

Running Head: Local and National Identity in Glasgow

“I’m Not a Fanatic Scot, But I Love Glasgow”: Concepts of Local and National

Identity in Glasgow

Natalie Braber

Nottingham Trent University

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Dr. Natalie Braber,
School of Arts and Humanities, Nottingham Trent University, Clifton Lane,
Nottingham, UK NG11 8NS e-mail: natalie.braber@ntu.ac.uk

Abstract

In this article, a grounded theory approach is used to explore notions of national and local identity held by two groups of Glaswegians: those residing in Glasgow and those living in England (sample size = 17). The data suggest that both groups have a strong sense of Glaswegian as well as Scottish identity, but there appear to be some differences between participants. Some Glasgow participants seem to identify more strongly with the negative prestige of Glasgow. For those living in England, a sense of being Scottish is more important than being Glaswegian as it allows a clear differentiation from being English. Neither group felt that a sense of Britishness forms a strong part of their identity as this has English connotations.

“I’m Not a Fanatic Scot, But I Love Glasgow”: Concepts of Local and National
Identity in Glasgow

The interaction between local and national identity is the subject of ongoing academic debate. This discourse is usually the domain of philosophers, historians, anthropologists and sociologists, but linguists have also made an important contribution (Llamas, 1999; Pichler & Watt, 2004; Johnstone, 2007). This first phase is part of a larger study which has multiple aims. During the first stage of the study notions of identity held by a specific group of Scottish participants – Glaswegians – were investigated, and compared with findings from previous research. The second stage, not considered in this article (Braber & Butterfint, 2008, in press), examined the extent to which a correlation exists between identity and local/regional accent in light of the changing features of Glaswegian English.

During this research several statements made by participants shed new light on the subject of national and local identity in Glasgow, an area which has so far been somewhat overlooked as relevant previous studies mainly considered British and Scottish identity. In this article, case studies of Glaswegians are presented to better understand varying degrees of identity and belonging in a multi-nation state. A *grounded theory* approach was used to examine common threads of belonging among two groups of Glaswegians – one group living in Glasgow, and another group now living in England. Examining national and local identities will allow us to develop a picture of how Glaswegians currently perceive themselves within wider societal contexts, and how these perceptions can be applied to other groups around the world, in areas where there may be a clash between local and national identities.

National and local identities are difficult to define precisely as there may be confusion around terms (Anderson, 1991; Barrett, 2007). Furthermore, there is no academic consensus on their definition (e.g. McCrone, 1992; Ichijo, 2004), although results from various surveys and questionnaires suggest that the public do not seem to have a problem in formulating their national identity (e.g., McCrone, 2002; Kiely et al., 2001; Brinkerhoff, 2008). One of the reasons for the academic disagreement may be that national identities are not fixed, but are relational concepts, dependent up on the claims people make in different contexts and at different times (Bechhofer et al., 1999). Dunn (1998) commented that changing societies mean that identities are no longer fixed at birth but that individuals can form their own identities

Anderson (1992) coined the phrase ‘imagined community’ to explain the binding nature of specific identity in a community which exists despite the fact that those within the group do not know their fellow members, and this sense of “collective identity” is important to many (see also Maier, 2007). Another feature of identity is that identities can co-exist and individuals can have “multiple or divided loyalties” (Penrose, 1993, p. 34) which allows individuals to have different identities with which to position themselves within their different social groups (see for example Barrett, 2007 on Social Identity Theory and Barrett, 2007 on Self-Categorization Theory). McCrone (1992) explained that people have what can be referred to as a “pick ‘n mix” identity that can be changed according to the social situation. Smout (1994) illustrated this with a series of concentric “territorial” rings showing that people can belong to different groups (e.g. familiar, local, state) and can hold different identities at the same time, although these identities do not need to be static.

The present study allowed for the examination of the concept of local (Glasgow) versus national identities (Scotland and Britain) within a group of participants. The situation within Britain is problematic as Britain is a state which is made up of smaller nations (England, Scotland and Wales – not considering Northern Ireland here as this makes up the United Kingdom). The Act of Union in 1707 marked the end of Scottish independence as it joined England. Scotland to this day remains part of Great Britain, although the creation of a separate Scottish parliament in 1999 has led to more political power for Scotland. However, during the intervening years Scotland has been politically and culturally dominated by England and this has led to much confusion (in the eyes of the Scots, the English and the wider world) about distinctions between Britain, England and Scotland (Barrett, 2007). This article involves an examination of Glaswegians attitudes towards their local and national senses of identity and, by extension, how such views can be applied to other similar situations in other “stateless nations” (Barrett 2007). This study includes consideration of the national and local identities of a group of Glaswegians now living in England. The aim here is to examine the strength of identity when no longer living within an imagined community. It has been suggested that many modern diasporas will maintain strong “sentimental and material links with their countries of origins – their homelands” (Sheffer in Brinkerhoff, 2008, p. 67).

