Open Research Online

The Open University's repository of research publications
and other research outputs

Masculinity manoeuvres: critical discourse psychology and the analysis of identity strategies

Book Section

oro.open.ac.uk

Masculinity Manoeuvres: Critical Discursive Psychology and the Analysis of Identity Strategies

Margaret Wetherell (Open University) and Nigel Edley (Nottingham Trent University)

In this paper we want to return to a particular historical moment (the mid 1990s) and to the identity struggles of a group of young white middle-class men as they negotiate their place within regimes of hegemonic masculinity. We first researched and wrote about this group of young men some ten years ago now (Edley and Wetherell, 1997). Our aim in turning back to this work is to argue for a particular 'take' on gender, discourse and identity. We want to highlight the benefits of approaches to discourse and gender which incorporate both fine-grain micro analysis and more macro-cultural perspectives. Our work is within the broad tradition of discursive psychology (c.f. Potter and Wetherell, 1987; Edwards and Potter, 1992) but unlike forms of discursive psychology which follow conversation analysis (e.g. Edwards, 2006; Potter, 2000; 2005) we seek to combine the study of discourse in action with analyses of the broader social context (Edley and Wetherell, in press; Wetherell, 1998; in press; Wetherell and Edley, 1998; 1999). Indeed, we believe that it is impossible to make sense of gender identities as these appear in the flow of everyday life without this dual focus.

In common with many other discursive and sociolinguistic approaches, our research adopts a broadly constructionist frame. In other words, feminine and masculine identities are seen as historically and culturally specific, as accomplished and performed rather than generated by – or an automatic expression of - some fixed and essential nature. Gender is flexible. We assume that identities are both 'given' and actively produced (Billig, 1991). That is, women and men will work with the historical and cultural resources available for making sense of self. Individuals are limited by these resources but also able, as agents, to customise them, play with them, negotiate, re-combine, create anew, and substantially change collective flows of meaning-making. Practice is open and transforming while always in relation to the sometimes apparently unassailable quality of past practice and the already taken-for-granted. As Connell (1987) notes, some configurations of masculinity and femininity are more "culturally exalted" than others (some gender regimes are hegemonic) and the effects of these power relations can be traced in what identities are constructed and how interactions, relationships and institutions are managed.

Constructionist approaches see the social actor as 'unfinished'. The performative is emphasised as well as the emergence of identities through reiteration (Butler, 1990). Increasingly, constructionist perspectives try to pay attention to complex interactions with the biological and with the embodied. Identities are seen as plural and complex. There are multiple possibilities for identification and a sense of self is articulated at the intersections of relevant social categorisations – not just a man, for example, but also white, middle-class, young and British (Brah and Phoenix, 2004; Frosh et al., 2002). In our analyses we try to pay attention to the ways in which identities vary in their chronology and durability from the speaking positions of the interactional moment, emergent in a fleeting conversation, to the idiosyncratic subject positions an individual might configure over time as their own 'personal order' and personal narrative canon, to the cultural slots or locations recognised, admired or despised by

large and small 'communities of practice'. We assume that active subjects compress together and work on these different orders in the moment. We study identity then as an assemblage of intertwining patternings.

Much of this is now very familiar and a comforting orthodoxy for discourse scholars. Indeed, social constructionist approaches got their impetus from the 'turn to discourse' across the social sciences. These approaches developed out of and in tandem with post-structuralist and other macro-discourse theories. Constructionism established discourse (talk and texts) as the raw material for empirical work and qualitative research and led to an explosion of language based research on gender (for an up-to-date account of the field of discourse and identity see Benwell and Stokoe, 2006 and for a review of recent language based work on gender see Speer, 2005). In common with others (Billig, 1987; Edwards and Potter, 1992), our own work over the years has tried to shift the unit of analysis in qualitative studies. We argued that attention should no longer be focused on the self-contained and bounded individual but on the practices which construct identities. Analysts should examine talk and conversation, self-accounting and self-presentation in interviews, in relatively natural social settings and in everyday mundane social interaction. We, and others, focused on social practices which we described as psycho-discursive (Wetherell and Edley, 1999). Psycho-discursive practices are those regularities within the practical discursive realm which construct psychological states. They are the regular procedures through which people build self-descriptions, tell stories about their emotional lives, construct memories and recollections, perform attributions, formulate their life histories, and so on. We suggest that such procedures produce a psychology and infuse subjectivity – they come to be inhabited as well as deployed in talk and social interaction.

