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ABSTRACT

MAN TO MAN: UNDERSTANDING HEGEMONIC MASCULINITY IN TURKEY THROUGH HOMOSOCIAL INTERACTIONS

YUNUSOĞLU, Enver
M.S., Department of Gender and Women’s Studies
Supervisor: Prof. Dr. F. Yıldız ECEVİT

April 2021, 195 pages

The aim of the current study is to understand hegemonic masculinity in Turkey by examining homosocial interactions between men. In order to better capture how male-male interactions contribute to hegemonic masculinity, I attempted to conduct a qualitative research based on feminist methodology. In the current study, I carried out semi-structured in-depth interviews with 20 men who belong to at least one homosocial group. In order to identify, analyze, and report themes within data, I undertook thematic analysis. From the participants’ reports, I identified two overarching themes. Those are (1) perpetuation of hegemonic masculinity and (2) stigmatization and negation of non-hegemonic masculinities. The results show that homosociality perpetuates emotional stoicism, heterosexual prowess, and ambivalent sexism which are the traits of hegemonic masculinity. In addition, non-hegemonic masculinities including gay men, nice guys, and elderly men are stigmatized and excluded from homosocial interactions since these men fall short of the expectations of hegemonic masculinity. The results suggest that anti-feminist knowledge, attitudes, and behaviors are produced, internalized, and practiced by the members of the homosocial groups and are legitimized through homosocial interactions.
Therefore, in order to understand gender division and discrimination both between men and women and within men, men’s alignment with hegemonic masculinity through homosocial interactions should be critically examined.

**Keywords:** Hegemonic Masculinity, Masculinities, Profeminism, Homosociality, Stigmatization.
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ERKEK ERKEĞE: TÜRKİYE’DE HEGEMONİK ERKEKLİĞİ HOMOSOSYAL ETKİLEŞİMLER VASITASIYLA ANLAMAK
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hem kadın-erkek arasındaki hem de erkeklerin kendi içerisindeki toplumsal cinsiyet ayrımı ve ayrımıcılığını anlamak için erkeklerin homososyal etkileşimler vasıtasıyla pekişen hegemonik erkeklik ile olan ilişkilerini eleştirel bir şekilde incelemek gerekir.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

How many roads must a man walk down,
Before you call him a man?

Bob Dylan, Blowin’ in the Wind

1.1. Background of the Study

To me, patriarchy is a red round table surrounded only by my male relatives and their acquaintances. Whenever I think of patriarchy and its effects both on my own life and the whole world, the image of red round table in my childhood always comes to my mind… I was not born into a patriarchal environment in which men and women sit, eat and socialize separately in the different sections, haremlık and selamlık\(^1\), of the houses. It was the time when the family gatherings would happen almost every week and the red round table in selamlık was to be embellished with delicious Turkish food, colorful seasonal fruits (picked off, chopped and ready to eat, for sure) and well roasted nuts for the male family members before they arrived home “too tired” from work…

In selamlık, a spacious living room occupied by my male relatives, men would be ready around red round table to eat their dinner when they came back home from work. The order of the dishes often determined the contents of the conversation they had around red round table. With starters, for instance, they would start talking about

\(^{1}\) I specifically use the words haremlık and selamlık derived from the daily use of Turkish idiom “Harem selamlık olmak” instead of their religious connotations which propose strict spatial segregation between men and women. Here, as the idiom suggests, I underline the homo-social interactions of my male and female relatives in the separate rooms in the same house and highlight the gender discrimination in the separate rooms. Even if they define themselves as Kemalist, open-minded, and forward-looking, there was an invisible agreement between men and women that they cannot come to the same room, sit and eat together, and talk to each other.
“cheesy” topics such as weather, daily routines, and problems at work. Before the main course, they had already been under the effect of Turkish Raki and thus the way of the conversation was shaped by dose of the alcohol they consumed. They generally continued with daily/weekly politics. Every man around this table would always start his speech by stating that he would welcome different political views in a respectful manner. However, men around the table were so politically polarized that they forgot their promises. After a while, nobody listened to each other, yet at the same time each tried to make the others accept his own political view. (By the way, politics is limited with political parties, ballot boxes, and voting.) After the political quarrel and the clash of the opinions, it was the time to talk about Turkish economy. With main course, all the men around red round table firstly would say “Şükür Allah verdiğin tüm nimetlere” – thank God sending all blessings- and kept on their conversation by mentioning their current investments on real estate, land, gold, currencies, etc. They were vehemently opposed to each other’s choices of investments because each thought that his choices were all the time the best and finally they tried to impose their investment ideas on the other men around red round table.

When the desserts started to be served in selamlık, my male relatives simultaneously started to lower their voices as it was time to talk about some secret topics which were not intended to be heard by their wives. They would proudly speak of their one-night stands they had in brothels recently and muttered the details of their sexual experiences, particularly their “tremendous” sexual performances. However, having a dost, referring to a person with whom a married man or woman has an extra-marital affair, was more prestigious than one-night stands all the time. As far as I remember, two of my male relatives who had a dost were the most respectful men around the red round table, since they were courageous enough to have a dost while they continue their marriages. Having a dost was one of the perfect ways for men among my relatives to show off their masculinity and economic stability. On the other hand, the men who did not have any kinds of sexual affair were harshly stigmatized as soğan erkeği, paper tiger, and then constantly encouraged to have extra marital affairs in order to move away from stressful work environment and family responsibilities a bit, relax and meet their sexual needs – actually to be able to
“exist” as a “real” man around the red round table by proving their masculinity with their sexual prowess.

In haremlık, a narrow room with kitchen, women were eating the food remaining from red round table when they finally finished serving to selamlık. In this room, the women in my family would spend most of their time by washing the dishes, preparing the new courses of the dinner, and bearing their children. On the other hand, there were some “lucky” ones eluding doing housework as they had already “deserved” it. For example, grandmothers, long time married brides and sisters of men around red round table were the lucky ones who could find chance to spend their time by chatting, doing lacework or watching soap operas on TV… While women in haremlık were doing the housework, they were talking to each other at the same time. The conversation topics mostly consist of recipes, the future of their children, and the problems that they experienced with their husbands. The women in haremlık were generally all ears when a woman talked about her problems with her husband. Whenever a woman would start complaining about domestic violence and sexual affairs of their husbands, she was silenced by her peers or mother-in law. Every woman in haremlık would say that “Don’t worry, as you know, “these” issues could be happen in any home, honey. Every one of us experiences them.” (Actually, these issues were to be swept under the mat). Moreover, women in my family tried to convince each other of being submissive, loyal and the one who forgives their husbands all the time no matter what their husbands do. Once any of them dared to “waffle” about divorce because of the unfair treatments of their husbands, they were scolded off by the other women and stigmatized as disobedient wives. Also, they were recommended to give up the idea of getting divorce and leaving the house for the sake of the honor of the family. That is to say, they were told to act like three “wise” monkeys by “seeing no evil, hear no evil, speak no evil…”

Until the beginning of my adolescence, I had a passport with me to commute between hareem and selamlık as a “sexless” child and could find a chance to observe all the things happened in different rooms in the same house. However, I was dismissed from the harem when I reached the puberty and became a teenage boy. From then on, I was potentially dangerous person for the women since I was supposed to be initiated to the male group through the rites of passages such as
circumcision, first sexual performance, etc. Consequently, I was assigned to *selamlık* as the new member of male group… From then on, as a member of this male group, I have had a chance to observe all practices of men in male-male interactions. That’s why, I assert that I know what attitudes men construct in these same-sex interactions. More specifically, I am acquainted with what men might think, how they react, and why they desire to dominate. For instance, I witness how men legitimize physical and psychological violence towards their mothers, sister, or wives in domestic sphere by stating their “reasonable” explanations to engage in violence, or how they justify their laziness and recklessness in domestic work. Moreover, in an office environment, I observe how the men condescend and patronize their women colleagues and the minority groups who cannot fit into the “real” masculine rules. Also, I notice that men try to find a common ground in which they can construct the common values, internalize the values they mutually shared, and make their actions acceptable for one another. In other words, they take these steps to be able to construct and follow the rules of hegemonic masculinity in the same-sex socialization setting, and sacrifice their humanity for the sake of masculinity. Consequently, I constantly witness how men within homo-social groups immensely affect one another’s points of view, decision-making process, and the ways of living. That’s why; it will not be surprising that the need that directs me to do this research overlaps with the feminist literature. Therefore, with my feminist lenses, I aim to raise very fundamental questions that occupied my mind throughout my life. The following questions would be the backbone of this study:

**Research Question 1:** How do strong homosocial relations between men influence hegemonic masculinity in Turkey?

**Research Question 2:** In what ways masculinities in Turkey are affected by homosociality?

In order to be able to relate the concept of homosociality with hegemonic masculinity in the following chapters, I will move from a broad evaluation of gender socialization to specific details of homosociality. More specifically, in the first subtitle of the background study, I will focus on the process by which men and women learn their gender related roles and expectations, and the agents that
influence the process. After that, I will specifically examine the male socialization and its interconnectedness with hegemonic masculinity in the second part. At that part, I will try to show the ways of constructing masculinities through the ideal of hegemonic masculinity and how men perceive the “gendered” socialization and react to it. Upon approaching to the end of introduction part, I will introduce the concept of homosociality generally and mention the evaluation of male homosociality in masculinity studies.

1.1.1. Gender Socialization

Gender is a revolutionary socio-cultural phenomenon which deconstructs the male/female binary classifications by questioning the assigned sex at birth and it is determined via every person’s relationship with the societies and cultures which are significant to them. The gender of a person often makes up a significant part of his or her identity. This is known as someone’s gender identity. Gender identity is a person’s internal sense of one’s own gender. More specifically, it is the way a person identifies his/her own gender according to how they perceive their own gender and what they choose to call themselves. It is referred to a continual process and it is not confined to static social positions because a person’s gender identity might not line up with their sex which is assigned at birth (Ogden, 2017). As gender is relational, gender identity, thus, is rooted in early social interactions and constantly being constructed by the accumulation of meanings attributed by and to the individuals over time (Burke & Reitsez, 1981).

Apart from the contributions of several factors such as race, ethnicity and class to the gender socialization of young adolescent, there are strong evidences about the effects of family, peer and school for gender socialization (Amin et al., 2017). Agents of socialization such as parents, teachers and peers accompany the process of the transition from childhood to adulthood, particularly the process in which boys and girls start to differentiate the masculine and feminine characteristics. These agents create their own gender orders which mostly construct the men’s superiority and dominance over women, and supports inequality between women and men (Connel, 2001). Thus, boys and girls are supposed to learn this gender order and accept the male privilege and superiority. Moreover, they internalize the gender roles attributed
to their sex, since they try to resemble to male or female adults who practice stereotypical gender roles (Hilf & Lynch, 1983).

To start with, family is one of the significant agents that highly influence the socialization of gender. The role of parents for the development of proper gender attitude is to implicitly or explicitly communicate the gendered expectations with their children (Kagesten et al., 2016). The construction of masculinity and femininity; thus, firstly takes place in the family. In this way, boys and girls in the family are treated differently by their parents because parental and societal aspirations for boys and girls are totally different. Hence particular behaviors attributed to boys and girls are encouraged by the parents to be able to be compatible with the “local community of masculinity or femininity practice” (Peacther, 2007, p. 43). The adoption of gender role attitudes such as being breadwinner and homemaker, thus, is shaped by the family relations and mother’s and father’s self-notion of gender. For example, the father is the person who works outside, rarely shares his emotions, treats his children in an authoritative way, and spends his leisure time outside home. On the other hand, the mother is portrayed as a submissive figure that cleans the house, cooks, and bears the children. At this point, children start to figure out differentiating between being man and woman and thus construct their identities by interpreting the gender order in the family. Therefore, children, as they observe the family dynamics, start to accept the dominant position of men and subordination of women and thus gender attitudes might be shaped in a patriarchal way. Moreover, when families and patriarchy collaborate, parents maintain the gender order. Simply put, they do not hesitate to buy toys which reproduce the gender differences and direct their children to do the activities which are compatible with their sex because parents intend to raise their boys and daughters with typical masculine and female traits (Hurrelman, 2009). The conscious or unconscious behavior of the parents might “naturalize” different norms attributed to each gender (Peacther, 2007). As long as boys and girls are taught to accept the “naturalness” of gender differences and essentiality as well as the indispensability of gendered power in the family, the patriarchal system can benefit from the legitimization of unequal relationships between men and women and thus constant perpetuation of traditional masculine and feminine roles.
Socialization as a complex process does not only actualize in the family. School has also a crucial role on gender socialization as it upholds gender norms through different rules and regulations. The rules and regulations which construct and maintain gender differences are implicitly put into practice in education (Hurrelman & Bauer, 2018). To start with, stereotypical feminine norms are being constantly constructed in the way that schoolgirls are forced to wear and act like a real “lady” because the real lady is someone who is always kind and well-mannered, takes good care of her, and controls her drives. Also, traditional masculine roles are strictly reinforced for boys by schools. For example, by teachers and the school administration, some masculine norms such as being tough, aggressive, and competitive are promoted so as to be a “real” man. On the other hand, when teaching of academic skills and academic success of students are taken into consideration, schools seem to excessively favor boys’ activities and academic performances over girls’ (Kagesten et al., 2016). Physical education classes, for example, are organized according to one’s gender. That is, the sports which are done at schools are separated into two: (1) the sports that can be done by girls and do not harm girls’ physical appearance and (2) the sports that are necessary for the physical and psychological development of boys. The physical capacity and muscular strength are defined with boys, which results in gender stereotyping in PE classes. Thus, as girls in the school cannot “fulfill” the requirements of the physical education, they mostly have the secondary position in this course as “delicate” and “fragile” individuals. Finally, girls incline to internalize the idea of “physical capacity” based on gender differences and also they are directed to be physically inactive (Gorely, Holroyd & Kirk, 2003). Besides physical education, there are many cases favoring boys’ attempts in academic courses such as math and physics and they are believed to be more successful in these courses. For instance, adolescent boys are aware of gaining an advantage over girls and supported more than girls in certain domains of mathematics success (Nancy, Almedia & Petersen, 1990). Therefore, schools as socializing agents play crucial role to reproduce gender roles and maintain the internalization of traditional masculinities and femininities in terms of activities and school performances.

On the other hand, peers have an essential role for the gender socialization of young adolescents and power for the perpetuation of gender norms. After children have
intense relationship with their parents in their very first years, they start to spend their time with their peers not only in an academic environment—schools—but also in outdoor spaces such as parks, playgrounds and schools. Therefore, peers contribute to the construction of gender identity, as well. In order to exist in male or female peer groups, schoolchildren are required to act in line with their gender. Physical appearance including clothing, hair styles and posture function as a mechanism that creates the construction of physical identity based on gender differences (Peachter, 2006), and also transforms the schoolchildren into gendered bodies. According to McGuffey and Rich (2001), consumption habits of schoolchildren also maintain gender differences. The music schoolchildren listen, magazines they read, TV advertisements they watch, and cell phones they use are designed and promoted through depending on the gender differences. For instance, wearing the expensive clothes and having the latest cell phones are identified with boys’ wealth and status. On the other hand, girls are identified with some “girlish” things such as being fashionable and attractive like celebrities they watch. A girl can be included in a female peer group as long as she does “girlish” things (Peachter, 2007).