Multiple Identities in Scotland

The concept of multiple identities is particularly relevant to people living in Scotland. Ichijo (2004) comments that although the world is made up of nation-states, these states are very likely to be made up of more than one nation, as is the case for Great Britain. As a result, the notion of Britishness is not an unproblematic one and during the last two decades national identity appears to have grown at the expense of

state identity, noticeably in Scotland (Kiely et al., 2005b; Carrington & Short, 1996). This may be the case for Scotland (and Wales) rather than England, as “majority populations” are more certain of their identity and have less need for identity displays (Hendry, Mayer & Kloep, 2007). Studies carried out by McCrone (1992), Bond (2000), and Rosie and Bond (2003) found that a Scottish identity was widespread with a sense of Scottish identity being more important than British identity.

Henderson and McEwen (2006) commented that this dual sense of identification, which has been common in Scotland since before the 1980s, becomes problematic when the conceptions of Britishness and Scottishness diverge. Britishness appears to have very different connotations for English and Scottish people. For many English it encompasses a liberal and inclusive identity, while for many Scots it appears to be an outdated and conservative attitude (for more details see Kiely et al., 2005b; McCrone & Kiely, 2000; Parekh, 2000) as well as containing strong Anglocentric connotations (Barrett, 2007). Ichijo and Spohn (2005) commented that this could have occurred because Britishness has incorporated a lot from Englishness with England being the dominant component of Britain, as well as the fact that the English may perceive the concepts of “English” and “British” to overlap (Rutland & Cinirella, 2000), something which many Scots may find hard to identify with (Carrington & Short, 1996; Ichijo & Spohn, 2005; Kiely et al., 2006b). Not being seen as English is important to many Scots and one of the most crucial aspects of identity is differentiating a group from an other (Brinkerhoff, 2008), and in relation to Scotland, the significant other is England (Hylland Eriksen, 1993; McCrone, 1992; Barrett, 2007).

In short, the Scottish sense of being different from other areas of Great Britain is growing rather than diminishing, despite the diverse population of Scotland and the

fact that, linguistically, the majority of Scotland's population does not differ to a great extent from the population of England (McCrone, 1992). Thus, rather than the sense of a separate national identity decreasing in importance as was predicted by some social theorists in the early twentieth century (Hylland Eriksen, 1993), it seems to have become even more important in Scotland.

The Importance of Local Identity

The vast majority of the studies outlined above concentrate on identity at a national, or macro, level. A far smaller number of studies have considered identity at a lower, regional or local, level. These studies have tended to be of a linguistic nature, for example in Berwick (Pichler & Watt, 2004), Teesside (Llamas, 1999) and Pittsburgh (Johnstone, 2007) which examined the sense of local identity in towns and compare this to the language variation which occurs among their speakers. Results of these studies have illustrated the link between the retention of localised language variants and the speaker's strength of local identity or affiliation. Results suggest that speakers with a low identification score, and therefore a weaker sense of local identity, tend to use fewer localised language variants (Llamas, 1999). These principles have been applied to Glasgow in this study to examine whether a strong sense of local identity correlates with retention of 'typical' linguistic features (Braber & Butterfint, 2008).

For this report, we considered feelings of identity in Scotland at the level of the city – Glasgow – and investigated the sense(s) of identity claimed by its participants and their attitudes towards the different identities available to them. Furthermore, an attempt was made to further examine what it means to be Glaswegian. Glasgow was selected as the case study as it is a city which has traditionally been stigmatized by insiders and outsiders, but its inhabitants are often said to have retained a strong and

proud sense of identity. The history of Glasgow has contributed to the stigmatization of the city (Daiches, 1977; Gibb, 1983; Maver, 2000; Pacione, 1995). As an industrial city Glasgow has suffered from the decline of the shipyards and ship-building industry after relying on this source of income and employment for many years. Historically the city has been plagued with high levels of deprivation. In the 1970s one in five Glaswegians were affected by deprivation and “in absolute terms one would have had to aggregate the deprived populations of Birmingham, Manchester, Liverpool and Bradford to surpass the level of the problem in Glasgow” (Pacione, 1995, p. 217). The Glasgow tenements, the slums, and the subsequent slum clearances have been well-documented (see for example, Daiches, 1977; Gibb, 1983; Pacione, 1995), as has Glasgow’s history of violence. Arguably more than most cities in the UK, Glasgow has acquired a highly stereotyped reputation. Whereas Edinburgh is seen to represent culture, tourism, Scottish heritage and shopping; Glasgow represents the Gorbals, tenement slums, violence and industrial corrosion (Maver, 2000). The very nature of a stereotype means that such views are unbalanced, here over-emphasising the negative aspects of Glasgow. However, it is through these stereotypes that many see the city and, by extension, its inhabitants.

