered lives often have insular views:

[...] I would say that had actually changed my way of looking at things. Maybe if I had carried on, if I hadn’t gone to boarding school or if I hadn’t been brought up in... in the... eh, Bangladeshi community maybe I would have been seeing things in a different way (lines 339-341)

Mahir was keen to stress his intra-ethnic friendships and he presented this as the product of living in an egalitarian British society. His rather sanguine description would be seen by some as failing to recognise the existence of prejudices that impact on people from different social, racial and sexual backgrounds. This could possibly be explained by the neighbourhood he lives in and the sheltered schooling he had had as a child and his secondary school years which were spent at boarding school, where his contact with people from other ethnicities and communities was limited.
However, I found it startling that Mahir, in promoting his stance on equality, disregards events such as the ‘riots’ of 2001 and incidences of racism and prejudice that happen on a daily basis. His dismissal of discrimination and difference seems to be motivated by his cross-cultural and cross-ethnic relationship (see Chapter Four). Connected to this, Mahir commented that first generation community members have issues with inter-community integration, and he connected these tensions to the Independence of Bangladesh:

MA [...] ... back at home life Bangladesh and Pakistan. obviously I mean we’ve been born and brought up in this country [ 
AR ] Right okay yeah. 
MA I mean ... and we’ve not had any ... eh sort of racial discrimination against each other. I think that the way I look at it. I mean I’ve never had any. I’ve ... I’ve got so many friends of Pakistani background [ 
AR ] Aha right 
MA But I mean I’ve never looked at them and say oh okay ... like they are a Paki or something 
AR Right okay yeah. 
MA Yeah I mean ... cause I mean we’ve all been brought up in this society. like in one eye together ... erm ... and been to schools together. everyone’s been treated equal. and we. I don’t know if it’s right to say in the western eye okay ... and er. ... but the parents ... who are from back home if you like the way they’ve I mean ... they’ve been brought up as. don’t know. they’ve been grown on. they’ve become old from over there. (lines 15-29)

However, Mahir’s view that intra-ethnic tension is only a first-generation issue is contradicted by what he says later about conflict between Pakistani and Bangladeshi young men, their communities, areas of segregation and conflict: “Obviously they knew. this is the Bengali community who live. majority of Bengalis lives there. or majority of Pakistani’s live on that areas. so let. you know. we’ll go round there. you know we’ll take a few boys. few boys down there and we’ll see if we can find them” (lines 230-32), and the resistance to his cross-cultural relationship.

Rahman too comments that intra-ethnic tension between Pakistanis and Bangladeshis is now uncommon although it had been an issue for people of the older generation. He was not sure about present-day conflict and tension, and like Mahir
he related this to masculine and ethnic competitiveness, probably because “You know maybe because they used to be like act bad. who’s the bad boy in each area. you know what I mean. but you know. that’s about it ‘innit. it’s all about young thugs ‘innit” (lines 745-747). Rahman connects such activities with younger boys, and though Rahman did not phrase it as such, he recognises that tension and conflict between young men in particular areas is also about respect and honour, and about establishing a reputation and marking territory through asserting masculinity and ability to dominate others. Rahman has connections with both Bangladeshi and Pakistani friendship networks, and comments that his Pakistani friends are of a more trustworthy and reliable nature. Rahman’s childhood friends of Bangladeshi origin have drifted away and he thought that marriage was often the cause. He went on to describe one friend as a “mawga” [under the thumb] (line 649), which is a derogatory term used to signify the failings of a man and his masculinity specifically connected to his role as a submissive husband and a man. For example, a man involved in housework, the care of children, who spends time with his wife and respects her opinion, will most definitely be described as a ‘mawga’ because he is seen to have compromised his position failing to maintain strict gender divisions and power. Rahman’s attitudes about gender roles and his constructions of masculinity are explicit, and importantly he roots these beliefs in religion and not culture. Rahman’s use of religion to specify gender roles allows him to accept his beliefs as inherently correct and also to dismiss any possibility of negotiating such roles and this of course is likely to inform his relationship with his own wife:
I've got a mate who's married and grown up, and he's like totally changed. You know, he's totally like listens to his wife. Like you know what I mean. Do you know what I mean. But okay his wife is alright. He picked alright. But end of the day, you know, in our religion men should have more power than a woman. Know what I mean. But him he's changed so. I think you know. I don't know. To me that's bad. Because all our mates think he's, you know. He's a mawga [laughs].

For Rahman, friends who are mawgas (under the thumb) and Bangladeshi friends fail to enact etiquette of friendship, which demands masculine solidarity:

So it's always been the Pakistani lads that's been nice to me together and stuff like that. And favours. Like when I've broke down they've gone and rescued me. I've phoned my mates and they are kind of busy. You know what I mean. They are like 'Oh I'm in my girlfriend'. You know what I mean. 'Okay mate'. You know. I'd never like, if they say 'I'm with the girlfriend' I'll put the phone down straight away. Cause I don't want to say 'Oh please go and leave them and come'.

Safi too narrated territorial and ethnic tensions as a child which involved conflict with Pakistani young men at his school (see also Chapter Four). Bangladeshis were a clear minority and in many instances he found that Pakistani young men often questioned his masculinity and strength. In his account he significantly constructs himself as a threat to Pakistani young men, who assessed and challenged his masculine ability through conflict and fighting. With hindsight Safi dismisses such events as child's play and in my view fails to recognise the connections to territory, strength and masculinity: "I think they probably thought 'Oh let's try him out then let's see how hard he is'. And I think you know. I think it was just. You know. It's just little kid mentality. 'Isn't that's. That's what it was.'" (lines 593-5). Safi dismissed these experiences as "it wasn't nothing major", which
he immediately qualified by adding that it was "something major right but it wasn't nothing that . . . didn't get dealt with . dealt with straight away" (lines 655-66), indicating that even though with hindsight these issues may now seem petty, they were significant enough at the time to need attention. Safi stressed that conflict should not be described as 'gang fights' but as "petty" and "just boys things" (lines 663-4), which resolved with age.

It is clear from the young men's interviews that their friendship groups are formed on the basis of many factors including ethnicity, racism, and territory and also in response to the factions that exist within the 'South Asian' community. It appears that Bangladeshi young men are in a more tenuous position aspiring to acceptance from white people and also for acceptance from Pakistanis. Some attempted to accomplish this by distancing themselves from their own community and relatedly, they possibly wanted to distance themselves from the weak masculine image of Bangladeshi men, presumed from their small build, and to be associated with the more dominant, stronger image of the Pakistanis. But in a similar way to their failed attempts to break into white groups, these young men learned that many differences still divided them from Pakistanis as well, and in this case too acceptance was gained at the price of going along with negative comments made about their own community. It is significant that it is Bangladeshi young men who comment on some form of tension be it perceived or actual with Pakistanis. And while Bangladeshi young men in East-Town note the factions within, Bangladeshi young men in West-Town view such tensions as dissolved with the 'race-riots'.
Muslim young people are argued to unquestioningly adopt the religious and cultural views of their parent generation and presented as tending to justify their views with reference to Islamic values (Archer 2001, Shaw 1994) (see Chapter One for further discussion). However, the image of a strong committed Muslim man that Pakistani and Bangladeshi young men often depict can be often an illusion with their participation in Islamic duties slack. Regardless, the contradictory behaviour of young men does not reduce their pride in their Muslim identity and their need to profess religiosity (Vertovec 1998, Macey 1999, Ramji 2007).

**Religious Adherence and Aspirations**

Some of the interviews were conducted with young men during Ramadan, which became the point of discussion and helped to indicate the extent of the young men’s religiosity. It was apparent from the young men’s stories that they do aspire to religiosity although their behaviour often contradicts this.

Shabaz was the only young man to speak at length about the influence of religion on his life and religion was a core aspect of his interview. However, Shabaz reconciled gaps between religion and his past behaviour by suggesting that this was a happenstance of being a teenager and a young man. He stated that he was “dragged into a lot of things. and er made me forget about Allah” (line 24-25) and although he did not detail the activities he was involved in, this is quite possibly sexual activity: “you can maybe blame the teenage hormones and the teenage life” (lines 196-7). Shabaz is however aware that this is quite unreasonable, commenting that “there are certain teenagers that are mature and do good things. and so maybe you
can't blame it know what I mean.. and maybe it's your own choice” (lines 197-99), with his “maybe” implying that he was not fully responsible. While Shabaz may have been intermittently religious, he described a difficult time at university “going through the worst time of my life” (line 38) as triggering his embrace of Islam. Shabaz found it difficult to overcome the failure at university especially as he had succeeded at all other levels of education. And while he could have resorted to, for example, drug abuse, to compensate for this failure, he instead returned to religion and “it changed my life honestly it did. it changed my life cos I knew what was the purpose of my life” (lines 50-52). This period in his life brought low levels of self-esteem: “that was really painful in the heart just wanted to collapse know what I mean. the pain there [demonstrates] strikes and when it strikes you just cannot do anything about it. everyone goes through it at one time in their life they will go through it. and I went through it then” (lines 53-55). The disillusionment he felt is repeatedly stressed in his account as “pain in the heart” (lines 42, 42, 52, 58), with religion as a coping mechanism bringing inner peace:

[... ] the white people. they're searching for one thing in life and what is that. inner peace and tranquillity in the heart. the richest man in the world for example Bill Gates can't find no peace in terms of him always wanting more and more wealth. you don't find it in wealth you don't find it in the opposite sex you don't find it in nothing else you find the buzz though. you find that little buzz. it's guaranteed you find that little buzz but it doesn't last doesn't last at all so the only thing that lasts is in the remembrance of Allah (lines 72-77)

Shabaz is certain his family appreciates his reform. However, his brother experiences difficulty in adjusting to Shabaz's new stance on life and often conflicts with him, making comments about “Osama Bin Laden and all that kind of stuff” (line 168) and is unable to comprehend his rejection of social activities such as listening to music or watching films.
The stories that the other young men told me indicated that many of them are in a state of confusion about Islam and its practices. Waqar, for instance, described some religiosity as a child and in our discussions about Ramadan it became clear that he misconstrues the meaning of Islam, because the purpose of fasting is not just an act in gaining empathy with the suffering of poor people, but it is also concerned with detoxing the mind and body of sinful thoughts, actions and bad habits:

[... ] you ask a lot of Asians and they turn around. first of all you don't know why you're fasting not if you asked all the Asians it's aw for the poor people so you think about them. how the fuck can you think about the poor people right when you know you're gonna get a meal at six o'clock (lines 594-597)

[... ] they all hold a pint in their hand and drink it [laughs] you know what I mean and when it comes to Ramadan they all stop and they wait for the most religious day of the year Eid and they'll all get pissed again [laughs hysterically] (lines 502-504)

Waqar clearly struggles to conform to the expectations of Islam, as he confessed to drinking alcohol and he also stated that he had chosen to fast this year but he was in fact not fasting when we met. Waqar’s knowledge I thought is limited and he narrated his efforts in bettering his knowledge through attendance at religious lectures and groups but which he described as deepening his confusion. Waqar struggles with the demands of religion and it is possible that he attaches his own sense of disorientation to the hypocrisy of people who covertly deviate from religious requirements or who, like himself, participate only in seasonal religiosity during Ramadan: “you get your religious ones in any city and do Jammat n that. they’ll want drugs don’t want to drink. a spliff. they’re preaching to you about Islam right. start telling you about God n this that come to the mosque. you see them at the mosque get to know them. get to know them they’re asking you for a
spliff [laughs hysterically]” (lines 574-577). Waqar connects drug-taking to the location, size and distribution of communities, with drug-taking a covert activity which carries fewer possibilities of being caught ‘red-handed’ by the family. For example, Waqar’s presupposes that Asians and Muslims in large communities such as Bradford and Manchester are commonly involved in drugs as opposed to those in smaller communities like East-Town who are involved in drinking alcohol. Waqar also related these regional differences to the size of the respective Asian communities and their integration with ‘gorae’ (white): “there’s more of a gorae [white] influence here . whereas down there its more apne [my people] really . you’re brought up with apne there [...] what’s East-Town about . football and alcohol . East-Town is a drinking city” (lines 382-386). However, Waqar’s theory fell to pieces when he pressed to discuss this further and he stated that there were actually relatively limited numbers of Muslim drinkers in East-Town. It appears that his talking up of the deviancy of Asians and Muslims in East-Town was to indicate that he was not alone in doing such things. Waqar’s claim about the drinking culture in East-Town is also in contradiction of Bilal’s claims about the prevalence of drug taking in the community, a difference which perhaps results from their different experiences of the separate cultures.

Yasin offered a theory around the level of integration in the community and the submission to culturally and religiously related morals. He is of the opinion that people in West-Town refrain from drinking on religious grounds, which is either a very naive view or else he is protective of ‘his own’:
Waqar suggested that some Islamic practices are now outdated, but when I asked him to elaborate on this point he rejected further discussion with: "things have to change. n that's all I can say about that" (lines 611-12). Waqar may have been reluctant to provide specific examples because it might be considered blasphemous and he was more willing to talk about the correct teachings of the Quran:

[... ] drinking can mess you up. you drink you'll be messed up for four days. you won't have a clear conscience know that. a hangover for four days you can't do any work. it affects you the after affects. its not good do you know what I mean. if you drank say I'll drink once a week. you're only going to be alert three days a week. the rest of the days your body is still going to be recovering. so it's wrong there know what I mean it's right the Quran was right in saying don't take drugs don't do this. erm don't commit adultery. don't do that don't spend too much money believe me [laughs] (lines 616-620)

While commenting on the correct teachings of the Quran, Waqar also stated that it can be interpreted incorrectly and used in an extreme form, and he displayed resentment at religious leaders who preached against non-believers but chose to live amongst them. His use of language such as "your Pakistan" (line 23) and "didn't take your country away from you you came here" (line 627-28) demonstrates Waqar's close attachment to his British identity: "think some people go too extreme about it now. aw khafirs [non-believers] you cannot speak to these khafirs this that. what the fuck you doing in their country then. if you've got such a bloody problem
with them right go back to your Pakistan" (lines 623-625). Waqar presents himself as more accommodating through his antipathy for religious leaders who preach against integrating with 'khafirs' but his use of pejorative terms like 'gorae' and 'khafirs' demonstrate that his attitudes are possibly not much different from the religious leaders and, like them, he sharply differentiates between 'them' and 'us' (apne).

Other young men also spoke about seasonal surges of religiosity. For example, Shabaz commented that as a teenager both he and his friends were overwhelmed by the significance of Ramadan, which seemed to have been an annual pattern. Naser and Amar also spoke about choosing to fast this year, and while Naser participates in the nightly prayers at the mosque, Amar described rarely attending except for the Eid prayers. Naser like Waqar appears to be rather confused about religion, stating that he had read the Quran an astonishing seventeen times when younger but with no comprehension of what he had read. His confusion was also made explicit through his misconception of Islamic laws in relation to alcohol, and he comments that drinking alcohol is "forbidden" (line 188) and not "haram" (line 187), although in Islam 'haram' is actually forbidden. Interestingly, Naser reconciled religion with his behaviour by implying he is a light drinker who remains in control of his senses and so is not breaking any religious laws:

NG: [...] I know it's against my religion. it's not really against my religion. it's not
AR: why
NG: you're not supposed to get absolutely hammered. it doesn't say that it's haram. pork is haram. it makes a fact of that that's true. but alcohols not haram it's forbidden. you're not allowed to do it (lines 184-188)
Crucial to his image and honour within the family, it is important for Naser, as for Waqar, that his parents do not know that he drinks alcohol. Firstly, this would tarnish their perception of their son and secondly, wider public knowledge about it would have repercussions for the family’s honour and reputation. Similarly, Rahman and Idris both related that their alcohol consumption had been curbed by the threat of family knowledge and the distress that this would cause their parents. Rahman constructed his deviant behaviour as a cause of peer group pressure to fit in: “never used to think about touching alcohol [. . .] I mean I used to just do it because I used to be the left one out. I never used to like it [laughs]. but I used to do it to make myself like in the group. you know what I mean. put myself in the group with the boys.” (lines 443-60). It seems that realising that his admission had sabotaged his earlier presentation of himself Rahman tried to persuade me that he had learnt from his mistakes and changed:

RT [. . .] But now. you know what I mean. I’ve left everything. so straight now. you know AR is that the only time you drank? RT Yeah that’s the only time. now. I won’t touch it. you know what I mean. it’s like I work with it obviously but. you know. I won’t like sip it down me or anything [both laugh]. no way. so I’ve done. I’ve done bad stuff. but I’ve always recovered of them. you know what I mean. I . and I’ve stopped. . . . (lines 461-66)

Similarly, Rahman spoke about social obligations which he conformed to in order to avoid negative implications regarding his masculine character. Rahman seemingly is worried about being perceived as a ‘mawga’ (under the thumb), because the majority of his friends are not married and to refrain from these social activities would result in such labelling. Rahman is aware that he does not behave in accordance with the laws of Islam, but excuses this through age, indicating that he sees religiosity coming with greater age:
Like Waqar, Shazad is somewhat sceptical about religion, with his lifestyle and behaviour when living away from home having distanced him further away from religion in the sense of having little impact on his daily activities, although significantly he still identified himself as having faith:

Shazad identified his religious observance as selfish and at times hypocritical, pretentious and solely for the benefit of his parents:

Moral integrity is more important than a pretentious pious image for Shazad. However, it is clear that religion is an important aspect of his identity as ultimately he suggests that he will regain religious faith with marriage being the turning point for this.

Bilal too correlates religiosity with age and similar to Shazad he identifies marriage as a platform on which reform can take place and be a turning point:
I'm always trying to look at it and erm. I kind of think, if I go into it, then I'll never be able to come out of it, and like make my money, if illegally or whatever. n mess around n that. so I'm a bit scared and reluctant in that way. just erm. waiting a few years. hopefully get married when I'm twenty five [...] that's when I think I will change (lines 262-267)

Bilal did not suggest that he partakes in religious activity and his discussions around religion were more about the implication of religion for his behaviour. This indicates that like other young men such as Shazad, religion does impact on Bilal's perception of self and that this perception may include the need to perform to religious obligations.

Shahin was not fully practising his religion when we spoke and he described turning to religion at difficult times, and he uses prayer as a mechanism for coping with the pain of his forced broken relationship. Being a Muslim evokes many emotions in Shahin as he has experienced parental disapproval and conflicts with culture and community because of his cross-cultural relationship. Illustrating the pressures that he and his girlfriend faced, Shahin described the devious plan they had devised in order to continue their relationship: "[crying] it's awful to say this being a Muslim. get married and get a divorce ... [crying]" (lines 50-51) (see Chapter Four for further discussion). Despite his concerns about the plan conflicting with religion, Shahin failed to acknowledge the conflicts of other behaviour, namely unforgivable sins under Islamic law such as fornication and, as he remains in contact with Shama who is now married, adultery. His insistence of immense faith and that he would die for his religion if someone dared to insult it is an over-response possibly made to convince me and perhaps himself.

Although Shahin insisted on the importance of religion for him, religion actually does not fit into the structure of his life: "I would say I would die for my
religion. If someone was disssing my religion I would come up to them. Don't you disrespect my religion. I don't disrespect your religion. So there's my issues. Don't disrespect me I won't do it to you. Do it to me I'll double you. Cos my religion. They tarnish it when they say this n that. I'm gonna tell them why. I'll explain to them why. I'll come up to them n say why you saying it. So religion is important very very important. Traditions nah. Religion is very important. But what I'm saying is I'm not a very very. I'm not a practising Muslim. I haven't got a dari [beard]. I don't wear robes. Pray five times a day. I know I should” (lines 624-634). Shahin justified his non-commitment on the influences of western society which includes his relationship, in effect claiming that his will was not completely “free”: “People say you're living in a naked country. People have no shame. I understand where he's coming from. Say for example things happening to me. I've learnt now. I'm learning from my mistakes” (lines 644-646).

Mahir was another whose behaviour was in direct conflict with the demands of religion and his claims to religiosity. However, Mahir used religion practically and constructively to secure marriage regarding his cross-cultural relationship with a Pakistani girl. Mahir was confronted by his mother about crossing this ethnic boundary and he used religion to point to commonality and to represent nationality as comparatively insignificant. However, although Islam prescribes that religious commonality is crucial and overrides nationality, given Mahir's madrassah education and knowledge that pre-marital relationships are forbidden in Islam, he fails to mention that his stance is not as pure and religious as he makes it sound:
I did explain on the religion side. From the religion point that you know there's no harm in actually marrying into Pakistani family you know she coming into a Bengali family cause the religion says you know as long as we have one belief you know the there ain't no problem you know with it (lines 104-107)

Whether Mahir misunderstands religion is not clear, but his claims of religious conviction are not supported by what was said in his interview and what really came across was that religion was a more a method for legitimating his relationship.

Jafar also appeared to have scant knowledge of religion, but this did not deter him from proclaiming that religion is central to his life. His religiosity is defined by attendance at Friday prayers and no smoking or drinking alcohol, although his claims of religiosity are overshadowed by the fact that he is not married to his partner and has had children out of wedlock.

Mansoor is not particularly religious and his claims about religious decency appear to be connected to his statements about his traditional and religious family, conveyed in his comment about participation in some religious activities and the influence of religion: "[...] my upbringing really made sure that the religion and tradition is so important to me just not so obvious. I don't present myself in that way but deep down I wouldn't eat haram stuff. If I saw somebody disrespected. females n stuff y'know cos religion is so important to be honest" (lines 1190-1193). Further contradictions concerning Mansoor's identity and his religion are apparent in his mentions of unspecified and presumably deviant behaviour when he had lived away from home: 

162
I delivered my training in Glasgow for a month and then in Doncaster for two months and then Bristol for another month. Stayed in hotels and stuff you can imagine it changes a person you are doesn’t it. And there’s no family around for a whole month, wow you can do whatever you want to do, so you do for the first time and then you realise whoa every year I go away for four or five months it’s not that exciting anymore is it? Wow you can do what you want well you can do it for the next month, you know then the next two months, so that’s what changes cos that’s the thing about Asian people. When I was growing up like you do as many things bad when you’re away from home as possible cos you know when you come home you’ve got to stop, and now I’m thinking what’s the rush I can do it anytime I want. (lines 1150-1159)

Listening to Mansoor describing his decision to restrict opportunities for young people to become involved in sex and alcohol, this seems rather hypocritical given the implications about his own deviancy. Here Mansoor positions himself as having an Islamic responsibility towards the young, because “if I had a girl friend I wouldn’t think it was a good idea for them to have a girlfriend. . Islamically it’s not supposed to be done” (lines 1030-31). However, I think this may be connected to the self-perceived and community-perceived responsibility he has towards the young people he works with and the personal repercussions if these young people become involved in deviant behaviour while in his care.

In contradiction to his professed religiosity, Mansoor described his struggles to meet the demands of his family and religion, identifying this as the source of his later rebellion: “my parents are quite religious and strict and very traditional backward in a way I don’t mean to use backward in a negative way but they are quite. so my upbringing was slightly different to the other Asian kids cos their families weren’t as religious maybe. but when I was outside the house that’s why I suppose I rebelled” (lines 760-4). Here Mansoor rationalises his rebellion by deflecting the blame onto his parents and the suffocating religious lifestyle. With time, his family have come to accept his westernisation. However, Mansoor, who is now living at home again, remains conscious of their expectations and is reluctant to offend his parents: “like
the other day I bought a shirt I just bought it cos I liked it it had this big dragon thing on the back of it . my dad saw it n he was quite unhappy with it so I thought I'll just take it off cos I don't want to make him unhappy" (lines 1184-86).

Although some of the young men appear at some times sceptical and confused about Islam, they still aspire to or try to conform to religious expectations. This indicates that they have an ingrained understanding that being religious is a part of their identity and masculinity. For example, the death of Naser's grandfather convinced him to re-embrace Islam. Naser, like Waqar, made attempts to better his knowledge of Islam but his approach to alcohol (see earlier) suggests that he has failed to fully grasp the Islamic position. It appears that religion is integral to his identity, in the perception of self and others and he places his parents in high esteem for fully practising their religion, although he emphasises that prayer alone does not make people into decent human beings:

[...] I now drug dealers who read namaz [pray] five times a day [...] at the end of the day I will piss on his grave he's killed so many people selling drugs and he does namaz and does that. think he'll get covered (lines 369-373)

Naser's aspirations for religious decency were further evident in his descriptions of the religious ceremony he had had carried out at his business premises prior to opening. He commented this was conducted to ask for the blessing of Allah and good fortune, although it might have been to conform to the expectations of his family and community rather than to fulfil a religious duty, which also indicates his need to feel acceptance, belonging and to be part of a community.

Similar to Naser, Qutuz relayed how his religiosity was triggered by the recent deaths of members of his family, and like Waqar, Naser and Amar he
discussed the seasonal nature of his religiosity during Ramadan, with this seasonal observance important to adhere to, if not at any other time of the year. Qutuz was particularly emotional when discussing the deaths of two of his cousins, one in his teens and the other in his early twenties, which triggered reflection on his own life and behaviour. Qutuz realised that he was not spending enough time with his family and decided to make lifestyle changes, and by implication I think he meant reducing the time he spent socialising and clubbing with his friends, something which he commented on later in his interview. But this seems to have been a temporary change, with Qutuz rationalising his lack of commitment to his Islamic duties because of his business and work responsibilities. This was however, a weak justification, as Islam provides ways of compensating for missed prayers or fasts:

QA: But it's just when . er. something like that happens. it gets you thinking [ 
AR: ] thinking about what
QA: Thinking about life. how good we are. people always saying you don't know when you're going to go . . . it's changed me . . . used to . . . what am I doing. so its like when that happened. all my Ramadan right . . . spent like doing 100% and stuff. [ 
AR: ]Keep all your fasts
QA: Yeah . . .
AR: Is that not something you did before
QA: Before I always used to miss one year. miss another one there. not pray know what I mean stuff . . . really you should its like compulsory to . . . you should pray all the time anyway if your Muslim but . . . especially in Ramadan you shouldn't missing that . I prayed but I never used to pray . like now I should be praying now but . it's just er the way my work is . . . I've got responsibilities and that . there's not another family member in the shop . you got to work to have enough experience of my work to keep an eye out . . cos I'm always like on the till and stuff . . .
AR: Right . your cousin passed away you started praying
QA: Yeah I mean. started to cut down on . going out n stuff . cut down on a lot of stuff . like that . I spend more time at home . more time with . you know like with the kids and stuff . . . (lines 154-171)

Rafiq, like Qutuz, justified his lack of conviction to religion by attributing responsibility with his friendship networks. And similar to other young men like Naser, Waqar, Amar, and Qutuz, Rafiq experiences a surge of religiosity during
Ramadan and in his interview he described particular comfort in the presence of other Muslims:

RH [...] we started going erm... about just before our Ramadan. and we went for about five weeks. used to go to Westbury mosque every week. and we started going there. started following the good steps. and started going back on the bad steps shall I say. stopped it again.

AR Aha. what made you go bad to the bad steps?

RH Erm... because it was Ramzan. Ramadan happened then after that. all the lads that were interested in going to the mosque. it's like no one was interested any more. and then they started going. going out and etc. and they started going back into the same league again. and erm. it's like... it's like no I always have that mind I always want to try and gonna do it. I'm gonna do it. cause then it's like you get one friend coming around and or let's do this. let's do that.

AR Yeah.

RH And then you just avoid that kind of thing.

AR Yeah.

RH And you'd rather go out with your mates. but sometimes you think you are better off being at the mosque. you feel more refreshing shall I say. them four. five weeks I went. honestly I felt so good. (lines 1125-1141)

Ethnic and Religious Factions

It is a common assumption that Bangladeshi and Pakistani communities live in harmony with one another with religion overriding difference. However, as discussed earlier it is clear from the young men's interviews that there are factions within the Asian community, which is divided along ethnic and religious lines, with Bangladeshi young men narrating incidences of intra-ethnic prejudice and conflict (see earlier). Such prejudice and conflict was also clear in discussions around religion. For example, Naser became rather heated when discussing the management of the local mosques in East-Town. Naser was clear that he and many other Pakistani members of the community had wanted a Pakistani mosque to be erected in Eastarea, the area of East-Town predominantly lived in by Pakistanis. However, the mosque was established in Elsworth instead, a predominantly Bangladeshi area in which a racist murder had taken place. Naser went on to argue against local
community politics, with community leaders who are ‘shit’ (line 724), and the celebration of Eid on separate days for Pakistanis and Bangladeshis. Naser said he would ideally like one communal mosque, but his suggestion that a Pakistani mosque should be situated within the part of the community and other comments he makes about Bangladeshis implies that he would probably expect the same for the communal mosque. Amar was also critical of the local mosque politics and suggested that the friction is not exclusive to the Pakistani community:

AG: [...] there's always friction going on with mosques and committees. you know
AR: is that just with the Pakistani community
AG: no I guess that happens in Bengalis. Sikhs. I know people from all the communities. sometimes. against each other sometimes with each other. sometimes. say for example the East-Town mosque. I know they always have friction going on. just recently with the Pakistan earthquake. basically I had one mosque call in one day collecting money which I donated some. and the next day the other mosque was here [...] they were actually competing against each other. I found that really wrong still playing with the politics (lines 244-252)

Shabaz too advocates that Islam should take primacy over ethnic divisions and unite people: "'oh it's a Pakistani mosque oh it's a Bengali mosque' know what I mean. you get that from the second generation but at the end of the day it's for Muslims to pray ya na. there's no Pakistani no Bengali mosques [...] I really hate it because at the end of the day we are Muslims and we should get on and be united" (lines 366-370).

Conflicting Identities: Culture, Nationality and Religion

Some of the young men spoke of the difficulties in incorporating conflicting aspects of culture and religion. For example, Dilshad commented on these:
Describing himself as going “with the flow” (line 366), Dilshad commented that present-day young people lacked full comprehension of these conflicts of culture, religion and western life, although they were perceptive enough to realise that they “have a lot on their plate” (line 367). At the same time, he creates the impression that his generation was free from problems and deviancy, and the pressures of the struggles between religion, culture and integration now drives some young people to alcohol and drugs.

In further discussions around identity and religion, Dilshad said that as a child his ethnicity had taken primacy over his religion, but with age religion has become highly important to him: “more than anything at the moment” (lines 496-7). None the less, Dilshad has some difficulty in classifying what is more crucial to and defining of him, arguing that his religious identity is first and foremost but contradictorily that he is a Bengali and loves his country of origin:

[...] I’m not Bengali I’m a Muslim. I read my five prayers. There was a time that I was quite cultured and more Bengali but there’s bigger thing than culture than being a Bengali or Pakistani. It’s religion [...] religion makes you understand that it’s it’s nationalism and patriotism which destroys a lot of countries a lot of people and if they understood religion properly. Our religion Islam properly. It makes a lot of things easier. It’s one it unites everyone (lines 494-500)
I mean I’m a Bengali my background is Bangladeshi you can say my background is Bangladeshi but. and I’ll have love if I go Bangladesh after thirteen fourteen fifteen years I’ll probably have love for the country. yeah there’s nothing wrong with that but being saying that I am I’ll die for my country I don’t see myself like that. I’m a Muslim first (lines 502-505)

However, while Dilshad was consistent in seeing Bangladeshi and Pakistani nationalism as erroneous because it split communities, his attempt to prioritise both remained, concluding near the end of his interview that “religion is very important to me but my background is Bangladeshi. I’m proud to be a Muslim. yeah” (lines 788-89).

Akin to Dilshad’s experiences, the relationship between identity, ethnicity and religion was a source of confusion and conflict for Mansoor. Initially he gave his Bangladeshi identity primacy, although when pressed on this he asserted that his religious identity is most prominent, but that his identity categorisation depends very much on the recipient of such information. In a wholly Asian setting, people will be particularly concerned in learning his religious affiliation, and white people with his ethnicity, and in the latter situation he will describe himself as Asian. Mansoor acknowledged the contradictions in his position, which are clearly illustrated with his later descriptions of himself as a Bengali Muslim. Mansoor’s negotiation and selection of a version of identity is appropriated to the particular audience:

[...] if there was five Asian people here n they said what’s your background I probably would say Muslim because I’d know what they’d know what I mean it’s my religion where they’re probably expect like you expected it could be either one of those two yeah. but if it was a white group I don’t think they expect you to cos the religion doesn’t matter to them most of them aren’t practicing n stuff does that make sense? so the common ground isn’t religion it’s background isn’t it it’s obvious they’re white I’m Black what’s my background. Bangladeshi or something yeah or Indian Asian I’d say Asian I wouldn’t say Bangladeshi y’know I’d say Asian cos some of them wouldn’t know what Bangladeshi means yeah. (line 887-84)
A further example of his chameleon-like approach is clear in Mansoor’s descriptions of his participation in a drama in which he presented himself as English: “we had to do this drama act n it was amazing n everybody laughed to hell but ours was absolutely brilliant. people love the English and the jokes n stuff” (lines 1011-12).

Some young men commented on the negative reactions to their religion and relayed stories where they had been the victim of Islamaphobia. Shazad spoke of negative reactions to his religion and he commented on his failure to understand the necessity for people to acquaint themselves with his religious status. Christians and Jews did not usually disclose their religious affiliation, and so why should he? After September 11th he experienced a rise in tension in both London and East-Town communities. He became the brunt of terrorist jokes at work, with little choice but to accept this as humorous: “there was a few people they were lads taking the piss and stuff like that about being Asian being Muslim. September 11th and stuff like that. like if I hadn’t shaved I was a terrorist. they would say jokes and I would react in a professional way and don’t talk to me like that cos I find it offensive and things like that. I tried to tackle it but then I was seen as like er miserable. take things to heart so I became more relaxed to it” (lines 543-546). Public response to Muslims did not differ at the time of the July 7th terrorist bombings, and while he can comprehend people’s apprehension he also resents their suspicions of him:

[...] the few times I’ve been on the train in London someone’s turned around and said oh you fucking terrorist Pakis and other people have just turned around and looked and they all look, you see it in their eyes their thinking that’s not what you should say [...] kind of we wouldn’t say it but we kind of thought it (lines 572-576)

Naser also referred to the terrorist attacks, proposing that July 7th was a conspiracy designed to implicate Muslims and determine future immigration policy. The other
young men said nothing about such matters, perhaps because the focus of the interview may have discouraged discussion about it.