Jockeying for Position

Having now set the broad theoretical scene, let us return to the young men and to the specifics of their identity work.The material we analysed came from a series of tape-recorded group discussions conducted over a 9 month period between 1992 and 1993. These discussions were held on a weekly basis with small groups of 17-18 year old white young men from a Midlands based, single sex, independent school and they were designed to cover a wide range of different topics, including sexuality and relationships, images of men in popular culture and feminism and social change (see Edley and Wetherell, 1997, for details of the method). The collection of discursive material was informed by a reflexive ethnography conducted by Nigel Edley drawing on his own experiences of a similar educational context.

As the research developed it rapidly became apparent that one of the main concerns for the young men themselves and one of the main topics of their conversation was the relations between several somewhat antagonistic groups making up the community of the sixth form, centred on daily interactions in their common room. Our participants represented the situation as a conflict between what they called the 'hard lads', the most powerful group, made up primarily of the school's rugby players and other groupings forced as they saw it out to the peripheries. A key part of the domination of the 'hard lads' was physical. During break-times, for instance, they would take over the common room with boisterous games. Generally speaking, these games, like that of rugby, served to underline the participants' abilities to give and

take physical punishment. The status of the rugby lads was further supported and sustained by certain formal structures within the school. For example, its 'honours' system recognised sporting achievement in a much more explicit way than academic success, with each member of the school's rugby (and cricket) team being entitled to wear a distinctively coloured blazer, which clearly elevated them above the black-blazered majority. Furthermore, the rugby players were heavily over-represented in terms of positions of authority within the student body - such as head boy, house captains and prefects. These positions provided their incumbents, not only with institutional power, but also with the kudos of having been personally selected by the school's head teachers.

The majority of the participants in our research came not from this dominant group but from a network of friends who defined themselves as "diametrically opposed" to the rugby players. The antipathy felt towards the hard lads appeared to be a very real part of this group's day-to-day school life. "We hate their guts", declared one, speaking on behalf of his friends. "They're a complete bunch of wankers", remarked another in a later interview. Not only did these young men see themselves as different to the rugby players, but they also saw themselves as superior. "You need to realise" one explained "that we are not the hard lads and we probably enjoy being slightly different and doing different things".

This battle in the school common-room echoed a wider debate in popular culture. In the late 1980s and early 1990s attention was becoming focused on the figure of the 'new man'. Rutherford (1988) was one of the first to suggest that dominant conceptions of masculinity were shifting, beginning to exemplify a tension between two dominant images or subject positions: 'new man' and what he called 'retributive man'. Retributive man represented a more traditional form of masculine identity. He was the (major) breadwinner of the family and the principal source of authority within the home: tough, competitive and emotionally inarticulate. In contrast, new man was represented as the ideal partner for the modern, liberated, heterosexual woman ("Germaine Greer's soul mate" - *The Independent on Sunday*, 14th April 1991).

Our analysis, then, concentrated upon the efforts of the young men we studied to construct alternative or counter-hegemonic identities for themselves. It became clear that there were no neat distinctions between the hegemonic and counter-hegemonic – rather strategies and routines are more frequently hybrid and often derive their energy and power from their hybridity. Our analysis also suggested that the pressure for challenging and changing the ways of being and understanding masculinity may come as much from within communities of men as without. Overall, in support of Connell's (1987; 1995) ground breaking work, our analysis demonstrated the ways in which masculinity is contested, not a given, or a fixed entity but plural, argued over and constantly shifting over time – in such a way as to maintain what Connell describes as the 'patriarchal dividend' most men still enjoy in relation to most women.