Methods

The aim was to discover whether a strong sense of Glaswegian identity exists in contemporary Glasgow, despite its diverse cultural and socio-economic population, and how this local identity fits in with people’s sense of regional and national identity. It was decided to investigate these issues using a grounded theory approach (for more details see Charmaz, 1995; Hendry, 2007). Using this approach meant starting with examining individual cases and seeing patterns emerge across speakers to allow patterns and interrelationships to emerge. This occurs by examining the transcripts,

coding responses and grouping these into similar concepts. From this, categories can be formed which can form the basis of a working theory. By examining responses from participants living both in Glasgow and England it was also hoped that further light could be shed on the factors that influence a decision of identity.

Analyses were based on interviews with Glaswegians living in Glasgow and Glaswegians now living in England (either Manchester or Nottingham). Full details of the panel of participants can be found in Table 1. The first group are currently resident in Glasgow and spent most of their lives there. The second group had all been born in Glasgow from Glaswegian parents and were now living in England. Participants varied with regard to the amount of time spent away from Scotland; figures ranged from 1 to 34 years which allows us to examine viewpoint from differing periods of absence from Glasgow. All participants returned to Glasgow to visit family and friends on at least an annual basis.

Participants were chosen on the basis of purposive sampling, taking into account changing views in different generations and differences between classes and gender and representatives from these groups were recruited. Participants were chosen who currently live in the Gorbals (an inner-city area in Glasgow, traditionally working-class) as well as the suburbs of Glasgow, such as Milngavie, which are traditionally seen as middle-class areas. Some studies examining identity in Scotland (for example Ichijo 2004) used participants from the intellectual elite. Our study used participants from the working and middle classes, many of which were recruited through community networks. This avoided using participants who had clear institutional links (such as lecturers, priests and politicians) who may use more standardized speech. This study was interested in gaining access to 'vernacular' speech in a relaxed environment (for more details see Milroy and Gordon, 2003).

Participants were recruited initially through the “friend of a friend technique” which then led to a “snowballing” technique – this technique is also known as “network sampling” and is a commonly used technique in sociolinguistic studies (see for example Milroy and Gordon, 2003).

Although the above sampling method has limitations, in the sense that it can lead to an unrepresentative sample, these interviews allowed the researcher to look for prominent themes of identity to emerge among a group of participants which could form the basis for future study.

Data Collection

The data were elicited using semi-structured interviews. The main benefit of such interviews is that they allow the researcher to gain detailed information about participants’ opinions, as well as being flexible in allowing the researcher to follow up interesting issues which come up during the interview (Smith, 1995). These advantages outweigh shortcomings of semi-structured interviews (see also by Ichijo, 2004) which are that they are time-consuming, both for data collection and analysis. The corpus for this study was collected by the author, who is herself from Glasgow, during the summer of 2005. Participants were interviewed in familiar surroundings (either home or workplace) and consisted of open-ended questions. These interviews lasted on average 45 minutes and were recorded. Participants were not informed about the exact nature of the study, but were told the investigator was interested in collecting data about attitudes towards Glasgow and Scotland.

The interview consisted of a series of open-ended questions that aimed to get the participant talking about their feelings towards Glasgow, Scotland, Britain and England. For example, respondents were asked where they would say they were from, whether they would call themselves British and how they would feel if they were

asked if they were British or English. They were also asked to describe what they felt constituted a typical Scot, a typical Glaswegian, if they felt there were such persons. Participants were also asked about Glaswegian accents, what constituted a Glaswegian accent, how the participant felt about them and about their own accent. Respondents were free to provide as much detail as they felt important, and were also asked at the end of the interview if they felt there was anything significant the interview had failed to cover. These questions were based on similar studies carried out by Llamas in Teesside (1999) and Pichler and Watt in Berwick (2004).

Data Analysis

At this stage of the study the content of the responses was focused upon, initially from the group resident in Glasgow and these were then compared to the migrant group to examine whether similar themes were found. The interviews were read several times in order to become familiar with the narratives. Recurrent themes were extracted, for example to investigate what responses were made about Glasgow and being Glaswegian. Did participants respond positively when asked how they felt about Glasgow and Scotland, and how did they feel about being from Glasgow? Responses about the positive and negative features of Glasgow and Scotland were also noted. Of particular interest were the ways the participants identified themselves and how they felt about labels such as British, Scottish, English and Glaswegian. The results from this analysis are presented below separately for each group of participants. Themes and issues which occurred throughout several interviews were also examined by a second researcher (who was not from Scotland) to cross-validate findings. These themes are listed in Table 2 and discussed in the sections below. Quotes were selected which expressed the opinions of the participants.