Dilshad connected Islamaphobia and the effects of September 11th to the negativity associated with the Muslim identity and recounted an experience at university where this was used to abuse him: “do you like Osama Bin Laden?‘ ‘why should I answer you. who are you?’ ‘aw you have to answer us like’” (lines 894-895). In confrontational situations like this, Dilshad commented that a strong response was necessary: “instead of sitting down and saying please don’t hit me” (line 897). Physical and verbal abuse is limited, but helps form a sense of paranoia in public:

[...] it doesn’t have to be things said to you you can feel eyes all around you y’know what I mean . actually you do . sometimes it’s not paranoia honestly you do it’s true you do feel it eyes all around you when you’re walking in town . there’s eyes always around you . honestly you can sense it when you’re in a shop you can sense it eyes around you (lines 887-981)

Mansoor also spoke about the consequences of September 11th and July 7th. His experiences are related to his discomfort with the actions of minority Muslims, and consequentially he presents himself with care to white people. However, he also reported himself as someone who had always adapted images to suit contexts, both to receive acceptance and establish a rapport: “I work with a lot of white groups and white young people n I always present myself quite western y’know in the clothes I wear the attitudes the way I talk for example” (lines 930-931). Mansoor comments that this could be interpreted as a lack of pride in his identity and “a low thing to do” (line 1133). Certainly he suggests that embodying a flexible identity allows those around him to feel at ease and constructs this as for their benefit, but it also follows on from his behaviour and his attempts to gain acceptance in Pakistani friendship
circles. And he continues that despite his efforts he is still seen as 'different': "I went to the youth group n a young man called me a Black bastard as soon as I walked in and Paki" (lines 201-2), although he wore the "track suits n proper chaver look" (line 1130), which again suggests that Mansoor is possibly uncomfortable with his identity and regardless of his efforts to 'blend in' he is constantly alerted to the fact that he does not.

**Women In Islam**

Earlier in our conversation, Rahman commented on religion, power and gender roles and used derogatory terms to label men with 'questionable' masculinity. When pressed to expand on what he meant, Rahman retracted his comment and said: "But I think . that part of what I said there it's not about religion . about our culture and the way our culture goes . you know what I mean like . people say . you know . 'your wife should listen to you’" (lines 934-936). With limited knowledge of religion and not easily able to justify his beliefs, Rahman then presented binary gender roles as based in culture. He went on to stress that religion does not specify that men should be more powerful than women but then narrated a story about Fatima who was rewarded for the immense respect she gave her husband, the Prophet (pbuh). In telling this story Rahman further demonstrated his misconstrued lack of Islamic knowledge, as Fatima was the Prophet's daughter and not his wife; and also although commenting that men are not more powerful than woman, he actually emphasised gender expectations which include male power and authority and female subservience and conformity:
Right, you know, she's the prophet's wife okay, and erm... she came, her husband came from work or something and said 'oh can I have a glass of water', and she said 'okay' and she went to get the glass of water, and by the time she came back he was asleep, so she's like thinking 'okay will I wake him up and give this glass of water to him or shall I just wait till he wakes up?' so she thought 'okay I'm not going to disturb him because he's having a sleep', so she stood there all night with that glass of water right, she waited until he wakes up, so he woke up in the morning and he saw her there, standing there with a glass of water, she goes 'here this is your glass of water', and he's like 'why, why, have I been here all night?' and she goes 'yeah I didn't wake you up', so you know, our Allah you know what I mean, he's made her the Queen of Heaven, do you know what I mean, so you know, that's what I know, in our religion, you know what I mean there is a Queen of Heaven and she's called Fatima, you know what I mean, because what this is because of what she's done, you know, that's a big respect to her husband what she's done, she didn't disturb him, you know, nowadays if somebody says give a glass of water and her husband goes to sleep, she would pour it on him, you know what I mean [both laugh]. (lines 958-73)

Rahman's story about Fatima is used to indicate what he interprets as women's lack of respect and authority for their husband now, and when asked to expand on this he stated "our women are still good" (line 975), implying a comparison of Muslim/Bangladeshi women against women from other communities. Rahman also had some concerns about young girls and especially his younger sisters and their attitude and dress sense: "And but sometimes I get scared, you know, like when they are in school and stuff, you know they get, I could see them get modern and stuff 'innit', but I don't like it, but then again I do like it because I want my sisters to be modern. I don't want them to stick out, you know, like a tep [typical] you know what I mean, but at the end of the day you know... as I said people have to do, make their life themselves 'innit.' (lines 979-984).

It is important to note here that although Rahman presents himself as embracing female independence, he still assumes he is the protector of his sisters' and the family honour (see Chapter Four for further discussion of shame and honour). Rahman's control over his sisters includes limiting their independence by managing their movements and so minimising the possibility of contact with young men. The policing of female sexuality is something which all members of the family
are involved in and by terming it as ‘saving’ his sisters Rahman implies his sisters are the benefactors, rather than his concern being the honour of the family. His sisters are fully aware of the repercussions if they dare to deviate as they have “crazy brothers”:

[... ] you know what I mean. If they are going the wrong way. You know. I can’t stop them. But they know they’ve got like crazy brothers. You know what I mean who’d kill them. You know what I mean. Like if they do something bad. They know their brothers. Like I’d get my sisters in on lockdown. Like I’ll make sure my younger brother go and pick them up from school. Bring them back. You know what I mean. Like well it’s a bit embarrassing for your sister when she’s fifteen. You know what I mean. But then again I don’t care. You know. It’s just the way I see girls these days in schools. You know what I mean. I think. You know. I think. You know. The only way I could save my sister going from the wrong way is go and picking them up. You know. If you just leave them to it they will go their way. You know what I mean. They will go their way. You know what I mean (lines 984-93)

In further discussions about women, Rahman presented the hijab (head covering) as worn by women as a mark of respect, and, constructing himself as progressive, he stressed he personally did not expect women to wear the hijab but at the same time thought that non-conformity often resulted in community gossip. This is illustrative of the power of the community in informing attitudes and behaviour both for men and women. Again Rahman had misconceptions about religion; the ‘hijab’ is compulsory in Islam, and is not worn as a mark of respect but for modesty and protection from sexual attention. Rahman’s conception of gender expectations is a fusion of culture and religion, and lacking knowledge about Islam he is unable to distinguish between what religion and culture individually prescribe. He also misunderstands behavioural expectations by seeing them as variable with age:

[... ] with me it’s different. You know what I mean. If I go somewhere. If I see girls not wearing head scarves I’m not. I’m not. At the end of the day I know they are young. You know. I’m not arsed at the end of the day. You know. But with older people they talk ‘innit. You have to. With older people you have to give that respect (lines 946-49)
Jafar would like his partner to convert to Islam and she remains reluctant. Jafar is clear that he does not want to force a change and sees her current life-style as the source: "Cause obviously they are in their sort of life drinking and all that, so you know what I mean don't you. that's their sort of life 'innit'" (lines 402-403). Jafar condemned his partner's family for interfering and threatening to disown her if she converts, and he is quite certain that once his children start attending religious classes then his partner will feel compelled to convert. It is significant that although Jafar is not wholly practising, he is certain that his children will inherit his religion and will have an Islamic education, stemming from his patriarchal attitudes about domestic labour and authority:

JH Yeah cause I know for a fact she will convert. not straight away but after a bit and all that sort of stuff. and she's going to see me go to mosque. she's going to see my kids go to mosque and all that. then she'll have to get 'em ready for mosque. you know. she'll have to bath 'em. have to put that [indicates to head]. what do you call it?
AR Aha hijab
JH Is that's what it's called yeah. hijab. she'll have to put all that sort of stuff on them. all that. they are gonna come home with like Quran and everything. and the missus she'll have to be clean to touch that stuff. she can't touch it anyway. I won't let her cause she's a Muslim and all that. but she'll have to. you know. then it will make her think 'innit and all that" (lines 496-505)

It is clear from interviews that for some of these young men religious observance takes a seasonal form, especially during Ramadan. This may be due to pressure from wanting to feel a part of a community and trying to present a respectable image, with such factors coming into play during the holiest month in the Islamic year. Many of the young men spoke about their behaviour being in contradiction with religious rules and having a scant knowledge of Islam. However, all of them also imply or state that eventually they will conform to religious requirements because religion is an important part of their identity, or more
specifically is fundamental to the communities they are a part of. Some of the young men correlate religion with age and responsibility, and see religion, marriage and masculinity intertwined and complementary to the roles that they should be performing. For some young men like Rahman and Jafar, it is clear that their mis/understandings of religion inform their conceptions of gender roles and their perspectives are patriarchal, demanding respect and conformity from women. Religion for all the young men I interviewed is embedded in their lives and their identity and whether they are practising or not it informs their beliefs and expectations in life.

**SOME CONCLUSIONS: YOUNG ‘SOUTH ASIAN’ MEN, STORIES, ACCOUNTS AND LIFE IN THE NORTH**

Many academics have researched and commented upon young ‘South Asian’ men’s lives, and while some have concentrated on aspects such as religion or identity, I have investigated ‘South Asian’ men’s lives and masculinity as they are lived and interpreted by the young men, ‘in the round’ and as whole lives as they experience and talk about them. Through the process of allowing the young men to choose, interpret and speak of their experiences, what they deem as important and hence crucial to their understanding and enactment of masculinity and identity becomes visible.

In this chapter, I have looked at interconnecting themes which flow across the young men’s experiences and lives, both ethnically and regionally. First and foremost, the family can be identified as exercising a high degree of control and a colossal influence over certainly all the young men I interviewed (see Chapter Four
for further discussion) regarding their decisions around education and their careers. And while it has been suggested that young ‘South Asian’ people are motivated by respect rather than fear and that the influence of the family is more negotiated than authoritarian (O’Donnell and Sharpe 2000, Yip 2004, Hopkins 2006), my interviews suggest that the influence of the family is rather more complex.

Young people have little resistance to family expectations, and these are not negotiated, but rather young people fundamentally accede to and internalise the demands of their role in the family, and integral to this is fulfilling the aspirations of their parents (Archer 2003). For example, Naser and Waqar both identified the importance of education as being an ‘Asian thing’ but also minimised the pressure in fact forced on them, suggesting that they are deeply influenced by ingrained family values but deem their decisions as autonomous. The young men’s need to confirm their capability to the family (and to others) regardless of their own interests points up both the influence of and the perceived significance for them of the role of a dutiful son (also see Chapter Four). Although respect can secure good behaviour, fear of failing parental expectations entwined with their own bound expectations of their role as a son can also be important motivating factors.

While it is clear that these young men are more assimilated into western society and culture than members of the first generation, those of the second and third generations are still subservient to the family and greatly influenced by its expectations (and see Chapter Four for further discussion). It has been suggested by Dwyer, Shah and Sanghera (2008) that religion can encourage young men to study and be successful, but this does not appear to be true for the young men that I interviewed. For example, none of the young men’s education or career aspirations
were connected to religion but demonstrably to the family. Religion can often be utilized as a coping mechanism at difficult times - for example, Shabaz embraced religion at a troubled time in his education - but conversely, it is the pressures of family expectations which are motivating and influential factors as evidenced by the experiences of young men such as Waqar, Shazad, Naser and Yasin. The family is powerful in instilling values of respect, status and honour in individuals, and success in education improves the standing of the family in the community. The power of the family is undisputed and young people learn values which are similar to those of their parents; they may rebel against this, but in the long term it seems they come to conform as the price of acceptance. In comparison, the Bangladeshi young men did not refer to their ambitions or educational achievements as being related to their family. It is not possible to tell whether the different direction taken by the unstructured interviews reflects any difference in the significance of the family. There has been interesting research (Gardner and Shukur 1994, Shaw 1994) on religion and identity and the impact that religion has on young ‘South Asian’ people’s lives. Shaw (1994) argues that the commitment to a Muslim identity provides young ‘South Asians’ with an ideologically effective justification for the maintenance of the family and solidarity generally, while other research has found that the vast majority of Pakistani and Bangladeshi young people choose to identify themselves as Muslim (Saeed, Blain and Forbes 1999, Gardner and Shukur 1994). While such research has noted this identification as a need for solidarity and belonging, it has failed to identify the specific connections to the construction and enactment of masculinity. My research, however, indicates that many of the young men identify themselves as Muslim through self-labelling or discussing religious
practices and experiences and masculine expectations and that religion is a part of their identity including as men. It seems that identity can be fluid and contextual and some of the young men struggle with which aspect of their identity should take primacy over others, be that ethnicity, nationality or religion, and religious identification does not necessarily bind them to other Muslim young men or communities. However, their experience of having contextual and shifting identities does not mean that they are confused about their identity or that their masculinity is ‘in crisis’.

My research shows that suggestions that young men are ‘caught between two cultures’, between the oppressive, traditional and fundamentalist parent culture and the secular modern world and are driven to deviance and criminality by this (Hiro 1991, Qureshi and Moores 1999) are incorrect. What is actually apparent is that young men are not confused or in conflict with aspects of their identity, but rather are very adept at negotiating, shifting and blending identities and aspects of different cultures, and they can and do enact various forms of masculinity and identity in different circumstances. So, for example, a Pakistani young man can consider and enact the identity and masculinity of a West-Towner, a Pakistani, a Muslim or a British young man or indeed a fusion of all these identities. And, unlike the first generation, these young Bangladeshi or Pakistani young men’s masculine identity is inseparable from their ethnic and locally grounded identity which demands allegiance and loyalty from them.

Most of the young men I interviewed were seasonally religious, with Ramadan the season when a sense of obligatory duties is experienced. Although the practice of religion may be lax for some, it is evident that many of the Pakistani and
Bangladeshi young men’s beliefs are rooted in religion. For example, Waqar, Naser, Mansoor, Shahin, Shazad, and Shabaz all perceived their behaviour and defined wrong-doing through a religious lens, and Naser stretched and re-interpreted the laws of Islam to incorporate his deviant acts as being legitimate. Waqar and Naser admitted to alcohol drinking and Shazad, Mansoor and Shabaz implied some form of deviant behaviour which included drinking alcohol and/or sexual activity, and they all deemed their behaviour as wrong. Although some young men did not refer directly to religion in their interviews, the guilt associated with their deviancy can be traced to religion. Both Rahman and Idris referred to their guilt over drinking alcohol as related to the betrayal of their parents, and this connection is made because alcohol is outlawed in Islam and their parents would be devastated by knowledge of this behaviour. Qutuz and Rafiq are also seasonally religious and aspire to be more religious than they are but justify their failures on the distractions of routine life events and friendship networks, while Jafar and Yasin indicated their religiousness through the stories that they told. Even though the young men’s participation in Islamic duties is slack, and their knowledge about Islam is low, what knowledge they have still informs in a complicated way their behaviour and interpretation of life.

Religious identity can provide a sense of self-esteem, but this is entwined with the young men’s tacit assumption that essential to their identity is their enactment of masculine behaviours, with religion closely connected with this. And even though many of the young men were not currently performing religious duties, religiousness is something they aspire to, with surges of religiousness experienced especially during Ramadan, or when triggered by particular life events. Religion can
provide other means to enact masculinity, for example, by bringing a focus to Shabaz’s life. Shabaz initially found success through education but his failure at university brought his masculinity and his purpose in life into question, with his later embracing of Islam giving him self-esteem and also providing an avenue for performing acceptable masculinity. Naser’s and Qutuz’s religiousness was triggered after deaths in their family. Religion for both Naser and Qutuz informs their rhetoric on life, and even if they do not practise it at all times of the year and are involved in deviant behaviour, they still have an allegiance to their religious identity. For example, conducting religious ceremonies endows Naser with a sense of fulfilling his religious duties which gives him self-esteem and also connects him to his community. Similarly, Rafiq described comfort, peace and tranquillity when he practiced religion. Religion is integral to their identity and their self-esteem is boosted in the knowledge that they are abiding by the practices of Islam. Shazad, Shahin and Mansoor all cited the anticipation and desire that religiousness will be initiated by marriage, which suggests that they have felt a need to embrace Islam but need some structured form of encouragement. They see themselves as failing as Muslims and want to start afresh and perceive marriage as almost magically transformative. For these young men, marriage is seen as a necessity of life; and as well as being a marker for masculinity, it also indicates that fulfilment of religious expectations is an integral part of a man’s role, which is to be a father and a husband.

Gender is performative and relational, and it has been suggested that ethnic minority femininity may be constructed as subordinate so as to bring young men greater self-esteem (Alexander 2000, Frosh and Phoenix 1998). The behaviour of women and the control of women are important cultural markers distinguishing
‘South Asians’ and it is through religion and culture that women are constructed as cultural carriers through their embodiment of collective honour, with their ‘proper’ behaviour and clothing embodying and signifying the boundaries (Yuval-Davis and Anthias 1989, 1997, Lyon 1997). Notions of honour and shame inform the control of sexuality and particularly of women’s bodies by men (Werbner 2005a, Werbner 2007, Thakar 2005). Thinking in these terms, Rahman’s masculinity is actually enacted through an explicit power over and control of women, with, for example, his policing of his sister’s movements enabling him to be the arbiter of his family’s honour (see Chapter Four for further discussion). Patriarchal power connected to a masculine construction of religion transcends locality and ethnicity. Jafar assumes that his children from a mixed relationship will be Muslims and his partner will eventually convert to Islam, demonstrating his attitudes about gender and subservience. Religion and culture explicitly inform the young men’s interpretations of gender roles, with the protection and control of women integral to how they live out masculinity, and through their hierarchical position they are able to require compliance and respect.

A significant theme connected to religion which runs through the young men’s life stories concerns their perceptions and enactments of a ‘good man’ as intrinsically connected to religiosity; and while many of the young men were not fully practicing their religion, they still consider a ‘complete’ man to be one who integrates religion fully into his life. Some research has suggested that this is because the Muslim religion provides a positive identity and a medium through which negativity can be deflected (Alexander 2000, Archer 2003, Gardner and Shukur 1994, Vertovec 1998, Dwyer, Shah and Sanghera 2008) and that it is
relatedly useful in resisting British identity and the West (Archer 2003). However, this does not appear to be so from my research. The allegiance that the young men give to their religion is perceived as innate and integral to their identity, it is something they are born with and they determine to be crucial in fulfilling their masculinity. This is not a non-British stance, but rather that their religiosity or future expectation of this is what boosts their self-esteem, their masculinity and hence their social capital within the networks and contexts they move in. Early work on masculinities and education presented Asian men as ‘invisible’, ‘passive’, ‘weak’, ‘effeminate’, ‘behavers and achievers’ (Mac an Ghaill 1988), but now this view has been displaced by a representation of Asian and particularly Muslim young men as the new ‘folk devil’, with the emphasis on deviancy, criminality, low achievement and religious fundamentalism (Alexander 2000, Archer 2001, Webster 1997). However, I found little evidence of the current concerns about Islamic fundamentalism amongst the young British Muslim young men that I researched, and the stories or experiences they spoke of did not speak of fanaticism about religious observance or the global ummah, but were rooted in primarily local concerns.

Some researchers have argued (Archer 1998, 2001, Gardner and Shukur 1994) that the adoption of a Muslim identity secures allegiance to a community and enables Bangladeshi and Pakistani communities to be as one. This was significant for some of the Bangladeshi young men I interviewed, but contradictorily they also spoke of the divide between the two communities as visible through tensions between Pakistani and Bangladeshi young men, and some of the Pakistani young men interviewed commented on the segregation of mosques along ethnic lines.
Muslim identity has been seen, among other things, as a commitment to resistance against anti-Muslim sentiment, and also with Islam seen as a psychological barrier behind which Bangladeshi and Pakistani young people can hide their lack of self-esteem and gain solidarity and an escape from being constantly identified in negative terms (Alexander 2000, Gardner and Shukur 1994, Vertovec 1998). I am sceptical of these views, given the current climate in which Muslims have become stigmatised and labelled as aggressors and terrorists, and also because very few of the young men interviewed mentioned any negativity attached to their Muslim identity or a lack of self-esteem. Being identified as a Muslim can no longer be an escape from being identified negatively by the dominant culture, because currently it carries very negative connotations.

Moreover, most of these young men had conflicting ideas about identity and which elements of it had primacy over other parts, as indicated by their references to nationality and religion. All the Bangladeshi young men made references to their ethnicity and religion, while the Pakistani young men commented about their lack of knowledge and their performance of duties. I do not think these young men experience a need to profess religiousness as a protection against anti-Muslim attitudes, and solidarity is actually superficial given the factions within Muslim communities segregated along ethnic lines, with the celebration of Eid an example here, as is the segregation of mosques. The Bangladeshi young men narrated tension and friction with Pakistani young men, in which their cultural and national backgrounds were used as tools to attack them. The assumption of solidarity at local and international levels, whereby Muslims are seen to belong to the global ummah (brotherhood), is belied by the many factions existing at international levels,
particularly along doctrinal and national lines. Muslim identity does not supersede linguistic and cultural differences and it is wrong to assume Muslims are a homogenous group, with this denying the fluidity of identity and the conflict that can exist within, as evidenced by my interviews. And while some young men drew on the notion of the Muslim brotherhood to signify commonality and identity, this is an imagined community which is sometimes at odds with their lived relationships.

From the interviews I carried out, it is clear that the young men’s identities and commitments are negotiated and reconfigured across community and territorial spheres and Pakistani and Bangladeshi communities do divide along ethnic lines and often live in segregated areas of the town; for instance, Westwick is defined and regarded as Pakistani territory and Westarea as Bangladeshi territory. Safi spoke of tension and conflict with Pakistani young men, while Mahir struggled with community and ethnic differences concerning his marriage to a Pakistani girl, which indicates that being Muslim cannot by itself supersede differences along ethnic and national lines. However, the young men in West-Town indicated that their friendship networks do cross ethnic lines and some commented that the race riots had helped to eliminate barriers between Pakistani and Bangladeshi young men. However, after completion of the interviews I discovered that some of the men I had interviewed were socially connected. For example, Qutuz is acquainted with Rafiq, Jafar and Rahman, with three of my brothers involved in negotiating interviews with them for me. My brothers selected young men of a common friendship network and this is connected to ideas they have about young men who would be safe and suitable for me to contact. Consequently, it is possible that if I had used other methods in
contacting Pakistani young men, I might have come across people with no connections to the Bangladeshi community.

Archer (2003) has suggested that young men perform and inhabit a range of masculinities and that Muslim young men assert powerful Muslim masculinities within the political sphere, closely related to patriarchal identities in relation to issues of gender, both which she argues are resisted in Black youth identities within the sphere of youth culture. However, this is not apparent from my research. My findings do not indicate that young Muslim men aspire to and enact Black youth identities, or have adopted Black masculine stances in response to racism, and I think it is too limiting to consider Black masculinity as simply a response to racism (Majors and Billson 1992, Cohen 1986). In respect of the ‘South Asian’ young men I interviewed, Black masculinity is much more complex and varied (see also Chapter Four) and there are many forms of ‘South Asian’ masculinity at play and some have closer connections than others to violence and/or racism. For example, Yasin was in a small minority at secondary school and he spoke of his difficulty in interacting and integrating with white children; and while he thought other Pakistani young men opted for criminal and violent ways to express themselves, he rejected this and saw success in education as the marker of his masculinity (see also hooks 2004). Rafiq narrated his experience of unrelenting racial abuse at school and, lacking adult support, turned to drugs and truancy as a way of dealing with his experiences. Rafiq has subsequently constructed a version of masculinity where his experiences of racism justify his abhorrence of white people, which becomes more extreme with alcohol intake (see Chapter Four). And although Rafiq’s account fits with the idea
that Black masculinity is a response to racism, his behaviour is actually both exceptional and also situational and connected to the bravado that alcohol provides.

Certainly a common theme running through all the interviews concerned feelings of difference, racism or bullying. Differences in terms of ethnicity, lifestyle, social class and culture were highly visible at school, and especially for those of my interviewees who attended private school there were distinct disparities between them and white children. However, racism for them was of a subtle form, while those who attended state schools seem to have experienced more extreme racism including being subjected to ritual ‘Paki-bashing’ days. Second and third generation ‘South Asian’ young men are not willing to accept racism as an inherent part of their lives, as first generation men did around assuming that their lives here were temporary, with young ‘South Asian’ men now positioning themselves as a part of British society and not tolerating second class status. In some aspects, my research shows that their responses to racism are not dissimilar from other young men’s responses to physical and verbal abuse. For example, it is clear that some of the young men situationally judge if and what response will be made, by gauging the likely outcomes of any altercations. Bilal is a classic example of someone who presents his behaviour as a form of protest and a way of responding to racism. It also involves the extreme use of violence, which he legitimates as a response to racism, and it thereby secures his own victimhood and constructs his violence as caused by other people, removing all responsibility for his behaviour from himself. Integral to Bilal’s masculinity is the need to appear tough, fearless and invulnerable, all characteristics Bilal portrayed through his narration of other events in his life, with violence very much central to this. For Bilal, enacting ‘man’ is very much entwined
with violence, and violence is used in displaying and proving his masculinity. Even though he claimed to have reformed, violence is still used to reaffirm his masculinity and status in his locality. Bilal is a member of the macho culture that is argued to be developing among ‘South Asian’ young men (O’Donnell and Sharpe 2000), which turns the earlier ‘effeminate’ construction on its head and fits with research findings in which white and Black young men have spoken of Pakistani young men’s aggression (Goodey 1998).

Bilal’s form of masculinity, with violence integral to it, is possibly connected to his social background and his age, as there were others, like Amar and Naser, who had experienced racism at school and had been involved in some violent conflict but now affirm their masculinity through other avenues. Waqar, Naser, Amar, Yasin and Shazad have all opted for success and money as markers for their manhood (hooks 2004), and Waqar and Shazad were particularly resentful about assumptions made about their intelligence at school (Mirza 1992) and now have a great need to disprove theories about their ethnicity, intelligence and ambition through success in education and in their careers. It is clear that violence plays an important part in displaying and affirming masculinity and significantly, although the Bangladeshi men narrated experiences of racism in school their responses were virtually non-existent. Mansoor did describe violent physical responses, but this was very much tied to the rejection of his identity, the masculinity associated with his ethnicity and his friendship networks.

As I commented earlier in the thesis, popular discourses on race and masculinity have described ‘South Asian’ men as effeminate, weak, passive, hard-working, eager to please and non-physical (Connolly 1998, Archer 2001). Such
stereotypes are racist and exaggerated, but have still influenced and shaped peer-group interactions, which in turn can lead to victimisation when they are the basis on which members of the stereotyped group are treated (O'Donnell and Sharpe, 2000). This is particularly true regarding the Pakistani treatment of Bangladeshi young men and the intra-ethnic tensions as narrated by the Bangladeshi young men. Many academics have commented on the feminisation by others of ‘South Asian’ men and boys (Haywood and Mac an Ghaill 2003, Mac an Ghaill 1994, Archer 2001, Goodey 1998, Frosh and Phoenix 1999, Cohen 1998), but they have failed to identify that it is Bangladeshi men in particular who are constructed as having an effeminate and weak masculinity connected to their small build and height in comparison to Pakistani men. The bullying of Bangladeshi boys is clearly part of a process where Pakistani boys are able to enhance and prove their own masculinities by picking on those at the bottom of the hierarchy (Goodey 1998), actively distancing themselves by excluding those ‘others’ from their friendship networks. In some ways it seems to me that this is not so very different from, for example, the bullying of white children by other white children where power is attributed and maintained through bullying and they can appear ‘hard’ and ‘cool’ in front of their friends.

Mansoor and Dilshad went to great lengths to distance themselves from an effeminate image, because it undermined their status and reputation as young men. For both, to better their position they condoned the abuse and ridicule of fellow Bangladeshis in exchange for Pakistani friendship. Although failing to respond to Pakistani abuse, Mansoor made violent responses to (white) racism but was only able to do so through power gained from buying into Pakistani friendship networks. Mansoor was able to enact and display an aggressive form of masculinity through
employing the power networks he had, something which would not have been possible if he had remained within his Bangladeshi friendship networks. Safi experienced tension and conflict with Pakistani young men and also as connected with his perceived threat to the status of young men in the school. Neighbourhood conflicts between Westarea and Westwick were also spoken of by Safi, with some Bangladeshi and Pakistani communities segregated with territory divided along ethnic lines. Mahir’s difficulty in being able to marry his Pakistani girlfriend also indicates that strong divisions exist even though some of the young men stated that conflict had diminished with the ‘race riots’ bringing the two communities together. Idris too experienced struggles with rival groups of young men, although his experiences were with young men of the same ethnic background but from a different territory. Idris’ conflict with Bangladeshi boys from Westworth again shows that seeing Black masculinity as a response to racism is far too restrictive and does not recognise the importance of masculine performances entwined with other aspects of men’s identities and experiences. Racism was not particularly apparent in Idris’ and Safi’s stories of their experiences, and their construction of aspects of masculinity is more in response to inter-ethnic rivalry. Notably, the literature that positions Black masculinity as a resistance to racism fails to recognise that it can also be a response to inter-ethnic rivalry and prejudice.

Friendship networks organised along ethnic lines are visible for the young men in the North-East group and connect to their views of masculinity; Shazad was the only Pakistani young man to have strong links and friendships with the Bangladeshi community. Although he recognises that there are levels of apprehension and tension between the Pakistani and Bangladeshi communities, he
opted for Bangladeshi friendship networks specifically for reasons of protection and privacy, that is, to escape surveillance from members of the Pakistani community. So while Shazad’s exploitation of friendship networks is in some ways related to deviancy, it is also motivated by his particular ideas about protection of honour and the family. For the young men in the North-West friendship networks are more complex. For some of them, ethnic boundaries were crossed to gain friendship and enact masculine power. For example, Rahman favours his friends of Pakistani origin, describing them as more trustworthy and reliable and his Bangladeshi friends as lacking friendship requirements. Rafiq conflicted with Pakistani young men in his neighbourhood and in his efforts to distance himself he has retreated to friendships with Bangladeshi young men. His justification of violence presents racism as its cause, and this seems to be an arena where he is able to successfully perform and reassure himself of his own masculinity, something which was limited in his clashes with Pakistani young men.

What is apparent is that the use of violence is crucial to how young men define and position their masculinity. Bilal, Waqar, Amar, Naser, Mansoor and Shahin made references to the use of violence in dealing with racial conflict, and for Bilal violence was also used in conflict with other young Pakistani and Bangladeshi young men. In school, Bilal and Mansoor were involved in struggles to secure status through their use of violence and for Bilal this has continued into his adulthood. Naser’s conception of masculinity is also entwined with violence and power, which became apparent in his tale of bullying and the response forced by his mother. And Amar and Shahin both spoke of violent reactions to racism. But what is generally apparent is that the prerequisite to prove masculinity physically seems to diminish.
somewhat with age and maturity, and the majority of the young men in both groups have sought other routes to enact their masculinity and specifically do so through education, work and their role within the family.

The young men’s behaviour fits with other young men’s form of protest, defence and offence tactics, the display and confirmation of masculinity, and the occupation of space and male presence. Also while some researchers (Goodey 2001, Macey 1999a, 1999b) have constructed young Muslim men as deviant, criminal and a threat to social order, the criminal and deviant activities of the young men I interviewed do not differ from those of other working class young men, such as their routine violence, street crime and drug taking. Also research exploring the possible increased macho male dominated street culture of young Muslim men (Macey 1999, Keith 1995, Webster 1997) does not indicate that this is significant, because the presence of young Muslim men parallels the growth of communities and corresponds to the growth of confidence and the carving out of social space, in comparison to the apprehensive first-generation immigrants who were ‘seen but not heard’. Some researchers have noted that the roots of criminality are born in generational tensions brought about by the breakdown of the family controls on the young and have considered that the cultural attributes of the family will not last (Webster 1997, Goodey 2001). My research does not support these assertions. My findings suggest instead that the family is still very much significant to young Bangladeshi and Pakistani young men and that family control still reigns, for example, through expectations about the role of the ‘dutiful son’, shame, honour (see Chapter Four). What surprises me is that there is a general assumption and expectation that the Muslim or Bangladeshi or Pakistani family and community should control their
young men (Webster 1999) and that their deviancy or criminality is a failure of the family and community.

All the young men told different stories about a wide variety of experiences, but significantly it was crucial for them to be perceived as decent and having legitimate morals and values. For example, Rahman, Idris and Rafiq admitted to deviant behaviour such as alcohol and drug abuse but all were clear in providing an account which diminished responsibility for their actions, with this placed on other factors such as their social networks or difficult periods in their lives which propelled them into deviant behaviour. Through such methods of rationalisation and justification, these young men were trying to save face and present themselves as decent. This suggests to me that they are, in my company at least, ashamed of their behaviour; and secondly, that they know their behaviour is wrong in accordance to religious requirements and the expectations of the family; and thirdly, in some way they feel they have failed and try to salvage their images and persuade themselves and me that it was not their fault.

Through the telling of selected stories and experiences young men tried to construct a positive image for me which they thought would portray them as decent human beings alongside enacting typical masculine traits such as violence and aggression, indicating that it is highly important for young men to uphold a viable masculine image and to be seen as ‘proper’ men. The young Bangladeshi and Pakistani young men were not very different from each other in their attitudes and in their presentations of masculinity, as shown by listening to and analysing their stories. However, some Bangladeshi young men recognised the disputes between them and Pakistanis, but the Pakistani men did not mention similar tensions.
My research supports the findings of Archer (2003) and Alexander (2000a) in that gendered identities are complex, negotiated and that social relations and identities are always provisional and contextual. Masculinity is varied and contextual and there are various masculinities at play. And while Bangladeshi and Pakistani young men are diversely different from other young men because of their cultural and religious heritage, they do not differ hugely in their masculine pursuits, and this is clear from the stories that the young men told. Young men of all ethnicities and classes want to be perceived as projecting a viable masculinity and both Pakistani and Bangladeshi young men, and in both regions, were involved in selecting and telling stories which they assumed would represent this. What I conclude differentiates the Bangladeshi and Pakistani young men from other young men are that some of the avenues of masculine pursuit, presentation and success available to them are specific to their religion and culture. I go on to discuss such matters in more detail in Chapter Four, which focuses on recurring subjects in the young men’s accounts which inform and construct Bangladeshi and Pakistani masculinity; and these include family, roles and responsibilities, community, intra-Asian conflict, marriage and intimate relations, and crime and violence.
Chapter Four

THE SOCIAL CONSTRUCTION OF 'SOUTH ASIAN' MASCU LINITIES

INTRODUCTION: MEN AND MASCULINITY

This chapter looks closely and analytically at what 'makes' 'South Asian' masculinities, in particular regarding Bangladeshi and Pakistani young men. It begins with a discussion of masculinity, of what it 'is' and how it is theorized. This is then followed by the analysis of themes that arose in the young men’s interviews discussed earlier which fundamentally inform and help construct their sense of masculinity, of how they perceive being a man and doing what men do.

Sex/gender identity is central to how people see themselves and how others see them and this seems to transcend all cultural boundaries as a kind of categorization occurring in all known societies, although taking sometimes very different forms (Whitehead 2002, Stanley 2002). Mass culture assumes that there is a fixed true masculinity which is thought to proceed from components of men’s bodies which drives and directs action, for example, men are seen as (generally in most societies) more aggressive than women. However, masculinity is not programmed into genes but comes into existence as people are and act in a social setting and therefore its contents and limits are a social construction (Connell 2000, Connell 1995). It is through the processes of socialization that people are moulded and mould themselves into gender identities, which involves the amalgamation of attributes and behaviours which are seen in particular societies as more and less appropriate for females and males respectively (Connell 1995, Edley and Wetherall...
masculinity is an identifiable set of practices that occur across space and over time and are taken up and enacted collectively by groups, communities and societies” (Schippers 2007, p86).