Gendered expectations widen the gap between male and female peer groups by emphasizing the feminine and masculine roles. Female peers, for instance, can enforce beauty norms by talking about endless diets and ideal bodies of celebrities, “feminine” appearance with make-up products continually bombarded with advertisements, and heterosexual romance pumped by teen magazines (Anjalin, 2015; Kagesten et al., 2016). This sounds really normal because boys are assumed to focus on their academic responsibilities, while girls are supposed to promote their “social” sides. Promoting certain standards of beauty between girls might result in another stereotype pertaining to the necessity of being well groomed and attractive all the time, yet at the same time, excessive attractiveness can enable a girl to be insulted as a “slut” since she cannot mind the balance between being attractive and too attractive. It actually arises from the unequal atmosphere which is created by different socializations interwoven with gender differences. As Duby (1991) underlines, boys are raised with the idea of completely revealing and experiencing their potentials compared to girls and this “privilege” is not unreturned. In fact, boys are supposed to meet the attributed expectations such as having physical and mental
steadiness and being active and competitive, etc. In the study conducted in teen summer camp, McGuffey and Rich (2001) observe boys and girls in their same-sex groups and examine their attitudes depending on gender differences. They recognize that teens have a group head in their same-sex groups and choose their group heads from the members who fulfill the requirements of traditional gender roles. For example, the group head of the male group is the most competitive and dominant and the least emotional one; also he has the leadership spirit and success-focused mindset, and at the same time he humiliates and objectifies the girls around him sexually. Furthermore, the study interestingly shows that other male members in the group member accept the dominance of the group head and obey the rules of group head without questioning the hierarchy between them. Of course, the position of the group head is not stable; he is required to sustain his position by reproducing the masculine attitudes he owns. On the other hand, other boys in male peer group try to compete with each other to be able to be the group head. While trying to do it, they constantly regard and categorize their male peers according to their masculine performances and thus this creates hierarchal settings in which girls cannot enter. According to Massad (1981), it is actually not surprising that boys in their early adolescence stick to the masculine roles more than girls conforming feminine roles. The reason is that there is more social pressure on boys while they are moving to adulthood, since masculine behaviors, preferences and interests are socially valued.

Therefore, male peers are “responsible” for sharing and spreading all roles they have internalized to other boys so as not to be isolated or alienated from the group. In short, to do so, male peers contribute to the reinforcement of the hegemonic male ideals by:

Challenging each other physically and verbally or encouraging risk-taking practices (e.g., alcohol, drug use, and unsafe sex). They also challenge each other to show their masculinity through early sexual conquest of girls. Any violation of masculinity norms is penalized by ridicule including homophobic insults and bullying. (Amin et al., 2017, p. 4)

Male peers, as it is seen, have a strong impact on the marginalization of boys who are target of ridicule as they fail to display the elements of hegemonic masculinity and show signs of physical and emotional weakness.
Apart from the effects of agents of socialization such as family, school and peers upon gender socialization, it is also necessary to examine how boys and girls figure out and experience the things happening around them, and react to the expectations from these agents because the experiences of individuals are equally crucial and meaningful. That’s why, the model of the tripartite *self* by Sedikides and Gaertner (2011) can be discussed in terms of gender socialization and construction of masculinity and femininity. Sedikides and Gaertner (2011) put forward three different selves: (1) individual *self*, (2) relational *self* and (3) collective *self* in order to be able to understand how human beings experience the world around them. The *individual self* emphasizes the unique side of a person. This notion comprises some attributions such as behaviors, traits, interests, experiences and goals. These attributions enable a person to differentiate him/her from the others. The individual self, as an identity model, is to be commonly seen particularly in Western industrialized countries (Trandis & Trafimov, 2001). Therefore, the individual self is not enough to understand and explain the interpersonal relations between people especially in Middle Eastern societies where personal bonds are particularly emphasized and individuality is not simply welcomed. That is, the model of relational *self* and collective *self* are more suitable to figure out the construction of identity in the socialization periods in non-Western countries. The relational self emphasizes one’s interpersonal side. This time, the attributes are shared with close ones such as family members, partners and friends. Therefore, roles are defined within relationships and interpersonal bonds determine the self-representation of a person. More specifically, the model of interpersonal self affects a person’s daily life so deeply that the decision making process of a person, for example, can be shaped by interpersonal relations such as mother-son, father-son and a close friend-the individual. For example, as Kandiyoti (1997) clearly indicates, an adult male, in his decision making process, takes his mother’s expectations, consent and confirmation into consideration even if he is accepted as the head of the family. That’s why; relational self is really crucial and decisive for the construction of gender identity while experiencing the relationships with the agents of socialization. Finally, collective *self* emphasizes one’s intergroup side. A person’s behaviors, traits, interests, experiences and goals are shared with group members and these attributes differentiate in group members from out group members. Racial, religious, ethnic
and gender identities, as well as occupational groups contribute to the construction of the collective self (Kashima & Aldridge, 2001). A person can be highly influenced by his/her group members in terms of conformity and then the person is inclined to support and protect the benefits of the group as he is supposed to share the same values in the group. The self-representation, thus, is realized through membership in a social group. Finally, according to Brewer and Roccas (as cited in Sedikides & Gaertner, 2010), “the collective self may accord the optimal level of self-definition by simultaneously meeting competing needs for assimilation through intergroup comparisons and differentiation through intragroup comparisons, respectively” (p.99). That is to say, men, for instance, might use collective self to legitimize their violence towards women and oppress alternative masculinities via social norms and perpetuate their dominance and status.

All the things that were acquired through social interactions might not affect the existing self-notions about gender all the time. When it is specifically focused on male socialization in the next section, it can be understood that every man gives different meaning to his gender identity and some of the meanings are consistent with hegemonic masculinity while some of them are not (Messner, 1992). In other words, each man “comes to understand both socially shared meanings of masculinity and the idiosyncratic meanings that comprise his unique gender identity” (Bird, 1996, p. 122).

1.1.1.1. Male Socialization and Hegemonic Masculinity

Male socialization is a critical process shaped by the stereotypical notion of masculinity because it provides a space to construct and reproduce traditional masculine practices. More specifically, masculinity is constructed through hegemonic patterns of masculinity in different socialization periods (Almedia & Petersen, 1990; Jewkes et al., 2015). Therefore, men are raised with hegemonic schema and scripts such as being tough, competitive, courageous, etc., and they are required to perform the gendered roles attributed to them. In male-dominated societies, the man, thus, becomes the “real” man as long as he meets the expectations of hegemonic masculinity. On the other hand, the man who identifies himself with the ideals of hegemonic masculinity tries to transform different types of masculinities into hegemonic ones because he could exist as a patriarchal being as
long as he subjugates women and “other” men. He also legitimizes his patriarchal practices by supporting the men’s dominant and superior position in the society. Finally, he knows that if he “fails” to become “real” man in any socialization period, he is mostly ignored, stigmatized and excluded from the society as he cannot realize the practices of hegemonic masculinity.

There are many studies that emphasize the importance of socialization in the construction of masculinity. One of the most crucial studies about the socialization of men was done by Heiliger and Engelfried (1995). In their study, they introduce eight socialization elements which might be so crucial in order to understand the role of socialization in the construction of masculinity (as cited in Onur & Koyuncu, 2004). The first point is that men are supposed to be the individuals belonging to outer world and public space where they are supposed to be strong, competitive and brave. In this ideal world, men are not expected to suffer from anything, cry, and mourn. They are to be rational all the time; otherwise, they can be “accused” of sharing their feelings, actually something from their “inner” worlds as women “always” do. Second point can be explained with the “utilization” of women’s labor by the men. Women are mostly charged with different types of reproduction in the domestic sphere. That means, women are responsible for giving birth, bearing children, cleaning, and cooking. In fact, they are captivated to household while men do not share housework and contribute to child care. Thus, men, who do not take part in domestic work, benefit from women’s labor power and production. The third element is the “silence” of men. The sense of speechlessness is constructed when men deprive themselves of expressing their emotions. The fourth one, which is also related to silence of men, is “loneliness”. Loneliness requires men to be self-sufficient and deal with the problems all alone. In addition, “rationality” is the fifth point for in the construction of masculine identity. As men are seen as the center of mind and logic, they are expected to rely more on reason than on rousing their emotions. The quality or state of being rational results in controlling the “irrational” groups like “women” who cannot possess reasoning powers. The sixth point is about men’s “domination” over women, which is closely knitted to the seventh element affecting the socialization period of men: “violence”. The man who hides his feelings, chooses to be lonely and boasts with his rationality prefers violence in order to be able to solve the social problems he faces. Finally, the last point which is
prominent for the construction of masculinity is the “physiological distance” meaning that there is a discontinuity between mind and body in the construction of masculinity. Physiological distance also refers to men’s inclination to make their bodies functional as they do in doing sports, for example.

I am of the opinion that the construction and perpetuation of hegemonic masculinity in Turkey might be critically evaluated through considering male socialization process of men in Turkey. Therefore, the points that emphasize the importance of socialization in the construction of masculinity mentioned above might be shared by Turkish culture to a certain extent. Consequently, it is appropriate to embrace the idea that socialization also plays an important role in Turkey as its basic qualities might not change much from one culture to another. In this way, it is possible to state that there are different mechanisms that construct gender identities and constantly shape the masculine identities in Turkey, as well. These mechanisms range from agents of socialization such as the family, peers, school and military institutions to sport activities, labour market and marriage. Finally, these mechanisms cause to the upholding of prevailing masculine norms and thus construct masculine identities through gender stereotypes.

To start with, the attitudes of parents have indispensable effects on the construction of their children’s gender attitudes. Gender discrimination initially starts with the question directed to the expectant parents: Is it boy or girl? The baby has not yet been born; however, the aim of the question, besides curiosity, is to weigh the advantages and disadvantages of having a baby-boy or baby-girl at a glance and at the same time understand the social, political and economic returns/benefits of having son or daughter for the expectant parents in the future. Also, the purpose might be to remind parents to be ready to teach gender norms proposing what is appropriate for girls and boy in Turkish society.

To make the parental effects on the socialization of children in Turkey clear, home as a socialization setting could be examined because home is the place where socialization begins and the politics of gender and space intersect explicitly (Özbay & Baliç, 2004). This type of definition could be highly suitable for the conventional Turkish families which generally consist of a man and wife, and one or more of their
biological children. More specifically, in traditional Turkish families, men are the bread-winners and decision-makers while women are the home-makers. These stereotypical roles are encouraged by the society and supported by the policies of the government. According to Navaro-Yaşın (2000), in these traditional households the father is like an “invisible man” because he is supposed to limit his sharing with other family members. In fact, he is expected to suppress his feeling and emotional reactions. Therefore, the perception of the father at home is that he is the stranger who is accommodated. However, this stranger is interestingly the decision-maker who administers the family. While the father legislates the patriarchal power in the family (Demren, 2001), the mother is responsible for the physical and psychological needs of the children. Even if this creates an unequal division of labor in the family, a secret compromise that determines the roles of father and mother in the family has been sustained by the mother and the father mutually (Bozok, 2005). Therefore, children in the family can witness this secret compromise and internalize the rules of it, and finally they become the potential implementer of that compromise in the future.

The study called *The Socio-cultural Construction of Masculine Identity: The Example of Tepecik Mahallesi* can be given as an example in order to see the concrete way of constructing masculinities and femininities in Turkey. Although this study includes data from a small neighborhood Tepecik, İzmir, it can give some comprehensive clues about Turkish culture in general and socialization of male identity specifically. In his study, Bozok (2005) emphasizes that rather than the baby girls, baby boys are preferable as they have the potential to continue the bloodline and family name. Secondly, boys are supposed to care the family members when they get older, retired or ill. Girls, on the other hand, are supposed to help their mother for the housework and cooking, and serve to their fathers and brothers until they get married and leave their families. Bell and Valentine (1997) can exemplify the gendered division of labor and power relations in family with a scene from the family dinner, which might be compatible with Turkish society and culture. The mother and the daughter (if any) are responsible for preparing and serving the dinner. On the other hand, the role of the father is to do nothing besides eating and chatting. What about the son (if any) in this scene? He is responsible for sitting and eating the dinner as his father does and he is required to listen his father while talking about
“important” issues such as politics and economy, in contrast to his sister who has to share the domestic work at home. Whatever girls in the family do for their families, they still have a lower status in the family since they stop fulfilling their responsibilities for their family and continue doing housework and serving to their husbands when they get married. Thus, girls are taught to be inferior to their brothers and act accordingly.

According to Bozok (2005), in the socialization period, boys are supposed to accept the power of the father, follow their steps and identify themselves with their father. This is because of father’s “mythical” position in the family. The father is the person who has already passed all stations of masculinity: he was circumcised, experienced sexuality, completed his military service, and had a job. That is, as it is seen, fatherhood might be the top position in which a man can prove his masculinity. In spite of the fact that fathers desire to be confirmed and supported, and followed by their sons, they do not permit their sons to be autonomous individuals to prevent them from disobeying their authorities. However, sons insist on going beyond the limited privileges provided by their father and thus they have a contentious relationship with their fathers as their fathers used to have. At this point, it would be better to examine the position of the mother in the family. Besides sustaining their “primary” duties such as cleaning, cooking and serving, mothers play crucial role for the socialization of their children. As socialization is widely seen as women’s job, women are supposed to take the responsibility of rearing the children (Connel, 2001) and undertake “mothers’ role as mediator” (Kıray, 2010). That is to say, mothers are required to take care of the physical and psychological development of their children. However, if something goes wrong about the socialization period of the children, the mother might be the first person who is accused of not doing their “feminine” job and rearing her children properly by the fathers who could not find “enough” time to take care of their children because of their busy jobs (Papataxiarchis, 1991).

Apart from the primary socialization, which includes learning a set of social norms and values, the children undergo a process known as secondary socialization. It is through this process children learn to become a member of a smaller group within the society. As secondary socialization occurs outside home, the schools become one of the first and most important institutional agents teaching children how to become
a member of a society and negotiate relationships. Teachers, some classroom activities and interactions among children reinforce gender roles children have already learnt in their families. For instance, in pre-school time, boys are assumed that they are physically active and they prefer to go out of the classroom and get dirt or play fight with the other boys. On the other hand, girls gather to play with dolls and plastic household and cleaning sets. Therefore, boys are supposed to act out traditional roles such being confident, physically active, tough and confident, whereas girls take the role of being future wives and mother through housekeeping and doll-bearing. In school time, same-sex peers maintain gender roles and children who are highly socialized by their same-sex peers tend to conform to typical gender role behaviors. Children learn that boys will be boys; girls will be girls. This division further limits the interaction between opposite sexes, which contributes to the gender-typed activities and some stereotypes for the future lives of the children (Martin et al, 2013). Also, in adolescence, as young boys and girls reach sexual maturity, both sexes become potentially dangerous to each other, particularly in Middle East countries (Mahdi, 2003). As teenage boys and girls are potentially seen as couples, their interaction with the opposite sex is limited. Thus, in Turkey, teenage boys spend most of their time with other boys from their schools or their neighborhood, so do girls (Bozok, 2005). Sexuality, sports and video games are the main issues discussed by male peers.

At high school, in addition to on-going power conflict between the boy and father, constant resistance to the authority at schools emerges. According to a study conducted in a high school in Ankara by Özkazanç and Sayılan (2009), there is culture of hegemonic male resistance to school administrators and teachers. The culture is based on idea of that the “powerful” one is the rule-maker; the “weak” one is obliged to lose. This culture replicates the patriarchal order whereby men are the rule makers while women and non-conforming men (also known as non-hegemonic masculinities) are the subordinates. In the same study, it is found that administrators and teachers insult their students by calling them “misfits” and “unsuccessful.” As a reaction to these humiliations, male students, more than the female ones, practice hegemonic resistance by adopting the idea that “you have to be powerful not to be oppressed” (p.12). The power conflict also emerges among students and this conflict creates gang organizations and maintains the hierarchical ranking of students into
age groups. To make it clear, on the top of the hierarchy, there is a high school boy who is older (generally third or fourth grader) than the other students, belongs to a gang in or out of the school, and oppresses the inexperienced freshmen and “others”. Successful students, girls who reject a relationship with one of the members of the gang, and boys who disobey the rules of hegemonic masculinity are otherized. Finally, viewing these girls and non-conforming boys as intrinsically different reproduces the patterns of hegemonic masculinity.