Participants Living in Glasgow

Theme 1 came up as a result of the questions relating to participants feelings about Glasgow and Scotland, whether they would change where they came from if they could, and the good and bad sides of Glasgow. Participants living in Glasgow had a variety of feelings about Glasgow and Scotland in general. When questioned specifically about Glasgow and being Glaswegian, three quarters of the participants expressed positive feelings. Positive responses to Glasgow included the friendliness of Glaswegians and their good sense of humour. AL said “the best things I think the people tend to be friendly. I mean if I were to go away anywhere and I come back I’m always amazed at just how friendly the people are”. Negative responses centred on the bad reputation of the city, and several commented that they wanted to distance themselves from this. YF remembered a time when she was given a lift while on holiday in Jersey “and the woman asked where we were from and we said Glasgow and she reached into the back and took her handbag through, conversation was non-existent after that”. The respondents who expressed positive feelings about Glasgow also mentioned the city’s bad reputation but were at pains to emphasize that this had changed in recent years. None of the participants mentioned wanting to move away from Glasgow, even though some had worked elsewhere for short periods.

Interestingly, almost all participants, including those who had expressed negative feelings towards Glasgow, were clear that they would say Glasgow if asked where they came from by a stranger.

Theme 2 came up in relation to the question which asked participants to identify themselves. There were some differences between the participants. It seems as if the focus on Glaswegian was different for some speakers. Some participants were more likely to say that they were Scottish and Glaswegian, rather than focusing on Glasgow alone. So there seem to be speakers who classify themselves as Scottish

AND Glaswegian and those who classify themselves mainly as Glaswegian. It seems as if the participants from the more working-class areas of Glasgow were more likely to include this information when asked where they were from. These participants said that the part of Glasgow they came from was an important part of their identity. On the other hand the participants from more affluent areas did not focus on such detailed localisation. The reasons for this may be that focusing on the exact area they come from (for example the Gorbals in Glasgow) allowed for a sense of covert prestige in the working-class speakers. This is very different to the participants from the more affluent areas who seem to adhere to a more overt prestige which values standard norms and values and by focusing on Glasgow and Scotland, allows them to distinguish themselves from the working-class speakers.

Furthermore, when questioned about the traditionally middle-class suburban parts of Glasgow (such as Bearsden and Milngavie, where some of the participants were from), those who were from inner-city areas said that these could not be considered 'truly' Glaswegian and distinguished themselves from people from these areas, whereas those from the middle-class suburbs emphasized that they were from Glasgow and that their place of living belonged very much to Glasgow (as well as to Scotland).

Theme 3 was the mention of problems between different parts of Scotland. AM said "Scots don't need enemies, 'cos basically Scots don't like each other", and GV mentioned an occasion when he was in the north of Scotland and the people there argued that he was not really Scottish. He said "So I get accused of not being Scottish, because I was almost a Sassenach ... the highlanders think they are the only Scots". Other participants also spoke of problems between people from Edinburgh and Glasgow. JR commented "I'm no fond of Edinburgh folk, oh yeah they're quite stuck

up a lot of them aye” and LP said “I don’t like Edinburgh, cos I find them cold, you know, face like a pub carpet”. Here it is shown by some participants that a sense of local identity can be linked to a dislike of others, emphasising Anderson’s concepts of the imagined community. GV mentioned that he felt proud to be Glaswegian, but that his Scottish heritage was equally important. Two interviewees said that they felt it was important to say they were from Glasgow as they wished to differentiate themselves from other Scots. So although participants are very fond of Scotland, they are very aware of problematic feelings between people from different locations, and of the sub-divisions which make up national identity. This may be one of the reasons why a local (Glaswegian) identity is important to this group, as it allows them to distinguish themselves from other parts of Scotland. LP stated that “ahm Scottish too, of course I am, anything else but Edinburgh, to tell you the truth”.