Defined by Difference: Constructing Self and Other

We turn now to the detail of the discursive picture in the common-room. Post-structuralist theorists have pointed out that all concepts are *relational*; defined, that is, by contrast with other concepts (Derrida, 1973). For identity, Edward Said (1978), among others, has suggested the importance of 'otherness' for defining self. Those

who are not 'us' define who 'we' are. We noted the beginnings of this kind of 'categorical struggle' in the comments of the non rugby playing young men about their 'hard lad' peers. How did this play out in practice? Consider Extracts One and Two. (Note the young men have been given pseudonyms; Nigel Edley is the interviewer.)

Extract One

AARON: With our group I think it'd be fair to say, it would be the easiest group to join. Whereas to be in the rugby group would be hard (.) I mean if you want to or not (.) I mean I wouldn't but you'd have to (.) it's all very chauvinistic and male and all that stuff (.) to get in there you'd have to like be 'ard and get kicked about a bit
(C 3)

Extract Two

NEIL: [...] whereas they'd probably see themselves as <u>men</u> and I'd probably see myself as a <u>person</u> rather than a man (.) well I am a man (.) I don't know
(B 1)

Aaron's comment begins to open up an ideological dilemma (Billig et al., 1988) which more clearly surfaces in Neil's puzzling over his status. The dilemma is this: if the 'hard group' are male, where male is defined through participation in chauvinistic activities and capacity for taking physical punishment, then where does that leave Neil, Aaron and their friends? As Neil says are they men or just people? How can he be simultaneously a man and yet not a man? One solution to this dilemma might be to side with the feminist critique of traditional macho masculinity and to abandon claims to traditional masculinity for themselves. Aaron, as we saw, uses a term from the feminist lexicon – "chauvinistic" and in Extracts Three and Four there are further indications of the young men's familiarity with aspects of this critique.

Extract Three

NATHAN: And I do think that they do define masculinity by (.) which women they've been out with and <u>shagged</u> [making inverted commas sign]
(B 1)

Extract Four

PHIL: Yeah (.) er I think if you had to erm (.) if you were listening to election speeches by all these groups of people the rugby sporting group would be you know (.) "We'll turn the common room into a football pitch and we'll have free beer" and like this and "It'll be really great and you'll have a really (.) and there'll be girlies (.) beer and girlies and rugby" and things like that you know
(C 2)

In these extracts the talk seems to be simply about the rugby players. And yet, we can see the two speakers are simultaneously constructing their own identities. When Nathan uses the word "shagged", for example, he is careful to signal that this is *not* part of his vocabulary at this moment. Rather, like Phil's talk of "beer and girlies and

rugby", it is constructed as referencing a lexicon which belongs to another type of man: the *macho* man. So, if the macho man is Other, where does this leave Nathan and Phil? In producing a critical discourse of the rugby players as male chauvinists, presumably one possibility would be to assume an alternative subject position like the 'new man' identified by Rutherford and others and available in contemporary popular culture of the day.

For Aaron and his friends, the identity or subject position of the 'new man' could represent an important cultural resource, allowing them not only to distinguish themselves from the rugby players, but also to challenge the basis of their power. For within its terms, the rugby players become objects of derision rather than admiration; their macho games appearing stupid rather than cool, pathetic rather than hard. But the situation is not quite that simple. In their new 'new man' guise, the young men, of course, are vulnerable to the gaze back from the macho lads. Identity, as noted, is relational and one very familiar taunt they become exposed to in the common room is that they are 'wimps'. One response is to accept this identity of the 'wimp' and re-work it. Consider Extract Five.

Extract Five

NIGEL: Okay there was something you said Neil that just interested me there (.) you said erm that you described yourself as a erm pacifist (.) wimp (1.0) do you <u>really</u> see yourself as [a] wimp.
NEIL: Oh <u>yeah</u> (1.0) yeah because (2.0) I've got this theory that em (1.0) I'm ss(.) I don't do anything (.) I'm scared of getting hurt (.) I mean I suppose everybody is but er (1.0) <u>yeah</u> I do I mean er if a wimp (1.0) a wimp (2.0) if a wimp's somebody who'll <u>back</u> down from a <u>fight</u> or won't get into them (.) and is seen as being (.) you know (.) physically less able (.) then that's fine (.) I'm happy with that
KEITH: There's nothing wrong with being a wimp is there? [laughter] It stops you getting beaten up [laughing]
(B 4)

The hesitations here perhaps suggest the care with which this identity needs to be worked. Indeed three turns later on in this conversation, Neil has another go at it, producing another version of himself - one which sees him disowning the identity of the wimp.