As it is seen, there are many factors that influence male socialization and masculinity both in Turkey and in different countries. Agents of socialization such as parents, schools, and peers have a great impact on the construction of hegemonic masculinity. In this study, I will try to focus on male peers in order to understand how same-sex socialization influences the hegemonic masculinity in Turkey. Therefore, in the following section, I will define the notion of “homosociality” in general and underline its relevance to hegemonic masculinity.

1.1.2. Homo-socialization

According to Merriam-Webster, homosocial means “of, relating to, or involving social relationships between persons of the same sex and especially between men.” Therefore, homosociality refers to same sex social interactions which are not of a romantic or sexual nature. The concept of homosociality was coined by Jean Lipman-Blumen in 1975. In her article titled “Towards a Homosocial Theory of Sex Roles: An Explanation of the Sex Segregation of Social Institutions” she initially defines “homosocial” as the seeking, enjoyment, and/or preferences of the company of the same sex (Lipman-Blumen, 1975, p. 16). She proposes that men seek to develop their attitudes and values together with other men within a space which is separated from female sphere, which results in excluding women from male-dominated realms of society such as business, politics, sports and economy. Same-sex socialization, therefore, can create occupational sex segregation between men and women and perpetuate the low status of women especially in male professions.

For Lipman-Blumen, the idea of homosociality might derive from the different socialization of boys and girls. When children are encouraged to have same-sex interaction, girls are inclined to play with a partner while boys tend to play in groups.
Thus, for boys, the idea of being in homosocial world can trigger an inclination to favor the group members. Also, when the boys grow up and become adults, they ask for help from other men more as they are not willing to be seen “needy” to women with whom they are not used to share the same environment. Therefore, it can be concluded that homosociality promotes clear distinction between women and men through gender segregation, which perpetuates men’s hegemony in the social system and thus the segregation of the important domains of social life (Lipman-Blumen, 1975).

After a long absence in the literature, the concept of homosociality started to be commonly used in masculinity studies as a tool to analyze social bonds and power relations between men (Hammaren & Johansson, 2014). It is also used to elaborate how men reinforce and defend the gender order and patriarchy through strong and intimate collaborations between men. Therefore, homosociality as a concept became useful for examining the relations “among” men by understanding the group dynamics. In addition to the discussions of homosociality in masculinity studies, Kimmel and Aronson (2003) put forward that homosociality has physical and symbolic connotations. Physical connotation of homosociality, as the name suggests, refers to a spatial segregation between men and women. This means there are some specific places where man can go and socialize most, and the existence of women is not welcomed. These “men-only” places include pubs, stadiums, gambling halls, amusement arcades, etc. Actually, these are the places both men and women can socialize; however, a certain group of men dominate these places and they try to create “male” common ground in which merely men participate. On the other hand, symbolic connotation of homosociality alludes to creating the male patterns of communication and interaction. In this symbolic zone, men are expected to develop “moral attitudes, political opinions, and systems of values” (Kimmel & Arason, 2003, p. 396). That means that it is not enough for men to be in the male sphere physically, they also need to share the same values and have the same perspective by being physically and symbolically far away from women.

Thus, it is possible for the men who share the same values and opinions to make something acceptable to other men within the group. For example, apart from intimate sharing, support, and friendship, the homosocial group also support and
legitimize domestic violence, unequal domestic division of labor, social, economic and political inequalities, and intolerance towards ethnic or sexual minorities. Therefore, both physical and symbolic connotations of homosociality seem to draw strict lines between male and female spheres. As a result of this, traditional masculine and feminine roles and the subordination of women and different masculinities are constructed by the homosocial group. Men within the homosocial group are inclined to legitimize their practices by affecting one other’s decision making processes. Therefore, they not only internalize some “legitimized” roles and expectations but they also transfer them to the next homosocial generations. A critical understanding of strong male bonds makes it possible to say that homosociality has a strong relationship with hegemonic masculinity and perpetuates the practices of hegemonic masculinity such as exercising power, domination, and violence.

1.2. The Purpose and Significance of the Study

In the current study, I aim at understanding how men experience masculinity, men’s engagement with the practices of hegemonic masculinity, and male homosocial interactions that work to shape different masculinities. More specifically, in addition to existing definitions and evaluations of hegemonic masculinity in Turkey, I will use the concept of homosociality to be able understand hegemonic masculinity and analyze social bonds and power relations between men in Turkey. Thus, I try to relate homosocial interaction of men to the practices of hegemonic masculinity in Turkey. To be able to understand how hegemonic masculinity is widespread in Turkey and its effects on reproducing inequalities among men as well as between men and women, I assume that it is better to examine the strong male bonds and thus homosocial construction of masculinity. Therefore, I will try to show how and why men in Turkey build strong male bonds and, through their strong relations to other men, how they construct the traits of hegemonic masculinity and perpetuate them.

On the other hand, I will try to figure out whether all men in homosocial settings are hegemonic or not. To do so, I will attempt to discover what they talk to each other, share together, and hide from one another when they are together. Finally, I predict that homosociality as social dynamic perpetuates the ongoing hegemonic masculinity in Turkey. Even though I search for understanding hegemonic masculinity in Turkey
through examining homosociality, I am sincerely aware of the difficulties to find the hegemonic masculinity “exactly” in homosocial settings since masculinity is a dynamic phenomenon which is in disguise and thus constantly changes. Therefore, I just try to follow the steps of different faces of “masculinities” in social male bonds. One way or another, in my study, I will assert that internalization of hegemonic ideals requires social interactions and it keeps in existence as long as it is mutually accepted by the members sharing the same homosocial settings. Since I try to show the effects of male homo-socialization on perpetuation of hegemonic masculinity, male peers who have homosocial interactions will be the subjects of this study.

As “feminism is for everybody,” (Hooks, 2000) and feminist methodology enables the researcher to reflect and problematize his/her matters in the field, I will benefit from feminist methodology in this research. I will critically seek the ideals of hegemonic masculinity and subordination of non-hegemonic masculinities in homosocial interactions. With my feminist lenses, I will show how the traits of hegemonic masculinity in Turkey are constantly reproduced and male power and privilege are maintained through homosociality. Therefore, this study aims to contribute to the pro-feminist social movement which questions the traditional masculine roles and problematizes different masculinities in social relations and homosocial contexts.

My purpose in this study is to take a step further by studying relations “among” men instead of studying relations “between” men and women. That is to say, what might make my study different from the other studies and significant is to understand hegemonic masculinity and gender inequalities through strong male bonds and interactions. As pro-feminist scholars suggest, it is not enough to look merely from women’s perspective to be able to examine the power relations between men and women. There are many prominent studies conducted about men and masculinities and some thesis and dissertations were written on men’s sexuality, men and violence, men and politics, etc. to understand the gender inequalities. Also, many campaigns were organized by conscious-raising groups in order to reach gender equality. However, reproduction of hegemonic masculinity in any field has continued to exist for ages and there must be some reasons behind this. Therefore, I try to put forward the concept of homosociality as one of the reasons that perpetuates hegemonic
masculinity. I hope studying men’s homosocial interactions as a pro-feminist researcher will give a chance to understand different masculinities in Turkey and thus discover my position in the patriarchal order. Finally, I aim to raise consciousness and empower the men I interviewed and the ones who can find a chance to read this study.
CHAPTER 2

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK AND LITERATURE REVIEW

...How many times can a man turn his head,
And pretend that he just doesn’t see?

Bob Dylan, Blowin’ in the Wind

2.1. Masculinity Studies

Masculinity makes its presence felt in every practice in everyday life. It is a fact that the daily practices of masculinity are mostly negative and hazardous especially for women. Sexual harassment, unequal division of labor at home, unequal payment at work, glass-ceiling, mansplanning, domestic violence, femicide, honor killing, misogynistic discourses… The list goes on. On the other hand, there is another fact that a group of men suffer from hegemonic masculinity and deal with the norms of patriarchy as well, because, as Connell (2005) underlines, the certain groups of men benefit from the “privileges” of being men and sustain them through the subordination of “other” masculinities. Therefore, it is necessary to talk about relations both within and between genders while speaking of masculinities and men’s concern for having the predominant position in gender order.

There are many studies on men and masculinity that derived from feminist theorizing and methodology and these studies show how men suffer from hegemonic masculinity in local, regional, and global level. In my study, I use the concept of “hegemonic masculinity” in order to understand strong social bonds between men in Turkey. In this chapter, I will present a theoretical discussion on men and masculinity studies and homosociality. To do so, I will give an overview of past and present state of masculinity studies by considering the relations between feminist
theory and masculinity studies. After that, I will focus especially on the concept of hegemonic masculinity in detail in order to comprehend the gender order as a whole. Finally, I will demonstrate how homosociality and the concept of hegemonic masculinity are inter-related.

2.1.1. Theorizing Men and Masculinity

Masculinity studies is an interdisciplinary field of study regarding men, masculinity, power relations, and sexuality. Until the late 1970s, masculinity either was taken as the fixed and innate notion when it was to be included in a scientific inquiry or was generally excluded from gender studies since women were seen to be the primary subjects for this field (Carrigan, Connell & Lee, 1985). Even though the relationship between feminism and masculinity studies seem to be complicated and problematic (Gardiner, 2005), studies on men and masculinities have been undeniably influenced by feminist theory. Based on the feminist theory, masculinity studies propose that there is no single femininity or masculinity. Instead, there are femininities and masculinities having different meanings in different contexts. Therefore, masculinity study, as feminist theory had done before, opposes to biologically determined sex-role theory claiming that sex differences are chiefly shaped by “nature.”

With the rise of second wave feminism in the 1960s and 1970s, a disagreement and division between feminism and masculinity existed in popular discourse in which men’s anger and anti-feminism were investigated particularly in the Western world. The idea that proposed femininities as socially constructed in patriarchal system (de Beauvoir, 1988) was not welcomed by men in the United States and Britain and their reactions were misogynist and homophobic because the women’s liberation movement in 1970s and 1980s meant to displace the men’s privileged position in the gender order. However, in academia, there were a small number of scientific inquiries that surrogated men’s superior position and thus studied masculinity in the departments of women’s and gender studies (Franklin, 1984). *Men and Masculinity* (1974) by Joseph Pleck and Jack Sawyer can be given as an example for examining men’s lives in the framework that takes feminist critique of traditional gender roles into consideration. From then on, a number of critical studies have been conducted by adopting feminist-inspired point of view and thus masculinity studies have started to broadly influence the feminist theory and methodology (Gardiner, 2005) in return.
One of studies on men and masculinity, is the inspiring article “Towards a New Sociology of Masculinity” (1985) which is the manifestation of newly formed masculinity studies and shapes other contemporary and present research on masculinity studies. Through bringing new terms such as “hegemonic masculinity” and “masculinities” into the gender literature, Connell changed the course of masculinity studies by creating a paradigm shift in this field.

Initial contribution to masculinity studies begins with the critique of the existing sex-role theory. Sex-role theory is pertaining to the situational nature of male and female roles and the actions taken by men and women are defined by their “innate” differences. This approach has been criticized for being problematic, deterministic, and unattainable ideal (Pleck & Sawyer, 1974; Pleck, 1987, Connell, 1987; 1995). Sex roles theory superficially represents sex roles regarding biological differences as if gender was a static phenomenon. However, the critique of sex role theory is broadly about the fact that the differences between “femaleness” and “femininity” are disregarded. Thus, the ones who criticize the sex role theory propose that masculinities and femininities are constructed and reproduced through power relations (Pleck, 1987). Also, some pro-feminist scholars like Pleck and Sawyer (1974), Connell, Carrigan, and Lee (1985), Clatterbaugh (1990), and Kimmel (1996), by taking a step further, reverse the idea that masculinity is static and innate notion. Instead, they mention the possibility of men’s, especially homosexuals and men of color, subordination and oppression by the patriarchal system.

Since the early 1990s, academic masculinity studies have been developed as an independent field of study which has benefited from post structuralism, queer studies, and race and ethnicity studies (Gardiner, 2002). Rather than competing with feminist studies, pro-feminist scholars supported feminism within masculinity studies and they become partners with feminist scholars in dealing with traditional masculinity. To do so, for instance, Carrigan, Connell, and Lee (1985) propose the concept of hegemonic masculinity which will be discussed in detail in the following section. In addition, Connell (1995; 2005) introduced the notion of “masculinities” in Masculinities in which she presents a critical feminist analysis of specific masculinities and focuses on how men play a crucial role for maintaining dominant forms of masculinities. Instead of evaluating masculinities as homogenous groups,
Connell proposes that subordination of women is not a fixed practice of *all* men. Therefore, practices of *all* men had better not be melted in the same pot and condemned in the process. Connel adds that both men and women are subordinated by the patriarchal order which is constructed and reproduced through power relations under changing conditions. Thus, masculinities are historically specific and dynamic structure which are open to change and challenges. For example, it is not really possible to evaluate the experiences working class men, Hispanic or Latino men, homosexual men in the same way because there are many different determinants of defining different masculinities and there is no single and fixed definition of masculinity as it was used to be defined as white, middle-class, and heterosexual (Kimmel & Messner, 2000). Even if masculinity is studied within the narrow framework of ethnicity, it might not be appropriate to evaluate the experiences of the Kurdish man living in Syria and Turkey in the same way. For this reason, there is not a single masculinity; instead, there are different “masculinities” that are being constantly reproduced by power relations.

### 2.1.1.1. Hegemonic Masculinity

Hegemonic masculinity has been a dominant term in the study of men and masculinities in analyzing power relations between men and women. It is the concept which can keep up with the changing history and transform itself according to time, space, and culture (Connell, 2005). Therefore, when compared to the notion of “patriarchy,” hegemonic masculinity is more fluid and dynamic concept, which makes it a fundamental concept to be used in gender studies (Hammaren & Johansson, 2014). The concept of hegemonic masculinity was introduced by Raewyn Connell in a 1982 report from a research project on secondary school in Australia. The notion of hegemonic masculinity emerged after Connell and her colleagues interviewed boys, teachers, and parents in the secondary school and understood the “active hierarchies of masculinity in school settings” (Connell, 1985). Based on feminist and queer theory, as well as psychoanalysis, Connell, Carrigan and Lee (1985) published their widely translated and mostly cited article called “Toward a New Sociology of Masculinity.” It is an article that has influenced the idea of different “masculinities” which criticizes the dominant literature of sex-role theory.
used for sociological research on men and masculinities (Wedgwood & Connell, 2004).

In the term *hegemonic masculinity*, the adjective *hegemonic* derives from the theory of cultural hegemony by Antonio Gramsci. In a broad sense, Gramsci’s theory of hegemony describes how an economic class controls society via the state, the law, capitalists and intellectuals and how these ruling agents control the culture of that society (Hearn, 2004). At this point, Connell glues the cultural dynamics such as values, beliefs and perceptions to the term of masculinity and thus he concludes that hegemonic masculinity is not a stable phenomenon. This means that the ruling patriarchal order might vary depending on the continents, culture and history and this creates different specificities of “masculinities” (Connell, 1995). The concept of hegemony, thus, has been used in the context of gender as a tool which has the ability to unmask the mechanisms in different cultures. Nevertheless, “hegemony does not imply total power and domination but instead is focus on a balance of forces and an ongoing struggle for power” (Hammaren & Johansson, 2014).