With regards Theme 4, an important feature is that none of the participants in this group spontaneously made mention of being British. When prompted two-thirds said they would use this term on official forms only, and a small minority of them added they may use British if they were abroad, for example JW said, “I do that when I’m abroad” although LP commented that being Scottish abroad tends to get a more favourable response than saying you are British. These reactions are very situation-specific, but were also found by Hendry et al. (2007) where “British” was only seen as an identity marker in a European context where ‘Welsh’ was not believed to be sufficiently recognised. Two respondents expressed a more positive opinion to the British label. For example, DM said that he was proud to be British and had an active interest in British history; he said “I know what the difference is between British and English you know, I mean you can still be proud of being British ... Britain has done lots of bad things, but they’ve also done a lot of great things for the world you know,

and you can be proud of it, but I don't know when you would tell people you're British, usually I would just say I'm Scottish". AM said "I'm a Glaswegian by birth, but I'm British by nationality". However, he too said that he would never use British as a label with which to identify himself. He also mentioned that he did not believe Scottish independence would be good for Scotland. A third of interviewees living in Glasgow said they would use the term Scottish on official forms as they felt strongly that they were not British. YF mentioned that this was important for her sense of "national pride" and NB commented "I put Scottish on official forms and I probably resent the British thing". GV expressed annoyance that in sport, if a non-English person wins they are referred to as "British", but if they are English, they are called "English". FM mentioned that she definitely did not feel British, and would express annoyance when referred to as such. Not surprisingly, all interviewees said they would correct a foreigner who asked them if they were English. It seems clear that a sense of Britishness does not feature as a part of many of the participants' identities, for example GV states "I don't feel British" and this may be due to the problematic nature of Britishness, in that for many it is still linked with a sense of Englishness (as was explained in the section on multiple identities in Scotland).

Theme 5 differed for the participants. AM commented that birthplace was important and that this was a large part of him and made him want to support Glasgow, "If a stranger asked me where I came from, I'd say automatically I came from Glasgow, I'm quite proud of coming from Glasgow. To be honest with you, I can't say I come fae anywhere else cos I didn't, and I'm as I say, from the city point of view I'm quite proud of being Glaswegian". NB said that residence was an important factor. Her daughter had been born in England, but felt herself very strongly to be Scottish, she says "she'll make a point of saying she was born there, but

she's say she's Scottish sort of thing". NB is the participant who was born in Ireland, but considers herself to be Glaswegian as she has lived in Glasgow most of her life. Only two participants commented that birth place was not absolutely essential to identity and that residency was also an important factor.

Participants Living in England

Although similar themes emerged in the interviews with participants living in England about Glasgow and being Glaswegian, there were some interesting differences. With regards Theme 1, all participants were very positive about Glasgow and Scotland in general and the theme that Glasgow is viewed differently by outsiders and insiders is similar to the first theme in the previous section. CM said "I know Glasgow's lovely, but that's [Scotland] something else". GN said "I think it's [Glasgow] great, I think it's misrepresented by those outside Glasgow". Two interviewees said that they had been fed-up with Glasgow when they left but that their time away had changed their opinions. All participants mentioned that Glasgow had a bad reputation outside the city, but that this was changing and that the stigma of coming from Glasgow had been reduced, CM commented that "Glasgow's got it act together", this is in contrast to the past where he would say he was from "Scotland first, as soon as they say where are you from I'd say Scotland, because I think when I first got there [South Africa], Glasgow had this image". IS also commented on the negative views others held about Glasgow "I always felt a bit inferior about coming from Glasgow cos it was sort of an industrial city and it was regarded as kind of working class and definitely not posh".

Theme 2 was different for this group of speakers. Similarly to the other group, all participants living in England felt very proud and happy to be Scottish. GN said "I'm very fond of Scotland, and very proud to be Scottish. I think we've got a lot to

be proud about, not in a nationalistic sense but just in terms of our cultural heritage, our landscape, our traditions, all those things that give us a unique Scottish cultural identity”. None of the interviewees felt that living away from Scotland made them any less Scottish. Over half of the interviewees said that they felt like foreigners in England and had some negative views about England. GB said “but the way in which you feel in England, displaced from Scotland, really foregrounds your Scottishness in a way that makes you sort of almost defensive”. A large proportion also mentioned that their time in England had made them either more actively involved with Scottish groups and societies or made them feel more Scottish than they had when they were living in Glasgow. CM said “I’m a member of all sorts of things, the Society for William Wallace, Burns Federation, Scotland Magazine, so Scotland’s really important, very very important to me”. Just under half of these interviewees also mentioned that they felt very strongly about Scottish independence and that Scotland would do better by itself. One interviewee was a member of the SNP (Scottish National Party), CM said “I’m a member of the Scottish National Party, ... I believe in it, I believe that Scotland should guide, should direct its own future, that’s no disrespect to down here, I think anybody should do likewise”. From this we can see that the participants no longer living in Scotland seem to take a more active interest in such cultural and political activities than those still living in Glasgow.