Schippers (2007) summarises masculinity as having three components. Firstly, it is a social location that individuals can occupy through practice; secondly, it is a set of practices and characteristics perceived as masculine; and thirdly, the embodiment of these characteristics has effects especially for how the individual experiences their sense of self, their bodies and how they present themselves to others. Both women and men are surrounded by expectations of how to behave, and for men it is often their fathers who ‘teach’ them about masculinity. As children they can earn approval for gender appropriate behaviour, which is often strongly affected by cultural norms, and “each man constructs his own identity in relation to specific gender notions deeply embedded in his culture” (Harris 1995, pg9). However, men in any country or society tend to share some similar notions of how to behave, and “the presentation of oneself as masculine or feminine is a task of everyday life, one that requires demonstrating appropriate behaviour” (Nock 1998, pg 40). That is, people learn how to present themselves in relation to familial and cultural ideas about masculine and feminine behaviour. Masculinity of course does not exist in isolation from femininity. It is strongly relational, for being masculine is being what feminine is not; and the dominant cultural norms are that being male involves such things as being in control, sexually aggressive, heterosexual, muscular, tough, self-reliant, violent, breadwinner, adventurous, athletic and successful. These ‘bad’ as well as ‘good’ attributes are often believed to be innate, and such characteristics are also often seen to influence or even determine male behaviour, and there is no point at
which men can proclaim that their masculinity is secure and earned, with the pursuit of masculinity continuing throughout their lives (Nock 1998).

Cultural norms about masculinity regarding how men should be and behave are often referred to as hegemonic masculinity (Connell 1995, Connell and Messerschmidt 2005). Hegemonic masculinity is the most dominant powerful form of masculinity operating within a culture at any one time and has the greatest status over and above other various forms of masculinity, and this position is created at many different levels in society and by the individual, including by being generated through the media, parents, public figures, and schools. Certainly such ideas provide a framework regarding how men should think and act and encourages ‘appropriate’ and conforming behaviour, and it is usually in western societies that the lives and normative attributes of white middle class men dominate the masculine ideal and less powerful forms of masculinity are subordinated and marginalised often along lines of race, ethnicity, sexuality and class. Donaldson (1993) suggests that hegemonic masculinity is a culturally idealized form and that “the public face of hegemonic masculinity...is not necessarily even what powerful men are, but is what sustains their power, and is what large numbers of men are motivated to support because it benefits them” (Donaldson 1993, p646), and also that “the crucial difference between hegemonic masculinity and other masculinities is not the control of women, but the control of men” (Donaldson 1993, p655), especially through the subordination and marginalization of other masculinities (Connell 1995). In a similar vein, Connell and Messerschmidt argue that “hegemonic masculinity (is) distinguished from other masculinities, especially subordinated masculinities. Hegemonic masculinity (is) not assumed to be normal in the statistical sense; only a minority of men might enact it.
But it (is) certainly normative... the currently most honoured way of being a man, it require(s) all other men to position themselves in relation to it, and it ideologically legitimate(s) the global subordination of women to men.” (Connell and Messerschmidt 2005, p832).

Hegemonic masculinity is in important respects a fantasy, for cultural ideals of how men should behave do not match the actual lives and attributes of the majority of men. The publicized normative models of masculinity are actually largely unattainable ideals. As many or most men aspire to what they are not, this helps to stabilize a structure of dominance and oppression, with hegemonic masculinity ensuring that all men benefit on some level, even though most men do not embody hegemonic masculinity (Connell 1995, Connell 2002, Brittan 1989, Harris 1995, Edley and Wetherall 1995, Stanley 2002, Whitehead 2002, Segal 1990, Donaldson 1993, Connell and Messerschmidt 2005, Schippers 2007, Archer 2003). Connell and Messerschmidt (2005) note that the growth of research on masculinity has helped to expand understandings of the concept of hegemonic masculinity. In particular, it has led to uncovering of the mechanisms by which hegemonic masculinity exists and is perpetuated, discovering its costs and consequences, and exploring the diversity of ‘real life’ masculinities. The concept of hegemonic masculinity, then, is useful in understanding an array of men’s behaviours from violence and crime to sport, war, sexual behaviour, health and disability.

In the context of this chapter, and my thesis more generally, hegemonic masculinity is understood as an ideal that most men are likely to aspire to, and this can provide a broad way of comprehending the behaviour and actions of young Pakistani and Bangladeshi men, including their worries about not being able to fulfil
expected aspects of masculinity and of being compared to others (Harris 1995). As Connell states, “the construction of masculinity through bodily performance means that gender is vulnerable when the performance cannot be sustained – for instance, as a result of physical disability” (Connell 1995, p54); and in such situations, men will try to find or create opportunities to demonstrate their masculinity, for example, concerning whether they can look after themselves in a fight, in a bid to impress and gain the respect of other men, with those who lack ‘sufficient’ or ‘appropriate’ masculinity seen to be inadequate (Brittan 1989, Edley and Wetherall 1995). Connell also states that “masculinities are created in specific historical circumstances. They are liable to be contested, reconstructed or displaced” (Connell 2000, p219). Gender and masculinity are not invariable, universal and timeless, they do not exist outside the remits of history and culture, and both masculinity and femininity are always changing and subject to the processes of reinterpretation. Consequently there are “variations between cultures, variations in one culture over time, and variations in one culture at one point in time” (Stanley 2002, p32); competing interpretations of gender always exist, and may be valid and powerful only in their own cultural setting (Stanley 2002, Brittan 1989, Whitehead 2002, Harris 1995, Connell 2000, Connell and Messerschmidt 2005, Archer 2003). With these variations in culture, and no one sole pattern of masculinity, there is a need to recognize the existence of masculinities and also to recognize that gender interplays with race, religion, class and other factors (Connell 1995, Connell 2000). And although cross-culturally there are many ways of being a man, it is a mistake to assume that this variation undermines male domination (Brittan 1989) because,
although not all men practice hegemonic masculinity, nonetheless all men benefit from it (Donaldson 1993, Connell 1995).

It is important to consider how academics have conceptualized and addressed ‘South Asian’ masculinity, and there was an extensive discussion in Chapter One on ‘South Asian’ identities, masculinity and other related discourses, while here I start by considering some of the significant accounts and perceptions of ‘South Asian’ masculinity.

Alexander (2000a) suggests that researching and theorising the lives of Asian young men are comparatively new to the ‘race’ to understand and investigate masculinities, for while they are hyper-visible in policy discourse they appear to be invisible in academic literature and “black masculinity has been left unscrutinised and marginalised in its assumed patriarchal dominance” (Alexander 2000a, p235). The research and debate on ‘South Asian’ masculinities is limited and it is particularly Muslim young men who have been subjected to debate. This concentration is usefully summarized by Hopkins (2006), who notes that there are two main discourses about the masculinities of young Muslim men – one that emphasizes patriarchy and aggression, the other effeminacy and academicism, and both of which offer polarized perspectives of young Muslim men’s masculinities. However, given the current climate post September 11th and July 7th, it is clear that the popular ‘Muslim male aggressive’ discourse has become more publicly dominant and the once prevailing image of the effeminate man has diminished.

I will firstly consider the debates around the effeminate ‘South Asian’ man by discussing the early work on masculinities and education. Typically, the masculinity of white boys has been structured and discussed by class, Afro-Caribbean
masculinity through racism and their mediated response to it, while ‘South Asian’
men were observed as being born into a traditional society which differs from the
Afro-Caribbean in that this culture has not been forged in response to overt
oppression (O’Donnell and Sharpe 2000). Academics writing on race and
masculinity have observed that Asian men were constructed as weak and effeminate
and Afro-Caribbean as macho (Mac an Ghaill 1994, Connolly 1994, Cohen 1997),
while white boys constructed Black and Asian boys as having a masculine identity
different from their own (Frosh, Phoenix and Pattman 2002). Particularly, Asian
boys have been construed as possessing a weak masculinity in relation to the tough
masculinity of Afro-Caribbean boys (Haywood and Mac an Ghaill 2003) and, “as a
result, young Asian men are not only stereotyped as being subordinate to young
white men, but are represented as weak, delicate and subsidiary to the strength and
prowess of black masculinities” (Hopkins 2006, p338).

This racial hierarchy of Afro-Caribbean and Asian men (Mac an Ghaill 1994)
as tough/weak is important when considering the construction of ‘South Asian’
masculinity and the experiences of the ‘South Asian’ young men I interviewed,
because ethnic identification plays a powerful part in the way youthful masculinity
has been articulated and expressed (O’Donnell and Sharpe 2000). Black boys have
commonly been constructed as possessing the characteristics of popular masculinity,
such as toughness, sexual attitude, style and talk; but in contrast, ‘South Asian’ boys
were racialised as ‘nice’ boys because of their religious commitments and for being
responsible and mature (Frosh, Phoenix and Pattman 2002, Hopkins 2006). The
boys’ sense of their ethnic identity and also their experiences of racism contributes to
the way they think of themselves as masculine (O’Donnell and Sharpe 2000),
because both Asian and Afro-Caribbean boys are caught up in myths about themselves. For example, both groups of young men believe that in relation to football Black boys are superior, Asian boys are not tough enough or fast enough and also that Black boys are better fighters as they are bigger (Sewell 1997). Cohen (1997) found that Black and white boys were involved in testing their masculinity with each other through ‘cussing matches’, and the style of conflict with ‘South Asian’ boys was quick, which prevented ‘South Asian’ boys from effectively defending themselves and proving themselves as competent fighters.

‘South Asian’ boys were the focus through which other boys were able to reassert their own masculine status, something which was also reinforced by distancing themselves from the ‘South Asian’ boys’ effeminate image. Renold (2004) supports this by noting that being excluded from a masculinised space reinforces ‘Otherness’, which can lead to occupying a space traditionally associated with girls and femininity. Hegemonic masculinities are constructed and maintained by the policing and shaming of ‘Other’ masculinities. Boys define and project their masculinity through traducing femininity, and it is boys who exclude themselves from masculine activities such as football and fighting, which positions them as more feminine and being seen as having a failed masculinity by both boys and girls. ‘South Asian’ masculinity is similar to what Connell (2000) terms as marginalized masculinities which are ‘socially de-authorised’, for although Asian young men may enact many of the features of hegemonic masculinity, they are oppressed by what is regarded as a more successful form or expression of masculinity. O’Donnell and Sharpe have suggested that the stereotype of Asian men as being effeminate has been fed by “the apparent tendency of Asian boys to be physically smaller” (2000, p79);
and in the masculine world, to be regarded as physically weaker is associated with weakness in character. The treatment of them as boys and their status suffers accordingly, and the stereotype of effeminate and weak is further reinforced by the tendency for them to suffer from racism at school (Archer 2001).

Haywood and Mac an Ghaill (2003) propose that stereotypes can shift with the presence and visibility of ‘South Asian’ young men. In working class schools in areas where there is a majority Asian population and white minority, the dominant representation of ‘South Asian’ youths tends to be negative and they are perceived as sly and not ‘real’ men. But where ‘South Asian’ young men co-exist with high levels of Afro-Caribbean students, they are perceived more positively in relation to the Afro-Caribbeans, who are regarded as low ability and aggressive.

There is a popular assumption that ‘South Asian’ parents place a significant value upon education and the educational system, with the supposedly tight-knit ‘South Asian’ family and community support encouraging achievement from their children, and this further strengthens the perception of the effeminate ‘South Asian’ man and constructs them as typically well-behaved and geared towards achieving (Archer 2001, 2003, O’Donnell and Sharpe 2000). This fits well with Mac an Ghaill’s ‘Academic Achievers’ (1994) in comparison to Black men, who are perceived as lacking in intellectual skills (hooks 2004, Mac an Ghaill 1994). Masculinity is connected to the body and those who aspire to academic success are perceived as a sissy, so those who do not want to jeopardize their manliness will not read books (hooks 2004), which suggests that ‘South Asian’ masculinity is enacted through the mind than the body.
O’Donnell and Sharpe (2000) suggest that the ‘South Asians’ commitment towards education and career success is actually an ethnic characteristic, and the strong parental encouragement into post-compulsory education, at best for boys, crosses class lines (Archer 2003), which suggests that achievement in education and career is related to ‘South Asian’ masculine achievement. O’Donnell and Sharpe (2000) argue that the career ambitions of ‘South Asian’ young men requires little explanation as immigrant groups are always concerned with improving their economic situation. In their survey, a large proportion of ‘South Asian’ boys came from backgrounds where their fathers were self-employed and the boys aspired to salaried middle class occupations. But the perception of the ‘behaver and achiever’ (Mac an Ghaill 1988) for the ‘South Asian’ male overlooks the fact that there is an educational crisis concerning their achievement (Archer 2001), and now there is a shift to more recent distinctions between ‘achievers’ and ‘believers’ (Archer 2003).

Another factor important in the construction of the effeminate ‘South Asian’ man image is their relationship and role in the family. ‘South Asian’ and Muslim men are portrayed as being significantly family-orientated in comparison to white men, with their specific family duties and responsibilities regarded as key defining features of being a ‘South Asian’ man (Archer 2003). This connects to wider understandings that ‘South Asian’ and Muslim culture are typically patriarchal and traditional (O’Donnell and Sharpe 2000, Goodey 2001), and Muslims pupils as having oppressive and authoritarian home lives (Archer 2001).

Since the 1990s, it has been observed that a macho culture has developed amongst ‘South Asian’ boys who are very different from others who are more academically and career motivated. The emergence of an aggressive anti-social
culture of ‘South Asian’ young manhood has been related to their impoverished backgrounds, their experiences of racism and a breakdown in ‘South Asian’ family control over their young (Webster 1997, O’Donnell and Sharpe 2000, Alexander 2000). Significantly, it is young Muslim men of Bangladeshi and Pakistani origin who are specifically portrayed as being aggressive, violent and policing the streets, and closely controlling the conduct of women in their community (Hopkins 2006, Macey 1999, Archer 2003). It is the combination of these images, and the perception of the fanatical Muslim man arising from the events such as those surrounding the Satanic Verses, September 11th and July 7th, which have been propelled and sensationalized by the media. This has led to the creation of the Muslim youth ‘folk devil’ and helped encourage the rise of gangs and erode the image of the passive, effeminate ‘South Asian’ man (Alexander 2000a, 2000b, Archer 2001, Archer 2003, Goodey 2001, Cohen 2002, Hopkins 2007). This shift in perception now identifies Muslims and Muslim masculinity as being problematic, although with religion and not cultural values seen as the source of differences (Archer 2003). However, religion is often seen as providing these young men with a source of pride, solidarity and status and a way of fighting back against inequalities (Gardner and Shukur 1994, Archer 2003, Vertovec 1998, Dwyer, Shah and Sangera 2008). Archer (2003), for instance, argues that for Muslim boys their masculinity can be read as organized around two themes: brotherhood and the authenticity of male voices. The idea of brotherhood creates a sense of strength and support through a network of identification which Archer suggests can be read in terms of intertwining racial and patriarchal themes through which boys seek to resist the stereotype of weak ‘South Asian’ masculinity, which is replaced by a strong Muslim masculinity. Alexander
(2000a) argues that there is an academic fascination with Islam and fundamentalism which has dislocated Muslims from the history of Black people and the ‘South Asian’ struggle, so that Muslims have become in a sense the new dangerous ‘other’ and now associated with cultural alienation, deprivation and danger, and the focus on religion fixes boundaries and identities where religion, ethnicity and culture are naturalised, essentialised and become synonymous with race (Gilroy 1992).

Redefinitions of Muslim masculinity have also been influenced by young men’s actions against racism and young boys have become adept at resisting, retaliating, constructing territory (see Chapter One). Black masculinity is seen as a resistance to racism (Alexander 1996, Majors and Billson 1992, O’Donnell and Sharpe 2000), and Archer (2001) argues that young ‘South Asian’ and Muslim men have become attracted to Black masculinities as a source of political opposition to racism and an assertion of masculine power. Connected to this take-up of Black masculinities, there is a growing perception that the new ‘South Asian’ gang sub-culture is modelled on Afro-Caribbean and Afro-American examples, which consume baggy jeans, rap music, drug dealing and taking, and again this image has been sensationalized by the media (Alexander 2000b). However, it is understood that this is not typical of all ‘South Asian’ and Muslim men and some are still geared towards academic and career success (Dwyer, Shah and Sanghera 2008).

‘South Asian’ families have been seen as a cohesive force in controlling their young, and ‘South Asian’ young men have been thought to be motivated by close family ties and respect, which has helped prohibit criminal acts (Goodey 2001, Webster 1997, Yip 2004), although a more recent breakdown of familial authority has led to the redefinition of masculinity (Alexander 2000a, Webster 1997).
O’Donnell and Sharpe suggest that ‘South Asian’ delinquent boys are adrift from their families and in most cases parents are unaware of their sons’ behaviour and “a chasm of communication and information of this kind between the generations is often a sign of rapid and deep cultural change” (O’Donnell and Sharpe 2000, p83). However, their research findings suggest that young ‘South Asian’ men are still influenced by respect for their parents and there is concern not to hurt their feelings (O’Donnell and Sharpe 2000). Other researchers too have produced research findings which also confirm that young ‘South Asian’ men retain a deep respect for their parents as a hardworking generation, which contradicts the dominant discourse that young Muslim and ‘South Asian’ men are in conflict with their parents’ generation (Archer 2001, Hopkins 2006, Yip 2004, Gangoli, Razak and McCarry 2006).

Hopkins (2006) in his research on Muslim masculinities in Scotland suggests that young Muslim men’s masculinities interact with and develop in relation to the masculinities of other young men who occupy the same local spaces, with the demographics of a particular place influencing how young men construct, negotiate and perform masculine identities. Hopkins asserts that “the various accounts of the young men’s masculine identities simultaneously support, challenge and subvert dichotomized stereotypes that either associate them with effeminacy and academicism or patriarchy and aggressions” (Hopkins 2006, p350), and so stereotypical conceptions of Muslim or ‘South Asian’ masculinity are contradicted by the varieties of identities. Similarly, Archer (2003) found that young men performed and inhabited a range of masculinities depending on the particular circumstances and experiences, with a range of masculinities existing which are
provisional and contextual (Dwyer, Shah and Sanghera 2008, Alexander 2000). For example, in their attempt to emphasise the different ways in which class, ethnicity, religion and gender interrelate, Dwyer, Shah and Sanghera (2008) have theorized that a range of Pakistani Muslim masculinities exists. These include ‘Religious Masculinities’, ‘Middle-Class Masculinities’, ‘Rebellious Masculinities’, and ‘Ambivalent Masculinities’, which are similar to Webster’s (1997) categories of ‘South Asian’ men constructed around criminality (see Chapter One), in that the categories stress that gender is not fixed but intersected by ethnicity, class, and religion. Typically ‘Religious Masculinities’ characterise those young men whose educational and career aspirations are shaped by their strong religious identity. These men observe religious practice, express a masculine identity which is religious and conformist, support traditional patriarchal gender roles and identify with the breadwinner role. ‘Middle-Class Masculinities’ characterize young men who are less religiously orientated and invest in their education as an important part of their identity, and they position themselves in contrast to other young Muslim men as more liberal and intelligent. ‘Rebellious Masculinities’ characterise those who display a ‘hard’ masculinity in public spaces, and they associate with physicality and territorial defence and loyalty. These young men also respond to parental and societal pressures to be patriarchal breadwinners; but while they emphasize their identification as Muslim, Islam does not shape their attitudes or actions. ‘Ambivalent Masculinities’ characterise those who construct their masculinity in relation to both ‘rebellious’ and ‘middle-class’ masculinities and parental expectations. Dwyer, Shah and Sanghera (2008) argue that, contrary to the assumption that the importance of school, family and religion is diminishing, it is
evident from their research that religion and family expectations still have a significant influence in shaping young Muslim men’s gender identities, although there were degrees of variation in how their Muslim identification was articulated. Ideas from Webster (1997) and Dwyer, Shah and Sanghera (2008) in particular are useful in conceiving how academics have understood ‘South Asian’ and Muslim masculinity and support my own research in showing that ‘South Asian’ men can occupy and enact different forms of masculinity which are intersected by class, ethnicity, and religion.

The most prominent ideas in the literature on ‘South Asian’ masculinities fits into the two discourses that Hopkins (2006) has stipulated as being, on the one hand, concerning effeminacy and academicism, and on the other, concerning patriarchy and aggression. The discourse on effeminacy and academicism is constructed through ‘South Asian’ young men’s ambitions regarding education and careers, the support that their family and their community provides, and the religiosity and traditional and patriarchal culture of ‘South Asian’ and especially Muslim men. In stark contrast to ideas about weak, passive masculinity, however, the strong aggressive masculine Muslim male image has been born out of public events such as September 11th and July 7th, which have turned the image of the effeminate ‘South Asian’ and especially Muslim men on its head. This aggressive discourse is supported by the criminality of ‘South Asian’ and Muslim young men, their responses to racism and the defence of their locale. The literature on ‘South Asian’ masculinities has been useful in discerning how other researchers have understood ‘South Asian’ and Muslim masculinities, and with this as the backcloth, in the
remaining part of this chapter I will discuss my own findings and how the young men in my research articulated their masculinity.

MASCULINITY AND THE FAMILY

'The Dutiful Son'

O'Donnell and Sharpe (2000) have commented on how ‘South Asian’ boys have a traditional patriarchal notion of what becoming a man involves and there is a universal acceptance that men (should) have more power than women; and for Muslim men their power and authority is established in relation to strong domestic and family control. O'Donnell and Sharpe have also commented that ‘South Asian’ men’s masculine sense is strongly connected to educational and career success and ‘South Asian’ young men are explicitly motivated by parental respect. In Archer’s (2003) research, the young Muslim men involved portrayed the family as strong and dependable and family duties and responsibilities were viewed as key defining features of being a Muslim man. Similarly in my own research, it is clear that the family has an intense influence over these young men and how they envisage and enact their masculinity. The family and young men’s role within the family defines the construction and enactment of masculinity, with some of the young men in my research having a categorical understanding that full masculine potential is intrinsically connected to their role and responsibilities of being a ‘good son’, and this is present for both the North-East and North-West interviews, and within and across the two ethnic groups. For example, Shazad, Amar, both Pakistani young men, and Dilshad, Mansoor, Rahman, Safi, Bangladeshi young men, provided accounts where it was unequivocal that their family instructed their role,
responsibilities and actions they took. Shazad is particularly adept at representing himself as possessing key masculine attributes of a dutiful son such as devotion to the family, sacrifice and selflessness:

[...] one of the reasons I came back was family. and to be around. to be there at the later part of my father’s life. certainly when he turns around and says I want to see you married and things like that it does have an impact on you. it was easy to fob it off when you were on the telephone 250 miles but face to face you see how he struggles and you appreciate that these people aren’t as young as they used to be. you appreciate how reliant they are on you as a person. (lines 103-107)

[...] worked 3 years progressed as a career and. moved back. I think that’s the hardest thing in the world (lines 158-159)

Shazad’s narrative suggests that he aspires to western conceptions of hegemonic masculinity such as independence, self reliance and success in his career; but nonetheless, he is still concerned with his role of a dutiful son which demands responsibility towards his parents and family. Similarly, Rahman became more responsive to his family role after marriage and the birth of his child: “I’m married now and I can’t study as well. you know what I mean. I have to look after my mum . dad . got my little boy as well” (lines 55-56), something which he also saw as general and in a sense natural and to be continued by his own children:

RT  [..] just realised that as you go older ‘innit . like my mum and dad is everything . you know what I mean . life is all about who brought you up and stuff you know what I mean . you have to look after the person who brought you up .

AR  So family’s very important to you then?

RT  Of course it is . because . well I realise now because I’ve got my own kid and . you know . when you look at him and giving that love to him . I think ‘oh my mum and dad gave me that love’ . you know . one day you’d expect . I’d expect my son to give me that love back to me . you know like the way I look after my parents . you know . you know . if he grows up and says ‘dad get out’ you know what I mean . you know what I mean . it’ll be like what the hell . (lines 359-368)
These expectations and experiences fit with the findings of Archer (2003) and Alexander (2000), who note that the discourse of the responsible adult Muslim masculinity is in particular characterized by looking after parents in their old age. The cultural values of the Muslim community involve inter-dependence and inter-connectedness, not the values of independence and individuality more favoured by the western society, and Yip (2004) argues that this is inextricably connected to the expression of religious faith and its emphasis on the rights of parents and familial duties (Al-Kaysi 1989, Haneef 1993). However, while my findings evidence that some young men are responsive to familial expectations, they also suggest that the ‘dutiful son’ discourse is more complex and involves fulfilling a range of expectations and responsibilities. The young men I interviewed displayed at times antipathy toward their roles and the pressure to conform to cultural masculine conventions, and this was so for both Pakistani and Bangladeshi young men. It is important to note that most of the young men did not directly connect their familial duties to their religion, which suggests that either the young men ‘inherit’ such duties unquestionably or that the influence of religion was not sufficiently explored.

Typically in the majority of ‘South Asian’ families, the eldest son is assigned primary responsibility of managing the family and this is not the result of discussion but something handed down, something accepted by those whom it is given to. For example, Shazad’s elder brother is viewed as a failure for absolving his responsibilities and in contrast Shazad presents himself as selfless, mature and considerate in embracing the role of a ‘dutiful son’. However, he fails to acknowledge that his absence when living away from home may have somewhat conflicted with and limited his ability to perform his masculine duties. Belief that he
enacts the ‘dutiful son’ discourse boosts Shazad’s self-esteem and his image and his performance fits somewhat with Goffman’s (1959) ideas around the ‘presentation of self’, where people often convey information that they think the tradition of the group or social status requires, in ‘impression management’. So although this may appear deceitful, it is deemed as necessary to maintain or construct a desirable image, and indeed Shazad was aware that his role acceptance was not quite as honourable as he had first described: “So my sister left her responsibilities come to me and on top of that there’s more responsibilities cos there is a gap in the household . . I think one of the reasons I was glad to leave East-Town was to get away from it all . to get away from all it . not all of it . some of it sorry” (lines 237-239). Other young men like Mansoor, Rahman and Amar also commented on their similar absorption in the absence of elder siblings. So if one child abstains or excuses themselves from managing and supporting the family, then the next mature responsible child takes this role. And once this role is accepted, even when others return to assist, the hierarchical shift seems to remain: “We live in one house and I’m sort of like the most responsible out of the house . I’m always looking out for everything but it’s always been like that from a young age . so that’s why I’m still doing it today” (Amar, lines 111-113).

Something which exists across the differences of location and ethnic origin for the young men is the antipathy they feel towards some aspects of their responsibilities and this is aggravated by what is seen as the inadequacy of siblings in supporting them:

[..] my older brother would fn blind and say they should have done they should have done this . but that’s all he’ll do he won’t really actually take responsibility (Shazad, lines 242-43)
[... ] it’s always me who’s looking after most of the stuff [... ] I’ve always been looking after everything (Amar, lines 114-123)

[... ] when I moved out my older brother moved out as well. and there was no-one there to look after my parents do you get it. and, you know, everybody moved out and my mum and dad on their own with my younger brothers. and that’s what I thought, you know, my younger brothers can’t look after my parents. do you know what I mean. they don’t even work. so I thought ‘I’ll have to move back in’ (Rahman, lines 234-238)

These young men stress their masculine status by foregrounding the sacrifices they have made, thereby demonstrating their selflessness and heroism, values of dominant masculinity (Coates 2003). For instance, Amar promotes his carrying out of his role of a ‘dutiful son’ as being beyond expectation, and seemingly it is important for him that I recognize this, as it was only with probing that a vague acknowledgment of his elder brother’s contributions was given with “does a little bit” (line 131). Although his elder brother also manages a business, Amar makes his resentment clear: “I feel like I’ve done so much and er. I feel like they’ve let us down like they don’t help us out enough” (lines 178-179). And as with Amar’s, Rahman’s and Shazad’s experiences, Rafiq too identified his younger brother as lacking a sense of family responsibility, although Rafiq equated this with his immaturity. From these young men’s accounts it can be deduced that firstly, responsibility, power and respect is related to age; secondly, opportunities are needed in order to fulfil a young man’s masculine potential within the family: “the younger ones a bit different he’s more no responsibilities. I guess that’s due to my dad probably cos he hasn’t been encouraged as much as us have really. maybe that’s why we took an interest at a young age cos we were doing it. so there’s no need for him. and now he’s sort of really spoilt” (lines 135-138); and thirdly, this position needs to be recognized and respected. For example, Rafiq manages the family business and his younger brother
assumes a position of power because of being related to the ‘boss’. However, this leads to conflicts with both Rafiq and the staff, firstly, because Rafiq expects respect and acknowledgement from his younger brother; and secondly, the staff do not recognize Rafiq’s young brother as having a position of authority:

RH: Now it should be just one person as a boss.
AR: Yeah.
RH: Who runs everything, and the other two, they should be like workers.
AR: Aha.
RH: He doesn’t understand that. he thinks no because it’s my brother’s business I should be the boss.
AR: Yeah.
RH: And I said to him ‘well look you can’t be a boss [laughs]. he’s like I keep coming up to you and it’s like say for instance I’m older, keep coming up and say to me ‘do this’. I just look at him and say ‘you what’?
AR: Yeah.
RH: I don’t have to do it.
AR: Yeah [laughs].
RH: But if someone about the same age said to me I’d be like ‘alright let’s do it’, but when a kid is saying summat to you and in a nasty way it’s the way he speaks got a bit of an attitude.
AR: Yeah.
RH: And it’s like… he’s got a deep voice or he looks like me, talking a bit rough. most of the staff just look at him and ignore him, and he gets annoyed with the staff ignoring him, and he starts arguing with the staff, so and I finally sat him down and I go ‘listen you can’t do this, this, this, you have to do it this way’. I go ‘at the end of the day I know we are all brothers but you’ve got to treat your workers right’. (lines 908-929)

In contrast to Shazad, Amar or Rafiq, Dilshad does not have the opportunity for his masculinity to flourish: The ill-health of Dilshad’s father left a void of power and familial responsibility which his elder sister occupied and continues to do so, which places Dilshad in an ambiguous position because, although he financially maintains the family, he is unable to assume the ultimate position of power and control which his sister enjoys:

[... ] don’t actually give you that full respect that you deserve you’re still that little kid in the family, but they don’t realise that I’m 25 and grown up now [ ... ] so I mean it is quite upsetting but sometimes I just take it with a pinch of salt (line 819-840)
Naser too is ‘managed’ by an elder sibling. However, Naser is not concerned with the lack of opportunity to develop his familial masculinity and he was apathetic to the accentuation of his shortcomings as a ‘man’ by what he described as the efficient management of the family by his elder brother, who in fact lives away from the family home. Whether Naser assumes that this responsibility comes with marriage is not clear, but what is clear is that he strives to fulfil other masculine goals such as developing his career and business and travelling.

**Parent-Child Relationships**

The young men’s stories told in their interviews were so concerned with the embodiment and presentation of successful masculinity in connection to the family that it was rare for them to identify the responsibilities that their family has towards them. Similar to Archer’s (2003) research, which found that Muslim young men portrayed Muslim and South Asian families positively and white families negatively, Safi compared and contrasted the ‘South Asian’ family as an antithesis to white families. For him, family values and networks of support distinguish ‘South Asian’ families from white families where “everybody fends for themselves” (line 49), commenting that:

\[
[\ldots] \text{What I think my biggest support was my family all being there for me. I mean, while I was inside I mean all the property market went up high, so when I come out I knew it was going to be impossible for me to get on the property ladder, but with family support, you know or... well. I’ve got the mortgage through (lines 50-54)}
\]

All the young men I interviewed were active in presenting themselves as tough, strong, independent and successful in their pursuits. However, these characteristics conflicted with the sensitivity and emotions they revealed when
discussing their relationships with their parents, which ranged from respect and adoration to loathing and resentment, with the influence of one parent more than the other often being clear. Archer (2003) in her research noted that young men associated their fathers with power and their fathers were able to command both respect and fear. In my own research, those young men who occupy a powerful position in the family enjoy status, respect, autonomy and control in line with their parents, and these men also enjoy close relationships with their fathers because their fathers perceive them as successful responsible, mature young men:

\[\ldots\] my dad usually says who's the father you or me [laughs]. that's my dad's term [laughs] I say yeah but you know erm . . you know like I've always been looking after everything (Amar, lines 121-122)

\[\ldots\] I like the way my parents treat me with respect . listen to what I have to say and erm . . rather than being told what to do being asked what they should do (Shazad, 176-77)

In contrast, although Rafiq does have some family responsibility, he has a difficult relationship with his mother (his father is dead) and he described his mother as unsupportive and lacking empathy with issues he had faced such as racist bullying, and this appears to be connected to his deviant behaviour. Rafiq spoke of a serious alcohol problem involving blackouts and the use of extreme levels of violence and blamed his alcohol abuse on the turbulent relationship with his wife and his mother: "Because before none of them were there with me . it was like because they weren't there with me they used to always blame me for it . that's why I started drinking and stuff and going my own way" (lines 537-539).

Bilal and Naser also have turbulent relationships with their parents and they are placed low in the familial hierarchy. Bilal conflicts with his mother and has
particularly negative attitudes about her. Naser views his father as indifferent, however, he still spoke with adoration and respect of him. Bilal is from a poor working class background and he narrated a story of deprivation and emotionally distant and unsupportive parents, although I experienced this as rather rehearsed, a frequently told story to excuse and justify his life on the streets and his involvement in crime. His story is a typical ‘Sad tale’, one used to justify his behaviour, and it is arranged and told in a way which explains how he became who he is (Sykes and Matza 1957, Scott and Lyman 1968):

(...) I know how difficult it’s been for my dad, bringing the children up and er, basically me being a child, especially a child in the middle of the family (...) they kind of had all the love and all the affection that I obviously wanted to have (...) obviously I looked for other answers. I think I tried to find them on the streets (lines 7-12)

Although I had some reservations about Bilal’s story as an attempt to justify his deviancy, overall he was successful in eliciting sympathy for his story from me because he appeared to have struggled as a child in a large family with very little support. What is interesting is that Bilal distinctively chose to deflect blame away from his father, by drawing on gender binaries and identifying him as the breadwinner, and he connected all his difficulties with his uneducated mother, who he represented as someone emotionally detached and unsupportive towards her children. The connection between the two was not clear, but his comments about transnational marriages in Pakistan, culture, shame and honour and gender roles are revelatory concerning his beliefs. That is, that culture dictates gender roles and therefore his mother’s attention to her domestic chores led to her neglect of her children. Generally it is expected and assumed that women will be immersed in domesticity and this does not preclude love and nurture for their children, Bilal’s
rationalisation suggests that either Bilal is unable to accept the human failings of his mother, or he is making an attempt to deflect blame:

[r... ] I wouldn’t want to get married in Pakistan because... I think that er... all the generations that have come... they’ve been coming... like my dad n that... it’s the same system... the wives are uneducated and I feel sorry for my children... having a mam like me... uneducated. I wouldn’t them to go through the same things that I’ve been growing through... I want someone to love... their children especially... I don’t want them to grow up... to be... to go through what I’ve been going through... so I think it’s time for a change... everywhere like... and its... people... obviously don’t realise that they’re like bringing their daughter in laws from Pakistan... but they don’t know nothing... they’re just there... they’re just breeding machines to be honest with you... they’re just there to have babies and keep the family izzat as it’s called... the respect... I’m totally... I’m totally against that (lines 274-283)

Similarly Naser spoke about his relationship with his father through a cultural lens. Naser represented his father as possessing desirable masculine traits such as selfishness and independence, and used this to justify his father’s behaviour in leaving as actually consideration for his family: “My father honestly had the guts to leave. that’s the way I look at it. he had the guts to leave. a lot of people do not have the guts to do that [...] where I know other men who would rather make their wife’s life hell. kid’s life shit just to make themselves feel ok” (lines 564-569).