According to Connell’s definition of hegemonic masculinity, it is “the configuration of gender practice which embodies the currently accepted answer to the problem of the legitimacy of patriarchy, which guarantees (or is taken to guarantee) the dominant position of men and the subordination of women” (1995, p. 77). That is to say, hegemonic masculinity is a system that gives men the privilege to establish a hierarchal relation between different group of men and women. Connell (1995; 2005) makes it possible to question the relationship between hegemonic and “multiple masculinities” such as *complicit*, *subordinated*, and *marginalized* masculinities in social struggle. She emphasizes that hegemonic masculinity is constructed in relation to these three types of masculinities. To define briefly, *complicit* masculinity refers to “patriarchal dividend” (Connell, 2005, p. 79) between strongly hegemonic individuals and the ones who know the privileges of hegemonic masculinity but do not practice them explicitly. The complicit group approves, supports, and applauds the practices of hegemonic masculinity for the sake of the possible benefits and the advantages of hegemonic masculinity even if they do not directly practice the patterns of hegemonic masculinity. *Subordinate* masculinity can be explained with homosexuality or “effeminate” actions, which is completely opposite to the ideals of
hegemonic masculinity. Homosexual men are dominated and subordinated by the heterosexual men. Moreover, boys or men who display non-hegemonic traits such as avoiding fighting and crying are also categorized as subordinated. Both groups face cultural abuse, strong stigmatization and exclusion. Finally, marginalized masculinity is about different masculinities regarding race and class. To Connell (2005), the strong interactions between gender and other structures as class and race bring into different masculinities. For example, it is emphasized that working class men are among marginalized men because they cannot practice the traits of hegemonic masculinity. Therefore, they are marginalized as the men who deal with poverty and unemployment and are exploited by the “privileged” groups in the capitalist societies. On the other hand, race plays very crucial role in constructing marginalized masculinities. Black men in U.S., for instance, are exposed to institutional oppression and physical assaults by the white-supremacist ideology. Since black men are excluded from the the group of “white” men, they cannot benefit from the “privileges” of hegemonic masculinity and thus they cannot practice hegemonic masculinity.

On the other hand, a number of scholars have criticized the concept of hegemonic masculinity (see Donaldson, 1993; Hearn, 2004; Anderson, 2009). For example, Donaldson (1993) has criticized the concept of hegemonic masculinity as being unclear and open to contradictions. He also asserts that it is not really easy to figure out what hegemonic masculinity is because counter-hegemonic part of the discussion is limited. In addition to the critique of Donaldson, Hearn (2004) and Anderson (2009) criticize the concept for the lack of discussion about how and why men show dominant masculine traits. They also argue that it is difficult to apply the concept of hegemonic masculinity, which they find essentialist, to some local masculinities. After receiving certain criticism, Connell and Messerschmidt (2005) tried to answer the defying questions and they reformulated the concept of hegemonic masculinity. By taking the women’s and gay movement, psychoanalysis, and the accumulation of studies on men and masculinities into consideration, Connell and Messerschmidt redefined the concept of hegemonic masculinity and explained how it actually works. Connell emphasizes that the concept of hegemonic masculinity pays the same attention to the hierarchies between men as it has done for the hierarchies between women. While rethinking the concept of hegemonic masculinity, Connell and
Messerschmidt (2005) reemphasized that the concept might be evaluated empirically at three levels as local, regional, and global. Local masculinity is constructed through social agents such as family, schools, neighborhoods, peers, etc. Regional masculinity is constructed at the cultural level and it is transmitted by film actors, politicians, and professional athletes. Regional masculinity enables a general sense of masculine reality in a society and the great impacts of cultural figures spread to daily practices and interactions of ordinary men. Global masculinity, on the other hand, is “constructed in transnational arenas such as world politics and transnational business and media” (p. 849). It is stated as a key figure for future research on hegemony since global dynamics such as migration and economic restructuring in the world influence gender. Therefore, global masculinity has a potential to reframe the local and regional masculinities.

Even if hegemonic masculinity is a contestable concept which can be examined in local, regional and global level, it has some common components that might be shared in different geographies. These are stereotypical masculine values such as independence, competitiveness, heterosexuality, sexual prowess, homophobia, restricted emotionality, initiative-taking, and being the breadwinner and primary provider (Connell, 1995; Sancar, 2009). In this frame, hegemonic masculinity is a functional concept which is constructed not only in relation to different groups of femininities but also in relation to non-hegemonic masculinities having “lower” status in the gender order (Connell, 1987). Indeed, hegemonic masculinity tries to dominate women and “subordinated” and “marginalized” men who are “unable” to meet the expectations of hegemonic masculinity. Regarding some men, who fall short of the expectations of hegemonic masculinity, as inadequate and inferior leads hegemonic masculinity to legitimize its permanent dependence on power, strength and oppression (Cornwall & Lindisfarne, 1994). By this way, hegemonic masculinity can sustain its hegemonic potency. Moreover, the men, who do not directly relate themselves to the ideals of hegemonic masculinity (complicit masculinities), have also a great impact on the construction and perpetuation of hegemonic masculinity by participating merely in homosocial activities, tolerating violence, and underestimating bullying towards non-hegemonic individuals. Thus, these groups of men are partners in crime with hegemonic masculinity so as to benefit from the merits of hegemonic masculinity.
Even though hegemonic masculinity is a global issue that can show differences in race, class, ethnicity, age, and occupation, as it is seen above, it exists as long as it is dignified and honored through culture and agents in particular context (Connell, 1995; Connell & Messersschmidt, 2005). Having covered the local, regional and global masculinities, it is time to question whether the concept of hegemonic masculinity enables a space for the discussion of the gender order in the Turkish context. Therefore, in the following section, I will discuss the hegemonic and non-hegemonic patterns which construct “masculinities” in Turkey and thus I will stop by every station in the endless journey of masculinity.

2.1.2. Construction of Hegemonic Masculinity in Turkey

Thanks to the translations of major studies into Turkish, the discussions on men and masculinity have taken place since the late 1980s. The inspiring article “Bargaining with Patriarchy” (1988) by Deniz Kandiyoti, for instance, could be the forerunner of the masculinity studies in Turkey although she does not directly point the term of masculinity in the article. In her article, Kandiyoti explores the dynamics of patriarchy and the patterns of hegemonic masculinity in Turkey. After Kandiyoti’s study, the development of theories and empirical studies on men and masculinities in Turkey had a break in the early 1990s (Bozok, 2013; Erol & Özbay, 2013). Studies on masculinity in Turkey could not take a step further and give rise to cultural, political and intellectual transformations as much as feminist movement did (Atay, 2004). However, the development of masculinity studies via academic studies such as books, articles and thesis started to slightly emerge in the second half of 1990s in Turkey owing to the ongoing translations of Connell’s and other scholars’ studies on men and masculinity. The pioneer of the masculinity studies in Turkey could be the special issue of the social science journal Toplum ve Bilim (2004) which provided a guiding compilation of research on masculinity in Turkey. From then on, many scholars in Turkey started to contribute to the field by publishing some studies.

Among many studies which have been conducted in this field since the early 2000s in Turkey, I would like to mention some studies from which I benefit for my own study. These studies include some issues such as discourses of masculinity (Bilgin, 2004; Yaşargün, 2019), love and masculinity (Sarı, 2004), sexuality of men (Özbay, 2005), socio-cultural construction of masculinity (Barutçu, 2013, Bozok, 2005;
Levent, 2015), masculine spaces (Alkum, 2018; Çokuğraş, 2016; Erdoğan, 2018; Kızılıkın, 2009; Özarslan, 2015; Özkök, 2019) and hegemonic patterns of masculinity (Sancar, 2009; Selek, 2008).

2.1.2.1. Stations of Masculinity

If “masculinity” is a journey, men had better pass all related stations in this journey safe and sound in order to become a “real” man. However, this journey has limitless routes and paths to follow and even though a man arrives at the last station of masculinity it will not mean that he has completed his journey. Each station implies that the man should be ready to the next one and go on to the endless circles of hegemonic masculinity. That is precisely why searching for hegemonic masculinity in Turkey is quite difficult. Nevertheless, it is better to follow the steps of hegemonic patterns affecting masculinity in Turkey in order to expose the possible existence of multiple masculinities. At this point, it is necessary to emphasize studies that try to find some clues about men and masculinities and mention male rites of passage in Turkey. Also, it is better to underline the initiation processes of boys into manhood and their indispensable effects on the construction and perpetuation of hegemonic masculinity.

It is assumed that men in Turkey can become completely “men” as long as they stop by the different stations of masculinities. That is, they should pass some fundamental rites such as circumcision, milli olmak -first sexual intercourse-, military service, marriage, and having children respectively. These rites are some of the turning points for childhood, puberty and adulthood. Thus, they enable men to establish the socio-cultural construction of masculinities and be initiated as adult male in the society (Roscoe, 2016). Cohen (1964) emphasizes that the rites of initiation not only legitimize the transition from childhood into adulthood for men and women but also determine rules, regulations and the social limitations in the society. Therefore, this part tries to show the construction of masculinity in Turkey through male rites of passage and how they contribute to the reproduction of the patterns of hegemonic masculinity in Turkey.

For men in Turkey, the first rite in the journey of masculinity is circumcision. In addition to its speculative positive effects on preventing some diseases, the
Circumcision is one of the necessities of religious tradition in Muslim countries. However, it is actually the first and the most important ritual that starts social and cultural gender coding formally and helps boys to complete their boyhood and thus take the first step for becoming men (Bozok, 2005; Taştıman, 2013). Circumcision is a ritual which on the surface seems to include honor, amusement, gifts, infinite care, special outfit with kaftan, while in reality it excites fear, anxiety and pain. Selek (2013) defines circumcision as the festive fear for a boy and she adds that he learns how to become a “real” man by suppressing his fears in the prosperous festival. After the circumcision, the boy “deserves” his masculinity by sacrificing his piece of flesh, implying that as a “completed” boy now he is ready to pass the other rites of masculinity. Therefore, as Bozok (2005) proposes, the roles expected from boys start to change after boys get circumcised. They are expected to display adult males’ manners and attitudes such as dissimulating the emotion, being tough, having inclination to display violence and competing. These expectations are also perpetuated when boys spend their time with other boys since boys aged 7-10 are inclined to use circumcision as an indicator of power and competition. Thus, hegemonic masculine identity starts to be constructed and publicly shared. Boys are no more boys; they are the young adults who are ready to explore sexuality.

Second fundamental rite after circumcision in Turkey is having the first sexual experience. Milli olmak is a cultural term that means having the first sexual intercourse, which has the implication of “becoming national” or “becoming first class person” (Keskin Korumaz, 2015, p. 432). Thus, they can be initiated to the men’s club consisting of men having sexual experience and power. Having a sexual adventure, even dreaming of it, is discussed as one of the behaviors for boys in the puberty (Sayılan & Özkazanç, 2009). Actually, sexuality is regarded a necessity for becoming a man. Thus, teenage boys are obliged to realize their first sexual relationship long before they get married. The “compulsory” act of first sex might not be good and satisfactory as it is narrated and imaged because (a) the decision of first sex is most probably not made voluntarily; instead, the boy can be forced to have his first sexual intercourse by his male peers, “brothers” or relatives, (b) the first sexual experience is generally realized with a relatively old and experienced sex worker who either mocks the teenage boy or acts like his mother in a damp and dirty brothel house (c) due to the distorted narrations of the first sexual intercourse, the
experience of *milli olmak* can result in emotional and psychological trauma in the future since the disappointed boy can think that the sex is not as it was told him before. Even if *milli olmak* seems to be one of the crucial stairways that must be taken by a young man in the journey of masculinity, this young boy is to know that once he has the sexual intercourse he is expected to have active sexual life during his lifespan (Barutçu, 2013). That is to say, this man is supposed be aware that he can keep his own seat in the gender hierarchy as long as he keeps his sexual life active. The structure of hegemonic masculinity, thus, is interwoven with male sexual discourse. This is the reason why men constantly talk about their sexual performance in a homosocial group to prove their sexual power and boast with it (Segal, 2007).

After circumcision and first sexual experience, the third rite of passage is military service. Every man in Turkey has to do his military service as long as he has no exceptions such as having physical and mental illness or different sexual orientation. For a man in Turkey, military service is the milestone event which requires systematical military trainings in a male homo-social environment (Selek, 2011). In this homosocial setting, systematical trainings might create sameness consisting of short haircuts and military uniforms, and thus the standardized individuals are ready to learn martial education and habits they will internalize and practice in their civilian lives. At this point, some men regard military service as a burden on their shoulders like the other burdens such as circumcision and first sexual intercourse, while the others regard the military service as a national and blessed mission done for the homeland. Therefore, military service for the latter group is an obligation for the transformation from being a young boy to a mature man because they think that every man must be a potential warrior (Sancar, 2012) and it is the military service that makes a man a real. As it is seen, military service functions as a factory that constantly produces hegemonic patterns of masculinities (Barutçu 2013). Therefore, the helpless acceptance of the mandate of the compulsory military service can leave irrevocable marks on the output of this “factory.” More specifically, while doing their military service, men have a homosocial environment in which they feel broken and shattered; however, they try their best not to sacrifice of their “masculine” principles as they have to keep obeying the norms of masculinity produced in military service. To prove their masculinity in military, they continue going to brothel houses, swearing, having “macho” postures, and mocking with the soldiers.
who do not follow the steps of hegemonic masculinity (Encloe, 2014). Therefore, the process of single-sex socialization in full and short term military service affects men so deeply that they learn how to legitimize gender roles they have already known and also they learn to perpetuate them. By the time a man finishes his military service, the society’s viewpoint on this man completely changes (Bozok, 2005) because he has completed his role of being young adult by risking his life for the sake of his homeland and he has proved himself as a potential warrior. Finally, he has graduated from the homo-social school of masculinity and become the “real” male adult who is ready to start a new life. In fact, the naïve and inexperienced boy turns into a respected man and he becomes ready to put the tyranny, domination, and violence which he has been already exposed to during the military service into practice.

Now, it is time for a man to find a job after completing the “honorable” mission of military service. After men in Turkey finish their military service, they are expected to go to public space and find a full time job in order to earn money, run the family and gain status in the society. Work life has an important role in men’s lives because through working outside, men might not only be productive and competitive but they also produce and maintain different hegemonic patterns of masculinity through building hierarchy in the workplace, keeping women and minorities (including non-hegemonic men) from getting certain jobs. For men in Turkey, there are some important reasons behind finding a job and working. As Barutçu (2013) underlines, working outside is one of the most indispensable masculine responsibilities for men in Turkey. By working, in the Turkish cultural context, men could show his ability of taking initiative and being the primary provider in the family. Being the breadwinner can be an opportunity for men to legitimize their superior position. Through this way, they become “whole” men. If they cannot find a job and do not work full time, they are prone to be stigmatized as not being self-sufficient men and husband-to-be or father-to-be. Moreover, working full time may not be enough for men because they are expected to sustain their success through promotions and they are required to look for career jumps.

After getting circumcised, boasting with the first heterosexual intercourse, doing military service and finding a good job, men in Turkey finally stop by the next station of masculinity: getting married and having a child. Upon approaching the end
of the rites on the way to masculinity, getting married and having a child as the last pieces of masculinity puzzle need to be fulfilled together even though many scholars prefer to put marriage and having children into different categories. The reason behind implementing these masculine rites together is the synchronic relationship between settling down into a proper relationship and transferring the accumulation of gendered knowledge to the next generations. As long as getting married and having a child are completed one after another, men in Turkey seem to be on the right path of the masculinity. To start with, marriage seems to be the legitimization of the sexual intercourse in Middle Eastern countries and Turkey. (Adak, 2016; İlkkaracan 2008). Marriage mentioned here is surely heterosexual marriage, which is one of the most important components of hegemonic masculinity. For men in Turkey, marriage is an “ability” to give up having different sexual partners, which is previously supported by the society as a glory of masculinity. Getting married and having a legitimate sexual life are respected by the same society. After having a certain degree of sexual intercourse out of marriage context, settling down and becoming husband and father are highly appreciated. As a man in Turkey completes the steps to become an adult male, it becomes his responsibility to initiate his own children and other generations. Thus, he can perpetuate the roles and expectations imposed on him (Barutçu, 2013; Bozok 2002). In this manner, the man, as “evin direği, the founder” and “the bread-winner” of the family, plays an important role for the conveying the masculine norms to his child(ren). By the time the man becomes a father, he not only proves his fertility but he also displays the masculine roles like being the rule-maker and the head of the family (Selek, 2011). When the man reaches to the position of fatherhood, he starts/continues dominating his wife and children because he sees himself as a single social and political mechanism that can rule the family. As family is one of the most crucial socialization agents that function for the construction of identities (Erdem, 2017), it provides a space for the father to construct their children’s identities through patriarchal norms and regulations. The best way to construct and perpetuate masculine norms is having a baby-boy. If the man has the baby-boy, he feels more superior to the father who has a baby-girl because the baby-boy is regarded to be the fundamental person who will sustain the family name and become the implementer of the accumulated masculine experiences given by the father. Thus, the father of the son can (re) construct his masculinity by creating
vicious circle of hegemonic masculinity (Kudat, 2006). Then, the father might feel satisfied and proud and he feels more like a man when he sees the effects of “like father, like son,” which is a proof that he transmitted the masculine values to the next generations.