Extract Six

NEIL: Actually (.) just thinking like that I think you know a wimp is probably not just physically (.) I think people who are mentally weak as well (.) and I don't think I'm mentally weak as in I can't stand up for myself verbally or you know (.) or perhaps a wimp's someone's who's timid and shy as well (.) but yeah I mean if you ask somebody they'd probably say some Emo Phillips [a stand-up comedian who adopts the persona of a weak, ineffectual man] type character (.) someone you know like that

[material omitted]

I mean we probably strike a balance between you know (.) talking about what they talk (.) talking about what (.) you know probably we'd class as the other people's talk

because I mean they talk about all sorts of you know (.) there's this lad Kelner who'll talk about nuclear physics or something you know spiel on for hours and the other lot'll talk about how did United do at the weekend and did you see that gorgeous bit of tot or whatever (1.0) so I think we probably (.) you know we talk about some interesting things including some bits in the middle.
(B 4)

Neil's new definition of the wimp is centred on a distinction between two kinds of strength (or weakness): namely, physical and mental. Under this new definition, the wimp appears as someone who has neither of these attributes. Neil, on the other hand, lays claim to mental toughness. In other words, the wimp is constructed as another kind of Other, a second reference point from which Neil can differentiate himself. Like Jason and the Argonauts, Neil and his friends can be seen carefully navigating a course for themselves between the Scylla of the macho man and the Charybdis of the wimp. Not as obsessed about sport as the hard lads, or about nuclear physics like the wimps, Neil and his friends are betwixt and between, a diluted mix of both.

There would appear to be an element of *complicity* here between Neil and the hard lads (c.f. Connell, 1995). He may not have the physical strength of the rugby players, but at least he has got *some* kind of strength. In a sense, therefore, the credibility of Neil's identity is dependent here upon some level of proximity to or correspondence with those of the macho men. In the following extract we see Neil drawing upon the very same distinction between physical and mental strength in order to undermine the position of the rugby lads.

Extract Seven

NEIL: I mean you could probably draw a list up (.) of what the qualities that make you eligible for [the hard group] (.) I mean (.) you've probably got to be attractive (.) handsome (.) good at sport (.) physically strong and I'd probably say mentally <u>weak</u> to go along with them [laughter] but I mean you've got to be (.) probably pretty sheepish follow the herd to do that whereas I doubt if one of them would stand out and say something against their whole group whereas one of us lot wouldn't think twice about it
(B 1)

Here we see Neil constructing a kind of identi-kit portrait of the typical rugby player. At first the list seems pretty complimentary, but then comes the sting in the tail. For all their bulging biceps, the rugby players are said to lack mental strength. They are portrayed as unthinking conformists, incapable, or even scared, perhaps, of doing their own thing. In this way a *categorical* difference is established between the identity of the speaker (and his friends) and the hard lads. No longer are they pale versions of the same thing. Instead a rough kind of equality is struck: both groups are represented as being strong, albeit in different ways. This attempt to undermine the position of the rugby players is extended further in Extracts Eight and Nine where, yet again, the same conceptual distinction is used. In both instances the young men are taking part in a broader conversation about the role of violence in men's lives.

Extract Eight

KEITH: No but I think it's because like for some of us it would take a bit of working up before (.) but for them they're always ready to give some (.) I suppose you're right (.) but it's not so much that if they did start anything it's just that it's always the outwards show of muscle
NEIL: It's like a show of weakness I think (.) that you have to resort to that (.) so that's probably what stops me having a go at one of them
NATHAN: I don't like to use physical violence not just because sometimes I might like lose or whatever but like sometimes I have in the past like (.) lost control and I don't like doing that
(B 2)