Naser’s stories about his father and family were complicated and required some lengthy unpicking. He accounted for his parent’s separation and his father’s behaviour through black magic, which is difficult to fit with the fact that Naser also presented himself as particularly westernised and not someone who would hold such beliefs. Nonetheless, he adamantly argued his father had been corrupted by black magic which sabotaged familial relationships, which of course does not fit with the autonomous and decisive father that Naser describes. Nor does it fit with his own dominant constructions of himself as westernized, independent, successful and powerful, in contrast with the emotional ‘backward’ and rather effeminate image he
presented around his comments about witchcraft and magic, because a belief in these is traditionally associated with women. As a person of ‘South Asian’ origin, I am conscious that there are ardent believers in black magic and typically it is drawn on as a means to explain, for example, the root cause for ill health and inexplicable situations and behaviours. However, black magic appears to be a justification for the breakdown of his parent’s marriage and his father’s indifferent relationship with him:

NG: [...] that’s it black magic horrible, it does exist. I don’t trust anybody. erm you know how people say... when I opened the shop I did khatum here [...] my uncle came and he always gives presents and his presents we’ve found so many things. always always
AR: more tabeezs or something?
NG: aye, whatever it could be anything. if he gave you a mobile phone there’ll be something with it. it’s that bad that bad (lines 469-475)

‘South Asian’ and Muslim cultures are defined by their values of inter-connectedness and inter-dependency, and these were values that both the Bangladeshi and Pakistani young men in the North-East and North-West I interviewed were motivated by. It is evident that familial responsibility is culturally seen as intrinsically connected to masculinity. However, the position that young men have in the age structure of the family hierarchy significantly impacts on the opportunities they have and consequently how they enact their roles and responsibilities. So those first-born or those absorbing the positions of another sibling can much more easily enact the ‘dutiful son’ role and often those further down the age structure are resented for their lack of duty. Young men who enact the ‘dutiful son’ role enjoy the benefits of their powerful and respected position and it seems that these young men also enjoy good relationships with their parents.
COMMUNITY

‘Community’ as a concept distinguishes a group of people from another and it defines both similarity and difference, which can be physical, ethnic, linguistic or religious, and its members are recognized by people of the same community and also by those on the ‘outside’. The community is experienced through both involvement and the attachment or commitment to a set of shared understandings which allow people to feel they are more members of one community than another (Cohen 1985). Cohen states “The symbols of the community are mental constructs: they provide people with the means to make meaning. In so doing, they also provide them with the means to express the particular meanings which the community has for them” (Cohen 1985, p19). Consequently Cohen argues that commonality in the community is not created through uniformity, but instead through common ways of behaving.

Chain migration for ‘South Asian’ people led to a change in family structure and village kinship, with religious affiliations becoming more significant as the basis of community formation. Those with similar cultural backgrounds developed an infrastructure of resources that enabled them to express their culture in their daily life in the places they migrated to, such as shops providing dietary, leisure, and clothing preferences. For instance, British Muslims living in Bradford, London and elsewhere have articulated their decisions to live in an inner-city ‘reconstituted’ ethnic community with its local networks of support, care, institutions such as mosques and informal exchange relationships of a financial and social nature (Phillips 2006, Salway 2008). These networks and especially kinship networks are important particularly to the first generation, those who themselves migrated, for the reinforcement of socio-cultural practices from their countries of origin, and it
generates a strong sense of kin-ties and obligations while also providing a sense of safety and security from the threat of racism (Yip 2004, Salway 2008).

Alam and Husband (2006) suggest that “similar norms about how we participate in specific religions, behave ‘appropriately’ in relation to our age or manage our wealth are found within the cultural expectations of group membership. We experience our faith, age and class, among other things, through our membership in ethnic communities” (Alam and Husband 2006, p9). Alam and Husband go on to argue that, typically, all ethnic communities have rules about how we should behave, with gender and ethnicity strongly linked and with community a means by which people can express their beliefs and values through rituals, because ethnicity can not be sustained in the mind alone. The sense of belonging to a collectivity through ethnic identity shapes the boundaries between ‘us’ and ‘them’, with in-group as well as out-group comparisons helping to confirm values and behaviour through the commitment to shared norms (Cohen 1985). For example, Salway (2008) in her study on the labour market experiences of young Bangladeshi men in the UK noted young men’s experiences of living in the ‘shomaj’ – the moral community – where their conduct was influenced by the boundaries of behaviour set by the community and family.

Alexander (1996) argues that the recent theorizations of community have created the mistaken idea that community is correlated with race and so community has become a symbol of the presence of Black people. This imagined community, she argues, provides a source of solidarity in opposition to wider white society which can be mobilized politically and collectively and which provides a symbolic link to other Black people. However, Ray and Reed (2005) argue that the racialisation of
community is problematic, because in some ways this is part of the Orientalist discourse in which racialised others are assigned exotic qualities absent from white culture. The ‘South Asian’ community is a term generally used to incorporate two points of identification: religious faith and ethnic identity. This, however, obscures the differences within a community, not only those of gender and class but also of religious practice (Burlet and Reid 1998). Baumann (1996) argues in a similar fashion that people can be members of several communities, each with its own culture, so that, for instance, the same person can speak and act as a member of the Muslim community, but also take sides against other Muslims as a member of the Bangladeshi community. So although ‘South Asians’ have tended to pursue religious interests rather than political ones, it is incorrect to assume that Bangladeshis and Pakistanis are one unified community because “speaking different languages and reflecting somewhat different cultures, these two ethnic groups are only nominally unified by their shared commitment to Islam” (Fararr 2002, pg 66). Fararr (2002) argues that community is ‘unreal’ in the sense of being socially constructed, and community is an aspiration for social relationships of social warmth and solidarity and the longing for justice and equality. Consequently, community has very real effects when it underlies and motivates action and drives the aspirations of particular groups.

Distinctions are often drawn between Afro-Caribbean and ‘South Asian’ communities, with the former seen as marked by conflict, lack of parental control, alienation and despair, with ‘South Asian’ communities seen as holistic, alien but peaceful, law abiding and successful, and with community and close family ties providing people with a cohesive and supportive network which inhibits criminal
acts (Alexander 2000, Goodey 2001, Webster 1997). Mawby and Batwa (1980) have also stressed the cultural and religious attributes of Muslim communities as inhibiting law-breaking as compared to white communities, and suggested that, despite similar experiences of economic and social deprivation to other communities, there is still a relatively low crime rate amongst Muslim communities due to the strength of support and familial and community control. Such controls rely on community enforcement and family prestige through mechanisms of ‘sharam’ (shame) and ‘izzat’ (honour), with deviance having repercussions on family honour both in the UK and the country of origin, which in turn impacts on, for example, future prospects such as marriage (Webster 1997, Shaw 1994, Yip 2004, Werbner 2007).

However, rising levels of criminal behaviour amongst young ‘South Asian’ men and events such as September 11th, July 7th and the ‘riots’ of 2001 have reinvented the community. In this, law-breaking has been attributed to inter-generational tensions brought about by the breakdown of family control over young people and a related widening cultural and generational gap within the ‘South Asian’ and specifically Muslim community, with those occupying formal leadership roles having difficulty in controlling ‘their’ young (Webster 1997, Alexander 2000). My research on young Pakistani and Bangladeshi men’s lives in the North-East and North-West shows that the community remains a powerful and influential aspect in these young men’s lives and the community can be understood as an extension of wide reaching extended family networks in terms of the influence and impact it can have on their lives.
'Everybody Knows Everybody': Safety and Security

My findings about the young men’s experiences living in the community are similar to those of other researchers (for example, Alexander 2000a, Yip 2004, Archer 2003, Alam and Husband 2006, Salway 2008), with the community a dominant feature in the lives of these young men and this was so for both the Pakistani and Bangladeshi young men and across East-Town and West-Town.

The young men in East-Town emphasised the benefits of the community such as safety and security: “I know who I’m around and these are my people” (Waqar, line 699), “East area is a good area cos it’s mostly... Asians right. Asians are ok. the English people don’t really like Asians” (Naser, lines 644-645). Waqar’s sentiment in particular is connected to his extended family networks in the community. ‘South Asian’ and Muslim communities have been found to form and expand through village-based kinship settlement of people into the same area who continue to maintain close contact there (Faraar 2002, Yip 2004). As Waqar comments, “[...] you get some business sense out if [laughs]. what I get from it. it’s good to know people really isn’t it. it’s good to go down the street and say hello this that instead of not knowing somebody” (Waqar, line 696-697). And similar to what the first generation have been found to enjoy, Bilal benefits from this settlement strategy in providing him security and preventing physical attack through safety in numbers: “Actually I’ve experienced it myself like when we go individually. like a group of people together. they won’t attack you they don’t want to know you” (lines 486-487). This notion of assurance of personal and collective safety is connected to what they regard as ownership and control of the area which is achieved through the assertion of a collective identity structured through ethnicity (Alexander 2000a).
Dilshad, Amar, Naser and Shabaz also commented on the community network as comforting, supportive and ‘home’:

 [...] we couldn’t live there it was just all English people, there was just no Asians if we wanted to go to the Asian shop you would find one about 20 minutes away from our house, there were no Asian shops around there at all, we found that really hard so we moved (Amar, lines 222-224)

In West-Town, the young men I interviewed similarly emphasised the positive attributes of the community in providing them with safety, belonging, emotional and physical support at times of need. Mahir, for instance, identified the community as exceptionally important for first generation immigrants like his mother, who, lacking in English language skills, came to rely on the community and its facilities. These, young men also enjoy living within the community, for example, Rahman and Safi commented on their attachment to their locality:

 [...] whereas I feel comfortable where I live because it’s not, you know, I’ve been brought up here and I know everyone around, you know, it’s just you feel good where you are brought up ‘innit (Rahman, lines 381-383)

 [...] even if it’s the worst area in the world. I mean to you that’s your home (Safi, lines 768-769)

And although Yasin believes his community to be inward and secluded, nonetheless he too has a deep love for it and he enjoys its entrenched values of loyalty, ‘looking after your own’ and the benefits of safety it conveys, although he also identified the distractions of extensive social networks. Jafar unsuccessfully attempted to situate blame for his academic failure with these networks:
Distance from one’s own community and its social networks has repercussions for the young men’s perceptions and enactments of masculinity because the confidence and the power it provides can diminish when its support is absent. In such circumstances young men can feel less masculine, or as Yasin phrases it, not as big or hard:

‘That horrible word reputation’: Community Surveillance, Shame and Honour

‘Sharam’ and ‘izzat’ – shame and honour - are ideas deeply ingrained into ‘South Asian’ culture and socialize and constrain people into putting the honour and the stability of the family ahead of their own happiness and needs. Honour is carried by both families and individuals and it involves notions of respectability, reputation, integrity and refers to caste, class status and symbolic capital. Around shame and honour people learn that they should act correctly according to their role, and it is women more than men who are more susceptible to such controls (Thakar 2005, Alam and Husband 2006, Werbner 2007, Yuval-Davis and Anthias 1989, 1997; Lyon 1997), and can become the victims of ‘honour killings’ for being suspected of
sexual deviancy or adulterous behaviour (Meetoo and Mirza 2007). Werbner (2007) argues that the significance of shame and honour is more extreme in Muslim societies, because “the protection of women from anything which dishonours, degrades or in any way exploits their sexuality is considered extremely essential” (Haneef 1993, p147), although the code of honour is present amongst Hindus and Sikhs as well. The defence of familial honour is expected of men as they grow older, and with this comes respect, power and authority over the protection of women and female sexuality. Shame and honour are mechanisms of compulsion used to regulate behaviour, with perceived deviance having repercussions for family honour, both in the UK and in the country of origin. And this in turn can impact on future prospects, such as regarding marriage, and although notions of honour and shame actively regulate female behaviour more than male, all the young men I interviewed in both the North-East and North-West spoke of or implied the power of these things and their impact on their lives and behaviour. What this suggests is that, although these young men may not experience the intensity of these controls in the way that women do, nonetheless shame and honour still impedes their autonomy over their lives and produces a vigilant need to maintain and protect the family honour. And as my interview data has shown, this can involve enacting pretentious, contradictory and aggressive behaviour in local environments.

In Alexander’s (2000a) study of Bangladeshi young men in London she discovered that they are often judged in relation to their family, which also encompasses the family’s status and affiliations in Bangladesh, and young men are aware of caste and class status in the community. Alexander argues that this conflation of class and caste with status, firstly makes explicit the divisions in an
imagined community, whether this is territorial or ethnic; secondly, it makes visible the connections between peer group boundaries; and thirdly, it illuminates the continuities between individuals, friends, families and wider notions of community. Similarly, my research found that the young men I interviewed are aware of honour and status of themselves and their family in the community. Caste position cannot be shifted and the connecting honour and status a man has is not something that is earned but rather is largely inherited from the position of the family in the community. However, honour and status are not static, and although the individual’s and the family’s actions can enhance or reduce honour, it is the community which has the power to grant such status. For example, Amar is awarded respect and honour because of taking control of the family business from his father. This also indicates that a young man’s identity in the community concerned is attached to his father, and community recognition is important for achievement and honourable status because they are important markers of ‘South Asian’ masculinity and success in the role of a ‘dutiful son’:

 [...] they probably don't know who my brother is. they probably know me better as X's son erm that's my dad [...] erm they've always recognised us. my dad has always been chuffed about that I think. knowing that people have said that your son's doing really well. more to me than my brothers really (Amar, lines 206-212)

While Amar’s experiences highlight the central role of the community in attributing status and honour, Dilshad and Shahin’s experiences show its power in taking honour and reconfiguring positions. Dilshad and Shahin both told stories illustrating that honour and status can be elevated by a family’s financial status. Coincidentally, both Dilshad’s and Shahin’s parents were swindled out of their shares in local businesses, with Dilshad describing community response as estranged, and Shahin experiencing
pressure to present a successful and honourable image to the community as a dignified response to those who had deceived them: "and because of that my mum would always say beware. don't make fun of our family cos they will laugh" (Shahin, lines 591-592).

Young men resent the prominence given to honour, status and image when this adversely affects happiness and autonomy, as with Waqar's comment that:

"[...] they don't care about their kids life and the way he's going to live it and how happy he is they just want to see their . they want to have pride in them . they just want to use their kid as one thing pride . so they can turn around to other parents and say my kid my son this my kids that . know what I mean . messed up (Waqar, lines 678-681)"

This response is connected to some of these young men's unsuccessful attempts to deny the impact and control the community exerts upon their lives. For example, Shazad presents himself as a person resistant to its limiting effects: "I learnt not to care about the community and come back . I've had to readjust to the community . purely for the sake of parents . erm because from my point of view it doesn't make a difference what the community think about me . I'm . they don't affect my life . they used to" (lines 59-62). This is unsuccessful, because he is aware that dishonourable behaviour can ruin the marriage prospects of his sister and so he conducts himself accordingly. However, Bilal suggested that, ultimately, the community was powerless: "[...]my mam used to say aw . everyone thinks you're bad . used to bother us then but now I'm not bothered . they know I'm bad fair enough what they're [community] going to do about it . . ." (Bilal lines 451-452). Rafiq's emotion and at points anger in talking about the community illustrates its powerful impact in his life, and dismissing his own wrongful behaviour he shifts his focus to
those he describes as hypocrites – the community - for overlooking the behaviour of their own children:

RH  Look at what they are doing. They always come to my mum saying this. that and the other. I used to get bollocked for it and then it came to a stage where I am just getting fed up of it and I used to start talking back to 'em. but my mum used to get really annoyed with me
AR  Right cause you're talking back to the elders?
JH  Yeah. but at the end of the day the elders. in fact if your kid is doing something wrong yeah and you don't look at your own kids but you are always pointing fingers at another kid. you are saying 'oh your kid's doing this. your kid's doing that. my kids are okay'. and you think 'hang on you don't know your kids very well'. cause they are out with us doing the same thing (lines 677-686)

The power of the community and its connections to young men’s honour and masculine status is undeniable and those young men who have tarnished reputations still aspire to community respect and honour. Alexander (2000a) identifies ‘respect’ as a key discourse through which young Bangladeshi men can become more centrally positioned within the discourses of community and “The issue of respect... is then inseparable from the question of visibility...the definition of respect pivots crucially on a disjunction between doing and seeing (or being seen), or between forms of knowing (Alexander 2000a, p195). In a similar fashion, Archer (2003) argues that respect operates through a discourse of honour and young men are required to negotiate between what behaviours are made public and what is hidden from who, as the display of an activity can cause offence, show a lack of respect and may also damage reputation and honour. Bilal, for instance, commented on his humiliation in being escorted from a local mela by the police for inciting hatred between local ‘South Asian’ communities, which not only demonstrates the power of shame in the eyes of the community upon him, but also his concern regarding his pride and his reputation amongst his peers, family and community:
so er he kicked us out in front of my mum and dad which was pretty embarrassing. you know. cos me being an Asian . . obviously all the Asians have going to look at us and go back to the mam and dad and look what's going on here (lines 160-162)

It has been suggested that “any act that violates the moral code, evokes personal and collective dishonour (for example to the family) and renders one the subject of malevolent gossip” (Frembgen 2006, p248), demands concern and this was common to the young men’s experiences in both East-Town and West-Town. The community is adept at collecting information on individuals and their activities through surveillance and exchanging information through complex social networks which can cut across different ethnic communities. Similar to Alexander (2000a) and Archer’s (2003) findings, my research too shows that young men have an acute consciousness of the community and the need to protect family honour and prestige impacts upon the young men’s behaviour and some of the young men I interviewed commented about employing tactics such as covert behaviour to minimize visibility and limit public knowledge because “. . . shame and dishonour derive not so much from the performance of a particular activity or behaviour . . . but from boys’ lack of discretion and/or their inability to hide these activities” (Archer 2003, p101). Gossip is a powerful regulatory force. For example, Naser and Shazad both provide a rationalization of their motives in being involved in covert activities and link their conduct with community pressures, which is also connected to respect for the family and the need to ‘save face’ within kinship networks and the wider community:

[...] my cousin [...] he's a good role model as well . they actually given us . enjoy yourself . don't bring it back home kinda of thing . that's one thing I can explain in a way that . its . you can't really do things in front of Asian parents . let them down break their hearts kinda of thing (Naser, lines 54-57)
Like when I was going out with someone in East-Town I was limited in terms of how much progress there was in the relationship, just getting to know that person. In London I got to know people, more closely than I ever have before. I’ve known people inside out and they’ve known me inside out. I wouldn’t allow anyone in East-Town to do that, cos the risks involved. They might know people. If it all falls to pieces they could tell people n stuff like that. Being in London gave me some sort of shield against it. (Shazad, lines 37-42)

Experiences of being on the receiving end of community surveillance and gossip were common. For example, Dilshad’s choice in marrying a close school friend was interpreted by the community as a love-marriage but which both Dilshad and his wife identified as an arranged marriage. Mansoor was identified as breaking cultural and religious norms by indulging in aspects of youth culture such as driving around in cars blasting out music. Mahir and Rahman also experienced the power of the community in labelling their behaviour as offensive and disrespectful concerning their pre-marital relationships, and both of them identified the strategies of community networks and the significant power of gossip in curtailing and regulating people’s behaviour, including because all too often honour is given prominence over happiness:

[...] passed the message on to my mother that saying ‘oh your son is seeing such and such person’, you know, and they are like ‘you know, how could he be doing this and that’. you know, and... so I mean... you could say that my mother was upset about it, like oh how can he have like, how can he have done that. you know, like yeah seeing sort of. you know, our. that enemy side you know [...] you know. how is she gonna face the society when it’s. when she goes outside and I know that people what people are gonna start point fingers at her. aw this is or, that’s the lady’s son like. such a such a thing... (Mahir lines 87-120)

The community scrutinizes female behaviour significantly more than male, because women are exalted as carriers of honour. They are expected to uphold family honour at all times and this is enforced by both male and female members of the family, who participate in the surveillance and control of sexuality (Thakar 2005, Tombs 1995, Werbner 2005, 2007, Alam and Husband 2006, Meetoo and Mirza 2007) such as
through managing the control of movement and so limiting the possibility of contact with young men:

[... I] you know what I mean, if they are going the wrong way, you know, I can't stop them, but they know they've got like crazy brothers, you know what I mean who'd kill them, you know what I mean. Like if they do something bad, they know their brothers. Like I'd get my sisters in on lockdown, like I'll make sure my younger brother go and pick them up from school, bring them back, you know what I mean. Like well it's a bit embarrassing for your sister when she's fifteen, you know what I mean. But then again I don't care, you know. It's just the way I see girls these days in schools, you know what I mean. I think, you know. The only way I could save my sister going from the wrong way is go and picking them up, you know. If you just leave them to it they will go their way, you know what I mean, they will go their way, you know what I mean (Rahman, lines 984-93)

Young men resent and try to resist the power of community surveillance over themselves, but fail to recognize their own contradictory involvement in policing female sexuality. And like Rahman, Dilshad too talked about his participation in female control and he accepts his role inherently and passionately: "[...] there's a lot of pressure in that sense to see them do well and you know not scar the family name because we've faced a lot in the past and they need to understand that, they can't put another bad mark on the family. If they put a foot wrong in anyway meaning like boyfriends or going out or something like that you know how our culture is they'll be at you straight away" (lines 463-475). Dilshad positions his sisters as needing protection and regulation and this was justified through what he indicated as previous unfounded attempts by the community to see the family as disgraced. Yasin too has similar conceptions about the conduct of female behaviour and that women have a particular responsibility to act honourably and avoid the 'male gaze':
Whereas when we were in college or whatever if you were with an Asian girl we wouldn’t walk round with them or, you know. If you go to a takeaway, whatever, but now when I go to takeaways together they just all hang around together and everything, you know. They are quite loud and stuff like that. Whereas when we were there you just, we had that kind of little bit respect, you know. Where, even there’s nothing going on. Even if you are just friends or you are just, its just not nice, you know.

Yes.

The older people they talk, they say ‘oh I’ve seen this person and that person’, but now I think the people from West-Town, they don’t care no more. You know, how they get seen or how they get perceived.

Right.

You know. whereas us it’s like we have to keep that little bit of respect, you know. We won’t like walk round in town centre because obviously you get all the olders, you know, elders, people’s uncles, aunties, whatever. walking round there, but that has another thing. I think has just completely changed, completely changed. Everything’s changing. The dress sense, everything, the dresses are getting shorter, tighter. Honestly I, that’s the way I see it. So it is all changing yeah. (lines 407-423)

My research findings concerning these young men’s experiences of living within the community and experiencing its controls echo those of other research, showing that they enjoy the benefits of the community and the local amenities as well as safety, security and belonging it provides, and this does not differ between the Bangladeshi and the Pakistani young men, nor across the two regions. It is also clear that these young men are bound by the moral community, which is structured around the values of shame and honour and demands that young men uphold and enforce family status and honour in the community. Shame and honour actively controls and regulates their behaviour through powerful community networks which can expose deviant or immoral behaviour, and the young men themselves are a part of the structures which closely police female conduct but fail to recognise their own involvement in all that they resent about the values of shame and honour.

INTRA-ASIAN CONFLICT AND VIOLENCE

Intra-ethnic conflict and violence is an important aspect of the ‘South Asian’ young men’s experiences of ‘community’ and their understanding and enactment of
masculinity. ‘Community’, used as a cover-all term, on one level absorbs all difference regardless of religion, nationality, class and makes seemingly invisible the ethnic differences and conflict that may exist. On another, the differences are real and consequential although the term stays intact. Practitioners and academics alike have failed to acknowledge the existence of multiple forms of ‘South Asian’ identities, communities, cultures and masculinities, following the people they research by grouping people under a common heading such as the ‘South Asian’ community or Muslim community, as though only one, singular and indivisible, exists. This has meant that the variations in experiences, individual voices, identities, religions, cultural differences of Bangladeshi, Indian and Pakistani groups, differences detectable in the interviews I carried out, is denied, as also is the existence of conflict and competition existing between these differing communities/groups. Bangladesh, Pakistan and India have all experienced serious intra-ethnic violence, and there is no reason to think that these divisions are not represented among the ‘South Asian’ communities living here in the UK (Lyon 1997).

Of especial importance to this research is the common assumption that Muslims ‘stick together’. However, although Islam can be a significant vehicle for collective mobilisation, it is in fact far less homogenous, and the cultural heterogeneity of Muslims is in fact fractured by linguistic, national and doctrinal loyalties (Samad 1996, 1998, Baumann 1996). A shared observance to Islam cannot overcome great cultural differences; and the racialised and cultural boundaries which separate one group from another are relatively fixed and movement is limited; for
example, marriage between Bangladeshis and Pakistanis is seen as problematic and avoided (Baumann 1996, Britton 1999).

Cultural stereotypes and prejudices are passed on by complex social means through generations, and although the media has reported on intra-Asian male conflict where these acts have been described as aggressive and criminal, academics have been very slow to address these issues (Goodey 2001) and equally slow to understand its relationship to masculinity. Few explanations have been offered for intra-Asian violence, although tensions and gang violence attributed to machismo, drugs and employment and also conflict based on religious differences have been pinpointed (Goodey 2001). Aggression and conflict amongst ‘South Asians’ is heavily concentrated among young men and boys. For example, throughout the 1990s there were a stream of incidents between Sikh and Muslim youths, and tension between these communities is not new (O’Donnell and Sharpe 2000), while fights between rival Bangladeshi gangs have also been noted. Alexander (2000) argues that intra-ethnic rivalry ensures that a particular style of masculinity flourishes and also rivalry and conflict sharpens ethnic and territorial differences, which in turn can intensify the expression of masculine aggressiveness. It is clear from the young men’s comments and stories that they have deep-seated cultural and ethnic stereotypes about each other as communities and as men, and these inform the embodiment, perception and enactment of masculinity, territorial segregation, conflict and the control of women, and also Pakistani and Bangladeshi intra-ethnic conflict and violence.
Communities within a Community: ‘That’s their area’

According to the 2001 Census the largest South Asian population in East-Town is Pakistani, as it also is in West-Town. It is generally assumed that the Bangladeshi and Pakistani communities in the UK have a harmonious relationship, but the interviews which I conducted with young men suggest that these are communities which are at unease with one another and a regional difference is also apparent. In the East-Town, the Pakistani young men interviewed evidenced negative cultural and masculine stereotypes of Bangladeshi young men, and Pakistani men were constructed as having a more powerful masculinity. For example, Bilal’s stories illustrate the power Pakistani young men assume and how Bangladeshi young men are envisaged in and through these.

In Bilal’s discussions around a dispute between young Pakistani and Bangladeshi men over power and territory in 2005, he presents himself as possessing typical masculine attributes of power and strength, and that he had intervened to resolve the issues between the two groups, he “went to sort it out you know with me being good again” (lines 127-128). Bilal commented on the cohesion of community based on the Muslim ‘brotherhood’ and justified his involvement as an act of loyalty and concern for his friends, something which Sykes and Matza (1957) refer to as an ‘appeal to higher loyalties’ as a method of neutralising negative acts. Supposedly, Bilal’s helpful efforts received a negative Bangladeshi response and because he had “limited patience” (line 133) he reacted with violent methods which he saw as justified because the other young men had been “cheeky” (line 176). Bilal further glorified his masculinity, strength and ability by claiming his response left three young men “lay[ing] on the floor crying” (line 134) and elevated his reputation in
the community by Bangladeshi non-retaliation, because “they know who I am” (line 135). However, Bilal contradicts and destabilises his supposedly notorious reputation by disclosing that he was threatened with a weapon by one of the Bengali men involved in the dispute, a disclosure which he then attempts to recover:

In telling this story, Bilal created imagery of a mini-riot in which he and his friends wreaked havoc and “no one come out”. His story seems to be highly exaggerated and sensationalized, to heighten both his own and Pakistani strength and authority in my eyes and perhaps his own. Waqar and Amar also referred to this tension between Pakistani and Bangladeshi young men, but neither was able to offer detailed stories of what had happened in the summer of 2005. Waqar, however, stated that the Pakistani young men were responsible for the tensions and he described clashes at local melas and while he acknowledges the wrong-doings of the Pakistani young men, he excuses and minimises their violence by arguing this was not as bad as in other Asian communities:

[...] they actually told the lad get in the middle n start dancing n they all attacked this one lad . forty lads jumping on one lad in the mela . stamping on his head n that . . but er that's it it kicked off . it didn't go that far whereas in other towns it would go haywire knives guns . here . it's just . that's it . it won't go past the stick (lines 290-293)
However, the Pakistani young men from East-Town I interviewed contended that there were no deep rooted tensions between Pakistanis and Bangladeshis, although the two communities operate at a distance:

[...] that's their area [Bangladeshi]. now if you walk through it the Pakistani mosque is bang in the centre of it know what I mean. not like turning their heads what the fuck you doing here. you see Pakistanis down there they've got no problem. they've got no racial hatred or nothing like that but it's just lately these few troublemakers have actually started on one lad for no reason (Waqar, lines 496-500)

[...] I've never heard of a problem with Bengalis ever ever ever (Naser, lines 613-614)

[...] there's no problem with Bengalis and Pakistanis (Naser, line 637)

[...] Bengalis and Pakis live together there's no trouble between them (Naser, line 727)

[...] there's no trouble inside Eastham (Naser, line 526)

[...] Eastwick's not bad. whoever's been saying this please come n speak to me I'll sort it out (Naser lines 529-530)

Intra-community conflict was something that Naser had difficulty in comprehending. His lack of experience of intra-ethnic conflict may be related to the more powerful position that Pakistani young men enjoy: "[...] a lot of people get intimidated by shit. they shouldn't. erm a lot of people. a lot of Pakistanis do act they do act. this is because there's more of them. young lads. the young lads. they do act like they're the fucking boys. own the town n this n that. right. maybe with the Bengali lads because there's less of them" (Naser, lines 555-559). And more generally, negative stereotypes about Bangladeshis were clear in what various of the
young Pakistani men said, and they commented about attempts to balance these out, although cultural and ethnic-specific torments were common-place:

[...] my brother came in 'aw guess what', what, 'the new neighbours are Bengali'. I said oh ok, yeah and erm he made a joke saying 'oh the fucking streets are going to stink of fish now', but that's a normal thing, I'm sure people say that the streets are going to stink of chapattis or whatever curries and stuff like that if it was the other way around (Shazad, lines 711-714)

[...] you can tell who's a Bengali right by looking at them. Bengalis are short, you're tall for a girl. Bengalis are short, dark skinned and most of them work in takeaways, check their fingernails they're yellow (Naser, lines 624-625)

As I laughed in shock at Naser's description of Bengalis, he quickly added "I'm not being racist or nothing" (line 627) and as 'proof', he then spoke in terms of stereotypes about typical Pakistanis. Interestingly, in comparison the Pakistani young men I interviewed in West-Town did not speak to me using similar cultural stereotypes about Bangladeshis.

The cultural and masculine stereotypes that Pakistani young men have of Bangladeshi people, many of which were expressed in the interviews I carried out, has an impact on the lived experiences of Bangladeshi young men. Dilshad, for instance, commented on the Pakistani ridicule of Bangladeshis associated with their lower height and eating fish. The 'fish joke' was also reiterated by Mansoor and Shahin as a way of abusing Bangladeshis and both Mansoor and Dilshad commented on the power and presence of Pakistanis which limited Bangladeshi retaliation, although both Dilshad and Mansoor represented themselves as successful in deflecting such negativity. Dilshad used his height and stocky build to distance himself from the 'typical' Bangladeshi and also by breaking into Pakistani friendship networks; and similarly Mansoor also successfully negotiated bullying through
developing close friendships with Pakistani young men. Both of them tried to reconfigure their ‘weak’ Bangladeshi masculinity and aspired to a more powerful version of masculinity, and indeed Mansoor went to the extreme lengths of gaining acceptance by co-participating in the bullying of Bangladeshi children (see Chapter Three).

All the Bangladeshi young men I interviewed in East-Town identified the tensions and conflicts as arising from the Independence of Bangladesh, but with Dilshad and Shahin regarding shared religion as a basis for mutual understanding and commonality and therefore positioning themselves within the ideals of the Muslim brotherhood and ‘ummah’ which draws on the strength and support of a common religious identity: “‘oh it’s a Pakistani mosque oh it’s a Bengali mosque’ know what I mean. you get that from the second generation but at the end of the day it’s for Muslims to pray ya na. there’s no Pakistani no Bengali mosques [...] I really hate it because at the end of the day we are Muslims and we should get on and be united” (Dilshad, lines 366-370). Indeed, there was a general census among the young men that racist, prejudiced attitudes were paramount amongst the first generation and which young people adopted from their parents and peers and struggled to escape from.

An acute difference between Bangladeshi young men’s experiences in the North-East and North-West is that, while young Bangladeshi men in West-Town recognized that tension and rivalry existed, where race is used to articulate divisions between groups, those like Rahman and Safi saw it as having resolved with the ‘race-riots’ which induced community cohesion through the common experience of racism:
[...] you used to hear a lot of it. you know. with Westarea against Westwick against Westarea. Westworth against Westwick. Everyone always against Westwick. but I think since after the West-Town riots you don't hear any of these things. cause I think. you know. that has like in a way brought everybody together. right. cause erm. you know. when that riot happened er... I think everybody found a way of. you know. getting on with each other. (Safi, lines 666-671)

In East-Town, it is clear that the Bangladeshi young men possess what was expressed as an undesirable masculinity and cultural identity by both the Pakistani and Bangladeshi young men I interviewed. But this was not so clear in West-Town, where Bangladeshi men seem to have a more powerful presence. Rafiq and Jafar have the benefit of cross-cultural friendship networks to provide them immunity from Bangladeshi attack because: "when they know you know such a person" (line 775) situations are resolved. Jafar too asserted that greater integration of Bangladeshis and Pakistanis had taken place after the 'riots', but prior to this conflict had been rife which was possibly connected to drugs:

JH   [...] West-Town when there's always a fight it's always Asian against Asian or Asian against Bengali and all that. but that passed out. cause at one time there was like Bengali's and Asians.
AR   Oh right. against Pakistanis.
JH   Yeah Pakistanis. yeah right. and that's proper like kicking off and all that. then . you know. it kicked off in the gym. some guy put a. erm. a weight. 20KG weight which is really heavy. like that tv. on some Bengali guy's head and leave him in a coma. you know. they were Westwick part. they were Westwick boys. but we was alright because obviously we know them lot. Westarea lot know through my brother. you know. like cause he went to school. he lived with them and everything and that (lines 200-209)

However, Qutuz's descriptions of conflict between young men of differing neighbourhoods and ethnic groupings indicate that inter-community conflict more generally continues to prevail, and this is discussed in more detail in the next section on 'Violence and Criminal Activity'.