In fact, as it is discussed in this section, men constantly reproduce patterns for hegemonic masculinity in every station of life. Even if men in Turkey seem to complete all rites of masculinity and arrive to the last station of masculinity by having a child, endless roads and dead-end streets are still available on the way to masculinity because masculinity is the impossible power to be realized (Sancar, 2009).

2.2. Strong Ties between Hegemonic Masculinity and Homosociality

The definition of homosociality suggests non-sexual bonds between persons of the same sex. However, current literature and informal forums exclusively focus on the concept of “male” homosociality. It is not because of women’s not having strong social bonds with other women. On the contrary, this is due to the fact that strong bonds between men more likely to reproduce hegemonic masculinity and the legitimization of their privileged position in the gender order. Therefore, it would not be an exaggeration to say that the relationship between the concept of homosociality and hegemonic masculinity is as strong as the relationship between men. Within a homosocial male group, men can easily produce hegemonic masculinity and maintain their dominant masculine attitudes. To simply put, men get together with the other men whom they have something in common and this gathering can enable men to construct some values, beliefs and attitudes they already mutually share. Therefore, male-male interaction can result in giving priority to one another’s masculine needs and goals and thus this might trigger the legitimization of the masculine practices.

To be able to figure out the effects of homosociality on hegemonic masculinity in Turkey, it is necessary to examine the concept of homosociality in detail. Therefore, in the following part, I will try to show the starting point of the conceptualization of homosociality and the powerful links between homosociality and masculinity. I will also cover some social inquiries which have related the concept of homosociality to
hegemonic masculinity in order to establish a base for my own study which might foreshadow an effective combination of these concepts.

2.2.1. Homosociality

The term homosociality was coined by the Jean Lipman-Blumen in 1976. In her inspiring article “Towards a Homosocial Theory of Sex Roles: An Explanation of the Sex Segregation of Social Institutions,” she discusses how homosociality functions at interpersonal level and how the same sex friendship reproduces the psychology of homosocial behavior. She also used the concept of homosociality to understand the gendered distribution of resources. In other words, she tried to figure out how same sex socialization patterns affects men and women to access the gendered resources. In this male homosocial world, women can only acquire status and reach resources through their relationship with men including their fathers, brothers, husbands, etc.,. More specifically, women’s access to resources in domestic sphere, politics, law and sports are limited in the homosocial world where at least one of the male acquaintances controls all of the resources. Moreover, since men control economy, politics and social world, women have fewer resources to share with men or one another. Therefore, women can have a chance to share the men’s world and access to resources as long as they “exchange” their “limited” sources such as sexuality, caring and childbearing. Based on the idea that social interaction can be understood through exchange system, Lipman-Blumen underlines that homosociality serves for the benefits of the men in terms of controlling all resources because it strengthens the strong bond between men and enables them to legitimize their gendered practices. Therefore, men seek for other men’s company to reinforce the same-sex interest in homosocially stratified society.

After Lipun-Blumen, the concept of homosociality was popularized by Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick. In her book called Between Men: English Literature and Male Homosocial Desire, Sedgwick finds out homosociality as the “emerging pattern of male friendship, mentorship, entitlement, rivalry, and hetero-and homosexuality” (1985, p. 698) in Shakespeare’s sonnets and in nineteenth century British novels. Even though the term of homosocial was being used historically as non-sexual social bonds between people of same sex in the social sciences, Sedgwick revises the concept and she put forwards that the concept of homosociality and homosexuality
are interconnected and cannot be disentangled because the boundaries between them are vague. Sedgwick assert that dominant patriarchal discourse has been instrumentalizing and sexualizing women for getting closer to men and “confirm to each other’s value” (p.160). This does not mean that all men are homosexuals but male relationships are mostly constructed around rivalry, sexual desire and repression. According to Sedgwick, the strong bonds between men through physical and verbal intimacy derive from homosocial desire and this desire is greater than any heterosexual or homosexual love relationships. Therefore, homosociality is particularly used as a term distinguished from homosexuality to emphasize a form strong male bonding creating power blocs to protect the male privilege. Also, it provides a basis for the hate speech towards women and homosexual individuals and maintaining the fear or hatred of homosexuality—homophobia.

The concept of homosociality was also questioned in terms of its relationship with hegemonic masculinity. Bird (1996), in addition to Lipman-Blumen’s argument, focuses on how meanings attributed to hegemonic masculinity are reinforced and how men who do not meet the expectations of hegemonic masculinity are subordinated through homosociality. In other words, hegemonic masculinity is perpetuated through men who adopt the same hegemonic patterns in the same homosocial world and exclude the non-hegemonic identities that do not fit into this world. In her study, Bird (1996) investigates the male homosocial interactions and deduces some meanings through these investigations. According to this, the meanings that were produced in homosocial interaction among men are emotional detachment, competitiveness and sexual objectification of women. Emotional detachment, in the context of male homosociality, means the limited sharing of feelings and avoiding attachment to other men on emotional level because for men expressing feelings is perceived as revealing vulnerabilities and weaknesses. Therefore, Bird claims that male participants in her research detach themselves from their emotions by stating: “boys will be boys,” “men will be men,” “feelings are not men’s things” (Bird, 1996, p.125). Competition is another meaning that contributes to the perpetuation of hegemonic masculinity in Bird’s study. Competition is “a pecking order (the hierarchy) between men” says one of the respondents in the study (p.127). In order to establish a masculine self in a homosocial environment, a man tries to find another man to show how much strong, goal oriented, and non-female he
is. Depending on the observation in her study, Bird also underlines that men in the study objectify women in their homosocial conversations by calling women as “them,” “girl” and “other” (1996). Men in the study boast about their sexual experiences by defining women “as objects to be used for sexual pleasure” (p. 128). Finally, Bird mentions some men who reject to dwell in the “men’s club” by violating the rules of hegemonic masculinity. These men do not accept the rules of masculinity and thus they are excluded from homosocial world. However, this process can be painful for these men because they are stigmatized as violators and the process results in “penalties to violators” (Bird, 1996, p. 130).

As it is seen, studies based on the relationship between homosociality and hegemonic masculinity assumes that male homosocialization reproduces the ideals of hegemonic masculinity. Many other scholars besides Bird identify and focus on many other trajectories that largely affect the perpetuation of hegemonic masculinity through homosociality. These trajectories are not really different from the meanings shown in Bird’s study, but they seem to be the updated versions of them with some new additions such as men’s physical and emotional stoicism (Kagesten et al., 2016), heterosexual prowess (Amin et al., 2018; Flood, 2008) and the subordination of non-hegemonic masculinities (Hammare & Johansson, 2014).

Physical and emotional steadiness is used as triggering component of maintaining hegemonic masculinity through male homosociality. Physical steadiness brings out the necessity of being physically tough for men all the time. Men are supposed to show high tolerance for pain and toughness when they are fighting and competing in sports (Amin et al., 2017). On the other hand, avoiding expression of intimacy, coping with the problems on one’s own and not sharing the feelings explicitly could be examples of emotional steadiness of men. In the context of stoicism, homosociality is used as concept that underlines the perpetuation of withholding feelings between men because in the male homosocial groups men are supposed to avoid expressing their feelings to seem strong and not to lose their dignity in the group.

Heterosexual prowess is another trajectory with which men boast in order to reach a key path to masculine status in the homosocial group. Having sex with lots of
women, dominating the women in the sexual relationship and exploiting women sexually are means of raising status of men (Kimmel 1994; Messner, 1992; Wight, 1994). As Keisling (2008) underlines, “heterosexual sex itself can be medium through which male bonding is enacted.” (p. 339). Sex could be used as a marker of manhood to consolidate the position of men in the culture of mateship which is constructed on sexism and homophobia because men keep each other’s sexual performance under surveillance. Therefore, women’s bodies commonly become the “material” in the “dirty talk” of the homosocial group through group members’ sexual narratives and storytelling. As a result of this, strong social bonds between men bring about sexual violence against women and perpetuation of it (Flood, 2008; Hawkesworth, 2020; Takeuchi-Demirci, 2015). Verbal transgression and sexual abuse to sexual assaults which even include rape and gang rape are permanently practiced by friendship circles as a way of keeping closely knitted mateship. That is, the more men in the homosocial group attempt to practice sexual violence against women, the stronger ties they have (Flood, 2008).

The last trajectory which is reproduced in male-male interaction is the subordination of all types of masculinities which do not adapt to the patterns of hegemonic masculinity. That is, men who favor emotional closeness with other men and avoid sexual objectification of women, and sexist discourses are easily stigmatized as “non-masculine” and “unreal” men since they did not follow the standards of the hegemonic masculinity (Hammaren & Johansson, 2014). Male peers, thus, broadcast their overt expression of homosocial feelings (Kiesling, 2005) and insult non-hegemonic masculinities by calling them “gay,” “faggots,” etc. to feel (more) masculine and fortify their status in the homosocial group (Kagesten et al., 2016). Thus, masculinities that are identified as “effeminate” (Connell, 1992) are excluded from the order of “collective actor” and allowed only to be the company of women and non-adult males.

2.2.1.1. Homosocial Setting

Space is an active place which is constructed through social relations. As Lefebvre (1974/1991) emphasizes in his book The Production of Space, space, just like gender, is a social product shaped by shared values and meanings, and it is mostly dominated by the hegemonic class. When the relationship between gender and space
is examined, it is necessary to emphasize the distinction between public and private sphere. While men have been active and had dominant position in public sphere, women have been “conserved” in private sphere since the industrialization period (Smyth, 2008). Although women participate in production in public sphere more than before, the idea that women belong to home –private sphere- and men exist outside home –public sphere- commonly shapes the gendered dynamics of the urban life. That’s why, in the socialization process, women are captivated in private sphere as their gender roles command so. Therefore, in advertisements, for example, it is not a coincidence to see the portrayal of the women who cook in the kitchen and raise their children at home while men go to work by their brand new cars or hang out with their friends in pubs and bars. As it is seen, the space plays crucial role in constructing, reproducing, and legitimizing traditional roles, belief systems and power struggles since it is the complex network of relationships which shelters the infinite desire of dominance and obedience in itself (Massey, 1994). Maybe, that’s why, space and hegemonic masculinity stick together by the existential glue that strongly keeps each other’s pieces together.

More specifically, homosocial setting is a place and circumstance in which mostly male gatherings set. According to Kimmel and Aroson (2003), there are two features of homosocial settings. The firstly each homosocial group has its own specific rules set and share by the group members. However, there is one common rule every homosocial group shares, which is unconditional acceptance of the rules of hegemonic masculinity. The second feature of homosocial setting requires the exclusion of women from male sphere through devaluing them. Men appreciate the homosocial setting as they feel more relaxed and comfortable there. In other words, homosocial setting enables men to do gender by enjoying the traditionally masculine activities they can do together and thus become “oneself” –actually have the “freedom” to be men. In a group discussion conducted by Meuser (1998), a man can only become “himself” and show his true colors when he realizes the simultaneous presence of men in the same physical location. These men do not have to control the way they speak in the male homosocial group and it is not necessary for them to take women’s emotions and opinions into consideration. Men in the Meuser’s study state that women are potentially hazardous for the male homosocial group because they can destroy the mood of the group and ruin the man-to-man atmosphere.
In her provocative book called *Gender and Space*, Spain (1993) proposes that spatial groupings between sexes are socially constructed and the spatial arrangements enable men to access to valued knowledge whereas these arrangements hinder women from reaching to that knowledge. That is to say, men deliberately exclude women from their homosocial setting in order to hide the valued knowledge from them because men in the homosocial settings think that knowledge is the power and homosocial is setting the part of the “power establishment” (Kiesling, 2005, p. 704). According to Spain (1993), the socially-constructed arrangements might also reinforce the status differences between men and women. For instance, men in the homosocial setting create some scripts about women’s behaviors, way of dressing, and bodies and perpetuate the inferiority of women through these scripts. Therefore, homosocialization makes construction of masculinity possible as “masculinity is largely a homosocial enactment” (Kimmel, 1996, p.7). As it is seen, male homosocial setting establishes male solidarity and habitual security in itself in order to confirm a man’s masculinity by excluding women and the men who cannot fit into the standards in homosocial setting. Consequently, homosocial settings maintain the legitimization of male dominance and masculine practices.

The culture of homosocial settings includes a great variety of differences. Every homosocial setting has its own specific rules and regulations and these rules can change from a culture to another or vary based on one’s social class. For example, the rules of a working class pub are different from those of upper Lions Club’s. However, the connotations homosocial settings have might not change across groups. As it was mentioned in introduction part in detail, homosocial settings have both a *physical* and a *symbolic* connotation (Kimmel & Aranson, 2003). *Physical* connotation of homosocial setting refers to co-presence of group members in the same environment; on the other hand, sharing the same values, attitudes and opinions are the *symbolic* connotations of homosocial setting. Therefore, as Kimmel and Aranson state, for a homosocial group to exist, it would not be enough to occupy the same setting physically because even if men share the same homosocial setting, they do not have to share the same values. Therefore, sharing the same values within the homosocial group is a requirement for close-knitted male interactions.
There are many global social inquiries conducted on the construction of hegemonic masculinity through homosocial settings. These studies have focused on the construction and maintenance of masculine practices through strong male-male interaction in public settings. Some of the global settings researchers studied range from a summer day camp in southeastern city in USA (McGuffey & Rich, 1999) to Indian temple called Sabarimala (Osella & Osella, 2006). In the study taking place in USA, McGuffey and Rich (1999) examine how children interpret gender boundaries while they are playing games in a summer camp. Also, the researchers explore how the ideals of hegemonic masculinity shape children’s gendered practices in these games. In another study carried out in India, Osella and Osella (2006) focus on Kerala masculinities in the process of annual pilgrimage to Sabarimala. They study the relationship between normative heterosexuality and homosociality in this religious performance in exclusively male sphere. On the other hand, there are some other studies exploring homosocial dynamics in legitimization of hegemonic masculinity. These studies comprise homosocial settings extending from bars (Bird, 1996), automobile and motorbike race (Shackleford, 1999) to tabletop role-playing game spaces (Bendele, 2019). In these studies, the marginalization of women and alternative masculinities in the homosocial settings is commonly shared. In addition, according to these studies, men, who desire for the homosocial bonds, are more likely to agree with discourses of masculine ideology taking place in their homosocial setting. Thus, men justify their hegemonic practices by engaging in miscellaneous set of behaviors in the homosocial settings (Godenzi, Schwartz & DeKesedery, 2001).

Fraternity is another homosocial setting which must be evaluated on its own because it is one of the best examples that posit both physical and symbolic meanings for homosocial settings. As it is understood from its Oxford Dictionary definition, fraternity means “a club for group of male students at American colleges or universities and a group of people who share the same profession, interests or belief,” which refers to the physical and symbolic connotations of homosocial setting. Even though fraternity is a socio-cultural setting belonging exclusively to

---

2 The entry of women of reproductive age to Sabarimala was forbidden for ages. However, two women called Kanaka Durga and Bindu Ammini broke this rule, entered the temple and changed the history. Thanks to the protests of women’s right activists and other women pilgrims, the Supreme Court allowed women of all ages enter the temple in 2019 (Sharma, 2021).
USA, its variations exist all around the world with different names and purposes. For example, Islamic settings such as tekke, a dervish gathering place, and Quran courses, as well as ethnic and cultural associations such as fellow citizen and countrymen clubs could be fraternity-like homosocial settings. Most of the fraternities require single-sex membership from among male undergraduates particularly in the United States and sharing the same masculine ideologies such as striving for high status, being tough, dominant and competitive are also required (Koss & Cleveland, 1997). Also, secrecy as a sign of loyalty is another common component shared by the members of the fraternities.