When asked to comment on where they would say they came from, 80 per cent said they would say both Glasgow and Scotland, and only a small remainder said Scotland and the part of Glasgow they were originally from – this no longer seemed to be as relevant as it was to the participants still living in Glasgow. Within the Glasgow participants, there seemed to be a sense of overt or covert prestige depending on whether participants identified more with Glasgow/Scotland or particular area of

Glasgow/Glasgow. This sense of covert prestige was not seen to this extent within the migrant participants. Living away from Glasgow may make such localised identities unnecessary as they are unknown in Manchester and Nottingham. Furthermore, there was no comment about certain suburbs “belonging” to Glasgow as there was with the Glasgow group. For these participants, there seemed to be no question that areas surrounding Glasgow belonged to the city. This may have to do with the fact that living from a distance would make it harder for this group to say that certain people did not belong to Glasgow, as they live far away, but still feel themselves to belong to the city. A sense of Scottishness helped identify speakers in relation to not being English.

Within this group, there was very little comment on Theme 3. GN was the only participant who mentioned this when he said “So although there is a sort of collective identity and pride in being Scottish, there are still regional sort of distinctions that are sort of identities within identities, that keep Scotland from being truly unified”, but later he mentioned “Glasgow. Scottish. You don’t have to say you’re Scottish because of your accent tells you that, that is part of your identity. It is good to always localise yourself to Glasgow”. The Glasgow/Edinburgh conflict, which was present in many of the interviews with those living in Glasgow, did not arise in these participants. Again, living away from Glasgow seemed to distance participants from problems taking place within Scotland. For them, the sense of an “imagined community” seemed to be larger than for those living in Glasgow, who frequently foregrounded problems within Scotland.

Theme 4 also holds for the migrant group as none of these participants voluntarily labelled themselves as British. When questioned less than half of this group said that they would never classify themselves as British and some made

additional comments to this. IS said that she would say she was British “but that it was a long way down the list”. CM said “I am British, but I don’t make a habit of saying it”. PD said “No I wouldn’t say [British], I would say I come from Scotland”. The majority of interviewees living in England commented that they would never say they were British, with some commenting that they felt Britishness meant Englishness and that it held too much of an “imperialist mentality”. DO commented that living in England has made him more Scottish, “You know, being down here I feel more, I definitely feel more patriotic, you know, definitely proud to be Scottish”. He also said that Britishness has always been a problematic term for him, “Years ago ... there was the point where I was saying I was Scottish and then European. I totally missed out British, because to me, British connotes English. And I think that the world over, the world you know, people of other countries do associate Britain with being England rather than being Wales and Scotland”. GN commented that he would not say he was British “because I’ve come to England and there is still an imperial mentality that constructs Scotland as other. And it is a sort of resistance to that other, that consolidates your Scottish identity even further”.

The majority of participants living in England said that they would like to move back to Glasgow and over half of them were making active efforts to do so. DO mentioned that to him England is just “a place I live. I don’t regard it as my home. Because Scotland, well Glasgow, is my home”. One interviewee, PD, who had no plans to move back, said “I love England, I’ve never had a reason not to like it, but aye, Scotland will always be number one”.

As we saw in the group of interviewees living in Glasgow, it was not clear from the responses of participants living in England what exactly made someone Glaswegian, Scottish or British in their own eyes (Theme 5). Although as these

participants were all living in England and still felt very strongly to be Glaswegian and Scottish, birth must be considered a more important factor than residence. This is logical as none of these participants were actually living in Glasgow at the time of the interview, but still felt very Glaswegian, so had to concentrate their sense of belonging on their place of birth, one participant (DO) states that England is just a place to live, but certainly cannot be considered “home”.

Discussion and Conclusions

These results suggest that on a first viewing Glaswegians have a strong sense of local and identity, which can exist alongside other identities, such as a Scottish identity. This study shows that the participants had a strong sense of local identity, regardless of whether they live in Glasgow or have moved to England. This study also shows that the participants are not limited to a single identity, but have different identities such as coming from the Gorbals, Glasgow and Scotland, which they can relate to and use in different situations. For many participants this sense of Glaswegian and Scottish identity stands in direct opposition to a British identity, to which many expressed a negative attitude. Although this sense of Glaswegian identity may initially seem universal for all participants, different levels of identity and belonging can be discovered if participants’ comments are analysed more carefully to examine new views given by these participants.

When considering the participants living in Glasgow, it seems that the only group who are less likely to completely foreground their Glaswegian identity are those who could be classified as living in more affluent suburbs. More research needs to be carried out in this field, but it seems there may be an interesting link between identity and socio-economic class. From these views it seems as if middle- and working-class Glaswegians want to differentiate themselves from each other.