243
'My Community, My Women'

Although there is some dispersal of residence of Pakistani and Bangladeshi people in West-Town and East-Town, there are well-defined areas of ethnic segregation. These are not just related to geography but also of the territorial boundaries around the power and control of women across them. For example, Bilal’s description of the events in 2005 was corroborated by Mansoor, who works closely with Pakistani and Bangladeshi young men in the locality. However, Mansoor spoke of this incident as connected to the impressing of boundaries of the ownership of women, and to a young woman that Bilal had dated and was then being dated by a Bangladeshi young man. Bilal’s violence was connected to personal competition and sexual jealousy and also to the local and territorial notion of ‘insider’ and ‘outsider’ based on ethnicity, and that a Bangladeshi had dared to cross onto his turf and his ‘woman’, something which was damaging to Bilal’s pride and also to his authority in the area. As might be expected, it was not Bilal who disclosed this to me. Firstly, this would have discredited the image he was creating for me, that of a violent offender turned good guy; and secondly, doing so would also have had consequences for his self-professed powerful and potent masculinity, because a ‘mere’ (as constructed in his narrative) Bengali had defied his power and authority by transgressing boundaries of the ownership of women, and this not only demonstrated he had lost power and control over ‘his’ woman but also brought his masculinity into disrepute. There is also a possibility that his knowledge of my ethnicity as a Bangladeshi might have curbed his description of events and at the same time heightened his need to project Pakistani power, control and authority over Bangladeshis:
Bilal’s intense pride in the Pakistani control of drug territories is significant in how he presents his masculine identity and the power it speaks over others and especially Bangladeshi men and masculinity. In our discussion of cross-cultural marriage between Pakistanis and Bengalis, Bilal’s negativity towards Bangladeshis was further evidenced. Here he was so deeply involved in presenting himself as reformed that he failed to recognize that his admission that he would never “let” (line 594) his sister marry a Bengali sets firm the boundaries and contradicts his surface promotion of an egalitarian attitude: “our parents didn’t accept it at all cos we’re different creeds and different people” (lines 592-593). He also commented that:

 [...] I’ve realised now. its took me time to realise that it doesn’t matter where you’re from . a Pakistani family a Bengali family . an Asian family we’re all human we’re all here to do the same thing . should be good to each other know what I mean . I think . we should appreciate each other learn from each other . fair enough we come from different creeds and cultures n that but you might have a better way of doing something and I might have a better way of doing something . I might have a better way than you . you might be . understand me better like that . so I think the best thing to do is learn from each other . (lines 691-697)

Like Bilal, Naser participates in the structural control of female sexuality and sexual territory which is so stringently connected with masculinity, territory and shame and honour. Honour is carried by families and individuals, but it applies to men and women differently because women are expected to deflect shame by being modest and men to retain their honour through the control of women’s sexuality (Thakar 2005, Tombs 1995, Werbner 2005, 2007, Meetoo and Mirza 2007). In this connection, Naser spoke about the power of honour ideas in convincing young men
that they are endowed with the protection of women, doing so around telling the
story of a particular event. On a family outing, a Bengali young man whistled at his
female cousin, which Naser responded to and a scuffle took place. Naser justified
his actions as compelled because it was a question of his honour and his masculinity
and the two cannot be separated. For him, the scuffle was caused by the young man:
"I actually obviously went over to the lads" (line 518). In this and similar things said
to me, women are positioned as property and they are frequently used or invoked as
tools to attack, incite reactions and damage the pride and honour of men, and Naser's
story was about protecting both his honour and masculinity. Naser's narration of
events fits neatly with Coates (2003), who suggests that masculinity is constructed
primarily through talk, and certainly by telling me this story Naser was able to
reproduce dominant values of masculinity and 'South Asian' masculinity i.e.
toughness, acting alone, protector of honour, protector of women, hero. Naser, like
Bilal, consistently sought to project an image of powerful Pakistani masculinity,
power networks and authority: and like Bilal, he also seems adept at turning to such
networks for support in, as his comment that his family is "very big here" (line 523).

Disagreement and intra-community conflict and tension is clear, and is
heightened by controversial cross-cultural relationships between Bangladeshis and
Pakistanis. Shahin and his Pakistani girlfriend, for instance, were unable to
overcome such tensions and be together: "people say she's a Pakistani your Bengali I
don't give a flying fuck I don't give a shit . . . my mum would think that my dad would
my sister in laws would cos they're from back home . . that's what I didn't want as
well . if I brought Shama into my family I know how lonely she would be that's
another way of me not wanting to be with her" (lines 179-185). Mahir, in a similar
way to some of the young Bangladeshi men in East-Town, spoke of intra-community tension being rooted in history, and he too proposes that this attitude is first generational while young people are less discriminatory: "like you don't wanna sort of upset her in a way that by telling her that 'oh actually I'm seeing one of your . you know . I'm seeing the . the most . enemies'. you know . sort of thing, you know” (lines 79-81). Mahir was aware of the possible repercussions of crossing ethnic-borders, but he successfully used the commonality of religion to convince his mother about his marriage to a Pakistani girl:

MA: I've heard all the stories in the past as well. like Pakistani and Bangladeshi . you know . like people actually being murdered or what . you know . over things like that getting . and getting to know the . getting married . you know , with each other and sort of getting killed . yeah . I mean that sort of . I mean they have been killed . you know .
AR: Yeah.
MA: So I mean in that sense I could say I was lucky yeah . I think that's the main . more reason that I say . you know . I believe firmly on my religion and thinking that . you know . because mainly I've had that belief . you know like . Allah who we believe in you know has actually helped me . (lines 383-392)

[...] but I mean I did explain on the religion side . from the religion point that . you know . there's no harm in actually me marrying into Pakistani family . you know . she coming into a Bengali family . cause the religion says . you know . as long as we have one belief . you know . the . there ain't no problem . you know . with it . you know . as long as it doesn't . I mean it doesn't actually . er . have to be Pakistani or Bangladeshi . you know . I could . . you know . like with anyone I mean if they want to . if . if an English person is Muslim and there shouldn't . you know . shan't be any problem of actually you getting married to . you know . such a person . (lines 104-110)

Mahir was able to avoid any extreme ramifications, but Safi experienced these when he attempted to cross ethnic and sexual territory, which he raised with me in discussing intra-ethnic conflict at school. He indicated that tensions existed because the dominant group of Pakistani young boys did not approve of his 'tough guy' attitude: "[...] I think they probably thought 'oh let's try him out then let's see how hard he is'. and I think . you know . I think it was just . you know . it's just little kid mentality 'innit . that's . that's what it was'.” (lines 593-595). Stressing his bravado,
masculinity and strength, Safi claimed to have won all the fights he was involved in. In one incident where he said the majority of the school attacked him, he even said that it could not be classed “as a loss” (line 611) as “nobody’s been able to get a punch on me at all because I’m crawled on the floor and I think they were just punching and kicking each other” (lines 617-618). In Safi’s ‘presentation of self’ (Goffman 1959), his masculinity is presented as a threat to the Pakistani boys and he told this elaborate story in which he escaped physical harm when set on by a group of fifty boys. Coates (2003) argues that boasting and making claims about who they are and who they are not is typical of how men talk masculinity, and presenting themselves as heroic in winning disputes, bearing pain or coming through an ordeal and other such talk is central to the production of masculinity. In what he said to me, Safi was so intent on presenting such an image that he overlooked the exaggerations of his story and how I might respond to these; he was clearly concerned to convey that tough men do not feel pain, to the extent of saying things that were highly implausible:

SU: Okay, yeah I won. won all of them. it’s just one that I didn’t. well I won’t even class that as a loss. but that’s because I got jumped by at least. probably the whole school. about fifty odd of them. do you know what I mean. after school they all jumped me.
AR: Aha.
SU: Right but even then erm I didn’t feel anything. cause there’s like so many guys around me trying to punch me.
AR: Aha.
SU: Nobody’s been able to get a punch on me at all because I’m crawled on the floor and I think they were just punching and kicking each other [both laugh]. You know what I mean (lines 610-618)

Humour is Safi’s way of diverting attention away from the implausibility of his story, together with his lack of attention to detail. When probed over the
circumstances leading up to this fight, he very reluctantly confessed he had made advances to a Pakistani girl and, significantly, then immediately retracted this:

AR: Why did they all jump you for?
SU: Erm... I don't know. Apparently right, erm... I was... I was. I made a move on someone's sister or something. I don't know.
AR: Aha.
SU: I can't remember.
AR: Oh right.
SU: Right but that was like... a long time ago. But as far as I know and when I was in West High, I don't think I ever did. Right. I think one of the things is it's mainly cause it's Pakistani. All and you don't know. I don't know anyone. You know what I mean?
AR: Right.
SU: You don't want to do anything silly like that. You know what I mean?
AR: Right.
SU: Cause in Asian families everyone from one way or another are family aren't they.
AR: Right.
SU: Do you know what I mean?
AR: Yeah.
SU: Every, you know, erm... I got. I mean you could be. You could even be probably related to us.
AR: Yeah I know.
SU: You know what I mean?
AR: Yeah I know what you mean.
SU: That's how it is ain't it with the Asian families... so you don't say or do anything... you know what I mean?
AR: Aha aha.
SU: Right especially in a new school. But I think it was just an excuse just to. You know. Get a. Get a punch in on me. That's it. Nothing else. (lines 623-48)

Here, Safi had crossed boundaries of territory and community by flirting with a Pakistani girl, which both attacked the honour of Pakistani young men at his school and also brought into question their masculinity. Goffman (1959) suggests that in presentations of self and performance, events can often contradict what people openly vow, which can lead to humiliation and loss of reputation. In Safi's attempts to save face in his interview, he called upon shame and the risks to honour regarding dating and flirting with young women and shared family and community links to dismiss any responsibility for the fight. This is a nonsensical rationalisation as the cultural codes, and the impact of shame and honour that Safi refers to is actually only significant within-group and within-community, and indicates that there is more to
these events than he is saying. Safi was possibly humiliated about the events and once realising he had admitted to his actions he then tried to retract or rather explain away his statements. As with any story, it is impossible to be sure of how true a narrated depiction of events is and one can only make assumptions about the likelihood from assessing the teller and the story. In Safi’s case, he may have been testing out the possibility of a cross-cultural relationship, but now denies this in embarrassment, although it is certainly possible that, as Safi suggests, this provided an opportunity for the young Pakistani men to exert their masculine power and territory at the school.

The research findings from the interviews I carried out suggest that the young men’s experiences of intra-community conflict, territory, and powerful cultural stereotypes, all inform their understanding of masculinity. However, the experiences of Bangladeshi young men in East-Town differ somewhat to those in West-Town, because they are perceived as possessing an effeminate form of masculinity connected to their lower height, slighter build and diet, which is also connected to ‘power in numbers’ and the comparatively smaller size of their community in comparison to the Pakistani one. From the comments of some of the Pakistani young men in West-Town, it seems that Bangladeshi young men locally in West-Town may have successfully negotiated a more powerful version of masculinity, although I think more research would be needed to properly assess this. Ethnic divisions and territory are also scripted through the practices of power and control over women that are available for young men, even though in West-Town there is an assumption, mainly supported by the stories they told me, that Bangladeshi and Pakistani
communities here have become more integrated through their mutual experiences of racism.

VIOLENCE AND CRIMINAL ACTIVITY

"It is no secret who commits the vast majority of crime. Arrest, self-report and victimization data all reflect that men and boys both perpetuate more conventional crimes and the more serious of these crimes than do women and girls" (Messerschmidt 1993, p1). Differences in higher rates of crimes for boys can be largely attributed to the fact that boys and girls are taught to behave differently according to gendered social codes, with the emphasis on boys acting tough and rough. Consequently behaviours that are violent or criminal are often excused as natural masculine behaviour and as a fixed aspect of social reality (Whitehead 2002, Brittan 1989). Although violence and aggression are predominantly seen as masculine and acted out by men, violence is not inherently masculine, most men are not violent, and women can be violent too (Segal 1990, Andersson 2008). Messerschmidt (1993) notes that there is no single standard of being a man, and he argues that the capacity to use violence does not automatically and necessarily imply the achievement of masculinity, just that for some men an easily available technique of validating masculinity is the use of violence, such as fighting, as proof of 'proper' manliness.

The perceived need for men and boys to be or at least to act tough impacts on the experience of many boys. However, toughness for ethnic minority young men can involve a display of a particular kind of masculinity, which brings together ethnicity, age and violence with physical vulnerability in other parts of their lives.
Racism is related to male aggression and identity and not just vulnerability, and it has been suggested that the focus on racist violence often neglects to recognize that being male is part of the way racist violence works (Goodey 1997), with some writers indeed suggesting that Black masculinity is articulated and shaped specifically as a response to racism (Majors and Billson 1992). South Asian young men were once perceived as victims of crime and racism and were admired for their restraint in dealing with such things (O’Donnell and Sharpe 2000). However, the development of a more macho culture has shifted from quiet and uncomplaining to militancy (Brake 1985, Webster 1997). White and Afro-Caribbean young men have spoken of Pakistani young men’s aggression (Goodey 1998), turning the earlier victim stereotype on its head, and in some ways the toughness of Asian boys has been seen as legitimized by the abuse they have suffered (Goodey 1998). But contra to these views, Alexander (1996) challenges the construction of Black masculinity as merely a reaction and resistance to white racism, seeing it as rather the search for control and as an aspect of social location; while Archer (2001) argues that this theory can be equally applied to young Muslim men and the style of masculinity among them.

As I noted earlier, the perception of ‘South Asian’ and especially Muslim young men has been changed by events such as the Rushdie Affair, September 11th, July 7th and other terrorist attacks where Muslim young men have come to be associated with global terrorism, fundamentalism, and behave in aggressive and criminal ways. The reinvention of the Black folk devil draws on a racialised masculinity centred on violence and machismo, attributes which once were seen as characterizing Afro-Caribbean men and distinguished them from ‘South Asian’ and especially Pakistani and Bangladeshi young Muslim men (Alexander 2000, Modood
This change in perception coincides with the increase of young Pakistani and Bangladeshi men’s involvement in criminality, drugs, violence and other forms of disorder, which media reports identify with the rise of the ‘Asian’ gang, supposedly modelled on African-American examples around baggy jeans, rap music, drug taking and dealing (Alexander 2000). Mawby and Batwa (1980) forewarned about the likely increase of young ‘South Asian’ criminality, because of low educational and employment prospects, although it was earlier assumed that aspects of Muslim culture and particularly close family ties would provide a supportive environment and counteract criminal tendencies (Goodey 2001). As I discussed earlier, Webster (1997) has defined five different categories of ‘South Asian’ young men around criminality (see Chapter One). He argues that it is the quality of the relationships parents have with their children which predicts the likelihood of delinquency and not the ethnicity of familial or parental culture, and he suggests that the root causes of South Asian criminality are generational tensions brought about by the breakdown of family control on young people, with their parents wanting to maintain control over them and the young people campaigning for change. However, my concern is not with the root causes of criminality, but rather the analysis of young men’s involvement in crime and violence and the performance of masculinity in relation to this, and here I find Webster’s ideas interesting and useful and an outline of my own categories of ‘South Asian’ masculinities, reworking his, can be found in Chapter Three.
Violence and Aggression: ‘You want a bit of me I’ll have a bit of you’

The interviews I carried out with the young men in the North-East and North-West, as earlier analysis will have made clear, evidenced that violence and aggression are crucial to the presentation and enactment, or reports of it, of a macho tough image. And although it was the Pakistani young men’s use of violence in particular which came to fore, I think that the lack of corresponding Bangladeshi young men’s violence is related to the particular young men that I came into contact with, rather than this being a more general feature. There were no differences across the two regions around the use of violence, risk-taking, and declarations of fearlessness and invulnerability, which are all widely practiced and normative elements of hegemonic masculinity (Connell 1995), present across the stories the young men told and especially those in Bilal’s, Qutuz’s and Jafar’s narratives.

Bilal’s presentation of his identity and masculinity is intrinsically connected to his use of – or at least his stories about – violence and he constructs himself as the epitomy of control and strength. Bilal’s story was long and complex and he provided some interesting data on violence and masculinity. Apparently Bilal’s life of crime began at the tender age of ten with his involvement in a gang of what he termed similar minded local youths who became involved in violence, fraud and shoplifting. A local youth worker who negotiated the interview with Bilal spoke of his violence and criminality and his position as a gang leader in the local area.

Bilal’s rationale for his involvement in crime and violence was clearly a much rehearsed story about a deprived childhood marked by a lack of love and support from his family. Moreover, this ‘sad tale’ (Scott and Lyman 1968) was told almost immediately when the interview began, and it was used to account for his
past, present and future and he presented his behaviour as a situation beyond his control (Sykes and Matza 1957):

BA: [...] they kind of had all the love and all the affection that I obviously wanted to have so
AR: from your parents?
BA: from my parents so obviously I looked for other answers. I think I tried to find them on the streets. know what I mean. and er my dad as I said was a labourer he was only on a limited amount of money. and obviously that was difficult for the family. so basically. when I was brought up I wasn’t really looked after properly. and then. I went to the streets for answers (lines 9-14)

Bilal’s use of the ‘deprived childhood’ discourse is made in an almost textbook way, with him rationalizing and glossing his behaviour as ‘looking for answers on the streets’, but never actually saying why and what these answers might be. This was used throughout the interview to nullify his accountability for his behaviour: [...] doing stupid things. pinching food and living life. well try to live life. try to live like struggle through. and basically I was looking for a different approach through all my life (lines 222-223).

Risk-taking and declarations of fearlessness and invulnerability are widely practiced and normative elements of some versions of hegemonic masculinity (Connell 1995) and these were attributes that Bilal continually represented himself as embodying. He emphasized things which promoted his strength, fearlessness, control, power and also the respect he gained through conflict with older boys and in particular fighting. His masculine pride and arrogance is implicit in his exaggerated claim that: “I think everyone knows who I am. everyone in East-Town” (line 336). The way Bilal sees the inter-connectedness of power and respect achieved through violence and aggression is very clear. This conception and performance of masculinity is fundamentally connected to his enactment of, or at least telling stories
about, aggressive masculinity. Certainly, the stories he told in his interview involved conflict, violence, defence of his honour and territory, all of which are connected with a particular and extreme version of masculinity. And although Bilal’s story-telling is ‘men talk’ in which, for example, boasting, making claims about self, emphasizing competition and conflict and acting alone, are typical (Coates 2003).

Bilal’s self-presentation can be identified as a conflict and violence version of what Majors and Billson (1992) identified as the ‘Cool Pose’. For example, Bilal’s self-presentation in the stories he tells is connected to his ability to maintain face under pressure and to earn respect from others, and this in turn is based on power and control. If he does not conform to certain expectations about his behaviour, then he risks losing his position; and if this happens, his sense of masculinity and himself as a man also fails, because both are intertwined. Like all stories, the reliability of what Bilal said in his interview as a one-to-one guide to actual behaviour cannot be easily assessed; however these most certainly strongly evidence the particular pose he embodies. One graphic story involves Bilal describing a clash with an older man, although he could not recall whether this was a physical clash: “hundreds of us went outside his house, smashed his windows” (line 187). The purpose of this exaggerated story is to evidence the power and control he exerts and the position he has requires. Bilal went on to say the same man also suggested a power deal, which he had rejected because it was outside his territory. For Bilal, and indeed all the young men I interviewed, masculinity is given context and is also circumscribed by specific location, and knowledge about the particular setting is crucial to understanding the variants of masculinity involved (Westwood 1995, Alexander
Clearly, for Bilal the enactment of masculinity is structured and contained by locality:

[...] I was going to take him outside and he approached us an hour later. He gans ‘you know what it is. I’m selling drugs in South-Town. I need a bit of back up’. I goes ‘hang on a second you’re fighting with us and now you need a bit of back up’. He gans ‘yeah you know these niggers, they gans they’re taking over South-Town’. He gans ‘you wouldn’t want that would you’. I goes ‘I’m not really bothered [...] its not my territory. Eastarea fair enough I’ll be bothered but not South-Town’ (lines 191-197)

Some of Bilal’s stories concern positioning himself as a ‘bad guy gone good’ around his pride in what he sees as turning his life around, which positions him in a ‘heroic position’ (Wetherall and Edley 1999) for achieving change and transcending a poor childhood and unsupportive family. This also involves stating his remorse for his earlier criminality: “[...] I don’t know how I slept the night looking back at it now. I actually mugged a lady, or a man. Beat him up took his things and went to sleep at night [...] I’m scared in case the future I don’t get a proper job cos of my convictions, which I’m not bothered” (lines 117-120). This is, however, combined with his continuation in local gang politics, which he then legitimates to me as the pressures of friendship etiquette and loyalty, but at the same time it is clear from his other comments that his sense of masculinity and identity more generally is so intertwined with violence, prestige and gang rivalry that he can envisage no other way of life:

[...] I still get into the odd fight, you know trouble. But I make sure it’s not my fault. I don’t look. I don’t go looking for a fight now. But if a fight comes my way, which always tends to do, that’s what I think, and then that will happen [...] friends do drugs don’t they, what can I say, and them get into fights and I get involved to be good n that, and sort things out. And I slowly slowly get dragged into it (lines 226-232)
Is Bilal alone and unique in this? Clearly the gang he refers to has other long term members, not just Bilal. And also, as their interviews make clear, Qutuz and Idris too were adept in defending their use of violence as a feature of friendship etiquette:

[...J someone’s like nasty to one of my mates, try pulling them away from it but, but the trouble follows you, you’ve got no other choice, you’ve got no other choice you’ve got to, you’ve got to protect your mates protect yourself... (Qutuz, lines 207-9)

In one story told by Qutuz, he described how he single-handedly defended his Bangladeshi friend, Baz, from Pakistani gang violence whilst others looked on, because “that just flipped me” (line 230). In telling this story, Qutuz not only elevates his own masculine stature but also implies that the Pakistani young men present a powerful masculinity when they are in groups, but because they: “barge” (line 301) in rather than “fight single” (line 301), with opponents being attacked only when off-guard and outnumbered. Like Bilal, Qutuz’s conception of men and masculinity incorporates such things as fearlessness, power and loyalty, and when other young men fail to embody these, this brings their masculinity into question for him:

[...J I mean I’m shocked that or... he couldn’t look after himself... I mean it is a bit of shock few guys coming up to you but... I mean Baz he’s really good in the gym, he like can lift more double weight than me... so for a skinnier lifting more weight than me... I do... in that sense... I would have thought he could have would have... done something to protect himself know what I mean (lines 317-21)

Fighting is proof of manliness, and even if a young man loses it still provides proof of his masculinity and ability to control pain. On this, Qutuz is quick to defend his manliness by dismissing injuries because he is prone to “easy nose bleeds and stuff”
and anyway he “didn’t feel nothing” (line 251). Indeed, the injuries are presented as demonstrating his fearlessness and his strength: “I had to. I hit three of them. but there was more coming. but I took er I don’t know if it was a bottle and took a whack there [indicates to side of forehead]. I don’t know if you can still see the bruise. this was like six months ago” (lines 242-44).

Idris’ stories of violence involved inter-Bangladeshi conflict with young men and he too legitimated his involvement through the demands of loyalty:

*First when I was young. when I was in year seven I used to get a bit scared. you know. you know because the other boys from Westworth they used to start on us. and after that I built my confidence and. you know. I said ‘you need to stand up for yourself’. imagine someone hits your boys or one of your mate at the front of your eyes. you need to do something. so after that. you know. I lost my fear. (lines 113-117)*

Through his stories of inter-Bangladeshi and territorial conflict, Idris was also involved in presenting himself as a tough young man and in one particular story he described how his friend was attacked by thirty Westworth boys (see Chapter Three). Like Qutuz, Idris was concerned with incorporating fearlessness, power and loyalty in his story and he claimed he took revenge for his friend but was himself later attacked for this, but of course he got his “own back” (line 71).

Rafiq was the only other young man to comment on inter-community clashes with young men and he recounted a complex story of violent clashes with local Pakistani young men involving guns and knives in which Rafiq and his brothers were unable to negotiate a powerful position and were rejected by local Pakistani networks:
RH: Yeah... what it was... a few years ago... some lads put... shot a bullet through a shop window...  
ERM... at that time we knew who it was and I ended up having a big argument with them.

AR: Through your shop window?

RH: Yeah... erm... my mum's shop window.

AR: Right okay.

RH: And at that time we had a... an argument with these lads... there were two from our area... one lives across from our house and one lives up the street... and a few lads from Westwick... and we ended up having a scuffle with them... and... all my own boys like... back turned on me... back turned on us... no one was there... and they were all backing the other lads up. (lines 626-634)

The circumstances leading up to these events were not clear from Rafiq's story but what is evident is that Rafiq's negative presentation of Pakistani young men is an attempt to divert attention from their rejection of him, which instead he presents as his own rebuffing of them and his subsequent reliance on Bangladeshi networks as a matter of choice: "the Pakistani lads they are like two faced... they will be nice to you when you've got summat but... when you haven't got anything they don't wanna be there for you" (lines 657-8), "the Bengali's are... if I get in trouble I phone them up and they are with me... straight away" (lines 654-55). These stories of violence, inter and intra-ethnic conflict posit that the alliances that young men make occur around notions of community, territory and age and can cross-cut ethnicity, and these are crucial to how young men envisage their sense of individual and collective identity and their masculinity and also help assert group loyalty and external difference.

Racism and Masculinity: 'Fuck off you Paki'

For some of the young men I interviewed, the racism they experience has become a general legitimation of the violence they routinely express or use. This is done, firstly, by presenting their actions as outside their control and formed as a result of and caused by their racist experiences; and secondly, it is done by them
insisting that the injuries that they cause are not wrong but a form of retaliation and punishment, given their own prior victimization (Sykes and Matza 1957, Scott and Lyman 1968, Alexander 1996, Majors and Billson 1992, hooks 2004). This was something that cut across ethnicity and region. For example, Bilal cited his very first criminal and violent act as the mugging of a drunken man who he said had been racially abusive, and the description of events that followed denying the man any victimhood and seeing his injuries as deserved. Bilal positions himself as the only victim, and justifies his and his friend’s behaviour as ‘caused’, because in response to racism (Scott and Lyman 1968, Sykes and Matza 1957, hooks 2004, Majors and Billson 1992, Alexander 1996). Bilal stated that he was not the “kind of boy who steps back . . . fair enough you want a bit of me I’ll have a bit of you as well (lines 403-404), with invoking racism he protects himself from all self-blame, the disapproval by others, and make his deviancy actually something else (Sykes and Matza 1957).

Waqar, Rafiq, Jafar and Mansoor also legitimated their use of violence through racism. Waqar spoke of being physically attacked by two white men and turned the focus to his age: “I was only young at the time n I was getting a smack from there n a smack from there n I was going to fight him n I got a punch from there which obviously dazed me” (lines 183-185). Powerful masculinity is presented as correlated with age and he proceeded this by saying when he was older he had “put them in hospital [laughs]” (line 182), justifying his violence as a response to the racism he experienced. Jafar too spoke about bullying and similarly justifies his own use of violence through his experiences of racism. In one particular story, Jafar
presents himself in super-masculine terms for physically responding to racial abuse from a much larger man:

JH: [. . .] so I had my car. I was coming, it's like on the main road you come and then turn off up a side street. Like a little side street it is yeah, and as I going to turn a white guy dropped. he was walking past and I stopped. And I gave him way a cause I was tired. I gave him way. I couldn't be arsed driving as well. I gave him way and then you know. I was being so kind to him. I stopped and gave him way and everything right. And I had my windows open, it was pretty warm as well right.

AR: Yeah.

JH: And erm he goes to me. he goes 'you Paki.' a racist comment. I didn't take no notice. honest to God cause I was proper tired. and then he come round and I had my window opened. and he goes 'you Paki bastards I hate you'. I goes come on then. I decided to put the hand brake on. I just flipped. my head just went the other way. I didn't think anything. come back. I just got out. I shouted him. I said 'come here.' right wouldn't come. shouted him again. wouldn't come. I shouted again come here he wouldn't come. he goes fuck off you pakis fuck off you paki' Jaha. was he by himself?

AR: Yeah he was on his own and I was on my own as well. but I had people behind me. they were just locking the shop up and that. and erm. he said. this guy was about six foot. he was about six foot. big lad and that. and erm. and I just ran up to him. I turned him around and I said 'come and say it to my face.' I didn't hit him. as soon as I turned him around he started you paki. I had to do it face to face with him and that. I go. he was sober as well. he was just a prick n that. I go 'come on say it to my face you idiot.' I was sat in the car he couldn't have done nothing then. and he was doing all this. you know. like moving his hands about and all that [shows karate moves].

AR: Yeah [laughs] yeah.

JH: honest to God, I was thinking 'shut up man.' I'm going to lose it, he just called me Paki. come on you might just do something. it might be a physical now. cause you aint going to walk, being serious you call me Paki and you think I'm going to just turn around and walk. It's just not going to happen. I'm gonna go down or you're gonna go down today and that. and he's doing all this and that. and then you know. it's like cause you're a martial artist and it just comes into your head. you know. what you are going to do to him and that. and it did and there was a wall there. honest to God there was a wall like the size of that sofa thing yeah. right and that. and he just come. so I took his hand and I broke his arm. wrist. I smacked it for him right so he couldn't do a punch. cause one of his punches, you know. he was a big lad. If he got a punch on me I would have been knocked. cause he's a big lad 'immit.

AR: Yeah.

JH: And I broke his wrist right and I gave him an upper cut right. you know. chin dig and lifted up a little bit.

AR: Yeah yeah.

JII: Right then I just turned round afterwards and like jumped up and kicked round like that and he goes flying over that wall and he's not conscious for half an hour and that. [. . .] I was tired at the time at the time I didn't want to fight. nothing. you know what I mean. I'm not a fighting person. but if they come I will do it and all that. but it was cause of racist comments. that's what happened (lines 592-643)

Jafar both constructs and envisages himself as a fearless, powerful, skilful fighter adept at responding to necessary situations, but what actually comes across is that he
did indeed ‘lose it’, that physical retaliation was not necessary, and his use of violence was to assert his physical ability and to confirm his masculinity in this situation. Jafar clearly practices situational tolerance or response, however, for regarding another incident, he and a friend refrained from conflict when they experienced racism at a local shopping centre, supposedly because responding would have been interpreted as “pakis started a fight” (line 695).

Rafiq too presents his attitudes and behaviour as in response to the racism he suffered as a child. He insists that whatever injury he gives is not wrong because of his own earlier victimisation; and his actions are presented as a form of retaliation or punishment. His violent behaviour is further explained away as triggered by alcohol. It appears that Rafiq’s bravado occurs in the presence of his friends, indicating his need to prove himself to others:

RH: I used to drink erm... and I used to drink and I used to be really racist.
AR: Oh right okay. racist to who?
RH: People. white people.
AR: White people.
RH: Yeah. I used to get really racist.
AR: Aha. why. why do you think that was?
RH: I dunno. just.... oh. I dunno. I used to always have a lot of problems in the school with English people. ever since I’ve always had like a grudge against English people.
AR: Aha.
RH: And I dunno. even till today if I have a drink now I’d probably go to the stage where I start kicking off at English people. I can’t control myself.
AR: Aha. so you don’t even have to know them?
RH: No just end up kicking off. they’ll look at me or something and I’ll say ‘what are you looking at’?
AR: Yeah. so does that get physical?
RH: It does.
AR: It does.
RH: Occasionally yeah.
AR: Aha.
RH: My mates stop me from doing that kind of stuff. (lines 36-55)

Similarly, in the interviews the behaviour of Pakistani and Bangladeshi young men in the ‘riots’ of 2001 are understood as being entirely in response to racism and
the inaction of the local police: “we didn't do anything right that day. but we did stick up for ourselves” (line 367), “the National Front and the Police against the Pakis” (lines 485-6)), and: “why not go and get all these people out of the pubs check their id and send them back home. you know what I mean. why not do that. why come to us. we live in West-Town. why tell us. cos we're from Westarea go back to Westarea. go back to Westworth or. why not say to these National Front fans that are sat inside these pubs yeah. that are stood outside these pubs yeah. to tell them to go home [...] go back to wherever they have come from [...] why did that happen know what I mean” (lines 451-57). And by focusing on the actions of the police, Qutuz shifts the focus of attention from himself and his friends wrongful behaviour and instead emphasises the strength of a common experience which transcended ethnicity, turf and territory: “we got told if you're not going to stick together don't expect anyone to help you this is the time [...] if you're going to forget this one they're. don't expect anyone to help you” (lines 430-35) and “people that never really got on together. were there working as a team” (line 560).

The riots are understood as being conflict between young men and the police, but the existence of a network of female help including over such things as the provision of bottles for petrol bombs and support is mentioned by Qutuz. However, Qutuz still positions women as requiring protection: “I wouldn't let my mum or my sister go to town cos I know that there will be some National Front [...] I wouldn't let my kid. my little kids or my missus or anyone got out. cos it wasn't the time I mean I was doing all the shopping. it did change things them days. we weren't exactly loving you know what I mean. so it was like all against us” (lines 510-16). Similarly, Jafar construes women as weak and in need of protection and men as
programmed to be alert and responsive to danger, and the ‘we’ of men is resonant in what he says: “what it was is nothing innit cause we are brought up here and we fight anyway [. . .] so we if anybody comes we would have done something anyway and that” (lines 98-99), implying an unspoken community alliance centred around honour and protection.

While physical violence is legitimated through racism, so too is verbal and aggressive behaviour. For example, Shazad narrated a story which he saw as involving racism towards his mother by a white woman. He had approached the woman for an apology on behalf of his mother and her non-response was responded to by his verbal aggression and the implied threat of something more, and this was specifically to instil fear into the woman:

[...] when I knocked on her window I said I want you to apologise to my mum and she locked the doors. the fear in her eyes [...] I said you shouldn’t say things like that you’ve got to be careful especially when you’ve got three kids in the back you never know what’s gonna happen it’s a crazy world isn’t it. I laughed and walked away. I’m a bastard I know (lines 606-614)

Shazad normalises and represents this as necessary for the protection of female members of his family: “if anyone says anything to me or about me I’m more relaxed if anyone said anything about my family then I react . . . if my mum if that person said it to me and not my mum . . . I wouldn’t have felt as aggressive . . I probably I wouldn’t have felt as aggressive I felt I want to protect my mum . and I’m not just gonna let someone just walk past and drive past in a car and say something like that to her . and just pull up nearby and pretend that it’s all normal” (lines 644-49).

Shazad further legitimates his actions although in a way which supports the idea that those positioned low in a social hierarchy pick on those lower and weaker than
themselves (Goodey 1998): “you know what. you only say it because you think you can get away with it. you only say it cos you think you’ll not get a reaction. maybe because every time you’ve said things like that up until now you’ve never got a reaction. you’ve got an Asian man standing next to you knocking on your window. you’ve got three children in the back of your car and now you’re fucking shit scared” (lines 607-11), but also and more extremely, “if my mum wasn’t there I’d fucking drag her out of the car and give her a punch” (lines 615-616).