Fraternities have been seen as the center of social life in college because a student wishes to have a social position in the college life and sustain the social and collective existence in a group. Meanwhile, the power of belonging emerges as an existential need because sense of belonging to a homosocial group is a critical need for a man to be able to cope with any kinds of problems that he can face out of the homosocial setting (Rogers, 2006; Ahlback, 2017). More specifically, a man can feel safe as long as he becomes a member of a political party, sports club, or any social clubs. Members in the fraternity, thus, start to be the member of the homosocial group by sharing the same room, dorm or apartment with each other and taking up classes, and organizing social events together (Murnen & Kohlman, 2007). In this way, they create some “fictive sibling relationships” (Kiesling, 2005, p.704) and they call each other “brother” since the homosocial setting ensures familial bonds. There are both positive and negative sides of joining the fraternity. For example, fraternities serve for some social responsibility projects. These are “raising funds for national charities, hosting blood drives, providing volunteer labor at fundraising events for charities, or tutoring students at local schools” (p.704), which create powerful network for the future. On the other hand, some fraternities are notorious with criminal activities such as heavy drinking, attempted rape, sexual objectification of women, gang rape and verbal coercion (Mouilso, Fischer & Cahoun, 2012; Seabrook, Ward & Giaccardi, 2018) because fraternities, as an organizational setting, enable members to perpetuate a mode of solidarity this solidarity which is mostly sexist and homophobic.
Sports (especially, organized sports) provides another homosocial setting which needs to be evaluated on its own since stereotypical masculine practices are over emphasized in these settings (Bryson, 1987; English, 2017). Organized sports such as soccer, rugby, basketball, and league hockey are some of the male dominated organized sports that are responsible for the mass production of hegemonic practices of masculinity (Messner, 2005; Sancar 2009; Howson, 2016). Although sport is defined as a physical activity engaged for pleasure and health, it actually constructs the principles of hegemonic masculinity such as power, competition, and necessity of emotional and physical stoicism. That is to say, men do sports for showing (off) their superior body features and proving their physical performance. At this point, football as an organized sport can be examined in the construction and the maintenance of hegemonic masculinity. According to Gilliam (2019), football is socially constructed through the hegemonic ideals such as competition, strength, and aggression. Moreover, it is culturally praised phenomenon which perpetuates traditional masculinity. On the other hand, football is constructed as a homosocial setting which reproduces “the exploitation and predation of marginalized groups” (p.28). That is to say, football contributes to exclusionary mechanisms such racism, misogyny, homophobia, and xenophobia. Therefore, it is not a coincidence that “disadvantaged” group of people are excluded and insulted in stadiums and tribunes almost every day (Karaçam, 2015).

2.2.1.1. Homosocial Settings in Turkey

Not only in the world but also in Turkey, there are a considerable number of studies about gender and space. From late the 1990s to now, the studies on men and masculinities have been conducted in Turkey. In addition, the relationship between masculinity and space has been exclusively studied by many scholars in Turkey since the first decade of 2000s. These valuable studies have been carried out in the frame of public and private spheres, which is a meaningful starting point and a consistent headway for the studies. In these studies, the core reasons behind the gendered gap between public and private sphere have been discussed. In this study, I will also try to underline one of the core reasons behind the gendered gap between public and private sphere: duo-focal family structure. Therefore, I will elaborate on the possible effects of duo-focal family structure on maintaining the captivation of women in
private sphere and the permanent existence of men in public sphere. To do so, I will attempt to introduce the duo-focal family structure in Turkey, and then I will try to discuss its possible effects on same-sex socialization and the construction of strong male and female bonding in public and private spheres before I specifically focus on studies conducted on homosocial settings in Turkey.

In many Turkish families, there is almost no strong single center of intra-familial relationships. In contrast, every individual is inclined to be the “focus” of his/her own separate social network. Therefore, there are two “foci” (the husband and the wife) in a traditional Turkish nuclear family since the spaces occupied by men and women are quite segregated. This segregation, as Yanagisako (1977) underlines, creates the concepts of women-centered and men-centered network. Women-centered kin network is attributed to “the centrality of women in the web of kinship linking together sets of households” (Yanagisako, 1977, p. 208). In fact, in private sphere, women could have a strong female bonds marked by the community of interests such as being responsible for raising children and managing the household. On the other hand, as Olson (1982) emphasizes, a Turkish man is included in “a parallel man centered network that reaches beyond nuclear family, household, and even kinship boundaries” (p.37). That is to say, men-centered network takes place in public sphere because they work and conduct business in open spaces such as markets, cafes, clubs, and mosques. Thus, the segregation between the private and public sphere is firstly constructed in the family, which creates a secluded dimension of social interaction between men and women. Finally, throughout the socialization process, this segregation is perpetuated by the members of the same sex groups outside the family.

When compared to girls, a boy’s social networks might be more uni-sexual “with some important exceptions” (Olson, 1982, p.50). When the boy has a sister, he can have a strong bond with his sister. However, in this interaction, the boy is expected to control his sister and be the guardian of her until she gets married. The mother is the second person with whom the boy has a uni-sexual social interaction because as Kandiyoti (1997) underlines, the boy is indebted to his mother for her devotions and sacrifices such as the pain of childbirth, bearing and rearing. Therefore, the son creates social network with his mother in order to express the gratitude he owes to
his mother and the social interaction between them is constructed on his mother’s sacrifices. This “limited” relationship between the mother and son mostly ends by the time the boy enters puberty and starts to identify himself with his male peers. Thus, the more the boy has a strong relationship with his male peers, the less he has an emotional tie with his mother because he starts to put his male friends at the center of his life. According to Olson (1981), social bonds between boys in Turkey are more central than the social bonds between girls. There are two reasons for boys’ having more central relationship with their male peers. The first reason is that boys start to socialize with their peers at an earlier age outside the house. They can discover the streets and stroll around gardens and parks freely in a group of four or five, whereas their sisters spend most of their time with domestic work. Second reason is the disconnected relationship between son and the father. Since the boys in Turkey are supposed to have a distant and formal relationship with their fathers, the relationship between them is slightly intimate. When they become delikanlı, being youthful masculine individuals, they are expected to go out and be open to new experiences like smoking, drinking, having sex in brothel houses, playing card and console games, talking and laughing out. However, they cannot do any of these activities in front of their fathers since these activities seem to be disrespectful. As there exists a spatial segregation between the fathers and boys, at the end of day, the majority of delikanlı boys prefers separate socializing from their fathers in masculine places such as internet cafes, coffee houses, nightclubs, etc., where they develop strong social bonds with other male peers. Even though Turkish families today believed to be egalitarian, spatial and relational segregations through duo-focal family structure still dominate daily life practices. Of course, this does not mean that male and female spheres are completely separate as haremlık and selamlık. However, as Olson asserts, men and women in Turkey are prone to have same-sex social bonds with their friends and/or relatives after they get married and thus the strong homosocial relationships they adopt still continue affecting the internalization of traditional gender roles.

In the frame of masculinity and space, there are also some studies covering spatial segregation of male spheres from female ones and its effects on masculinity. These studies investigate the power relations between men in some specific settings peculiar to men. These studies mostly focus on how men develop moral attitudes,
political opinions and values in the same homosocial settings including coffee houses, nightclubs, brothel houses, dorms, bachelor’s rooms, military barrack rooms, pubs, and *halı saha maçları*. Here, I will mention some homosocial settings researchers in Turkey have studied up to now. These settings consist of bachelor’s rooms, coffeehouses, nightclubs and.

To start with, bachelor’s rooms are one of the homosocial settings studied in the context of construction masculinity in Turkey. Kızılkan (2009) examines the relational construction of masculinities through the homosocial setting, bachelor’s room. She suggests that bachelor’s room in Süleymaniye district in İstanbul provides a setting for men who migrate from rural to urban areas for different kinds of transitions in the construction of masculinity. Transitions from adolescence to adult masculinity and from the habits of rural life to urban life habits could be given as examples for the construction and accumulation of hegemonic masculinity in bachelor’s room. In these rooms, some patterns of hegemonic masculinity such as being strong, emotionally detached, and the householder have been constructed and maintained. As a result of the research, Kızılkan (2009) indicates that spaces such as bachelor’s room play a critical role for maintaining the bachelorship as a source real manhood and for the subordination of different gender identities.

Coffeehouses are one of main settings that create strong homosocial bonds between men in some Mediterranean and Middle East countries such as Turkey. As a public sphere, the coffeehouse is a potential place in which men choose to spend/kill most of their leisure times and also it is the setting in which dominant masculine roles and expectations are constructed. In her study which she conducted in coffeehouses in İstanbul and Muğla, Arık (2009) asserts that coffeehouses are the places which are peculiar to men and the common ground where men get socialize easily outside home and practice their masculinities. Arık proposes that men’s talk, as the center of the homosocial interaction, is the most significant component reproducing hegemonic masculinity in coffeehouses. Participants in the study reveal the idea that “a coffeehouse becomes a real coffeehouse as long as it belongs merely to men” (p.183). It is important to note that this idea derives from the men’s talk practiced by “dominant” male character having some features like heterosexuality and physical
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maturity (e.g. deep voice, beard and moustache). In addition to Arık’s study about the relationship between coffeehouses and the construction hegemonic masculinity, there are also similar studies conducted by Alkum (2018) and Özkök (2019). Alkum implemented his research in coffeehouses in Batman, whereas Özkök carried out his study in Sincan, the district of Ankara province. Even though both studies were conducted in different places in Turkey, the results of the studies are commonly shared. After implementing in-depth interviews in Batman and Sincan, Alkum (2018) and Özkök (2019) indicate that coffeehouses, as a homosocial setting, play very crucial role upon the construction and perpetuation of “ideal” masculinities imposed by the society. In these studies, men’s talk is still the center of homosocial interaction and it still reproduces the patterns of hegemonic masculinity and excludes “feminine” attitudes and “other” masculinities.

Another homosocial setting that contributes to the construction of masculinity in Turkey is nightclubs. In her brilliant study taking place in nightclubs in Ankara, Erdoğan (2018) focuses on the construction of different masculinities in nightclubs. She asserts that masculinities in culture of nightclubs in Ankara are constructed through multiple masculine performances; therefore, she puts hegemonic masculinity into three categories: the owner, patron of the nightclub, staff of the nightclub, and the clients. According to the results of the study, patrons in nightclubs in Ankara, for example, are seen as the “absolute power” that sets the rules of nightclubs and enforce them, which make patrons to the top the patriarchal hierarchy. In this hierarchy, staff of the nightclub has the second position. Erdoğan states that these men are referred as “dedicated” laborers by the hegemonic discourse and the masculinity of these men is constructed through the clash with other men who waste their money and time in the nightclubs. The last group in nightclubs consists of the clients who are out of the patriarchal hierarchy in the nightclubs. They are the representatives of the hegemonic masculinity outside the nightclubs. Clients, therefore, come to the nightclubs so as to “purchase the masculine identity” (p. 149) by showing off their economic stability. One way or another, these groups vigorously affect and transform one another. In addition to Erdoğan’s study, Özarslan (2015) examines different masculinities in different nightclubs in Burdur. He focuses on understanding the femininity and masculinity within the context of nightlife particularly in rural district Çavdır, Burdur. He analyzes men into three categories.
such as paralı (the moneyed) competing to spend more money to seduce women, belalı (the bullied) having nobody and no place to dwell into, a position to protect the nightclub, and the ability to chase women from a region to another, and yakışıklı (the handsome) who could find a chance to access to women’s bodies. In his study, Özarslan reveals that nightclubs, drinking establishments (meyhane), and taverns as “homogenous” spaces (p. 123) play very crucial role in creating patterns for different masculinities and perpetuating conservatism, hegemonic masculinity and hierarchy.

To sum up, homosociality is seen as a masculine experience which takes place in “male-only” settings and many studies have been conducted in this framework. However, homosociality has also symbolic connotations as it is covered in this chapter and in the introduction part. In order to sustain their existence in the homosocial group, men are aware of the necessity of sharing the same values and opinions with the group members. That is to say, it is not enough to share the same homosocial settings. Men in hetero-social settings can also reproduce homosocial discourses and perpetuate traditional masculine practices through homosocial interactions. Upon approaching to the end of this chapter, it is appropriate to say that hegemonic masculinity could also exist as long as it is approved by the men and proven to men in the homosocial circle. That is, men search for other men’s desire and “they organize the men’s perception of what is lacking in their identity, and how the men wish to achieve masculine ontology” (Kiesling, 2005). Here, homosociality is used as a tool to maintain the patterns of hegemonic masculinity. Moreover, the relationship between the concept of hegemonic masculinity and homosociality seems to be a put-up job which has been designed to justify the subordination of non-hegemonic masculinities and legitimization of men’s tyranny and domination.
CHAPTER 3

METHOD

...How many times can a man look up
  Before he can see the sky?

Bob Dylan, Blowin’ in the Wind

This study aimed at understanding how men experience masculinity, men’s engagement with the practices of hegemonic masculinity, and male homosocial interactions that work to shape different masculinities. Such endeavors are meant to obtain feminist aims and are pursued in line with feminist research practices. This research is quintessentially pro-feminist because it aims at revealing how male-male interactions in homosocial groups foster patriarchal relations and gender inequality. As a man living in a patriarchal society, I am aware of the fact that gender inequalities mainly emerge, are promoted and perpetuated in all-male gatherings and male homosocial interactions. Therefore, in order to make perpetrators of sexist views salient, I interviewed men who belong to at least one homosocial group, prefer to spend much of their time within their all-male group, and are highly influenced by their male friends in decision making processes. Through conducting this research, I acknowledge the necessity to examine men’s engagement with the practices of hegemonic masculinity in putting an end to male dominance, patriarchal order and unequal treatment of people based on their gender because violence against women, enacting sexist attitudes, and maltreatment of women and non-hegemonic masculinities in general sense can only cease if men’s attitudes and their certain practices (that are especially associated with hegemonic masculinity), as well as their peer relations, are critically examined.
3.1. Pro-feminist Research

There are a great number of feminist researchers (mostly women) studying women to examine gender hierarchy and systematic inequalities, whereas relatively few studies on men are conducted by male researchers (Robertson, 2006). Feminist social research done by women, for women, and about women is believed to reveal women’s subordination, oppression, male authority, and gender inequality operating at different settings and levels (Mies, 1983). However, in social research which is conducted by men about men, it is claimed that “the shared gendered experiences and assumptions about masculinity may be left unexplained” (Pini & Pease, 2013, p. 9). The possibility of conducting research by a male researcher about men through adopting feminist point of view is increasingly questioned. Also, in which way and to what degree the subject position of the researcher affects the social inquiry about men is highly debated. As the male researcher, simply for being a man, is one of the members of the oppressing group, he is not trusted for doing feminist research and he carries the burden of creating anti-feminist knowledge (Hearn, 1993). It is clear that conducting a pro-feminist social research on men and by men raises some methodological questions. However, as hegemonic masculinity maintains its dominance and privilege through the subordination of other masculine and feminine identities, it should be acknowledged that not all men are involved in the construction and perpetuation of hegemonic masculinity. Patriarchy organized around gender identity produces a hierarchical pyramid of multiple masculine identity subgroupings including “hegemonic”, “marginalized”, and “subordinated” masculinities (Connell, 2005). Therefore, men’s lived experiences of patriarchy and their alignment with hegemonic masculinity can provide a rich understanding of gender division and discrimination both between men and women and within men. Moreover, feminist and anti-patriarchal knowledge can be generated by men who do not adopt the traits of hegemonic masculinity. In this sense, researching men by a pro-feminist researcher becomes of great importance because pro-feminist research provides a possibility to resist patriarchy and change men’s privileged position in the patriarchal order by “deconstructing men’s own social and historical formation as masculine subjects” (Flood, 2010, p. 65). However, as male dominance in nearly all aspects of social life persist and men occupy the privileged status in society, for men conducting research about men, critical reflection on their social statuses and
locations is essential for resisting to and changing the patriarchal social order (Harding, 1991). In fact, critical autobiography, known as the examination and deconstruction of men’s social formation as masculine entities, is quite important in studying men and masculinities. “Putting oneself in the picture” is suggested as an indispensable methodological element of pro-feminist research (Flood, 2013). In keeping up with these suggestions, I adopted a reflexive approach by situating myself in the research process and critically reflecting on my role in knowledge production.