Extract Nine

NEIL: There's a few people (.) a few you know perhaps in September I've thought you know "I've about had enough of this (.) I'm gonna go and smack this kid" but I (.) you know I've only (.) I've only started (.) I've only had a brief fight with one person since September you know I (.) I've got quite a lot of self control because I could probably name about 10 people who I've you know been extremely tempted or less than that (.) but you know there's a few people I really would like to go and er smack because they really do get on my nerves and I don't (.) I don't bother <u>them</u> but they bother <u>me</u> (**NIGEL**: Hm m) and er (.) I think sometimes it'll come to a point where I may have to do that (.) but it's not something that I'd be proud of (.) I mean I'm more proud of the fact that I've been restrained I think than letting go
(B 4)

As with Extract Seven, a key difference between the participants and the rugby players is said to be the latter's lack of mental toughness (in this case "control" or strength of character). Moreover, the hard lads' outward displays of physical aggression are constructed by Neil as being evidence of their lack of character. Unlike him, they lack the mental discipline or sophistication to deal with difficult situations in civilised ways. As soon as the rugby players are provoked they have to resort to violence. In contrast, Neil, Nathan and, arguably, Keith pride themselves upon being able to "restrain" themselves.

Yet perhaps the most significant feature of these extracts is the way in which each speaker manages to construct himself as *capable* of physical aggression. It is not that they cannot engage in displays of macho violence, it is just that they all have the self-discipline to control such outbursts. Keith argues that he and his friends just require "a bit of working up" before they resort to violence. So while they claim to have slightly longer fuses, the implication is that that when they "go off", the result is just as spectacular. Similarly, Neil portrays himself as teetering on the brink of "smacking" some of the hard lads. It is not that he cannot do it; it is just that he does not want to. Nathan's account is also constructed upon a supposed distaste of physical violence. Yet, in many ways, his argument is even stronger. For unlike the others, he claims to have actually lost control of himself in the past. The main virtue of this account is that, in claiming a history of physical violence, Nathan heads off the assumption that his current pacifism hides a cowardly streak. However, of all these tales of self containment, probably the most colourful appears in Extract Ten below.

Extract Ten

AARON: I'm fairly quick thinking on my feet so I can usually talk my way (.) talk myself out of doing anything more than anything else.
PAUL: You tend to size up the situation you just think (.) there's no point in getting into a fight you're gonna lose is there?
AARON: No (.) I mean (.) a lot of situations [inaudible] the first option that really presents is <u>hit</u> them and then the rest of them are self control measures (1.0) think quick on your feet (.) talk your way out of this (1.0) so I've got (.) I have to talk my way out of it so that I'm not seen as the loser (**NIGEL**: Right) I don't mind a draw but I can't be a loser so I have to talk my way out of it so I look good to myself (.) otherwise I get very aggressive.
NIGEL: Okay, so erm (.) there has to be some sort of showdown which can be verbal?
AARON: Yeah (.) I mean (.) as I say I'm a fairly quick talker (.) so I'm (.) with regard to other people I think
NIGEL: Can you think of an episode where that's been the case?
AARON: Not recently (**.**) not really (.) erm (.) well (.) perhaps with Tommy Ladham on the football field (1.0) he's a (.) he's very aggressive but not very intelligent (**NIGEL**: Hm m) I'm not saying I'm intelligent (2.0) so there was a situation (.) well it was a dodgy tackle (.) I mean both of us just went for the ball as hard as possible and there wasn't really (.) and he got all on his high horse (.) "If you do that again I'll take your <u>shins</u> away" (.) and erm (.) you know (.) the aggression bar went straight up on me (**.**) I was thinking to myself and erm (.) I mean I totally outworded the lad (.) because I'm quick at thinking on my feet (1.0) I can just quickly reel off something (.) blah blah blah blah and he just (.) walked off
(C 7)

Reminiscent of a scene from the film *Cyrano de Bergerac*, Aaron describes a battle between brawn and brains. And just as in the story, the hero defeats his enemy with a mixture of guile and wit. It is a victory of mind over muscle, of mental control over violent physical action. Looking back over the last three extracts it is possible to detect a certain 'turning of the tables' taking place. In differentiating themselves from the rugby players, Aaron, Neil and the other members of the friendship group have not really distanced themselves from the traditional definition of masculinity at all. Indeed, they have represented themselves as out-doing the rugby players at pretty much their own game. Across all of the extracts, the result, then, is a set of hybrid identity positions – mixing elements of critique of traditional masculinities with subtle claims to key elements of those very masculinities.