Mansoor’s responses to perceived racism were similarly situationally judged: “if we think we can fight them we’ll fight them if we think we can’t then you just sort of shout something back n run away or throw something at them or walk away just take what they give you” (lines 226-228). And like Waqar and Rafiq, as he became older Mansoor began to enact greater power and confidence. However, his comment that “you can fight with your mouth as well and walk away” (221-222) indicates that control too can come with age and it is perhaps just as important to masculinity as is violence and aggression.

Jafar similarly represents himself as a protector and he also justified his violent behaviour in one story as being a response to the racism his father had experienced. Jafar’s father was racially attacked and in response to this, in company with his friends, he went on a violent rampage of beating “anyone and everyone” (line 236). Jafar provided a rather unbelievable story following this, proposing that when he learned the whereabouts of the perpetrator, he “blew his house up” (lines 240, 242). Like Shazad, he grounds these events in the view that male pride, honour and masculinity necessitates the protection of the family and therefore requires vengeance, and he makes claims not just about his own macho version of masculinity
but of all Asian men: "Asians said, you know, 'if you touch my family you are dead man'. you know what I mean. it's like even though someone says, you know, 'you touch my sister I'm gonna kill you'. it's true they are gonna kill you [...]. you know what I mean. right they say your family, your family is the most precious thing in your life. even though I don't live at home. I got my missus and that. but if anyone even said anything to my sister. my brother. even my dad. I will go. I'll even do life for'em. honestly I'll even kill'em. I mean I'll literally just buy a gun from somewhere and I'll kill em" (lines 253-61). But this apparent concern for familial honour also has to be interpreted in the context of his inter-racial relationship and the children he has who were born out of wedlock. It would seem that something more complex exists here, with the rules of honour being applied to others rather than himself.

**Territory and Masculinity: 'They're born with it'**

A territory provides the ground on which some versions of masculinity are enacted and the defence of such territory is related to strength and physicality (Connolly and Neil 2001). The streets are places of social inclusion and can provide geographies of social belonging (Matthews et al 2000, Sack 1986). But at the same time, control over space can take place on the basis of social markers such as gender, ethnicity, religion or residence, which are used to define boundaries of inclusion and exclusion, with young men affirming collective identities through their occupation of territory (Hall, Coffey and Williamson 1999). This can work to deter incursions into 'their' areas (Watt and Stenson 1998); and in the interviews I carried out, for these young men it is evident that ethnicity, gender and territory define boundaries of
inclusion and exclusion and their perceptions of identity and masculinity and the behaviour that stems from such. This cuts across regions and across ethnicity among those I interviewed. For example, in the incident (see earlier) that Qutuz narrated of his defence of a Bangladeshi young man called Baz, this conflict was rooted in both ethnic and territorial rivalry, with Baz originating from Westarea and the Pakistani young men from Westwick. The different codes of honour at work divided Raz and them and ensured their group loyalty: “even if they don’t like each other they’ll team up together cos they’re from Westwick” (line 298) based on internal loyalty and external difference. Territorial pride involves excluding those that do not have the right ‘credentials’ as outsiders, and removing potential threats can lead to open local and regional rivalries (Cohen 1988). Consequently, ‘South Asian’ boys and young men are not only adept in organizing themselves against the fear of racism (Webster 1997), but also to lessen the threat of intra-ethnic and territorial conflict, and this involves a street-style form of masculine conduct which is connected to safety in numbers (Watt and Stenson 1998).

Qutuz’s account, for instance, evidences a ‘nationalism of the neighbourhood’ (Cohen 1988) which is played out in relation to masculinity, identity and territory; it focuses on defence and offence, and the fear of violence and vulnerability increases in venturing out of the territory (Connolly and Neill 2001). In Qutuz’s interview, Pakistani masculinity is valorised through his descriptions of their clashes with Black men; this is significant because Black men are perceived as possessing and enacting a hyper-masculinity, with the Pakistani young men presented by Qutuz as being confident, powerful and aggressive enough to challenge them. Qutuz connected the confident masculinity of these Pakistani young men with
the powerful networks of the ghetto, the gang ideals and organized warfare, things they are ‘born with’, which in turn justifies and naturalises their behaviour: “with them nothing can surprise you know what I mean they’re like that. they’re born with that. they’re born with these problems. they’re born in the middle of these problems in Westwick” (lines 270-72). Similarly, Jafar too constructs Pakistani men from Westwick as embodying a hyper-masculinity and like Qutuz he identified this as connected to networks, groups and ‘safety in numbers’, and their violent behaviour which in turn ensures their reputation persists: “you know they’ll be the group that probably think they are harder than one guy. obviously if you’ve got ten there and you’ve got one person you are going to be harder aren’t you” (lines 138-140).

Idris narrated experiences of inter-community fighting and conflict between Bangladeshi young men, with those living in Westarea (his neighbourhood) clashing with those from Westworth, and which could be sparked off by anything from conflict over sexual territory or “dirties (dirty looks)” (line 13). Idris presented inter-community tensions and rivalry as inherited and such competitiveness as a normalised part of childhood, and suggesting that young men have moved on from these conflicts with age: “they have grown up” (line 83), however, often young men are unable to overcome the demands of loyalty and the divisiveness of territory, implying that it is central to their sense of individual and collective identity and their vision of masculinity:
Crime is gendered and the vast majority of crimes are committed by men and young boys of working class backgrounds, and this is argued to be strongly related to rising unemployment, with men lacking work as an outlet to express their masculinity and identity and so turning to violence, aggression and crime (Edwards 2006). Across both localities, drugs was a common topic that the young men I interviewed spoke about in relation to crime and territorial claim, and was clearly connected to the embodiment of masculinity for some of them.

Bilal spoke extensively about drug activity in his local area, and although he denied his own involvement in this, he did say that if ever he could not financially maintain himself then he would use criminal means to do so. Bilal linked drugs and criminality with a lack of jobs and education, and he also spoke of drug dealing as a relatively simple way of conforming to the cultural masculine conventions and family expectations of being the breadwinner:

[...] you tell your mam and dad you going to work, you don’t, you just mess around. do what you want during the day ya na. relax n that. and make your money selling drugs, give half your money to your mam n dad at the end of the week which you’re meant to do in Asian families [...] your mam n dad are happy they think you’re working and you’re giving the family money (lines 235-240)

Yasin too connected drugs to power and respectability, commenting that “everyone wants to be the man” (line 494), because wealth, status and power are potent signifiers of masculinity. He also criticized what he saw as the lack of legitimate
ways of achieving this. Rafiq was the only one of the young men I interviewed to admit to drug taking, and he attempted to absolve himself of responsibility for this through presenting an apparently causal time line of events. In this, racist bullying led to truanting with his brother and alone, which followed on to hanging around on street corners, the consumption of cigarettes and drug taking with his brother. Drugs here seemed to be the answer for Rafiq, and Seidler (2006) has argued that men can often turn to drugs as a way of controlling their emotions and helping affirm their identity by sustaining their image in front of other young men.

The violence and aggression expressed by the Pakistani and Bangladeshi young men I interviewed combines racism, ethnic and territorial divisions, and group violence and conflict. It is the Pakistani young men’s conduct which is more visible, while it is not clear whether Bangladeshi young men conduct themselves in a corresponding way but simply have less ability to express this because of their lesser numbers. But what these interviews show very clearly is that the young men of both Bangladeshi and Pakistani descent often utilize racism to absolve themselves of any responsibility for using violence or aggression against people who cross them, and some of them draw upon the discourse of ‘appeal to higher loyalties’ to defend their routine use of violence in their locality. Territory is highly important to all these young men, as it defines who is positioned as an insider and who is not, identities which are perceived in terms of conflicts and rivalries.

MARRIAGE AND INTIMATE RELATIONS

Marriage is an important institution in which men and women can enact and perform their gender roles. Marriage is part of a personal identity and masculinity
within this, because it involves the expected performance of behaviours informed by community and family as well as personal expectations tied to how being a husband and a man is understood. Marriage is expected to change men because after it they are expected to become responsible, to father children, to provide for a family and protect them, with men who fail in these respects seen as a bad husband and having a failed masculinity (Nock 1998). Indeed, Nock (1998) suggests that marriage is the way that most males become ‘men’, with the role of husband a core aspect of masculinity, because marriage “requires and venerates behaviours that are central to cultural definitions of manhood” (Nock 1998, p6). The husband is defined as the head of the family and the primary breadwinner and the wife as the homemaker; and it is men who benefit from marriage more than women. Marriage permits men to identify themselves as good or bad husbands because the standards of marriage are known to all. Good husbands are mature, faithful, good fathers, providers and protectors, and basically “good husbands are good men” (Nock 1998, p8). Marriage in ‘South Asian’ cultures involves the assumption and expectation of men providing for their parents and wider family while also exerting a level of control over their wife and children (Charsley 2005) and in Muslim cultures marriage is additionally related to duty and Islam (Haneef 1993, Samad and Eade 2003).

‘South Asian’ communities are often viewed as collectivist and white cultures as individualist, with the latter stressing personal goals and detachment from family, community and religion and having a strong emphasis on love and people choosing their own marriage partners. In ‘South Asian’ cultures, the family and community are all-important. Parents interpret it as a moral obligation to marry their children, and prospective partners are introduced by parents, the extended family or friends,
with this known as an ‘arranged marriage’, with the basis of matching usually ethnicity, religion, economic position, reputation, caste and education (Charsley 2007, 2005, Triandis 1995, Goodwin and Cramer 2000, Samad and Eade 2003). Arranged marriages are perceived not just as a bond between two people but as a match between two families; and this very often involves reinforcing existing kin-ties transnationally, with a good arranged marriage adding to a family’s honour and prestige and its social networks (Charsley 2007). Samad and Eade (2003) found that the social class and educational backgrounds of parents are connected to the degree of choice that is offered to their children and they suggest that ‘traditional’ arranged marriages are most common amongst the least qualified and the working-class. Reasons cited for arranging marriages to close kin is related to risk management; firstly, the family is known, and secondly, assessments can be made about whether the spouse will make a good match through consulting trusted referees in the kin group (Charsley 2007). In Charsley’s (2007) research on transnational Pakistani marriages, she found there was a belief that arranged marriages between young people in the UK were less likely to succeed, as young British ‘South Asian’ women are deemed less likely to adjust to the role of homemaker, and a spouse from the country of origin is believed to be more religious and traditional, which will benefit the children born of the marriage. Transnational marriages have also been linked to the perceived limited marriage pool in the UK and the difficulty in finding potential spouses of similar status and class backgrounds; and while there is a disposition to marry cousins, arranged marriages also occur outside the descent group (Samad and Eade 2003).
In western cultures there is a presumption that marriage follows falling in love, love is perceived as its core element, with emotional attachment underpinning its success or failure (Nock 1998). But in arranged and Muslim marriages, it is generally accepted that love will follow marriage, with the practical elements of the marriage underpinning success (Haneef 1993). Arranged marriages are often contrasted to love marriages in that in the event of marital difficulty a person will have the support of the family, whereas in love marriages they are less likely to, and also love marriages are equated to high levels of divorce. ‘Love’ marriages are accepted with some reluctance in ‘South Asian’ cultures, especially in cases where young men and women cross traditional boundaries in forming their relationships; and when relationships cross ethnic or religious borders (Goodwin and Cramer 2000, Samad and Eade 2003) or involve down ‘caste-ing’, they can occasion extreme resistance. Overall, there are few inter-ethnic marriages and specifically between Pakistanis and Bangladeshis (Samad and Eade 2003, Baumann 1996).

The issue of forced marriage has become the focus of both national and international interest and the Forced Marriages Unit established by the Home Office and the Foreign and Commonwealth Office deals with on average 400 cases a year (http://www.fco.gov.uk/en/fco-in-action/nationals/forced-marriage-unit) involving people who have been forced into a marriage or are at risk of one. A forced marriage is defined as where one or both parties do not consent freely and entry into such a marriage is accompanied by physical, mental and/or emotional duress and coercion from family members (Uddin and Ahmed, 2000, Symington 2001). Although the victims of forced marriage can be either men or women, most reported cases involve young women, and young men are thought to be better able to resist (Symington
It is often assumed that forced marriages are a religious practice, but no major faith condones forced marriages. Free consent is a prerequisite of Muslim, Sikh, Hindu and Christian marriages, and forced marriages exist in many communities and cultures, and ‘South Asian’ and specifically Muslim communities feel it has been used to stigmatise them (Uddin and Ahmed 2000, Gangoli, Razak and McCary 2006, Symington 2001, Samad and Eade 2003). Motivations for forcing a child into marriage are many and complex, including strengthening family links, peer group and community pressure, upholding perceived cultural and religious beliefs, controlling behaviour such as female sexuality and unsuitable relationships, honour, immigration and fulfilling a commitment to the extended family (Uddin and Ahmed 2000, Gangoli, Razak and McCary 2006, Samad and Eade 2003, Ouattara, Sen and Thomson 1998) some of which were present in the circumstances around the marriage or pressure to marry of the young men that I interviewed.

These young Bangladeshi and Pakistani men interpret marriage through a hetero-normative context and have specific cultural expectations of what a marriage entails, the division of labour and what is expected of them; and for those who were not married, the form of marriage they will enter and what they envisage family life to be like were involved too. The experiences and perceptions of the young men did not differ cross-culturally or across the two regions. In the North-East group, two of the young men were married and one had recently experienced a relationship breakdown. Six of the young men in the North-West group were married or in a relationship at the time of interview. Over both groups, two described their
marriages as ‘love’ and five as ‘arranged’, but it was evident that three were potentially ‘forced’ and a further one could be described as a ‘love’ match.

‘Arranged’ Marriages: ‘Family are happy then I’m happy’

Safi is the only young man from both regions to talk about having what is traditionally understood as an ‘arranged’ marriage. Safi’s marriage was arranged in ways noted by other researchers (Samad and Eade 2003, Gangoli, Razak and McCarry 2006, Charsley 2007); the suitability of potential brides and their families was explored by his family and he was then given an opportunity to meet the prospective partners. Safi normalized his experiences as a masculine responsibility in fulfilling family wishes and he agreed to marry his cousin, who he had initially rejected. I had some difficulties in categorizing Safi’s marriage because, although he perceives it as ‘arranged’, it shows some of the slippages between ‘arranged’ and ‘forced’ marriages (Gangoli, Razak and McCary 2006), because the emotional pressure he experienced to fulfil family expectations could be interpreted as forced:

SU: [. . . ] cause it was quite a while back I can’t obviously remember my feelings and thoughts . all of it . but one of the things I do know is eh . I just think I went with the motions . rather than giving my time to kick back and think . cause . you know . with Asian . with Asian lads or girls . you know . when they go back home to get married . I mean they know what’s expected to them and what’s going to happen right . AR: Right . SU: And so on . you get me . so I don’t think you have . cause it’s already in your head . AR: Right . SU: You know . there’s only so much you can actually feel or think . AR: Right . SU: You just go through the motions . cause mentally you are already ready for it otherwise you wouldn’t have got on to that plane to go over . do you get me ? (lines 436-48)

However, as Safi comments, it is complicated. Young ‘South Asian’ people are born into a culture where a high level of duty and responsibility towards parents is
normalized, and this includes fulfilling parental hopes and aspirations by marrying an approved partner. And although emotional pressure is evident, the final decision was Safi’s and he chose to enact the role of the ‘dutiful son’: “And that was enough. enough for me. yeah. as long as me family. me mum and me family are happy then I’m happy. and then when I seen her on my wedding night I was like the happiest man in the world then” (lines 511-13).

‘Forced’ Marriages: ‘I said no it was no use’

Like Safi, Qutuz had been socially and culturally moulded into accepting that he would have an ‘arranged’ marriage and similarly he wanted to fulfil his parent’s wishes but would have preferred to delay his marriage. Qutuz categorized his marriage as ‘arranged’, although he spoke of the circumstances under which he married being “wrong” (line 77). Qutuz was deceived into travelling to Pakistan under the pretext of a family holiday, and he was then coerced into marrying at the age of eighteen. Research findings interpret parental motivations around forced marriages as a form of social control (Samad and Eade 2002, Gangoli, Razak and McCarr 2006), and in a similar vein Qutuz’s parents identified marriage as a way of changing him because he “was too wild or something” (line 50). Marriage would they thought curb what they interpreted as bad behaviour and encourage maturity and adulthood (Nock 1998), and Qutuz’s father was particularly responsible for coercing him into marriage: “[. . .] it was my dad. he used to take me out for early morning walks. and talk to me. so. and if I said no it was no use” (lines 60-1). Qutuz’s experience was one he clearly experienced as very debilitating; and while many men
like to position themselves as strong and in control of their emotions, Qutuz spoke of vulnerability and abuse:

[... ] we used to go out for morning walks, and the reason he used to take me on these morning walks, he wanted to say to me this is what’s happening but what was pissing me off like, I’ve gone Pakistan with my mum, my dad and two sisters, we were told we were going to buy land, so me, the family elders, was going to see some land, where we were going to build our mansion... and that was all I got told. So when we were there, I didn’t even know it was a one way ticket, so I didn’t know that. I didn’t have hold of my passport and I thought I was going there for four weeks and it were three half month. So it’s not. I mean... at that time I felt really bad about it. I mean I was young as well... but er now I look back on it, I still think it was wrong but I feel that, I don’t feel that, it was that bad. At that time it was. (lines 70-78)

Rafiq too had a transnational marriage in Pakistan whilst he was ostensibly on ‘holiday’. Rafiq spoke of his childhood as difficult, and a later involvement in drug abuse and alcohol consumption, which appear to be the catalysts for his mother wanting his early marriage: “when I got married I started calming down a bit” (line 194). As with Qutuz, he also interpreted his marriage as ‘arranged’ and the coercion he experienced took an identical form, the threat of him being left in Pakistan: “It’s like everyone’s pestering you to do this, do that, do this do that, and things, you don’t listen to them, what they going to do and leave me here, and you are in that kind of situation, and and I just thought I would get married, gonna get married one day or another” (lines 237-240).

Individual Perceptions and Slippages: Arranged or Forced?

Amar married at the age of twenty-three in Pakistan and entered into what he understood at the time as an arranged marriage. Amar was given the option to marry later or someone of his own choice and, conscious of the need to please his parents, he agreed to marry his cousin who also happened to be his brother’s sister-in-law, and it seems that this was because kinship ties would be made stronger and the
character of his spouse would already be known (Charsley 2007). Amar agreed to his marriage under some pressure, because he was mindful that his brother had been married a few years and his own was expected and his father's ill-health added a measure of urgency. Amar sees the final decision to marry as his, but what he recounted to me suggests that his marriage could perhaps possibly be termed as a forced one. Although he tries, he is unsuccessful in persuading himself that his decision had been correct and this decision had been his alone, and his sifting through events questions his free will, and also lends support to the view that a life story approach provides people with the opportunity to reflect upon their life and to give meaning to their experiences (Mishler 1991, Atkinson 1998, Miller 2000):

[...] I've got no like disappointment in it. but at that time it was probably the best thing for us to do. (lines 350-351)

[...] I was looking for my mum and dads health wasn't very good. I knew it was coming. once my brother got married. I knew there might be a chance for something like this. then my dad asked us he gave me good time to think about it. I had to think about it. and er I didn't see anything wrong with it. at that time (lines 358-361)

[...] was basically my dad asking me and at that time I had nothing planned. I wasn't thinking of anything else. looking at everything. I was in business at that time I wasn't messing about in school or something. erm. and I though that time would be best. looking back now I think I was a bit young at the time. you know. yeah but I'm ok with it (lines 374-377)

Amar's interpretation of his marriage has changed over time and his "yeah but I'm ok with it" is his current understanding, but it is hardly enthusiastic and is underpinned by his lack of choice and his utilization of the 'dutiful son' discourse. That is, he saw marriage as the next logical step in fulfilling his role after taking on responsibility for the business and the family and his attempts to deny that force was involved seems to be a way of salvaging masculine autonomy. What this raises is
whether Amar’s acceptance of tradition and his role as the ‘dutiful son’, which underpinned his marriage, is itself forced? This is difficult to answer, but it seems that initially Amar perceived his marriage as ‘arranged’ but with the passage of time he now questions this, indicating that the line between ‘arranged’ and ‘forced’ marriages can be unclear: “[...] but at that time I thought it was the best thing to do. I had nobody in mind so you know. I wasn’t forced into it or pressurised in any way. me my dad. I know my dad really well. me and my dad get on more than everybody in our house. so like. he was the one who asked us. look if you’ve got someone just be open with us and tell us. and I don’t think I would have had a problem in telling my dad in anyways. erm but the way everything was at that time. my dad was quite ill. he had had two heart attacks” (lines 392-397).

**Love Marriages and Relationships**

Like Amar, Dilshad also terms his marriage as an ‘arranged’ one but in his case it could in fact be defined as a ‘love’ match. Dilshad’s wife is a school friend he lost and then re-established contact with and they developed what he described as a close friendship. With her imminent prospect of marriage looming after her mother’s ill health, Dilshad approached his family about making a proposal for her hand in marriage. His definition of an arranged marriage is possibly connected to this parental involvement, but it is certainly not ‘arranged’ in the traditional sense where parents scrutinize prospective partners before recommending the final decision. I would label his marriage as ‘love’, as too did other people in the community, and Dilshad’s comments about this indicate something of the difficulties that love marriages have to endure:
[... they want to hear you deny, but they know they want to hear you deny so even if you deny, they know you're lying but I wasn't lying so I just admitted it oh yeah yeah, but they don't like that when you're admitting it, 'yeah that's fine' because I admitted it, admitted to a lie which I was making. that's what people wanted to hear but didn't want to hear. it's confusing but er it worked effectively so then people couldn't say 'oh look he's denying it he actually went out with her'. if I admit it oh yeah yeah they say damn he's admitting it so we've got nothing over him. so let them you know what I mean (lines 716-722)

Shame and honour are gender differentiated and affect young men differently from women. As a consequence, young men's families are relatively more supportive than women's concerning love relationships. For example, Rahman's family, as with Dilshad's, were concerned about honour and status in the community but were also supportive of his decision to marry his friend's sister, while his wife's family disowned her. And Mahir's family, who were also concerned about similar issues, were more supportive than his wife's family, who also disowned her:

[...] cause end of the day they actually, you know, cause I addressed it to the father. I said 'this is what the situation is' [...] I mean I did actually give them time (Mahir, lines 405-9)

[...] then my family found out and they said to me, you know, if you want to be with this girl bring her home, you know, then you know, so I took her home. she was living with my sister. then my family waited for a year, you know, they had no reply from the family do you get it, so they thought, you know, at the end of the day, my family said 'look we can't get you married off like this because, you know, with our culture and everything, people talk'. but I. I don't believe in all that stuff, you know. (Rahman, lines 139-44)

The difficulties experienced in love relationships were also spoken of by Jafar, with his comments possibly connected to his partner being of mixed descent and not a Muslim. Although his family have now accepted his relationship, they would ideally like his partner to covert to Islam but her family will not allow this. Love marriages between people who are born into the same cultural community may not experience the same level of resistance that cross-cultural relationships do, and this is connected to the perceived notion that marrying out is more damaging to
family honour. This was what motivated Mahir’s and also Shahin’s decisions to conceal their relationships from public and family knowledge:

[... so I mean obviously I kept it quiet. and presumably that’s the way. you know. my wife. you know. she did the same as well. cause obviously we knew now what the. you know. the conse... what the situation was gonna be like afterwards in our life if they do find out. so I mean we just left it at that and just carried on seeing each other (Mahir, lines 64-7)

[... very painful for her. thinking ‘oh my eldest son is doing this to me now’. I mean I. you know. from my. personal thoughts that. just. it’s just that I think my mother was more concerned about what the rest of the people in the area and the community. what they’re gonna be thinking about it. Like. you know. like you’re son’s got married to this. you know. Pakistan person (Mahir, lines 112-116)

SC: Shama’s mum n dad. n her brother. they’ve got no... what I did to her two years ago they’ve still got that vendetta against her... meaning that she was a burden in the family.

AR: How do you mean

SC: Cos er brother knew what I did parents knew what I did...

AR: what do you mean by what you did

SC: ] when I hit that lad[ AR: ] oh yeah sorry yeah

SC: He went back to Shama’s house n said everything [about Shahin’s and Shama’s relationship] n after that Shama’s life. last two years Shama’s life has been the worst ever n it’s my doing . (Shahin, lines 116-124)

Shahin’s actions had a damaging impact upon Shama’s honour and reputation in her family and the community, and once her relationship with Shahin was known about her family then forced her into marriage. This fits with the findings of studies about forced marriages in the UK, which have linked forced marriage to the desire of families and communities to control the sexuality of young people, especially where young women and men have relationships deemed unacceptable (Samad and Eade 2003, Gangoli, Razak and McCarry 2006, Uddin and Ahmed 2003), with marriage interpreted as a means of damage limitation.
Single Men and Expectations of Marriage

Young men experience dilemmas around the form of marriage they would like to have, because this can conflict with what the family demands. For example, Shazad’s parents are keen for him to enter an arranged marriage while he would prefer a love marriage, although he is aware that an arranged marriage would have benefits for both him and his parents. In an arranged marriage, a woman is more likely to succumb to the tradition of living in an extended family situation, absorb the role of housewife and take care of her husband’s parents. An arranged marriage has the potential to be less complicated, and the man concerned will retain love and respect from his parents and his authority in the household, while a love marriage may be difficult for his parents to accept and his parents may consider his wife to be of poor character i.e. a ‘loose’ woman. Interestingly, Shazad spoke of a love marriage as limiting his parent’s power, control and authority over his wife, because his wife would be more independent, outspoken and powerful in the knowledge that Shazad would have chosen her over his parent’s wishes:

[...I straight away from day one in a way I’m in the middle between my mum and her. and my dad and her do you know what I mean, but if I have an arranged marriage my parents always come first… not because. I think that’s purely because you’ve kind of conditioned yourself to think like that being Asian (lines 279-282)]

And although he presents his concern here as related to the authority of his parents, what comes across is that he is also concerned with his own position: In a love marriage Shazad and his wife would enter the marriage on the basis of a mutual and equal understanding of the person’s expectations, and if his wife was not amenable to playing the traditional housewife role he could not expect or demand that she should. Shazad’s dilemmas are also connected to the honour, happiness and stability of the
family: "sometimes it doesn't make a difference how strong you feel about someone but it would cause so much problem. so many problems that it just wouldn't work. there's so many sacrifices that have to be made and pain to be caused. so is this really worth it. and in the end. two three years down the line. my parents. I might hate the person. and why did I put my family and myself through that" (lines 346-350). Aware that love-marriages do not always work, Shazad opted to place his future into his parent's hands, who could then be held responsible if things went wrong:

[][...] then the concept of arranged marriage seems an easier way out. because if I don't have. it's safe a non risk thing in a way for me. a low risk thing. I'm taking some responsibility away but in a way I'm passing but of a back to my parents. if it doesn't work out cos she's this that n the other. well my parents chose her. it sounds. shallow but its true. erm. yeah so that's the way it is. (lines 358-62)

Dilshad's experiences bear out the dilemmas expressed by Shazad, because his mother lost not only power over Dilshad but also what she would have wielded over his wife if he had had an arranged marriage. What I interpret as Dilshad's love-marriage, what he sees as an arranged one, has similar implications to those Shazad described. There are practical consequences in the household because his wife is often at work and not fulfilling her expected role as a housewife and a 'good' daughter-in-law. This in turn has repercussions for Dilshad's position and role in the household, because his limited power over his wife in his parent's eyes brings his masculinity and his role as a husband into question.

Bilal faces pressures to marry including the threat of disownment and, like Shazad, he expresses a dilemma concerning whether to fulfil his parent's wishes or his own. Ideally, he spoke of wanting a love marriage:
That's what they say now. They say it all the time. If you don't listen we're just going to disown you. And it's not as though we need you anyway. We've got all the money we wanted now. And we've got two other sons and two daughters...  

So you think that might force you into a marriage  

Aye yeah. Aw you feel sorry for yourself, then hang on a second what am I going to do all for a sake of a marriage. But then again that marriage is gonna decide how I'm going to live my life the rest of my life know what I mean. So I've got to be careful. What to do. And I think these next few years is gonna be the hardest days of my life (lines 645-652)  

Bilal's parents, like many others, regard marriage as a means of controlling young people and bringing about changes in behaviour. His parents are keen for him to have a transnational marriage, which Bilal strongly disagrees with because he speaks of women from Pakistan being "breeding machines ... and keep the family izzat [honour] as it's called" (lines 281-282). Securing a child's marriage is a way of sustaining familial honour in the community because it signifies having dutiful children. However, Bilal does not appear to be particularly concerned with family honour, given his violence and criminality; and his suggestion that he might fake an engagement in order to give him time is difficult to digest:  

[...] I might get engaged to somebody but then that's taking the piss on like the girl. The girl that I'm going to get engaged to. So. Now I've started getting a conscience know what I mean (lines 635-637)  

Mansoor too faces pressure to marry. However, although he is certain he will enter an arranged marriage to please his parents, he rejects the traditional form of an arranged marriage which is common in Bangladeshi families, where young people often marry outside their kinship networks, because he sees this as giving him little assurance of compatibility, personality and honour:
MR: [...] it's not gonna be I know this guy down in London who's got a cousin nieces nephews' daughter in law. yeah who's ready to get married. n she's great y know n I'm like how do you know she's great. oh yeah but she's got a degree in this. aw yeah right great. n you know what she wear when she goes out. you know that she walks out with her head scarf n doesn't take it off at the bus stop. excellent dad you really know that don't you cos your cousin knows that because he's asked his nephew who's asked his brother in law who's asked his do you know what I mean. you don't know do you. you don't know who you're marrying. so I'm not into that but I'm up for arranged marriage if I meet somebody. then they can arrange it [laughs]

AR: [laughs]

MR: I'm only joking. I'm sorry [laughs] yeah that'd be good. I'd like to meet somebody or I'd like somebody like if my sister turned n said 'oh Mansoor y know I met this girl and she's great'. n I'd be like my sister she'd understand she'd. if she met somebody she'd be able to tell cos you can tell certain things can't you. my dad can't tell cos she'd saying aslamualaikum to my dad with her headscarf on looking down y know. he'd be like that's sweet n serving him tea when he went to the house n then she'd be out on the town dancing with me on a night out n I don't even know. know what I mean. naaah. so yes I am into arranged marriage n I would never upset my parents when it comes to marriage n stuff like that. (1208-1225)

Women: ‘They basically look after the house’

A division of labour that is informed by gender seems to cut across all cultures and it is generally accepted that women should invest more time caring for the family and the household and men should absorb the role of provider. This view cuts across the interviews of Pakistani and Bangladeshi young men in both regions.

Amar’s account of his household structure provides an example of this. Amar’s wife takes sole responsibility for looking after their child and co-shares the domestic chores with the other women in the household, while he maintains the business and manages the family. Actually, he comments that his wife would enjoy some responsibility in running the family business, while he prevents this because of what he terms as the protection of honour and preventing the ‘male gaze’, but which is actually the articulation of power and control. Amar rejects her involvement because of the presence of male shoppers and friends in the shop, indicating the strict gender roles prevailing, with work as the male domain and the home as female. For Amar, ‘allowing’ his wife to work perhaps would bring his masculinity and his ability to
provide for his family into question, which fits with Mac an Ghaill’s and Haywood’s (2007) ideas that “in some working class cultures men grow up to assume that being a ‘good’ husband involves being a good provider for your wife and children. It is through work that they can affirm their male identities” (Mac an Ghaill and Haywood 2007, p96). Many of the young men’s ideas about what women do as wives and mothers reflected their ignorance of the work involved as well as their lack of gratitude:

[…] they basically look after all the house and the kids n that. we’re all married. three brothers and three sisters all married. it’s all in the family married. and erm they just look after the house n stuff. and erm food n stuff like that. that’s like most of their day. even though there’s three of them in the house (Amar, lines 143-145)

Similarly, Qutuz and his wife divide the typical roles of provider and homemaker, while his lack of responsibility for his children and time spent on leisure is justified through his efforts of being the provider (Chapman 2004), something which Rahman also echoed. Rahman’s wife undertakes child rearing, looking after his family and parents, and his lack of respect both for his wife and her role, power and expectations are clear: “she is a bit slow. but it’s all. they know what time the food should be ready for. they’ll wake up and get it and they’ll get it ready for two. whatever” (lines 872-74) and the extract below not only signifies the authority he assumes in the relationship but that manipulation is also necessary to remain in positions of a dutiful son and a powerful husband:
"[...] and she was a bit annoyed you know what I mean like. no. I want my own space. you know, obviously I understand, you know what I mean. I'm not being selfish or anything. I know, you know. she's a British girl and stuff. you know what I mean. she needs her own space. but end of the day I told her, you know. my parents need me. do you know what I mean. you are here because of my parents, not because of your parents, you know what I mean. you are here because of me as well. but end of the day my parents give you this space, they gave you all this respect. you know what I mean. normally, you know. If girls like that, you know. people don’t give respect. you know what I mean.

AR: Yeah yeah.

RT: You know what I mean, so no I told her 'look at the end of the day I want you to live where I wanna live... so I went that day. didn’t say nothing. I didn’t know if she was going to move back in or not. you know what I mean. I weren’t there. I come back from work and found everything’s back in my house [laughs]. so, you know. we’re back in that house. you know what I mean. been home since then. (lines 240-254)

For Jafar, being the breadwinner is seen as particularly significant for his masculinity and role as a father, with kinds of employment which involve power dressing to project status being especially appealing to him: “I've always wore. from a young age I've worn smart shirts n that. you know. be smart. but come in these seven eight month ago [what he currently is wearing]. I never used to wear trackies and all that. none of this lot. I'm used to smart shirts or jeans and that. but I don't know. I just like that environment. you know going out smart and you wake up in the morning and you've got pack shirts and suits and all that. you feel good with yourself” (lines 779-83).

In my discussions with the young men overall about marriage and relationships, it is clear firstly that all men accept that they will marry at some stage in their lives. Secondly, although love-marriages are resisted by the family, young men receive more support than young women in securing the marriages they want. Thirdly, in spite of this young men experience considerable pressure to marry and are not always able to resist; and while some aspire to a love-marriage, others are willing to put their needs aside for the family. Fourthly, it is clear that the young men have confused perceptions about what are forced, arranged and love-marriages and some of them consequently find it difficult to label and understand their experiences.
Fifthly, some of these young men experience forced marriage in a way that is very similar to young women, where their liberty is put at threat in order to extract their consent; and while some research proposes that young men are better able to resist forced marriage, the young men that I spoke to were in fact unable to overcome the pressures of their family, family circumstances and the pressures of honour. Forced marriage comes across clearly as a way of controlling young people.