3.1.1. Reflexivity

In mainstream social research which mostly uses quantitative methods, the relevance of researcher’s self in the research process is highly disregarded in the name of sustaining objectivity (Edwards, 1993; Letherby, 2003). However, in social research, especially in feminist research that are mostly conducted by qualitative methods, it is accepted that there is no single reality awaiting to be discovered by an objective researcher. Instead, realities, knowledge and representations are regarded as socially constructed. In constructing the reality, research process is not an exception because the research context encloses both the interview setting and the wider cultural context (Broom, Hand, & Tovey, 2009). Therefore, in feminist research, it is acknowledged that knowledge is produced and realities are constructed by both the participants and the researcher (Campbell & Wasco, 2000). That is, the role of the researcher’s subjectivity in knowledge claims, meaning making and constructing realities is not denied in a feminist research. In this context, reflexivity becomes a vital methodological component of a feminist research and the practice of including the researcher’s beliefs, values, thoughts and judgments in the research process gains prominence.

In the current study, as a man researching men who employs some feminist practices, I also chose to situate myself in the research process to facilitate the understanding of the values, beliefs and dispositions that led to the choice of the subject, as well as the subsequent analysis and interpretation of data. For this reason, I started the introduction part with an autobiographical anecdote and I put this study into words in the first person point-of-view to establish a rapport with the readers and take over responsibility of co-constructing the knowledge produced in this study. To
accomplish these goals better, I will also share some parts of my personal life and experiences that I thought are related to the ethical and theoretical issues I address in this research.

3.1.1.1. About Me

When I was a child, I was so introverted. Maybe, I had to be shy and quiet because from time to time I would feel unjustly and negatively judged for the things I did and/or “did not do.” My interests and pursuits in life has long been criticized by my school teachers, peers, relatives, and neighbors. For example, I would not play football, watch football matches on TV, and even support a football team as other boys around me would do. In addition, I never fought with my friends or beat someone to handle some problems. Nor did I raise my voice in dealing with a disagreement. I never wanted be an engineer, pilot or medical doctor. Instead, I have loved reading so much ever since I learned to read. Storyland was my homeland where I felt outgoing, relaxed, and safe because nobody could judge me there. At the same time, books provided me a space through which I learned lots of things and reacted to certain situations without directly experiencing them. Also, I loved dreaming. I sometimes dreamed about being a character in the stories of Jules Verne, sometimes imagined becoming a successful archeologist who runs from excavations to excavations. To make it short, my interests seemed too “girlish” for a boy and some of my preferences fell short of society’s expectations. Therefore, I was not a “real” boy who was able to perform conventional masculine behaviors and fulfill the certain expectations of the society. Our neighbors and relatives were really curious about me and my future. They even suggested my parents that I should be apprenticed to a mechanic’s garage or a tailor’s shop in order to learn the real life and become a “real” man. However, my parents kept buying me books…

My reading experience I never gave up gave me the power of questioning at an early age and enabled me to look at life from different perspective. One of the perspectives I obtained through books is feminist perspective. My first feminist questioning dates back to the secondary school days. Even though it was the time when I could not figure out what I know and how I know, the question I asked to my teacher could be viewed as a feminist attempt to understand the things around me. More specifically, when I was in secondary school, I read one of the prominent novels called Acımak by
Reşat Nuri Güntekin. The protagonist of the novel, Zehra, is a merciless head teacher in a school. She has tolerance neither to her students nor to the people around her. Needless to say, she has some reasons for being merciless and tough because she encounters some difficulties and challenges in life. One day, she receives a letter and learns that her father is about to die. The person sending the letter insists that she visit her father before he dies. At first, she does not want to visit his father but later on she decides to visit him reluctantly. She does not feel pity when she sees her father dying... After that, she finds a diary kept by his father and starts to read it in her way back to home. The diary reveals everything about her father: Her mother cheats her father and he keeps it secret. Her maternal grandmother supports her daughter in cheating Zehra’s father and leaving the house. After Zehra finishes reading the diary, she feels regretful about the things she did not realize before. However, it is too late to make amends because she has already lost her father... After this incidence, she starts a new life and becomes a new person who is more tolerant and merciful... When I finished the novel, I could not understand the reason why all women in the novel are villains. The mother, grandmother and Zehra are malicious, disturbing, seducing, merciless... By the time I asked the question: “Teacher, why all women in this book are so bad?” my teacher got puzzled first. Then she said, “Maybe, it is because of the writer’s way of knowing the world, honey. Let’s say he chose to show them in that way. Maybe, they are good people if you meet them in real life, huh?” Now, it was my turn to get puzzled. Maybe, my teacher meant that the novels are not independent of authors’ values, beliefs, and their way of knowing the world. From then on, I have always kept in my mind that there are many different points of view in life. There is no single reality; instead, there are many realities which are not solid and rigid and they are constructed through experiences.

My feminist questioning of life continued through my reading experiences in my high school days. When I read the novels written by feminist writers, I started to figure out that there are many authors who could write something about women’s position in the society, gendered roles, sexuality, inequalities, and minority groups. I got fascinated by and admired their powerful voices and fearless questioning of life when I read their works. Up to that time, I had read many short stories and novels written by male writers and never thought of alternative perspectives. Thanks to
feminist writers, I started to be acquainted with some key concepts such as feminism, gender, patriarchy, sexual taboos, etc. Since these writers and their books provided me with vivid illustrations of social and historical events, I could conceptualize the social phenomenon. From then on, for example, I recognized that domestic violence already has political meanings apart from being a form of physical violence. I also understood that it is purposive and political to choose mostly boys as the protagonists of adventure novels. After recognizing different realities and gaining awareness about gender issues, I decided to transform my amateur reading experience into more professional one and thus I was accepted to the department of American Studies which offered me a wide range of courses on literature, history, art, religion, and aesthetic. I took up some courses related to gender which provided me with an interdisciplinary and global perspective and created a critical and theoretical base for my reading experiences. When I searched for feminist theory in detail and read many articles and books, I discovered a book called *Masculinities* by R. W. Connell who is one of the pioneer scholars in Man and Masculinity Studies. She mentioned different kinds of masculinities consisting of men who are “privileged” in patriarchal society and the men who are “subordinated” by these privileged men. When I read some parts of the book, I felt that I was familiar with the story and I was not alone in a global context. Depending on my own experiences, I decided to write a thesis on men and masculinities. Therefore, I continued my studies in Gender and Women’s Studies program.

In sum, my personal experiences and values gave the way to conduct this research related to masculinity studies. Since I was accepted to the programme, I have always had an idea to contribute to the masculinity studies in Turkey as a pro-feminist researcher who is courageous enough to confront patriarchy and willing to engage with feminism. Among many topics related to masculinity studies, I chose to focus on homosocial relations in Turkey because based on my observations throughout my life, I sincerely believe that patriarchal values and practices are mostly reproduced through homosocial relations. In other words, in male-male peer interaction and man talk, patriarchal order is constantly perpetuated. As a person who constantly disagree with sexism, misogyny, and homophobia and thus is stigmatized as the misfit of male homosocial groups, it would be worth studying homosocial relations in Turkish context.
3.1.2. Building Non-hierarchical Relationship

In addition to adopting a reflexive approach by situating myself in the research process and critically reflecting on my role in knowledge production, I incorporated feminist principal of building non-hierarchical relationships between the researcher and the participants. In contrast to the conventional social inquiries, which establish the ground for an authoritarian relationship between the researcher and the participants (Raheim et al., 2016), the proposed framework of feminist research provides possibility to create non-hierarchical and non-exploitative relationships between the researcher and the participants (Bozok, 2013; Letherby, 2003). Feminist methodology questions the hierarchal relationships in terms of ethics and indicates that participants are treated as the “objects” of the research as long as the asymmetrical relations between the researcher and the participants are sustained (Stanley & Wise, 1993). Some feminist researchers criticize hierarchical relationships in the research process in that it obscures building rapport and trust that are essential for the disclosure of information from the participants (Oakley, 1998; Reinharz, 1992). Also, hierarchical relationship between the researcher and the participants is considered denying the researcher of reaching wide range of knowledge because it is difficult for the participants to manage self-disclosure in a research context in which they feel overwhelmed by an omnipotent researcher (Hammersley, 1992).

In order to avoid asymmetrical relationships, in a feminist research, the researcher shares his/her values, emotions, perceptions, and experiences with the participants to a certain extent (Oakley, 1998). By this way, the research process becomes more than a question-answer session and it turns out to be a real conversation in which authentic experiences are mutually shared. In a research process in which the relationships are non-hierarchical and non-exploitative, it becomes easier for the participants to share personal information. However, it is important to note that this strategy alone may not be effective in every interview and it may not be applied in all situations because the power dynamics in each interview varies based on the cultural, social and personal background of the participants. For example, as a man interviewing men in the current study, when the participants and I shared the same gender socialization and similar life experiences, the power imbalance between us
was minimized. However, the lack of shared perspective and experiences made it difficult if not possible for us to feel very closely associated. The most difficult thing for me as a pro-feminist researcher was to listen some participants’ sexist expressions and their efforts to make me align with their sexist attitudes, which sharply contrasts with my personal dispositions. On the other hand, it was also difficult to keep up with the non-hierarchical relationships when the participants recognized that my personal beliefs, values and thoughts were different from theirs. They may even regarded some of my questions hostile, biased and judgmental, thus they may not always be at ease answering some questions. However, when I recognized the gap between us, I tried to remind participants that we all go through the same gender socialization process and I also became a man in the same society. I hereby could manage non-hierarchical relationships in interviews. Also, as another strategy tackling with the hierarchical relationships in the interviews, I disclosed my research to the participants. I explained some details about the study, answered each participant’s questions about the nature of the research sincerely, and requested them to give feedback on the interviewing process. This strategy really worked to win participants’ trust and increase their commitment to the study.

One of the important means of power which cannot be ignored in interviews is linguistic subordination (Bourdieu, 1996). Bourdieu asserts that the level of language, as well as the appropriate verbal and non-verbal signs used in communication, foster collaboration in the interviews. As for the current study, it is important to note that in each interview linguistic subordination somehow appeared. In some of the interviews, I was in a position of linguistic subordination when the language used by the participants gained hegemonic power. This was most clear when participants got caught up in talking and told their experiences within their homosocial groups. One of the participants, for example, referred his buddies by their nicknames, which were unknown to me. When he said “weasel”, “squirrel” as such, I could not understand what he was talking about. Therefore, in such situations, I could not easily follow the flow of the conversation and I felt uneasy. Another example in which language became a barrier between me and the participants occurred when participants conveyed their disagreement, and sometimes discomfort, with the words I used. For instance, in an interview, I asked a question about sexuality by using the phrases “intimate relationship” and “making love.” The
participant asked me in return, “Do you mean fucking?” and he explained the difference between intimate relationship and “fucking.” In doing so, he also said that “making love” is mostly used by women and thus the phrase has feminine connotations. The conversation between me and the participant was actually a part of a male talk for the participant -if not for me- therefore, I was supposed to use a language closer to jargon they (men in homosocial groups) developed. This experience made me recognize the difference of using “making love” and fucking” and in the subsequent interviews, while asking some questions, I tried to use “masculine” words. This small adaptation in language made us feel closer and more sincere, which avoided building up hierarchical relationships in the interviews.

On the other hand, sometimes in the interviews, I was in a position of linguistic domination. For example, when I addressed participants I tried to use formal language because this is my way of addressing people when I meet them first time. Therefore, in the interviews, instead of saying “sen” (you; second person singular) to the participants, I preferred using “siz” (you; second person plural), which sounds more formal. However, in the second interview, the participant told me that he found this way of addressing odd, reserved, and even insincere. He said:

Bro, I am offended. I spent my time for your project and tell everything about me but you call me ‘siz.’ OK, I see you have higher social status and you are a gentleman. Also, you don’t seem like a man saying words like ‘fucking’ bla bla…, but I don’t want to be called ‘siz.’ I wish I could have more intimate conversation with you.

It was clear that the participant got a false impression and found me so reserved and distant. By saying “you” I did not mean to express social superiority, neither did I intend to be so distant. I realized that new rules of interaction have to be negotiated to create non-hierarchical relationships in the interviews. Thanks to the participant’s feedback, I started to address the participants by their names or I called them “abi” (older brother) if they are older than me. Therefore, I believe I broke the invisible wall between me and the participants and bridged the gap within the linguistic domain, which were useful for eliminating the distance and hierarchy between us.
3.2. Research Design and Procedure

Even though quantitative research has long been used to study social phenomena, in recent years, qualitative research has gained prominence. Since each individual experiences social reality in a different way, profound descriptions and experiences can better be revealed through gathering and analyzing non-numerical data (Creswell, 1998). In line with the starting point of this study as that of understanding how men in homosocial groups experience hegemonic masculinity, I aimed to reach a deeper understanding of men’s individual experiences in their homosocial groups. I considered that the most appropriate method to obtain men’s individual experiences of being a member of homosocial group would be the qualitative research because as Schwalbe (2009) underlines “qualitative methods provide the best insight into how men present themselves as gendered beings” (p. 279). Among several data collection techniques within qualitative research, I chose to conduct in-depth interviews with men who is a member of a homosocial group. Therefore, in order to understand the reasons behind strong homosocial bonds between men and interpret how these relationships affect men and masculinities in Turkey, I conducted semi structured in-depth interviews with 20 participants coming from different homosocial backgrounds. For data analysis, I used thematic analysis proposed by Braun and Clarke (2006).

Before I obtained ethical approval (see Appendix A) from Middle East Technical University Human Subjects Ethics Committee (HSEC), I had planned to have interviews with my close friends and male relatives who socialize and spend much of their time with their male buddies. However, due to ethical considerations and concerns that can arise during or after the interviews, I gave up the idea of interviewing my acquaintances and I decided to conduct my research with the male participants I do not know. However, reaching to potential participants was not easy. Initially, I just found five participants meeting the required criteria to be included in this study. Later on, these five participants provided referrals and they informed their friends about the study. Following the suggestion of Parker, Scott and Geddes (2019), I asked these five participants to recruit other men and then I asked other men to recruit others. As the interviews proceeded, I could reach other participants.
belonging to other homosocial groups.⁴ Therefore, in participant recruitment process, I used snowball sampling technique.

I conducted the interviews from August, 2020 to December, 2020 and arranged the place of the interviews by asking each participant’s opinion in order to make participants feel more comfortable. On participants’ request, the interviews took place in participants’ offices or workplaces and in public places such as coffee shops and cafes. However, I need to note that since I conducted the interviews when the outbreak of COVID-19 has spread to the entire world and we were under the state of lockdown, finding the proper location was really difficult. We tried to meet at a time during off-peak commuting hours to minimize our exposure to people and we carefully adhered to social distancing requirements.