Conclusions

In this paper we have looked at the construction of masculine identities within a specific cultural and institutional setting. The institutional practices of the school in which the research was conducted both privileged and, to a certain extent, produced a particular version of masculinity. The hard lads or sporty boys were its main representatives (both symbolically and literally). As a consequence, school life for them tended to be relatively straight-forward. For the remainder, however, whose voices we examined above, life was much more difficult. They were the ones who are most alienated by the dominant cultural order. As John Shotter argues,

It is in the very nature of the phenomenology of power that those...
who have it experience its workings the least aware of it. [T]o have
power is to find no resistance to the realisation of one's desires. [I]t is
those without power who find at every turn resistances to the
realization of their desires. (1993, p. 40 - see also Billig, 1991, Ch. 4)

We have tried to demonstrate the active and highly creative rhetorical work involved
in formulating identity under these circumstances. As discursive psychologists would
anticipate, our analysis did not reveal the existence of stable or consistent selves, but a
good deal of variation in the ways in which the participants talked about their own
gender identities. This picture of rhetorical selves and the constant negotiation of self
in talk vindicate the broadly social constructionist perspective on gender outlined in
our introduction.

Secondly, we have tried to illustrate in this paper the value of a form of analysis
which combines an interest in patterns of discourse in situ with attention to the social
context. Although broad sweep analyses of cultural types such as the 'new man' and
the 'retributive man' found in cultural studies are useful, cultural theory does not
convey the lived texture of identity negotiations and historical shifts and their
instantiation in everyday discursive practices. As we have argued elsewhere (c.f.
Wetherell, 1998), conversation analysis and forms of discursive psychology which
restrict researchers to the interactional details of the talk alone on a turn by turn basis
similarly are inadequate for understanding the patterning of gender. The feminist
ethnomethodologist, Dorothy Smith (1990), puts it well when she argues for
investigations which focus instead on how objectified social relations enter into
people's situated activities. Our approach attempts to emphasise *both* the situated and
the objectified.

More particularly, we take from post-structuralism and macro discourse analyses an
interest in what Michael Shapiro (1992) calls 'institutions of intelligibility' or the
'background' structures of intelligibility which organise talk. It is clear that every live
conversation - such as the ones presented above - represents a victory for certain
institutionalised forms of intelligibility at the expense of others. Conversations are a
product of the lines of force which shape the economies of the said and unsaid. But, in
common with forms of more micro discourse analysis, we also maintain that social
activities are partly self-organising - their intelligible character emerges as people
manage their joint conduct, collaborate, recognise and constitute their circumstances
as something accountable and recognisable. Social interaction is indexical - what
things mean, how they work is fluid and open, the meanings, what actually is
happening, and any closure around this, has to be achieved over and over again. The
data above demonstrate how each action is context renewing and context creating as
participants inter-subjectively worked out how to go on with each other as part of the
'long conversation' (Maybin, 2006) which made up the culture of their common
room.

The final point we wish to stress is that when looked at in this way, identity strategies
appear complex, contradictory and multiple. In terms of ideological practice, they are
messy and inevitably hybrid. On the one hand, the young men interviewed built a
critique of a form of masculinity, a form which certainly requires critical examination.
In Connell's terminology, the dominant position of the rugby players, the hegemonic

group, was challenged by a subordinated or marginalised group - a cultural struggle was thus vividly reproduced in talk. Yet, in this case, there was also complicity. New identities were built in dialogue with the identities which were to be challenged and superseded. The development of an adequate feminist politics around masculinity depends on taking these patterns in the mobilisation of meaning into account, both in terms of the content of the identities being formulated here by young, white, middle-class men and the process of discursive change which seems entailed. For an adequate discursive psychology of masculinity, it seems necessary to be able to work closely with text and talk, to examine its design, as well as interpreting the place of those designs in terms of more global social contexts.

Transcription Notation

The following transcription notation is a simplified version of that developed by Gail Jefferson (see Atkinson and Heritage (1984) for a more comprehensive account).