CONCLUSION: SOUTH ASIAN MASCULINITIES

Men (and women) are surrounded by expectations of how they should behave. For men, their identity is constructed in relation to the gender roles embedded in culture, but also there are ideas about how men should behave which cross-cut cultures. ‘Being a man’ requires the occupation of a masculine position and the embodiment and enactment of the characteristics of masculinity which prevail ‘locally’ and which effect how men experience themselves and present themselves to others. The dominant characteristics of masculinity generally involve being in control, heterosexual, tough, violent, a breadwinner and successful, a package which is often recognised as hegemonic masculinity. This is what is culturally idealized, which only a minority of men enact but which many others are involved in pursuit of, with the demonstration of such characteristics projecting and in a sense proving socially a man’s masculinity.

The young men that I interviewed were all pursuing aspects of hegemonic masculinity and also masculine ideals which are relational to their family and community ideas about proper masculine behaviour. Overall, I conclude that Pakistani and Bangladeshi versions of masculinity do not differ greatly from others.
However, some avenues for achieving masculinity are exclusive or perhaps rather highly normative to their community, in particular regarding the roles and responsibilities that a young man acquires and absorbs in the family. This is shared by both Pakistani and Bangladeshi young men and is closely connected to fulfilling the role of a ‘dutiful son’. The ‘dutiful son’ discourse demands from young men their devotion, sacrifice and selflessness by prioritising the family’s needs above their own, breadwinning, managing the family, looking after parents in old age and satisfying their wishes with regards to marriage. Embodying and carrying out these responsibilities provides a young man with status, respect and power in the family in line with their parents, and from my interviews it appears that those in this position enjoy good relationships with their parents.

The responsibility of the family is passed down from the father to his first born; and while typically it is the eldest son who is the successor, in their absence a responsible child who feels responsible will fill this gap and this hierarchical shift is likely to remain even when others return or male children come of age. Some of the young men like to envisage and represent themselves as the ‘dutiful son’ and they told stories which demonstrated this. It is evident from these stories that responsibility, power, respect and authority are connected to age and also to there being suitable opportunities to demonstrate they ‘are’ this. That is, it requires acknowledgement by others, and so the young men denied this recognition are in an ambiguous situation regarding conveying their masculinity and that they are ‘real men’. Researchers have commented on masculinity amongst Muslim men (Archer 2003, Alexander 2000), while my research indicates that this is rather more complex than has been detailed. In particular, although the ‘dutiful son’ discourse is a
normalized one amongst these young men, some of them are resentful of the demands it makes of them, although and significantly their protests are about the division of labour and practicalities, and not the hierarchical and powerful position they enjoy as part of this. Those young men who are denied or reject opportunities to be ‘dutiful sons’ are still aware of the pressures and expectations and they find other ways of enacting a ‘proper’ masculinity.

The community is to an important extent an extension of the family and it informs, regulates and demands that individuals fulfil the expectations of their roles and gender. And while all communities have prevailing ideas about how people should behave, in South Asian and particularly Muslim communities, gender and ethnicity combines with the unequal rules of honour and shame which are seen to govern male and female behaviour, and young people are socialised and pressurized into placing the honour and stability of the family above their own happiness. Honour and shame are extremely powerful in informing and instructing people’s lives, and they require conformity. These young men are very conscious of the need to uphold and ensure family honour in the community and this is integral to their understanding of masculinity.

The community is an imperative part of Bangladeshi and Pakistani people’s lives, and the existence of immense pressure in presenting a favourable image of themselves and the family to the community was expressed by all the young men across ethnic and regional separations. They are resentful that ideas about shame and honour restrict their liberty and their behaviour, but it is actually women who are culturally exalted as carriers of honour and are affected much more than them. The young men that I interviewed are aware of the differing rules governing male and
female behaviour and resent the values of shame and honour but fail to recognise and question their own involvement in this. Indeed, they are clear in accepting that part of performing their masculinity involves them actively ensuring that female members of the family do not dishonour the family name, and they do this through surveillance, control of their movements, policing their dress and controlling social networks they move in. Similarly, the young men try to ensure that their activities do not damage the family name, but at the same time quite a number of them are involved in culturally and religiously deviant behaviour, usually covertly. However, even those who are openly deviant are able to manipulate the differences in gender-related behaviour in their favour, because male deviancy is regarded as less damaging to family honour.

These young men experience the community as domineering, but also benefit from their family position in it, which helps them in expressing their masculinity. For example, Amar, Waqar, Naser and Qutuz enjoy the social and family networks they have in the community and spoke of these as exalting their power and authority. Significantly, it was Pakistani young men who emphasized the beneficial link between community, family, power and position, and my research data indicates that this is connected to the size of their community in their respective areas, the length of its establishment and the strength of village kinship networks. By comparison Bangladeshi young men such as Dilshad and Shahin spoke about their families being unable to reconfigure their position in the community arena because of a lack of powerful networks, but it is not clear whether this is the case for the Bangladeshi young men in West-Town as well. It is also important to note that some of these young men recognised that the community provided safety and security, which
enabled them to feel comfortable in enacting not only ‘ordinary’ masculinity, but also that powerful masculinity which exists in the presence and comfort of safety in numbers.

‘Community’ as a concept is widely used to characterize all ‘South Asian’ communities as part of one greater one. However, this makes invisible all the differences that exist around such things as religion, culture and ethnicity, and a shared observance of Islam cannot overcome great cultural differences. The use of terms such as ‘community’ or ‘South Asian’ conceals the tension and conflict which runs deep in the ‘community’ and which divides young men on ethnic lines. This conflict undoubtedly impacts upon masculinity and its performance. In both areas where I carried out interviews, the dominant ‘South Asian’ population is Pakistani. This appears to have had significant impacts upon the lived experiences of both Pakistani and Bangladeshi young men, including how they perceive and enact masculinity.

It is clear in both areas that Bangladeshi young men are perceived as being effeminate in comparison to Pakistani young men who perceive themselves and are perceived by some Bangladeshi men as being hyper-masculine. The Pakistani young men revelled in telling stories which represented Pakistani masculinity as embodying typical hegemonic characteristics such as power, strength, independence, machoism, loyalty, and some of them also expressed prejudiced attitudes and stereotypes about Bangladeshi people, being feeble, disloyal and weak. In East-Town, it is evident that some Bangladeshi young men aspire to emulate and embody the powerful and tough image of Pakistani masculinity, and some of them have resorted to extreme lengths to enact a similarly potent form of masculinity. In West-Town, it is not clear
whether the Bangladeshi young men have similar aspirations. Some of them spoke of Pakistani men enacting a more powerful and tough masculinity, but also some Pakistani young men suggested that Bangladeshi young men also enact a macho masculinity via their social networks. This suggests that the embodiment and enactment of masculinity can be a case of ‘who you know’, and also the territory one is in can enhance or destabilise a young man’s sense of masculine presence and be related to the use of violence and aggression. Interestingly, the young men in West-Town assume that differences and tensions between young male Pakistanis and Bangladeshis have resolved with the ‘race riots’, but Qutuz’s story about conflict between Pakistani and Bangladeshi young men, and the difficulties cited by Mahir regarding his cross-cultural marriage, indicate that such tensions still exist. The difficulties experienced in relation to cross-cultural relationships in both the North-West and North-East suggest that more general tensions between Bangladeshi and Pakistani communities are prevalent, and much of this is expressed through the women who are seen as available to young men and a young man’s masculinity and honour requiring the protection of ‘his’ women.

Violence and aggression are often perceived as part of masculine behaviour and certainly the perceived need to be tough permeates the talk of many of the young men I interviewed. As they told it, the use of violence reinforces their sense of their masculinity and presents them as ‘men’ to other people, especially other young men. And while it is Pakistani men’s use of violence and aggression that came to fore in the interviews, this may be connected to the particular young men, both Pakistani and Bangladeshi, that I came into contact with. The Pakistani young men who were involved in violence and aggression represented themselves as risk-takers, powerful,
fearless and invulnerable; and what I think is particularly significant is that their use of violence and aggression is neutralized and constructed as necessary under the circumstances, which implies that at some level they know violence and aggression to be inappropriate and need to 'explain away' how they behave. The young men were all adept at employing particular excuses for any use of violence and aggression, around such things as loyalty to their friends and responding to racism. Majors and Billson (1992) have suggested that Black masculinity is articulated as a response to racism. My research suggests that the masculine performances of these young Bangladeshi and Pakistani men is connected often indirectly to racism, but not for all of them. And those who use violence or aggression do so to evidence their strength and ability around behaviour which they believe will show them to be tough and brave, with this violent tough mode becoming pressing when it concerns honour, loyalty and the protection of family members. Also, some of the young men are involved in assessing situations for the chance to behave in ways which will enhance their masculine pose.

The role of the ‘dutiful son’ involves marriage in order to satisfy the wishes of their parents and who they want them to marry. Marriage is spoken about as an important arena where adult masculinity takes form, and this is reinforced by cultural and religious expectations that they will marry appropriately and live out a responsible and patriarchal form of masculinity. How they see the division of labour in marriage is informed by the general expectation that women will care for the family and the household, and men will have the role of provider, and this very binary approach is evident in both the Pakistani and the Bangladeshi young men’s interviews.
Children are taught from a young age that their duty is to conform to parental wishes and this is largely accepted across both groups of young men and the two regions. The pressure to conform has resulted in some of them entering marriages against their will in order to fulfil these obligations; but, significantly, although the young men concerned identified their limited or non-existent choice, they failed to identify that their marriages had been ‘forced’. And although it is often assumed that young men are better able to resist forced marriages, I found that the young men who were forced into marriage were mentally and physically coerced through the demands of their ‘duty’ to fulfil parental expectations and threats to their liberty, very much in the way young women are. The reasons for coercing the young men into marriage were primarily to control their behaviour as a form of damage-limitation to salvage familial honour, around the belief that marriage reforms ‘boys’ into ‘men’. Generally, I felt that these young men have confused perceptions about love, arranged and forced marriages and in fact their actual experiences of marriage confirm that there can be slippages between these categories.

Reading and analysing the narratives by the young men and the stories told within them, it becomes clear that they are motivated to select and tell stories which they think will depict them in a favourable masculine light, thus pointing up what they perceive to be ideal masculine attributes and behaviours to which they aspire. The young men’s stories convey how this masculine persona is lived out within local culture as well as wider community traditions and expectations, including around the ‘dutiful son’ discourse, upholding honour, and fulfilling expectations about marriage, all connected with masculine success. For example, in his stories Amar presents himself as very much devoted to his family and his role of the ‘dutiful son’, which
required him to marry according to his parent’s wishes. His masculine position is successful so long as he maintains his position in the male and family hierarchy through continuing his role of the ‘dutiful son’, but if he is seen to fail in performing his duties then he revokes those aspects of masculinity connected to his elevated power and position in the family. Also, it is important for some of the young men to be seen to be fulfilling masculine roles and responsibilities, because both this and telling others about their experiences and achievements confirms their masculinity to themselves and others.

While the young men are aware of the demands of their masculinity in relation to what culture, community and the family prescribes, they are also involved in the pursuit of a masculine identity through the use of violence and aggression. Through specifically selected stories, a number of them, including Bilal, Qutuz, Rafiq, Jafar, Waqar, Naser, Safi and Idris all represent themselves as very able to protect themselves and others and some of them indeed demanded admiration for their skilful use of violence. Interestingly, many of these young men were involved in telling stories which both elevated their masculinity but also minimised the responsibility for their actions. For example, in Qutuz’s story about the ‘race riots’, he was skilful in representing the events as entirely in response to the actions of others. Through the telling of stories around violence and aggression, these young men were able to represent their masculinity by identifying and conveying what they suppose it is to be typically masculine i.e. power, protection, violence, fearlessness, aggression. In short, all the young men were involved in the selection and telling of stories which they considered would demonstrate a potent masculinity which embodied both cultural forms of masculinity and also hegemonic masculinity,
through which they connected to violence, family responsibility, honour and shame, protection, the community, friendship networks, work, and love.

My research indicates that these Bangladeshi and Pakistani young men aspire to hegemonic masculine traits just as many other British men do, but also they share family and cultural ideas about a form of masculinity related to interdependency, interconnectedness and being dutiful. Being dutiful incorporates a number of prerequisites, including being responsible, looking after the family and their parents in old age, managing siblings, acting honourably, protecting the family honour through surveillance and control of female behaviour and their own, being diligent about any slurs or attacks on family honour and fulfilling their parent’s wishes about marriage. It is in these latter respects that Bangladeshi and Pakistani masculinity differs from that of young white or Black men.

My research has added to the debates and theories and filled in some of the gaps in conceptualizing ‘South Asian’ forms of masculinity. Other research (Archer 2003, Alexander 2000) has noted that South Asian masculinity is defined by family duties and responsibilities, but this work has failed to identify that this role is not somehow ‘innate’ for all men and that often young men are in conflict with and show antipathy towards it, as my research amply shows. The wider research literature has also failed to identify that not all men aspire to or are able to enact the ‘dutiful son’ discourse, and some are involved in pursuing ways of enacting their masculinity, including aspiring to western conceptions of masculinity such as independence. These men are considered and some identify themselves as failing to fulfil what is seen as masculinity in their cultural, and specifically their family, arena. Something else the research literature has failed to identify but which my research illuminates
concerns the processes whereby young men become ‘men’ in relation to their family duties, such as taking on responsibilities in the absence of elder siblings or the ill-health of their fathers. This patriarchal power is handed down and is not a collective venture amongst siblings, and a young man must be deemed of age to achieve and maintain a position of power and respect in relation to such responsibilities. My research also suggests that those who take on this patriarchal role have good relationships with their parents, although this needs further assessment. It also confirms Dwyer, Shah and Sanghera’s (2008) finding that the importance of the family is not diminishing, for family expectations continue to have a significant influence on young men. And while religion does emphasise the rights of parents and family duties (Yip 2004), the link between this and the enactment of the ‘dutiful son’ is not clear in my research. This may be because the young men accede to their duties unquestionably and do not connect the ‘dutiful son’ to religion, or else the interviews I carried out did not allow sufficient opportunity to discuss the influence of religion on their life because I allowed them to set the agenda for what we spoke about.

Research (Yip 2004, Salway 2008) has suggested that community is of most importance and significance to first generation ‘South Asians’, while my research indicates that it has similar importance for young Bangladeshi and Pakistani young men as well. Its kinship ties and social networks provide them with a sense of belonging, safety and security, both from the threat of racism and also from intra and inter-ethnic conflict; and the boundaries between groups within the ‘South Asian’ community and also outside it help police behaviour through ideas and practices concerning shame and honour. My research confirms other work (Salway 2008,
Alam and Husband 2006, Gangoli, Razak and McCarry 2006, Werbner 2007, Yip 2004) which has emphasized that shame and honour regulates behaviour and these control mechanisms police female behaviour more than male, with the young men policing the sexuality and movement of young women (Ramji 2007). The young men involved are behaving in similar ways to the first generation around gender roles (Shaw 1994, Archer 1998), including the expectation of female subservience and a binary division of labour. And although these young men do not experience shame and honour in the ways women do, and some like to deny its effects, nonetheless shame and honour unequivocally influences their autonomy and level of control over their lives.

What I consider to be a significant contribution to the debates around ‘South Asian’ masculinity concerns the dissection of ‘South Asian’ masculinity and identity in my research. I have evidenced that ‘South Asian’ young men enact and embody a variety of positions related to masculinity, and that Bangladeshi and Pakistani masculinities need to be understood as having important differences as well as similarities and should not be subsumed under a general category such as ‘South Asian masculinity’ or ‘Muslim masculinity’. My research also demonstrates that Bangladeshi and Pakistani communities are not in such harmony as is generally supposed. The young Bangladeshi and Pakistani young men I interviewed have deep-seated stereotypes about one another which objectifies and defines each other as different and unacceptable as men as well as members of these ethnic groups. Here specifically it is Pakistani young men who are seen and see themselves as hyper-masculine and powerful in comparison to Bangladeshi young men, who are considered weak and effeminate. My research also shows that Pakistani and
Bangladeshi versions of masculinity are formed and enacted in relation to each other and the Pakistani young men with some Bangladeshi young men are involved in helping them present a more powerful masculinity by distancing themselves from Bangladeshi young men as a group.

Few explanations have been offered for intra-Asian conflict and violence by academics, while the young Bangladeshi men themselves see it as rooted in nationalism and Bangladesh’s war of Independence. However, my research suggests that there are other factors at play here, including territory divided by ethnicity, the control of women and masculine rivalry around this, and constant intra-ethnic tensions which can erupt into violent altercations. It is clear that some young Pakistani and Bangladeshi young men aspire to hegemonic masculine traits such as violence, aggression, risk-taking, invulnerability, and the young men's use of violence and aggression is not very different from young white or Black men from similar backgrounds and class. However, many of these young Pakistani and Bangladeshi young men’s violent and aggressive behaviours are represented as a response to racism, often occurring in the past while at school, and this parallels the view in other research that ‘South Asian’ young men have become more militant and aggressive in response to racism (Webster 1997, Goodey 1998). This does not mean that all ‘South Asian’ young men enact a tough and aggressive masculinity, but those that do, do so more confidently around notions of a masculine and tough response to things that earlier generations just accepted (O’Donnell and Sharpe 2000).

Other research has explored experiences of marriages and especially forced marriages (Samad and Eade 2003, Charsley 2005, 2007, Gangoli, Razak and McCarry), and while my research contributes to these debates, it also points up the
processes by which young men are able to see themselves as achieving masculinity through the way that marriage is closely connected to the ‘dutiful son’ discourse and ideas about being a man. It also reinforces the findings of Gangoli, Razak and McCarry (2006), that there can be slippages between forced and arranged marriages, and also between what are considered to be arranged and love marriages. This suggests that young men have confused ideas concerning marriage and consent, perhaps because the prevailing style of masculinity does not easily allow them to see themselves as lacking in power and control. The stories they told show that in love marriages young men can experience more family support than young women in such situations, which undoubtedly is connected to honour; and while some of the young men aspire to love marriages, most are willing to sacrifice their own needs to satisfy their parents, again connected to being a ‘dutiful son’ and what they consider to be appropriate masculine conduct.

Archer (2001) has suggested that Alexander’s (1996) theory that Black masculinity is a response to structural inequality, a corresponding search for control and an aspect of their social location, can be applied to Muslim masculinity. I am inclined to disagree, regarding the first two points here. I do not think that Bangladeshi and Pakistani masculinity is a search for control or is specifically constructed as a response to racism, but certainly my research evidences that Bangladeshi and Pakistani versions of masculinity are shaped by their location and position in the family and community. ‘South Asian’ masculinity is more complex than other researchers have proposed and reducing it to simply family responsibility and duty (Archer 2003, Alexander 2000) fails to recognize that ‘South Asian’ masculinities are varied and that young men can occupy a range of masculine
positions. Masculinity for ‘South Asian’ men in western society involves a negotiation between different and to an extent competing discourses of masculinity; such as the ‘dutiful son’, the macho aggressive, while others are influenced by the independence of the white culture version of masculinity. And while some young men may behave in violent ways, they still seek to embody and enact family and cultural expectations of masculinity in ways, which range from being dutiful to marrying to please their parents, clearly indicating that their ethnicity is intrinsic to Bangladeshi and Pakistani young men’s sense of self and masculinity and the way in which their masculinities are embodied, articulated and lived.
CONCLUSION

YOUNG ‘SOUTH ASIAN’ MEN AND THEIR MASkulINITIES

Researching young men’s lives using an approach which uses a life story research methodology has been an interesting and valuable experience through which I was able to identify many of the observations noted by other life-story researchers discussed in Chapter Two in my own research materials. The aim of the this approach is to obtain stories about a person’s lived life, or aspects of it, and this approach allowed the young men I interviewed to become the authors of their stories through the ways they selected and shaped what was told. The stories that the young men told permitted me to explore and analyse how past events, experiences and relationships have influenced their life and current experiences; and what the young men included (and excluded, of course) told me in a powerful and direct way what they wanted to convey about who they are. Researching young men’s lives through this approach allowed me to better understand their lives, and even though their stories were sometimes fragmented and were certainly moral and thus partial accounts, they still told me a great deal about the social world the young men inhabit. Through this research experience, I was able to appreciate in a way what method texts cannot fully convey, that the meaning of experiences are best told by those who have experienced them. Each young man’s story is a clear statement of how he understands himself and the context he lives in, and what is told and re-told becomes visibly apparent and important. The stories that the young men told me point up what resources are culturally available for them, because it is these young men’s
communities and cultures which help shape their memories, stories and experiences and which provide meaning to these (Lawler 2002, Atkinson 1998, Gilbert 2002, Cotterill and Letherby 1993, Bruner 1990), including in relation to being men. However, I quickly realized that I could not straightforwardly accept the stories that the young men told me as referentially representation of themselves: I can only know what they tell me and there might be discrepancies between what they say and what they actually do. The young men chose to tell particular stories, these stories rely on memory and recall, the telling of an event or experience is always an interpretation, and a story is likely to be told in different ways to different audiences and in other contexts. It is impossible to assess the reliability and the truthfulness of the stories that I have collected in positivist or fundamentalist terms, I had to accept the stories as accounts, as these were what were available to me, and this is how I have analysed them.

Coates (2003) has commented, and my own experiences in life story collection confirm, that every aspect of story-telling is a motivated and strategic presentation by the teller. A life story as told is a constructed performance and the young men I spoke with only selected and told me what they wanted to reveal to me, a process whereby they wanted to persuade me that they are of a particular character and enact various masculine traits, and through this process of selective storytelling they then became in the eyes – or rather ears – of the beholder the person they were trying to depict. For example, Bilal was rather contradictory in articulating a set of stories which presented him as macho, aggressive, but yet also vulnerable and sensitive because of his childhood experiences and the pressures of marriage. The stories that Bilal told represented these characteristics but they were also evidently
about him explaining and justifying his behaviour and his life to another person. This process of collecting and researching young men’s life stories has enlightened me about these processes that people are involved in, in talking about their lives, and that all telling has a strategic aspect to it – a moral accounting. However, as researchers (Plummer 2001, Denzin 1989, Bruner 1990, Stanley 1993) have argued, stories have their own ‘truth’ at the time of telling and they provide an insight into the perspective and self-presentation of the teller. In my research, it became clear what discourses the young men subscribe to and how they interpret their experiences and their lives, even though in their accounts these might be different from how they were first experienced. For example, through the stories told by Amar about his marriage, it became very clear that Amar’s current telling of his ‘arranged’ marriage differs from how he actually experienced it at the time. At the time of his marriage, Amar interpreted his consent as free and willing but now questions the circumstances around this. The evident differences between his actual experience, interpretation and time of telling does not make the story any less valuable but provides a detailed insight into the cultural and social processes that Amar was influenced by, his varied interpretations of his experiences, the choices he made and his actual desires in relation to marriage.

Earlier in the thesis I discussed Pamphilion’s (1999) approach to the analysis of life histories, which I still think can usefully be applied to the analysis of life stories to help reveal the cultural specific processes that impact on young men. Her approach is important in stressing that researchers should focus on the individual processes of telling a story and the meanings embedded within this. The life story research method, like all other methods, cannot uncover ‘uncontaminated truth’ but it
does provide an in-depth way of understanding the world and the conceptual systems that underlie these young Bangladeshi and Pakistani men’s lives. And it is clear that the young men’s stories and narratives are contextualized within cultural and situational limits as to what can be said, heard and accepted as meaningful or nonsensical (Stanley and Wise 1993, Atkinson 1998, Lawler 2002). The local culture, community, religion and the young men’s ethnicity provides and shapes a set of understandings that give meaning to their life and their experiences, not least because their culture marks, shapes and constrains what stories can be told and the way it is told (Chase 1995, Gubrium and Holstein 1995, Denzin 1989, Bell 2003, Atkinson 1998). The stories that the young men told in their life stories were coherent, contextual and fitted the overall narrative and representation they aimed to produce; and it is by focusing analytically on the processes of story-telling and the identification of themes that it then becomes visible how individuals tell stories in ways that make their lives seem coherent and planned (Pamphilion 1999). All the young men told coherent, connected and motivated stories which represented a certain type of character, and here I found works by Sykes and Matza (1957), Mills (1940), Scott and Lyman (1968) and Goffman (1959) about self-representation and accounts particularly useful in realizing for example whether this was a depiction of a macho aggressive, family orientated or religious persona, and interestingly regardless of conflicting aspects of their accounts it was still important to them that they were perceived as decent and moral citizens and their references to religion were part of strengthening their claims around decency.

In researching the young men’s life stories, I became aware that researchers should not forget that the people we research are not just ‘voices’ but are real people
with real experiences and these experiences convey a great deal about their lives, their social worlds and the structures grounded within this. For example, the ‘dutiful son’ discourse is grounded in culture and religion and the young men I interviewed were born into this cultural and religious community and nurtured and moulded into interpreting and accepting that their masculinity is intrinsically connected to their responsibilities towards the family through cultural and religious doctrines. Young Bangladeshi and Pakistani men in a sense ‘inherit’ and certainly learn the understandings associated with the ‘dutiful son’ role, and the telling of their stories relating to this are communicated and presented in their stories and gives meaning to and legitimates their (as represented) experiences as correct. It is through the analysis of these stories that what narratives are possible and deemed acceptable for these young men comes to light. For example, for Amar masculinity is intrinsically connected to the ‘dutiful son’ discourse and his stories constructed him as someone particularly devoted and motivated by this, with subsuming himself within family responsibilities and marrying to please his parents part of this. He was unable to I think configure or visualize a version of masculinity beyond this. Analysing their stories reveals the young men’s particular interpretations of gender-related behaviour and masculinity which they perceive as connected to their duty towards the family, with those who articulate other forms of masculinity considered to be failing in masculinity.

School experiences were a starting point for many of the young men in telling about their lives. They may have assumed that this was a ‘safe’ part of life to start talking about in the sense of not revealing too much about their private lives. On the surface this may be true, but the school experiences that young men spoke of
revealed many masculine influences and pressures and variations in enactment. The school is an important site where racism can often come to fore and different versions of masculinity meet around this. In the school space, young men learn and rehearse their masculinity and compete against each other, whether this is inter-ethnically or with young men of other ethnicities. A common experience cited by the young men in relating their experiences at school to me was the experience of racism, ranging from subtle forms to ritual ‘Paki-bashing’. Verbal and physical racism not only targets them because of their visible difference but also because of their masculinity; and while the rivalry with white young men is a way of resisting racism it is also an active process of engagement whereby some of them performed a potent form of masculinity and carved out an ultra masculine space within school.

School was also important in establishing what forms of masculinity were viable for them in relation to their territory and locality, with the school space providing an arena where young men can rehearse the masculinity they aspire to embody and enact. For example, a Bangladeshi young man from East-Town is considered by others to be typically passive and un-aggressive and he is treated accordingly by Pakistani young men and defined as being uncool and effeminate. This management and positioning of Bangladeshi young men affirms the form of masculinity they are expected to enact, and the bullying of Bangladeshi boys sets up a process in which Pakistani boys are able to distance themselves from claims about effemininity, and enhance and prove their own aggressive masculinities. Although some young men I interviewed rejected the Bangladeshi stereotypical form of masculinity in favour of more dominant versions, they find it almost impossible to
escape the ethnic-masculine categorisations which can still inform the basis on which they are perceived and treated.

The Pakistani response to Bangladeshi young men is possible through confidence in their more extensive social and territorial networks, both within and outside school, and this 'numbers' approach confirms the stereotypes that these men have of each other i.e. Pakistani young men are aggressive and Bangladeshi young men are effeminate. Similarly, in West-Town a Pakistani young man from Westwick is stereotyped as being aggressive, violent and criminal and can be perceived accordingly regardless of whether or not he actively accepts this form of masculinity. In school, his territorial and social links buy him social capital and a version of masculinity connected to this. And while Bangladeshi young men in West-Town appear to be negotiating a more active visible masculine presence than young men in East-Town, they are still not able to configure a dominant form of masculinity similar to that of Pakistani young men.

The more aggressive and dominant versions of masculinity that young men enact in school has dramatically changed the image of the ‘behaiver and achiever’ (Mac an Ghaill 1988). Young ‘South Asian’ young men are now considered to be troublesome and the young men are aware of racist assumptions made about their masculinity, ethnicity and educational potential. Some young men go on to strive to shatter misconceptions about themselves while others conform to what is expected of them. While the assumptions some teachers in the past made about these young Pakistani and Bangladeshi young men were racist in effect, some of the basic elements of these assumptions are also connected to class and hence have many
similarities with the assumptions that teachers often make about white working class young men and their intelligence and lack of ambition.

The young men’s accounts were constructed through a range of selected stories which were frequently organized around epiphanous moments which allowed me to identify the particular routes that the young men had taken, the choices they had made and the ways in which their gender, ethnicity, culture and religion intersected, influenced and shaped these. For example, culture and ethnicity constrained and brought an end to the relationship of Shahin and his Pakistani girlfriend who, although themselves were not concerned with ethnic differences were unable to resist the pressures of the family and the power of shame and honour. Shahin succumbed to such pressures and interpreted it as his masculine duty to protect his girlfriend’s honour and subsequently encouraged her to marry according to her parents’ wishes. This is just one example from many of how the young men’s life stories were shaped, marked and constrained by their culture, ethnicity and/or religious content, and these experiences are specific to the biographies of ‘South Asian’ young men and differentiate them from other young men from different backgrounds. It is clear from the example above and many other stories that the young men told me that they often find it difficult to contend with their culture, identity, masculinity or ethnicity. For example, Dilshad and Mansoor rejected Bangladeshi masculinity and identity to emulate the more superior and macho masculinity of Pakistani young men, which negotiated, elevated and positioned them as more masculine.

In order to understand the ethnic identities and masculinity of Bangladeshi and Pakistani young men, the distribution and dynamics of power in the local context
needs to be understood, including how ethnic identity is simultaneously classed,
gendered and sexualized (Mac an Ghaill 1999), with little research having been done
to understand how such inter-relationships are lived in local, cultural arenas by
Pakistani and Bangladeshi young men. For example, distinctions are made between
an authentic/cool Caribbean masculinity and ‘other’ African masculinity, and
African boys who identify themselves as ‘Black’ are often ridiculed by
Caribbean-identified boys for possessing an identity which is less desirable and cool
(Archer and Yamashita 2003); and earlier I suggested that it is possible that there are
similar divisions and hierarchies constructed by Bangladeshi and Pakistani young
men. My research indeed clearly shows that Bangladeshi and Pakistani young men
position and perceive each other differently and the assumptions made about each
others masculinity is crucial in this. There is a deep-seated assumption of superiority
by Pakistani young men, who see Bangladeshi young men as weak and uncool, and
these stereotypes are clear in East-Town, perhaps because the Bangladeshi
community is considerably smaller than the Pakistani community. In West-Town
Pakistani young men are very much in a position of superiority and Bangladeshi
young men are active in negotiating a more masculine presence. However, power is
contextual and depends very much on the resources that young men can draw upon
through their social and territorial networks and which can also provide safety and
security. For example, Bilal, a Pakistani from East-Town, presented himself as
embodying and enacting a powerful aggressive masculinity in frequent altercations
with Bangladeshi and other men, and this appears to be made possible with the
support of a network of aggressive and similar minded young men. In comparison
Rafiq, a Pakistani from West-Town, was not able to present himself around a macho version of masculinity because he lacks connections with local powerful networks.

In Chapter One, I discussed masculine identities as gendered practices which are relational, contradictory and multiple, with there being a need to understand how Bangladeshi and Pakistani young men ‘do’ masculinity and ‘are’ men in specific contexts and to ascertain whether there are multiple forms of ‘South Asian’ masculinity and what these consist in. My research indicates that there are multiple forms of masculinity available for young Bangladeshi and Pakistani men to enact, but the variations which the young men can choose from are not so very different, with the greatest being by local area rather than by ethnicity, as discussed above. Bangladeshi and Pakistani masculinity overall does not differ greatly, with all variant forms of masculinity embodied and enacted through culture, ethnicity and religion. At basis, culture and religion prescribes that men should embody the breadwinner role, protect the family and enact their responsibilities towards their parents, siblings and extended kin – and these masculine requirements do not vary for Bangladeshi and Pakistani young men.

There are other forms of masculinity available for young men, either because some choose to reject the dutiful son/breadwinner role for an alternative stance or because this role is limited and unavailable to them. Young men in such positions might seem to be living in what is considered a more western form of masculinity with the emphasis on independence and ambition, such as Waqar, Naser, and Yasin. However, these young men are still importantly motivated by cultural and family expectations. So, for example, Waqar, Naser and Yasin may not be fulfilling the role of the dutiful son, but they are still greatly influenced by family expectations and
pressures to do well, which indicates to me that overlapping forms of masculinity are at play and can sometimes conflict with each other. For example, Rahman presents himself as a dutiful son, a powerful husband, a loyal friend, and the protector of honour, while the demands of being a loyal friend can conflict with protecting the honour of the family when friends engage in deviant behaviour, and this indicates that how Bangladeshi and Pakistani young men ‘do’ masculinity varies by context. Hence it is not sufficient enough to talk about ‘South Asian masculinity’ as there are various aspects of masculinity which constitute a version or form of masculinity which is localized and differs by context and over time.

Pakistani and Bangladeshi communities were once identified on the basis of ethnicity; however, this categorization, because of the effects of global and national events, has given way to community identification on religious grounds. Muslim communities are considered to be dangerous, troublesome, aggressive and fundamentalist, which undoubtedly has an effect on young men’s understandings of themselves as men and how they see masculinity. I agree with Alexander (2000a) that this religio-ethnicisation of ‘South Asian’ young men leaves them little space for difference, re-imagination and contestation. However, ‘South Asian’ men as an indistinguishable grouping is how many people perceive them; and within their own community, young men are enacting various forms of masculinity with varying degrees of difference. From the young men’s accounts, it is clear that religion is important to them, but at the same time their professed religiosity cannot be taken at face-value, and their involvement in religious activities is complicated. Seasonal religiosity, especially at Ramadan, is frequent among the young men, while their allegiance to religion is contradicted by various of their actions and beliefs.
However, it is quite evident that many of the young men’s beliefs are nonetheless rooted in religion and their guilt about deviant behaviour can be traced to this, so that religion still informs their lives in a complicated way. Religion is an inherent part of the young men’s identity and masculinity and they clearly belong to a collectivity and actively distinguish between themselves and ‘others’, however, for the young men that I interviewed, although religion in this contradictory way is part of their identity, it is not the core aspect of their identity or complete sense of themselves as men, with other factors such as culture and ethnicity also influencing and shaping their masculinity. Religion influences aspects of their life, but it does not encompass their whole way of life, and it certainly does not bind all Muslims and override differences. The Muslim community is divided along ethnic, cultural and doctrinal lines which become particularly visible when young men try to cross these divisions, and to assume that ‘Muslims’ are a homogenous group denies the fluidity of identity and the conflicts that exist within.