What this study brings out, in particular for the Glaswegians still living in Glasgow, is the paramount importance of a strong sense of local identity. The participants living in England also feel a strong sense of Glaswegian identity, but for them the sense of a Scottish identity seems more immediately apparent to live alongside a local identity. This could be caused by these participants being confronted by English identity on a daily basis, and for them the larger, national Scottish identity may seem to carry more weight than the smaller, local Glaswegian identity. Approximately half of the Glaswegians living in England feel stronger links to their sense of identity as a result of living away from Scotland, and many are actively involved in Scottish groups. But in these cases the overarching sense of identity was of belonging both to Glasgow and Scotland, as opposed to the strong Glaswegian identity held by many of the participants living in Glasgow. This sense of being actively involved in Scottish cultural and political groups was not mentioned by any of the participants living in Glasgow. For participants living in England, distinguishing themselves from the 'other' (England) existed on a more national level, whereas those living in Glasgow seemed to focus on the 'other' being other Scots, particularly those from Edinburgh. Living at a distance from Glasgow seems to illustrate that local issues – whether problems between different localities; or emphasizing differences between traditionally working-class and middle-class areas of the city – have become less important and the focus is more on differentiation within their new living environment.

Another interesting aspect of the participants living in England is that they have kept their Scottish and Glaswegian identity and that none of them expresses a desire to be considered as 'local' in either Manchester or Nottingham. A study by Kiely et al. (2005a) showed that the vast majority of English people living in

Scotland, although making no claims to Scottishness (even though some of them had lived in Scotland many years, had brought up their children there and had no plans to leave), were reported as making statements such as ‘I feel I am Scottish’ or ‘I think I am Scottish’. None of our participants feels or thinks they are English. Between the two groups of participants there was uncertainty about what ‘made’ someone Glaswegian (or Scottish), whether birth or residence were of paramount importance. For the participants living in England, however, birth played a more important role as they felt that they still ‘belonged’ to Glasgow, and no other residency could ever influence this part of their identity.

What the grounded theory approach used here has shown is that there are particular themes of identity which can be elaborated in future study, both to establish whether Glasgow is similar to other cities in Scotland, but also on a wider level, whether those living in Glasgow are similar to other nation-states where inhabitants may be able to choose from national and local identities.

Limitations of this study are that the small sample size means that no overall generalisations can be made, only tendencies to specific individuals can be established. However, these themes can be incorporated into future studies. Individual interpretation of what it means to be ‘Glaswegian’, as well as factors contributing to this sense of identity must also be unpicked.

Although this preliminary study hints at a link between local identity and other social features, such as residence, it is a complex issue and certainly one which should be examined in further detail, to increase our understanding of the nature of local (and national) identity.

References

- Anderson, B. (1991). *Imagined communities. Reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism*. 2nd edition. London: Verso.
- Barrett, M. (2007). *Children's knowledge, beliefs and feelings about nations and national groups*. Hove: Psychology Press.
- Bechhofer, F., McCrone, D., Kiely, R. & Stewart, R. (1999). Constructing national identity: Arts and landed elites in Scotland. *Sociology*, 33, 515-534.
- Bond, R. (2000). Squaring the circles: Demonstrating and explaining the political 'non-alignment' of Scottish national identity. *Scottish Affairs*, 21, 15-35.
- Braber, N. & Butterfint, Z. (2008). Local identity and sound change in Glasgow. A pilot study. *Leeds Working Papers*, 13, 22-43.
- Braber, N. & Butterfint, Z. (in press). The effect of migration on local identity and sound change: the case of Glaswegian. In J. Partridge (Ed.) *Interfaces in language*. Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars.
- Brinkerhoff, J.M. (2008) Diaspora identity and the potential for violence: Toward an identity-mobilization framework. *Identity: An International Journal of Theory and Research*, 8, 67-88.
- Carrington, B. & Short, G. (1996). Who counts; who cares? Scottish children's notions of national identity. *Educational Studies*, 22, 203-224.
- Charmaz, K. (1995). Grounded theory. In J.A. Smith, R. Harré & L. Van Langenhove (Eds.) *Rethinking methods in psychology* (pp. 27-49). London: Sage Publications.
- Daiches, D. (1977). *Glasgow*. London: Andre Deutsch.
- Dunn, R.G. (1998). *Identity crises: A social critique of postmodernity*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