(.)   Short pause of less than 1 second.

(1.0)   Timed pause (in seconds).

[...]   Material deliberately omitted.

[text]   Clarificatory information.

text   Word(s) emphasized.

References

Atkinson, J.M. and J.C. Heritage (eds) (1984) *Structures of Social Action: Studies in Conversation Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Benwell, B. and Stokoe, E. (2006) *Discourse and Identity*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Billig, M. (1987) *Arguing and Thinking: A Rhetorical Approach to Social Psychology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Billig, M. (1991) *Ideology and Opinions: Studies in Rhetorical Psychology*. London: Sage.

Billig, M., Condor, S., Edwards, D., Gane, M., Middleton, D. and Radley, A. (1988) *Ideological Dilemmas: A Social Psychology of Everyday Thinking*. London: Sage.

Brah, A. and Phoenix, A. (2004) 'Ain't I a Woman?: Revisiting Intersectionality', *Journal of International Women Studies*, 5 (3), 75-86.

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

Connell, R.W. (1987) *Gender and Power*. Cambridge: Polity

Connell, R.W. (1995) *Masculinities*. Cambridge: Polity.

Derrida, J. (1973) *Speech and Phenomena and Other Essays on Husserl's Theory of Signs*. Evanston: Northwestern University Press.

Edley, N. and Wetherell, M. (1997) 'Jockeying for Position: The Construction of Masculine Identities'. *Discourse and Society, 8* (2), 203-17.

Edley, N. and Wetherell, M. (in press) 'Discursive Psychology and the Study of Gender: A Contested Space'. In L. Litosseliti, H. Saunston, K. Segall and J. Sunderland (eds) *Gender and Language: Theoretical and Methodological Approaches*. London: Palgrave/Macmillan.

Edwards, D. (2006) 'Discourse, cognition and social practices: The rich surface of language and social interaction'. *Discourse Studies*, *8*, 41-9.

Edwards, D. and Potter, J. (1992) *Discursive Psychology*. London: Sage.

Frosh, S., Phoenix, A. and Pattman, R. (2002) *Young Masculinities*. London: Palgrave.

Maybin, J. (2006) *Children's Voices: Talk, Knowledge and Identity*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Potter, J. (2000) 'Post cognitivist psychology'. *Theory and Psychology*, *10*, 31-7.

Potter, J. (2005) 'Making psychology relevant'. *Discourse and Society*, *16* (5), 739-47.

Rutherford, J. (1988) 'Who's That Man?'. In R. Chapman and J. Rutherford (eds) *Male Order: Unwrapping Masculinity*. London: Lawrence and Wishart.

Potter, J. and M. Wetherell (1987) *Discourse and Social Psychology: Beyond Attitudes and Behaviour*. London: Sage.

Said, E. (1978) *Orientalism*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Shapiro, M. (1992) *Reading the Postmodern Polity*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Shotter, J. (1993) *The Cultural Politics of Everyday Life*. Milton Keynes: Open University Press.

Smith, D. (1990) *Texts, Facts, and Femininity: Exploring the Relations of Ruling*. London: Routledge.

Speer, S. (2005) *Gender Talk: Feminism, Discourse and Conversation Analysis*. London: Routledge.

Wetherell, M. (1998) 'Positioning and Interpretative Repertoires: Conversation Analysis and Post-Structuralism in Dialogue.' *Discourse and Society*, *9* (3), 387-412.

Wetherell, M. (in press) 'A Step Too Far?: Discursive Psychology, Linguistic Ethnography and Questions of Identity'. *Journal of Sociololinguistics*.

Wetherell, M. and Edley, N. (1998) 'Gender Practices: Steps in the Analysis of Men and Masculinities'. In K. Henwood, C. Griffin and A. Phoenix (eds) *Standpoints and Differences: Essays in the Practice of Feminist Psychology.* London: Sage.

Wetherell, M. and Edley, N. (1999) 'Negotiating Hegemonic Masculinity: Imaginary Positions and Psycho-Discursive Practices.' *Feminism & Psychology*, *9* (3), 335-356.