Arguments that suggest Muslim identity almost automatically deflects negativity and prevents low self-esteem (Archer 1998, Alexander 2000, Gardner and Shukur 1994, Vertovec 1998), are no longer viable, if they ever were, given the current climate in which Muslims are considered to be aggressive and dangerous. I do not think the young men’s references and allegiances to religion are motivated as a response against such negativity. It might be thought that a shift in public perception of Muslims might have a negative impact on their perceptions and enactments of masculinity in relation to their identity or professed religiosity, but this did not appear to be so. Moreover, most of the young men had conflicting ideas and practices concerning identity and which elements of it had primacy indicated by their
stories and references to ethnicity, religion and nationality. Self-esteem and religious identity for them are connected, however, to masculinity because even if they are not currently practicing, religiousness is something expected of good men, something which they aspire to be and believe they will become later in their lives.

Earlier research (Shaw 1994, Archer 1998) noted that members of the second generation adopt positions broadly in line with those of their parents and proposed that young men unquestioningly accepted patriarchal values and embodied these as positive and constructive ways of enacting ‘South Asian’ masculinity. My research indicates that both the views and the masculine enactments of second generation young men have changed. First generation ‘South Asian’ men were considered to be patriarchal and dominant in the family and cultural arena, but effeminate because passive and prone to victimization in the wider context. Second generation ‘South Asian’ young men are distanced from this and have an image and set of masculine behaviours which are still very much patriarchal and dominant but also aggressive, confident and street-wise. These young men inhabit a form of community within the larger community, in which ‘new’, for them more relevant, and contextual understandings of masculinity have been developed and are being enacted in response to a complex intermingling of perceptions of racism and inter-ethnic competition, violence and rivalry. The young men I interviewed still hold similar views to the first generation, such as gender expectations about women and honour, and although they might rebel against some of the values of their parents, in the long term they come to conform as the price of acceptance. They are very much aware of their masculine responsibility towards the family and the ‘dutiful son’ discourse is normalized, and while not all the young men fully enact this role, they are involved
in fulfilling aspects of this such as pleasing their parents around educational achievement or marriage choice. All the young men that I interviewed were of a working-class background, although some were socially mobile through their educational and work achievements, and it is possible and indeed likely gender expectations and familial responsibility may vary for young men from a middle-class and more educated background, perhaps particularly around street behaviours and routinised violence in their dealings with other young men. However, further research would be necessary to explore this, something I would hope to do at a later stage.

Part of the embodiment of ‘South Asian’ masculinity is being concerned with shame and honour and the regulation of female behaviour, something which has been commented upon by various researchers (e.g. Ramji 2007, Werbner 2007, Nagel 1998). This aspect of ‘South Asian’ masculinity is informed by the inter-related expectations of the family and community, requiring that young people place the honour of the family above their own happiness. The young men’s extreme consciousness of this and the tensions and strains of maintaining ‘face’ within the family, community and their social world, leads them to live semi-secret lives, in a bid to protect their family and parents from knowledge of their deviant behaviour by maintaining a respectable image in the wider community. Although these young men are aware of the pressures and demands of honour for themselves, it is actually women who are positioned as carriers of honour and are affected much more than men through restrictions to their liberty, dress and behaviour. The young men are very aware of this, and while many of them act dishonourably themselves they have no qualms whatsoever about their involvement in the control of women and wholly
accept that female regulation is a part of their masculinity. This indicates that an interconnected network of discourses around ethnicity, culture, gender and power are used by young men to construct a notion of masculinity. Macey (1999) suggests that the use of power and shame to control women is the mobilization of a particular interpretation of Islam. However, I am inclined to disagree with this because I do not think young men interpret the control of women as being an act of religion, not just because their understandings and enactments of religion are limited, but because young men have inherited the idea that this is natural and ‘how it must be’ and act upon this without any qualms because it is what is expected of their gender-related position and behaviour and is perceived as integral to their identity and articulation of masculinity. This perception does not differ from that of the first generation and I do not think that men’s beliefs around gender-related behaviour, assumptions about power, shame and honour will vary greatly in upcoming generations of young men from the same class backgrounds. Alexander (2000) has suggested that ethnic minority resistance to racism through masculinity may be grounded in the subordination of women. I disagree because I do not think that it is racism which motivates young ‘South Asian’ men to oppress women; they assume the legitimacy of this through patriarchy, as do all men from all classes, cultures and ethnicities. However, I do not reject the possibility that at times when young men are lacking other avenues for enacting masculinity that the control of women may appear to be easily available and fulfil a sense of masculine achievement.

Some studies have suggested that Black masculinity is constructed as a reaction and resistance to white racism (Majors and Billson 1992), with Afro-Caribbean boys viewed as super-masculine by many other boys by being tough
and intolerant of racism (Frosh. Phoenix and Pattman 2002, Nayak 1999), with elements of Black masculinity being admired and adopted by ‘South Asian’ young men (O’Donnell and Sharpe 2000). Earlier in the thesis I asked to what extent Bangladeshi and Pakistani young men have adopted forms of Black masculine style, and whether Bangladeshi and Pakistani masculinities are constructed as a response to racism. It is not altogether clear from my research whether Bangladeshi and Pakistani young men do admire or are adopting Black masculine styles of behaviour including in response to racism. Violence and aggression are generally perceived as a part of a particular style of masculine behaviour, with those who are particularly tough or aggressive considered to be more masculine, and it is certainly clear from my research that Bangladeshi and Pakistani young men do aspire to embody traits such as violence, aggression and toughness.

It is in my view too restrictive to construe Pakistani and Bangladeshi masculinity as simply a response to racism, because masculinity is a complex matter and treating it as one-dimensional does not allow the identification of masculine performances entwined with other aspects of men’s identities and experiences. It is evident from my research that there are many variant forms of ‘South Asian’ masculinity at play and which are available for young ‘South Asian’ men, and it is also clear that ‘South Asian’ masculinity can be a response to inter-ethnic rivalry and prejudice. My research distinctively shows that Pakistani and Bangladeshi versions of masculinity are formed and enacted in close relation to each other and that versions of masculinity are localised. My research throws light on understanding the various positions that ‘South Asian’ young men can enact and embody in relation to being a man, and although Bangladeshi and Pakistani young men are often perceived
as being the ‘same’, they need to be understood as being diverse and different with context being very important in this.

Young ‘South Asian’ men can indeed be seen to be constructing their own hybridic forms of identity and masculinity in relation to their locality and neighbourhood, with their commitments and loyalties being negotiated and reconfigured within and across community and territorial spheres. For example, young Pakistani men from Westwick are particularly identified as being aggressive and violent by both young Pakistani and Bangladeshi young men in West-Town and in the wider area. This hyper-masculinity that young Pakistani men can embody is intrinsically connected to territory and grounded patterns of inclusion and exclusion on the basis of ethnicity and gender. This ‘nationalism of the neighbourhood’ (Cohen 1988) provides a safe space and a sense of belonging and is crucial to the young men’s sense of masculinity and identity. The safe space that young Bangladeshi and Pakistani men occupy allows them to access social networks which lessen the threat of racism, intra-ethnic and territorial conflict. Those that are not seen to have the right credentials to fit into the neighbourhood are deemed to be outsiders and potential threats, which can lead to rejection and rivalry. The safe spaces within what is identified by young men as ‘their’ neighbourhood provides an arena in which specific forms of masculinity can be enacted, having their own patterns of inclusion and exclusion and positioning masculinity in relation to this space and identity in a way that then becomes normalised and expected. For example, young Pakistani men from Westwick have a reputation for aggression and violence which they then have to sustain; as Cohen (1988) comments, “You become an ‘Eastender’ by demonstrating that the ‘East End’ belongs to you” (Cohen 1988,
Bangladeshi young men in West-Town can be identified as enacting a powerful aggressive masculinity within the safe bounds of their own territory and community, as evident in the narratives of Idris and Qutuz, but they struggle to do so outside this. And Pakistani young men appear to be hyper-masculine both within and across their territory, but this is only possible with the support of strong bonded networks and outside of this they can experience a loss of masculinity, indicating that contextually men can be more and less powerful and powerless.

Part of the process of researching and writing this thesis has been to assess whether or not Pakistani and Bangladeshi young men are developing a more aggressive style of masculinity, and I can safely state that, yes, they have developed a more confident and dominant form of masculinity which has shifted on from the masculinity that was and is still enacted by first generation men. This more visible and confident presence of Pakistani and Bangladeshi young men is connected to the growth and expansion of communities and young men’s spatial awareness and control of their locality and territories. It is quite evident from my research that there are similarities between Bangladeshi and Pakistani young men’s behaviour and those of other young men from other different ethnicities and communities who are of a similar age, education and class background in their efforts to occupy and mark local territory. And similarly these young Bangladeshi and Pakistani men conflict over space and sexual territory, which again does not differ from the behaviour of white or Black young men of a similar background.

Unlike the first generation, the young Bangladeshi and Pakistani young men I interviewed identify the locality in which they live in as ‘home’, a ‘home’ which at times needs protection from racists or outsiders, and some of them justified their use
of violence through their experiences of racism. The violence and aggression that Bangladeshi and Pakistani young men enact is also a process whereby they mark out their territories to outsiders from within the ‘South Asian’ community. However, not all men enact violence and aggression and other masculine processes are at work and are used to identify and position each other as different, for example, the territorial control of women and social networks.

Researching young Bangladeshi and Pakistani men has demonstrated that the use of violence is crucial to how they define and position masculinity and themselves as men. Most of them made references to the use of violence in dealing with racial conflict and with other men, and what seems clear is that the prerequisite to prove masculinity physically seems to diminish with age and maturity and they seek other ways to enact their masculinity, such as work, education or conforming to family expectations. Young Bangladeshi and Pakistani men are not very different from young men of other ethnicities in relation to their use of violence and aggression, their forms of protest, their defensive and offensive tactics, their occupation of space, and behaviours which display and confirm masculinity. What distinguishes these young Bangladeshi and Pakistani men from other men are their cultural and religious heritage and their related understandings of how to ‘be a man’. Cross-culturally, men share similar notions of how to behave as a man which requires the enactment of particular types of behaviour. My research indicates that Bangladeshi and Pakistani young men aspire to typical hegemonic masculine traits, just as other young men do, of similar backgrounds but they also have culturally specific ideals including interdependency, interconnectedness, being dutiful and vigilant about shame and honour, which set them poles apart from other young men and makes
clear that ethnicity is central to the way masculinity is conceptualised and how masculinities are embodied, articulated and lived.
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Appendix I

East-Town: Pakistani Young Men

Naser

Naser was my first Pakistani interview participant. He was twenty four years old and single at the time of interview. He described himself as a Mirpuri Pakistani with parents who are divorced. Naser lives with his mother and siblings. At the time of interview Naser had recently established his own business and was thinking of expanding his franchise.

Naser was keen to talk about himself, his achievements and his life. He came across as proud and arrogant, about both his own achievements and also his family, who he described as being an important part of the community in East-Town. Naser did not need much encouragement to talk extensively, but often switched topics in mid sentence. I found it hard to bring him back to any issue that he failed to clarify or discuss in-depth. Naser had no difficulty in expressing himself, but just jumped from topic to topic.

Naser’s interview started with (lines 10-20) a statement about relationships, his family and his grandmother, before we were interrupted. What follows is a typical example of Naser switching topics with little hesitation, because after this interruption (and there were many of them), he went on to talk about education (lines 24-29), work and aspirations (30-39), family (39-57), living away (61-64), education (lines 65-84), family (88-122), relationships (126-171), living away from home (172-183), religion (184-190), racism (194-265), Asian children (267-299), growing Asian class (302-312), terrorism and conspiracies (314-322), refugees/underclass (323-
Amar was the second Pakistani participant I interviewed. Amar was twenty eight, married with one child and was the oldest participant in the East-Town sample. He described himself as a Pakistani Muslim. He left school and took over the maintenance of the family business from his father and continues to run it. He lives in an extended family unit with his two brothers, their wives, children and his parents. Amar was a pleasant person to interview, but his responses often needed probing and it was clear he was withholding information, emotions and experiences.

The interview with Amar was shorter than the other interviews as it took place at his business premises and we were constantly interrupted. Amar's interview started with a brief explanation of how he came to run the family business and continued with his experiences of school (lines 15-47), his father (47-52), school (53-102), his take over of the business (103-108), family (109-153), responsibilities (155-181), religion (182-197), the neighbourhood (198-237), conflicting mosques (238-257), Pakistani/Bangladeshi tensions (258-292), racism, (293-322), marriage (323-
Waqar

At the time of Waqar’s interview, he was nineteen, single and living with his family. He was studying at a local University and had been in a relationship with a Hindu girl for four years. Waqar was working as a caretaker at the University halls of residence and described himself as also being a landlord and renting out property to local residents. Though Waqar was only nineteen, he came across as a very confident young person. He was open in describing his experiences; his emotions were often illustrated by his extensive use of expletives. Though he did not provide any label for his identity, he spoke about the Pakistani community and specific Islamic practices.

Waqar’s interview commenced with a discussion about his school life (lines 5-79), work (80-119), friendship circles (119-130), education and school life (131-150), violence and racism (152-194), family (201-216), drugs/alcohol (214-224), rivalry (226-229), Pakistani/Bangladeshi rivalry (231-240), violence at work/in East-Town (241-256), territory (256-280), Pakistani/Bangladeshi tension (282-295), Asians and crime (296-322), the growing Asian generation (322-326), alcohol/drugs (326-345), religion and homosexuals (346-376), alcohol (375-399), culture/religion (399-434), rehabilitation (436-455), experiences of those being rehabilitated (457-468), racism (469-494), inter-ethnic rivalry (494-501), friendship circles (506-514), girlfriend (516-532), city rivalry (534-562), alcohol/drugs (564-579), religion (573-628), racism (627-632), education (641-652), work (653-667), culture and
community (669-699), work (700-715), education (715-723), influence of external factors (728-741), marriage (742-762), responsibility (770-790), and the role of a wife (817-848).

Shazad

Shazad was my fourth participant, and he was twenty five, single and living with his parents at the time of the interview. Shazad was a very confident and arrogant young man and knowing him on a personal basis I found him to enjoy opportunities to be the focus of attention, with the length of his interview reflecting this. This personal knowledge had an affect on how I prompted and probed him for information. Also I often made assumptions about events, feelings and experiences, and likewise Shazad felt that he did not have to clarify or expand on descriptions of experiences. For example, at the start of the interview when asking him to decide where he would like to start his ‘life’, he asserted ‘you know about university’ to which I replied ‘no I don’t’ as I didn’t know ‘everything’ but he was adamant that I did with ‘yeah you do’ (lines 5-7).

Shazad’s ‘focused life story’ began with an experience that had changed his life, which was moving to the South (lines 10-15); and he went on to discuss the Pakistani community (16-20), changes within himself (21-29), community and family (31-95), marriage, relationships and family (97-147), family and responsibilities (149-255), marriage and relationships (256-361), religion (363-394), marriage and religion (396-413), school experiences (418-447), family and school (448-457), school, further education and friendship circles (461-499), experiences of racism (501-538), experiences after terrorist attacks (539-596), racism (597-687),
Pakistani/Bangladeshi tension (700-719), identity and conflict (734-751), friendship circles (752-771), identity and religion (772-802), children (817-829), the growing Asian generation and lifestyle (831-918), appreciation of life (919-932), independence (941-968). Shazad refrained from discussing anything too personal and avoided talking in-depth about experiences such as relationships. I felt this was because the interview was being recorded and he wanted to protect himself. When the interview finished and the tape recorder was switched off he spoke more intently about his recent break up with his girlfriend.

**Bilal**

Bilal was twenty, single and living with his parents at the time of interview. When it was suggested that I interview Bilal because of his notorious reputation in the local area, I expected to meet a large framed young man who would be intimidating. He was nothing of the sort, but slim, tall and on first impressions did not seem like someone who was known for his violence and fighting ability. Bilal was pleasant and seemed to enjoy the opportunity to ‘show-off’ and shock me with his stories and scars.

Bilal’s account of his experiences in East-Town almost immediately started with stories about his bad behaviour and violence (lines 4-5). I conjecture this was prompted by a conversation with the person who had negotiated my meeting with him, which was followed by a justification for his behaviour, his deprived family background lacking both in finance and emotion (5-18). This was followed by the events that led to his first involvement in gang activity (19-37), life changing experience (38-55), crime and violence (58-103), local drugs and crime (105-115),
mugging (116-123), Pakistani/Bangladeshi tension (125-177), fighting at University (179-204), shoplifting (204-224), violence, drugs, friends (226-241), credit card fraud (242-248), parents (250-256), religion (258-266), marriage (267-315), friends and crime (316-336), refugees (338-348), school experiences, racism and violence (352-398), racism (399-406), violent friend (406-428), involvement with the police (430-435), community (436-453), sisters (454-472), death of his uncle (473-481), community (482-491), identity (503-517), his most recent fight (519-550), drugs and territory (557-580), and Pakistani/Bangladeshi territory/tension (568-626).

The interview ended with Bilal when the library closed where we had met, and the conversation resumed in my car while he waited for a lift from his friend. The conversation continued with discussions about marriage and family (631-666), socialisation (666-673), change in behaviour (673-687), community cohesion (691-698), poverty/social class (697-719), crime and East-Town (720-742), drug activity and territory (732-792), and it ended when Bilal’s friend arrived with a discussion about guns, neighbouring cities and the drug culture (794-820).
Appendix II

East-Town: Bangladeshi Young Men

Dilshad

Dilshad was the first Bengali participant I interviewed and he was twenty five and married at the time. He described himself as being a Muslim and a Bengali and he was living with his parents and sisters in an extended family setting and was involved in community work when I met him. Dilshad was a pleasant young man to interview and he found no difficulty in finding a topic to talk about. He spoke extensively of experiences about racism and described himself as an anti-racist, but it was not clear what efforts he made in fighting racism.

Dilshad’s interview began with the changing dynamics of the community (lines 12-18), this was followed by racism (18-22), Pakistani/Bangladeshi conflict (22-24), racism in school and in the locality (24-96), the changing face of racism (96-137), a local racist murder and community work (139-150), friendship networks at school (151-172), Pakistani/Bangladeshi conflict (173-246), community and culture (247-287), parents and racism (287-290), struggles of life (290-304), religion (304-305), parents and racism (306-316), ‘safe’ areas and ‘no-go’ areas (317-342), friendship networks (344-351), balancing culture, life and religion (352-370), family and community (372-411), his difficult childhood and family (413-435), responsibilities (441-445), religion (445-448), his sisters and responsibility towards them (449-467), community (463-485), his sisters and his responsibility towards them (483-491), religion and identity (494-505), his father’s ill health (511-518), a fallout with a friend (516-536), sister’s marriage (537-546), lost weight (546-559),
marriage and family (560-624), responsibilities (625-631), events leading to marriage (634-671), marriage and changes in himself and wife (672-690), expectations and family acceptance of marriage (692-705), community response to marriage (709-742), relationship with his wife and in-laws (744-766), religion and identity (774-789), reflection on life, happiness and marriage (799-813), family and responsibility (816-842), position in community (843-854), self reflection (857-865), religion and politics (868-875), and Islamaphobia and racism (883-920).

**Shabaz**

Shabaz was the second Bengali participant to be interviewed. He was twenty five and single at the time of the interview and described himself as a Muslim. Shabaz was enrolled on a university course and was involved in voluntary work with the community when we met. He was living with his parents at the time and hoped to marry soon.

Shabaz was an enthusiastic participant and appeared to find enjoyment in the opportunity to discuss his life experiences. Shabaz was very organised and had written a list of things he wanted to tell me about, and referred to this list throughout the interview to make sure he had covered all his chosen topics. A very important part of his life was his religion and he spoke of his delight that the interview had begun in such a way that enabled discussion of this. The interview transcript for Shabaz’s interview is rather short as unfortunately I forgot to switch off the pause button when I turned the tape over.

The interview with Shabaz began with religion and practising religion as a child (3-30), university (31-38), his turn to religion and struggles with education
(39-61), the meaning of Islam (62-77), changes in himself and choices about Islamic practices (79-94), family (96-119), change in friendship networks (120-157), his brother and religion (160-170), music, film and religion (171-194), the positive influence of religion (195-201), self reflection (205-208), Muslims and media coverage (212-217), change of image (220-226), school experiences (231-246), friends at school (246-258), racism at school (262-284), reactions to racism (287-295), changes in experiences of racism (298-307), other experiences in school (309-345), Pakistani/Bangladeshi divide (348-387), youth exchange (388-417) and the neighbourhood, community and racism (419-439).

**Mansoor**

Mansoor was the oldest of the Bengali participants. He was born in Bangladesh and came to East-Town when he was two. He juggled with descriptions of his identity, sometimes calling himself Bangladeshi and sometimes a Muslim. Mansoor was involved in community and youth work and was living with his parents at the time of the interview.

Mansoor described himself as someone who had difficulty in talking about himself; however, his interview was the longest one I conducted, both in the North-East and the North-West. The interview started with discussions around school, racism, bullying and fighting (19-102), family responses and his brothers experiences of racism (105-139), other experiences of racism (146-167), experiences with the police (169-179), different responses to racism (184-191), racism (196-237), clashes between different areas and schools (237-261), friendship networks (271-316), Pakistani/Bangladeshi conflicts, friendship preferences and bullying (319-374),
family (376-384), bullying (383-391), friendship groups (393-405), changing points in life (407-423), bullying again (430-456), interest in girls (454-469), friends (470-489), experiences in Bangladesh (497-563), community (591-610), left home (612-623), experiences at work and changing friendship networks (637-670), left home and community response (679-697), learning to drive at thirteen (698-717), family responsibility and experiences while growing up (719-775), family honour and his misbehaviour (775-789), his brother’s bad behaviour, family and community (800-841), distance from Asians (844-856), religion (853-862), identity (866-901), 9/11 and 7/7 (903-915), image (929-947), youth exchanges and experiences (950-1033), relationship (1034-1041), personality (1050-1063), community gossip and young men’s attitudes to girls (1064-1093), the community attitude to him (1103-1112), identity and flexibility (1116-1134), work experiences (1144-1174), marriage and its possible impact (1177-1190), religion and beliefs (1190-1193), youth work (1195-1205), marriage again (1206-1226), youth work again (1229-1242), and his future (1242-1251).

Shahin

Shahin was twenty five at the time of the interview. He did not offer any description of his identity although he spoke of the community and Bangladeshis. My interview with Shahin was negotiated by a third party, and we were both very surprised when we met that we already knew each other.

The interview with Shahin was an extremely difficult and uncomfortable one to conduct. Shahin was very emotional about his recent break up with his Pakistani girlfriend, and this became the primary focus of what he chose to discuss. I also
knew Shahin’s girlfriend and he commented that if I had been a stranger he would probably have discussed other issues, but because he knew me I had triggered emotions and memories which were still very raw. The interview ended when we had to leave the coffee shop where we met, but the conversation continued in the car as I offered to take him home and this was also centred around his girlfriend.

Shahin started talking about his experiences of living in the North-East with how he first met his girlfriend and the speculation about their friendship (7-18), and this was followed by friendships and cultural boundaries (20-27), the marriage of his girlfriend’s sister and his supportive role (27-38), the marriage of his girlfriend and its effect (40-53), events leading up to the marriage (53-77), marriage and his feelings towards his girlfriend (79-90), family and community response to their relationship (97-119), the damage to his girlfriend’s honour (119-126), painful memories (126-131), others efforts to damage girlfriend’s honour (135-148), anger at his girlfriend (152-156), regrets and divorce (154-173), other people’s influence on the relationship (172-188), attack on his girlfriend’s honour (191-203), the husband (203-222), closure and turmoil (223-262), his girlfriend’s future (262-268), the husband and his girlfriend (277-296), religion and his girlfriend (297-315), his girlfriend and pressure on him to marry (330-341), implications of the clashes with girlfriend’s first suitor (342-359), the future for his girlfriend (359-372), the future for him (374-376), his current state (376-400), divorce (404-416), the relationship (416-426), the community and Pakistani/Bangladeshi tension (431-452), fear of future and feelings (454-472), support of friends (474-476), difficulty in coping (484-518), regrets (52-524), development of the relationship (546-555), difficulty in coping (561-567), his move to East-Town from the South (577-580), family conflict
friendship networks (595-599), community (604-615), identity (617-627), religion (625-646), reflection 646-650), school and locality (653-678) and experiences of racism (679-688).
Appendix III

West-Town: Bangladeshi Young Men

Mahir

Mahir was twenty eight, married with one child and living in West area, a Bangladeshi populated area of West-Town at the time of interview. Mahir lives in an extended family with his mother, brother, wife and child. At the time of interview he was in the process of setting up his own business. Mahir found it somewhat difficult to talk about his experiences but this was related to his admission that he had not read the information sheet prior to the interview. At the end of the interview he stated that he would have been more coherent and expressive with more time to collect his thoughts.

Mahir was a pleasant young man to interview but often needed probing to encourage depiction of feelings and events. Mahir is an acquaintance of my family and I have in-depth knowledge of his family and many of their experiences. A topic discussed at some length in the interview was his marriage to a Pakistani young woman, and the presentation of this relationship was narrated in way that minimised the tension in his family and the ill feeling towards his relationship. This is discussed in-depth in the chapter related to ‘Marriage and Relationships’. Mahir did not label his marriage but from my knowledge of his relationship I know it to be a ‘love-marriage’.

Mahir’s interview started with marriage and conflicts between Pakistanis and Bangladeshis (lines 5-35), the start of his relationship (36-59), his covert relationship and pressures of family and community (60-91), religion and his relationship (93-
110), his mother-community relationship (112-126), Westarea community (128-153), boarding school (155-167), segregated communities and prejudice (169-178), experiences with Pakistanis (179-185), no tension between Pakistanis and Bangladeshis (186-209), some tension between areas (210-240), relationship and his wife’s family (241-266), community (268-284), mother and response to relationship (285-297), religion (298-302), in-laws and their non-acceptance of the marriage (303-317), boarding school and commonality with Pakistanis (318-341), stresses equality (342-352), his non-conflict personality and racism (353-383), the aftermath of his marriage (384-416), his wife and mother’s relationship (417-425), his son (426-446), the race riots (447-482), equality (488-496), and racism (497-513).

Safi

Safi was twenty seven and married at the time of interview. He had recently moved away from the extended family unit and was living alone with his wife. Safi is an acquaintance of my brother, who helped me to negotiate the interview.

Safi was convicted for his involvement in the ‘riots’ of 2001. Safi was a pleasant man to interview and initially he was quite conscious of the tape recorder. Safi married in Bangladesh shortly after the ‘riots’ and described his marriage as arranged. Safi asked that I come to his house for the interview and I knew his wife would be present. His wife chose to sit through the interview which I found quite uncomfortable even though she understood very little of what we were talking about.

Safi found it difficult in talking about his experiences in prison, but he chose to start the interview with the ‘riots’ (lines 10-41). This was followed by family support and relationship (45-83), riots, events, fear for family, involvement (84-156),
work experience (158-167), involvement in riots (169-177), marriage (179-186), his arrest (190-197), events at the time and leading up to the riots (199-236), his conviction and fellow rioters (238-280), his experiences in prison (282-427), marriage (428-519), Pakistani and Bangladeshi areas/conflicts (549-687), little conflict with white children (688-699), Asian passengers on his bus (703-734), community (735-817), prison (821-835), work (836-844), prison (848-863), marriage (867-912), family (914-923), prison (924-958), reflection (962-973), prison and racism (980-1018), neighbours (1020-1037), identity and culture (1046-1094), and a local youth project (1096-1112).

Rahman

Rahman was twenty three and married with one child at the time of interview. He was living in an extended family unit with his wife, child, parents and brothers. Rahman is also an acquaintance of my brothers, and they helped negotiate the interview with him. Rahman was twenty when he married and like Mahir, Rahman did not label his marriage but it was clear from his experiences and description of the relationship it is a ‘love-marriage’. At the time of interview Rahman was working in the catering industry and had been since the age of sixteen. Although the interview with Rahman went rather well, I was somewhat uncomfortable with some of the views he expressed about women and gender roles.

Rahman's interview started with a brief introduction (lines 1-20), drugs in West-Town (22-34), change in responsibilities (36-44), school experiences, regrets and reflection (45-91), pre/post marriage relationship, family, community (92-219), family (222-301), his child (303-317), marriage, family (318- 368), community (369-
Idris

Idris was eighteen at the time of interview and this interview was negotiated by Rafiq, a young man I interviewed for the Pakistani sample. Idris was living in an extended family situation with his parents, brothers and his sister-in-law. Idris was studying at college and had had part-time jobs in the catering industry and he was in a relationship but did not discuss this at length. It was quite difficult to interview Idris as his responses were of a very short restricted nature and he needed constant encouragement. At the end of the interview, Idris said that he wasn’t feeling well and his attendance had only been at the request of Rafiq and his acquaintance with my brothers, but I do not hold his ill health accountable for the poor interview but saw his inability to express himself as connected with his age.

Idris’s interview started immediately with his experiences about violence and fighting in school (lines 3-28), and this I believe may have been influenced by his
discussion with Rafiq about the interview with him. The interview continued with rivalry and conflict with other Bengali boys (30-88), a fight with a white boy (90-99), weaponry (102-111), fighting as a child (113-117), Bengali vs Bengalis (118-133), Pakistanis vs Bengalis (134-141), a fight with white boys (142-153), friends, drugs (154-171), studying (172-181), community, gossip (186-214), drugs, territory, (215-308), his future and marriage (314-339), relationship, marriage (342-382), ambitions (385-391), alcohol, family (393-446), drink/drugs (448-474), changing youth, drugs (477-516), regrets and future (517-541), friends, territory (549-586), riots (587-632), Bangladesh, ill health (637-708), racism (709-784).
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West-Town: Pakistani Young Men

Yasin

Yasin was twenty two and the youngest of the West-Town Pakistani group and my interview with him was negotiated by my younger brother. At the time of interview, Yasin was single and was working for the family business. He had a degree but wanted to return to University to study law, both to further his career and for the benefit of the family business. Yasin was living with his family but had recently bought a house as an investment for this future.

Yasin came across as a confident young man who found enjoyment in speaking and vocalising his experiences and opinions. This was shown by his eagerness to start the interview, and I was unable to switch on the tape recorder in time before he started talking about his experiences of living in different towns and cities and youth provision (lines 1-16). This was followed by discussion of his old friends and street corners (16-27), West-Town and attitudes (28-44), young Asians from other cities (46-56), football, racism (58-84), perception of West-Towner's, the riots (86-104), wasted talent (104-112), school experiences (115-137), brothers, fights (138-148), education changed his views (150-158), responsibility (160-167), young people, role models, school (171-191), ambitious, family business (192-224), friendship networks (226-237), work, home and community (239-266), university (279-309), past university experiences and community differences (310-436), West-Towner's (438-454), a friend and university (456-485), West-Town boys, drugs, (488-581), recent fight in Westworth, territory (582-714), territory and fights (715-
Jafar

Jafar was 23 at the time of interview, living with a partner and had two children. His partner is of mixed race descent and Jafar has been with her for a few years. He is hoping she will convert to Islam, as do his family, but there was some animosity from his girlfriend’s family in preventing this. Jafar was a pleasant young person to interview and though we talked about various topics he spoke very strongly about his girlfriend’s family and their interference in his relationship.

Jafar’s interview started with a discussion about his opinions about differences and similarities between East-Town and West-Town (lines 16-36), the riots (36-141), moving away from West-Town, lack of opportunities (142-165), bad behaviour, drugs, school, family (169-198), Pakistani/Bangladeshi friction (199-228), events leading up to the riot (230-247), family (249-266), leaving home (267-283), marriage, girlfriend, family (284-348), family, his girlfriend, religion (349-382), his girlfriend and converting to Islam (383-441), his girlfriend’s sister, cultural comparisons (440-451), family, his girlfriend’s place (452-491), his girlfriend, religion (493-516), Asian girls (519-530), siblings (532-559), bullying, his most recent fight, racism (567-643), honour, sisters (644-661), fighting (662-686), racism (687-702), children, girlfriend (716-739), his return to education, work (741-791), friends (793-808), neighbourhood, community (809-846) and interests (848-857).
Qutuz was twenty seven and married with two children at the time of the interview. He married in Pakistan and labelled his marriage as ‘arranged’ but it was evident from his descriptions that it was a forced marriage. Qutuz had a very busy schedule as he was managing many of the family businesses and the interview had to be conducted in the early hours of the morning and his participation was only out of courtesy for his friendship with my brother. Initially the interview was quite difficult as Qutuz’s responses were short and limited, but once the interview was underway he visibly relaxed and became more descriptive. However, the interview had to be cut short due to my brother’s insistence that Qutuz had work in the morning, but I had not found Qutuz eager to leave and he appeared to be enjoying the interview.

Qutuz’s interview started with a very brief outline of his life (lines 5-6), marriage as a life changing experience (8-110), a death in the family, friends (111-152), religion (154-172), family (174-188), friends (189-195), violence, fighting, solidarity, conflict (195-338), riots, involvement, the events leading up to the riot, racism (340-495), (interrupted) events leading up to the riot, police, riot (506-558), someone else wrongly accused for Qutuz’s involvement in the riot (560-642), and his father’s support (647-653). We were interrupted a number of times by my brother checking on the progress of the interview as he wanted to get to bed, and this obviously affected the flow of conversation. I think Qutuz would happily have continued, firstly, because he was enjoying it and secondly, I think he would have been too polite to suggest an end to the interview.
Rafiq

Rafiq was twenty eight and recently separated from his wife when I interviewed him. I was quite nervous about meeting Rafiq as he was one of the first friends of my brother who I was interviewing. I had some reservations about the way I was recruiting participants, and that their perception of me as a friend’s sister which could impact upon the interview situation and the data that I collect. Though it may have affected what Rafiq (and what others) chose to tell me, I was still able to collect data of much interest and it was the longest interview I conducted with the Pakistani men in West-Town. Rafiq was a very pleasant person to interview and he did not shy away from talking freely about his marriage and his children and became visibly upset by this discussion. Rafiq like Qutuz was clearly forced into marriage, but he chose to refer to it as arranged and like Qutuz he had gone on holiday to Pakistan when he was coerced to marry. Rafiq is currently living with his mother and was running the family business when I met him.

Rafiq’s interview started with a brief chat about his background (lines 3-10), the focus of the interview (11-19), experiences on the streets, mugging (20-29), marriage (31-33), alcohol and racism (34-57), racism in school, networks, fear, bullying (58-112), brothers, truancy (114-123), street culture, drugs, stealing, (124-190), marriage, his relationship with wife, divorce, his family and their interventions, his children (192-425), his relationship with his brother (427-436), the stress of his situation, missing his children (438-467), his wife’s role, accusations of affairs (470-510), alcohol, violence and family support (512-540), his relationship with his children (541-600), divorce (602-616), community and conflict with Pakistani young
men (619-647), Bengali friends (649-662), community, gossip (664-692), conflict and violence with Pakistani young men, a court case (693-760), Bengali friends (765-788), business, responsibilities, staff issues, conflicts with brothers (789-968), conflict with the white community (974-997), race riots (1003-1015), his brother and his Bengali wife, family tension (1017-1049), his brother's expectations of responsibility (1051-1069), family, his mother and attitudes to marriage (1075-1105), religion (1108-1147) and his ill health and stress (1152-1205).