- Henderson, A., & McEwen, N. (2005). Do shared values underpin national identity? Examining the role of values in national identity in Canada and the United Kingdom. *National Identities*, 7, 173-191.
- Hendry, L.B., Mayer, P. & Kloep, M. (2007). Belonging or opposing? A grounded theory approach to young people's cultural identity in a majority/minority societal context. *Identity: An International Journal of Theory and Research*, 7, 181-204.
- Hylland Eriksen, T. (1993). *Ethnicity and nationalism. Anthropological perspectives*. London: Pluto Press.
- Ichijo, A. (2004). *Scottish nationalism and the idea of Europe. Concepts of Europe and the nation*. London: Routledge.
- Ichijo, A., & Spohn, W. (2005). *Entangled identities. Nations and Europe*. Hampshire: Ashgate.
- Jackson, P., & Penrose, J. (1993). Introduction: placing 'race' and nation. In P. Jackson & J. Penrose (Eds.), *Constructions of race, place and nation* (pp. 1-23). London: UCL Limited.
- Johnstone, B. (2007). Linking identity and dialect through stancetaking. In R. Englebretson (Ed.), *Stancetaking in interaction* (pp. 49-68). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Kiely, R., Bechhofer, F., Stewart, R. & McCrone, D. (2001). The markers and rules of Scottish national identity. *The Sociological Review*, 49, 33-55.
- Kiely, R., Bechhofer, F. & McCrone, D. (2005a). Birth, blood and belonging: Identity claims in post-devolution Scotland. *Sociological Review*, 53, 150-171.
- Kiely, R., McCrone, D. & Bechhofer, F. (2005b). 'Whither Britishness? English and Scottish people in Scotland'. *Nations and Nationalism*, 11, 65-82.

- Llamas, C. (1999). A new methodology: Data elicitation for social and regional language variation studies. *Leeds Working Papers in Linguistics*, 7, 95-118.
- McCrone, D. (1992). *Understanding Scotland, The sociology of a stateless nation*. London: Routledge.
- McCrone, D. (2002). Who do you say you are? Making sense of national identities in modern Britain. *Ethnicities*, 2, 301-320.
- McCrone, D., & Kiely, R. (2000). Nationalism and citizenship. *Sociology*, 34, 19-34.
- Maier, C.S. (2007). 'Being there': Place, territory and identity. In S. Benhabib, I. Shapiro and D. Petranović (Eds.), *Identities, affiliations, and allegiances*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Maver, I. (2000). *Glasgow*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Milroy, L., & Gordon, M. (2003). *Sociolinguistics. Method and interpretation*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Pacione, M. (1995). *Glasgow. The socio-spatial development of the city*. Chichester: John Wiley.
- Parekh, B. (2000). *The future of multi-ethnic Britain: Report of the Commission on the Future of Multi-ethnic Britain*. London: Profile.
- Penrose, J. (1993). Reification in the name of change: the impact of nationalism on social construction of nation, people and place in Scotland and the United Kingdom. In P. Jackson and J. Penrose (Eds.), *Constructions of race, place and nation* (pp. 27-49). London: UCL Limited.
- Pichler, H. & Watt, D. (2004). 'We're all Scottish really': Investigating the tension between claimed identity and linguistic behaviour in Berwick-upon-Tweed. *The influence of the languages of Ireland and Scotland on linguistic northern varieties of Northern England*, University of Aberdeen, 28 June 2004.

- Rosie, M., & Bond, R. (2003). Identity matters: The personal and political significance of feeling Scottish. In C. Bromley *et al* (Eds.), *Devolution – Scottish answers to Scottish questions?* (pp 116-136). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Rutland, A. & Cinirella, M. (2000). Context effects on Scottish national and European self-categorization: The importance of category accessibility, fragility and relations. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 39, 495-519.
- Smith, J.A. (1995). Semi-structured interviews and qualitative analysis. In J.A. Smith; R. Harré & L. Van Langenhove (Eds.) *Rethinking methods in psychology* (pp. 9-26). London: Sage Publications.
- Smout, T.C. (1994). Perspectives on the Scottish identity. *Scottish Affairs*, 6, 101-113.

Table 1. List of Participants

Participants living in Glasgow

Name	Gender	Age	Career
AL	Male	24	Student
AM	Male	52	Salesman
DM	Male	52	Electrician
FM	Female	43	IT
GV	Male	54	Community Worker
JR	Female	58	Head dinner lady
JW	Female	60	Secretary
LP	Female	50	Community Worker
LT	Female	37	Dinner Lady
NB	Female	44	Arts Worker
SG	Male	37	Chef
YF	Female	42	Technician

Participants living in England

CM	Male	52	Engineer
DO	Male	30	Unemployed
GN	Male	34	Lecturer
IS	Female	46	Teacher
PD	Female	62	Retired cleaner

Table 2: Themes found in Interviews

Theme	Subject
Theme 1	Views of Glasgow and Scotland by outsiders – they tend to view Glasgow negatively, but Scotland positively
Theme 2	Coming from Glasgow AND Scotland vs. coming from Glasgow only
Theme 3	Subdivisions of national identity in Scotland
Theme 4	Being British
Theme 5	What makes someone Scottish, Glaswegian etc