In each interview, I informed the participants about the research process and obtained both verbal and written consent from them. Through the consent form (see Appendix B), participants gained information about the aim of the study and research process. Also, through this form, participants were reassured that their identities would be kept confidential. However, in order to grant anonymity but at the same time personalize each narrative, I requested participants to map nicknames for themselves. Another purpose for making the participants choose a nickname for themselves was to letting them more involved in the research process. Almost all participants willingly suggested nicknames that would represent them in the study and they generated their nicknames inspired from their old MSN and Mirc accounts, console games, and TV series.

With the permission of participants, I recorded all the interviews by using a voice recorder. I activated the recorder when I started to ask questions in the socio-demographic form (see Appendix C), which included information about participants’ age, birthplace, education, occupation, relationship status, and income. (For further details about each participant, see “Stories of the Participants”). Based on participants’ answers, I filled the socio-demographic form on behalf of them. The interviews continued with the semi-structured interview questions (See Appendix D). I directed open-ended questions which were compatible with the purpose of the

⁴ None of the participants belong to the same homosocial group; they all come from different groups.
research and the research questions of the study. More specifically, the questions were broadly about gender roles, male-male peer interactions, social bonds between men, man talk, and the possibility of different masculinities. The initial questions I asked were the same across all interviews, however the flow of each interview changed with regard to the length and depth of participants’ answers. Based on participants’ answers, I asked additional questions or raised some points I thought would be important to gain in-depth information. Depending on the conversational flow, the interviews took 40-100 minutes. At the end of each interview, I summarized what the participants talked about to avoid misunderstanding and misconceptions, and answered the participants’ questions regarding the study. Finally, I requested the phone numbers or e-mail addresses of the participants to share the results with them.

### 3.3. Participants

The ages of the participants were between 25 and 40. All participants were born and raised in Turkey except one participant. The participant named Eymen was born in Düsseldorf, Germany but raised in Kayseri, Turkey. All participants “proudly” identified themselves as heterosexuals. Every participant stated that he belonged to at least one homosocial group and seven participants out of 20 belong to more than one homosocial group. The participants have had homosocial interactions lasting for at least five years to twenty years. Almost all participants mentioned the difficulties in initiating new participants to their homosocial groups. They also noted that it was not easy to welcome a new member even to a WhatsApp group because as one of the participants stated “it is really difficult to find a trustworthy and like-minded bro in this terrible transitory world.” Every group has different rules and rituals to initiate the new member to their homosocial groups; however, being manly man (*adam gibi adam*), honest and loyal to the group are the common characteristics every group requires from the new participants. Nearly none of the participants accept initiating LGBTQ+ individuals to their homosocial group since they find them “notorious,” “perverted,” bad role models, and against *fitrat* -nature. They are so intolerant to LGBTQ+ individuals that they stated they do not even want to be in the same setting. On the other hand, most of the participants particularly underlined that they were opposed to have a female friend or they refused to get socialized with women. Every
participant noted it is okay to be in the same environment with women and spend time with them for a while; however, few of them stated that they could hardly have hetero-social interactions because they could not act the way they want and “do something masculine” like swearing explicitly, watching football match, drinking alcohol, and sharing their secrets with their male friends when women are around.

3.3.1. Stories of the Participants

Sari Bela – Yellow Trouble: He was born in 1985 in Adana but he especially emphasizes that his parents are Bulgarian immigrants. He graduated from high school and he is a taxi driver for a long time. His nickname comes from the color of his taxi and blond hair. He works in a taxi station next to the famous brothel house in Adana. He is married and has two sons. He has a dost, a person with whom he has sexual affair. He regularly visits his dost living in Kilis and he says, “Bro, you know, our wives are the mothers of our children. They are angels, but we need a Satan who will stir us up, don’t we? We need also satisfaction; we need to get some ass! [Laughing].”

Sahne Adamı – The Man of the Stage: He describes himself as “the one and only artist of the family.” He was born and raised in Ayaş, Ankara. He is twenty-seven years old. He has two younger brothers and an older sister. He graduated from a vocational school of higher education, department of Foreign Trade. Since his childhood, he has been singing. He says his role model is Özcan Deniz. He plays keyboard and sings in wedding ceremonies. He works with the wedding orchestra consisting of five male instrumentalists and he loves spending his free time with these orchestra members. He got divorced two years ago and has a religious marriage with his childhood sweetheart. He emphasizes the importance of virginity “in the age of bastards.”

Şef – Chef: He was born in 1984 in Bolu. When he was 12, he was sent to the tourism and management boarding school and stayed in the dorm of the school. He had his internships in different touristic cities such as Antalya and Muğla. He graduated from the department of culinary arts. He works as an instructor in culinary schools in Ankara. He plans to earn a master degree in a private university in Ankara. He is the member of a leftist teachers’ union and also actively works as a
volunteer at a non-governmental organization. He is married for nine years. He supports gender equality. For example, he expresses his deep pleasure when sees the ongoing involvement of female chefs to the well-known restaurants which used to predominantly employ male chefs. He has a homosocial group consisting of his friends from the boarding school for more than twenty years.

**Jack Daniel:** Actually, he has been called by his friends as the “sponge” which absorbs alcohol and never gets drunk. However, he does not prefer to be called as “sponge” since it reminds the cartoon character “Sponge Bob.” Instead, he prefers naming himself Jack Daniel which is inspired from his favorite whiskey brand Jack Daniel’s. He was born in 1987 in Bursa. He graduated from the department of Economics. He works as a manager in a fine-dining restaurant in Ankara. In his leisure time, he loves drinking and chatting with his best friend from high school. “I drink a lot,” he says, “because I am a very aggressive person by nature and I get relaxed when I drink.” In addition, he proudly says he has two girlfriends one of whom will be his future wife and he adds: “We, men, all know that there are two types of girls, girls with whom we can have fun and the girls we will get married.” He does not believe in love or permanent relationships, instead, he is fond of one-night stands and the healing and relaxing power of sex.

**Şeytan – Satan:** He was born in 1995 in Kırıkkale. His father is an ex-footballer playing in amateur leagues. Since his childhood, he has been familiar with watching and playing football. When he started high school in Kırıkkale, he was discovered by a football manager and taken to the youth team of a national team and thus had to drop out of school. Now, he is playing in a team in minor league. His nickname comes from the nickname of ex-football player Rıdvan Dilmen. He loves sports cars and luxurious watches. He says he is obsessed with some brands such as Dsquared2, Givenchy, and Gucci. He is afraid of being alone at home, so he lives with his best friend from Kırıkkale. He always goes on a holiday with his friends from the same football team because he says, “I can’t cope with god damn life all alone.”

**DJ Mendy:** He is a DJ working in some local bars and clubs in Mersin. He was born in 1991 in Mersin. He has no siblings. He studied Political Science and Public Administration in Mersin University. “I have my master degree from nightlife,” he says. He says he cannot live without music and girls. He starts working at 11.00 pm
and comes back home very early in the morning. He has had a girlfriend until recently but he believes in open relationship. He states that since he was 19 he has never masturbated. He either has had a girlfriend to have sex with or has one night stands. He says he earns lots of money from making music but he smokes and drinks a lot. That’s why, he hardly pays his rent. He loves smoking weeds with his male friends from nightlife and giving “crazy” parties.

**Diriliş – Resurrection**: He was born in 1980 in Tepecik, İzmir. He graduated from high school. He started working as a sales representative in the last year of high school. He works as a distributor in a beverage company in Ankara. He is married and has three daughters. “We’ll keep trying until we have a baby boy,” he says. He likes hanging out with his friends from the same firm every Saturday night. He describes those nights: “What can I want more? Thank god! Men to men nights, without nagging of women and children’s whining. Just chilling and having fun.” He likes watching TV series, particularly Ottoman series (he named himself having inspired by the name of a historical TV series) and action movies.

**Muttaki – The Person Who Practices Taqwa**: He describes himself as a strong believer of Allah. He is 27 years old and lives in Tarsus, Mersin. “By the time I belonged to the tariqat and followed the order of my Gavz, the primary guide, I understood my life was full of mistakes. I would drink alcohol, I had a motorbike, and I would fool around. A complete waste of time!” he says. He is married for 3 years. He does not want his wife to work because he thinks “women have many things to do like cooking, cleaning, and taking care of children. They cannot neglect their duties and responsibilities to earn money. Moreover, working is not suitable for their fitrat, creation.” He is also opposed to his wife’s watching TV because he thinks that his wife is negatively affected by the Turkish and Indian soap operas. In his free time, he goes to the dervish fraternity with male friends and practices rabita, having a strong bond with the dervish.

**Sex Machine**: He was born in 1991 in Antalya. He studied aquaculture engineering but he works in a gym center as a personal trainer. He says he cannot understand people who think sex is taboo. “Look at series and movies, everybody is chasing for love and finally has sex at the end of the day, right?” he says. He takes care of his body and health so much and cannot stand “chubby” people. In his free time, he
loves cooking because he says, “women love men who can cook” and reading romance to “update” his fantasies. He has a homo-social group from the university and they meet almost every month. “Even if they call me ‘rent boy [laughter],’ I love them. I know their intention is not bad. If I were them, I would, of course, be jealous of me,” he adds.

**Pars – Pars, the Anatolian Tiger:** He is the oldest of three brothers. He was born in 1983 in Kütahya. When his mother died, he moved to Ankara with his family. He dropped out of college and started to work in his father’s garage. When his father died last year, he stopped working as a car mechanic and decided to start his car rental business. Now, he is working with his step brothers even if he does not really like “their” mother. He says, “They are my father’s sons, not that woman’s. God damn that woman, she seduced my dad.” He does not believe in happy relationships or marriages. “I never understand women’s actions in my life. Even the Satan admitted he couldn’t deal with women. How is it possible for a man to deal with those evil women?” he says. He also supports violence towards women “when they deserve it.” He continues his education in Open Education Faculty, the department of Administration. In his free time, he likes smoking shisha especially with his friends in hookah bars.

**Çavuş – The Sergeant:** He was born in 1993 in Muğla. He has graduated from high school. He works as military personnel in Turkish army in Kırklareli. He is engaged. He enjoys hanging out with men whom he has been friends with for twenty years. “Carpe diem” meaning seizing the day is his motto and he says, “We have no plans or projects. One of our friends calls and says ‘Let’s go there,’ then we go. Take it easy! Don’t panic! Life is too short to hurry up, life is fun.”

**Kelebek – Butterfly:** Actually, the butterfly mentioned here is not an insect with colorful wings. It is a kind of pocket-sized knife. “Don’t get me wrong bro, you can see real butterflies in the nature, not on the streets. Every man needs a butterfly knife [he pulls it out of his pocket] and has to know how to shake it [he starts shaking it].” He was born in 1990 in Kırıkkale and moved to Ankara since his father was convicted of theft in Sincan, Ankara. He graduated from high school. He is married and has a son and a newly born daughter. He wants his son to be a lawyer in the future. He works as an electrical technician. He goes to kırathane, coffeehouse in
his neighborhood in his spare time and claims that “coffeehouses are the last places which remind men the forgotten values and principles.” From time to time, he says he likes kadına gitmek, going to brothel house and he adds “I do not go to brothels as much as I used to since my daughter was born.”

**Eymen:** He was born in 1987 in Germany. Because of familial problems, he was sent to Kayseri and raised by his grandparents and uncles. He had not seen his mother until he went back to Germany. He dropped out of high school in Turkey and moved back to Germany to live with his father. He works as a technician in a company in Düsseldorf, Germany. He is divorced and has a son. He says, “My father is a problematic man, he did bad things. He was not a good role model for me, but I want to be a good role model for my own son. I don’t want him to live the same things I experienced.” He likes hanging out with his kemik kadro, the main group to meet, almost every week.

**Filinta – The Handsome Boy:** He was born in 1992 in Bolu. His father and mother got divorced when he was 14. He then started to live with his father. He graduated from the faculty of Business Administration. He works as a pharmaceutical sales representative in a famous pharmaceutical company in Ankara. He does not like being called hovarda, womanizer, by his close friends. “Women don’t leave me alone. I guess they find me handsome and attractive. If you ask me, I am just a normal guy,” he says. He describes himself as an open-minded person with some limitations. For example, he says he cannot stand LGBTQ+ individuals “who are completely contradictory with God’s creation.” He loves eating out with his friends from the same company and drinking alcohol.

**Yargımachine – The Justice Machine:** He describes himself as a person “who speaks truth and would be expelled from nine villages.” He was born in 1986 in Sakarya. He had his primary, secondary and high school education in different cities in Turkey because of his father’s job. When he came to Ankara for the university education, he decided to stay in Ankara forever. He studied Industrial Engineering in METU. Then he had his MBA in New York Institute of Technology. He works as an engineer in an energy systems company in Ankara. He often goes on business trips. He does not want to work with women as “women are emotional creatures who act instinctively and thus irrationally in an office environment.” “Business requires
discipline, logic and wisdom, sorry but most of them [women] don’t have any of these qualifications,” he adds. He says his biggest pleasure in his life is goygoy, having idle talk, with his four male friends from university.

**Reis – Chieftain:** He was born in 1981 in İzmir. He had to drop out of high school because of monetary reasons and started working as an apprentice of a house painter. He also worked as a seasonal worker in Manisa and Aydın. He says he saved money and opened his own small painting store. He got married at an early age. He has three daughters and two sons. He is opposed to the education of girls since “schools break moral values of girls.” He supports early marriages of the girls because he thinks that women lose their fertility as they get older. He also adds, “As our ancestors told us: *Kadının sırtından sopayı, karnından sipayı eksik etmeyeceksin*.” He likes playing football with his friends from the same neighborhood twice a month and going to meyhane, the tavern with the same group.

**The Protector:** He was born in 1991 in Malatya. He does not know his biological family. He was raised in an orphanage in Malatya. He graduated from the department of Physics. He works as a civil servant in Ankara. He wants to get married with a woman with headscarf and start a family. He likes listening arabesque songs. He spends most of his time on social networks and he says he uses his social media accounts to promote domestic and national products of Turkey and show them to the enemies of Turkey. (His nickname comes from the first Turkish series broadcasted on Netflix). He also likes smoking shisha and hanging out with his friends from the post office in which he works.

**Scarface:** He was born in 1990 in Ankara. He says he had a difficult adolescence and “Let these razor scars speak [showing his forearm].” “I have really bad friends and I accept it,” he adds. He studied Tourism and Hotel Management at Ankara University. He works as a receptionist in a well-known hotel in Ankara. He wants to be the manager of the hotel in which he is working now. He is interested in guns and in his free time he goes hunting and to shooting range with his male friends.

---

5One of the sexist Turkish proverbs which can be translated as: “You should beat a woman all the time and always keep her pregnant.”
Ironman44: He was born in 1989 in Malatya. He graduated from the department of Econometrics. He lives in Ankara and works as a branch manager in a bank. He lives with one of his best friends. “If it were up to me, I would live in a bigger house and I would stay with all of my bros,” he says. He says he feels so attached to his male friends. “They are more valuable than my family; they are already my family,” he says. He likes going to gym, throwing parties and watching Netflix series. He suffers from some bad habits such as heavy drinking and hanging out with call girls.

Zalim – The Tyrant: He was born in 1984 in Kırşehir. He has no brothers or sisters. He was raised by his grandparents in Mucur, Kırşehir since his family worked in Ankara. When he started to go to high school, he moved to Ankara. From then on, he has been living with his parents. He graduated from the department of Business Administration in the faculty of open education, “Throughout my life, I have been tall and chubby and so many people are afraid of this big man and call me Zalim,” he says. He works as a security officer in a newly built residence. In his free time, he likes playing backgammon and drinking something with his friends from the same neighborhood. “My bros are my one and only reality, whatever they do, I stand behind my friends,” he says.

Ezhel35: He was born in 1991 in İzmir. He graduated from Deutsche Schule İzmir; however, he did not continue his university education. He is a rapper. (His nickname comes from a famous Turkish rapper Ezhel). He loves writing his lyrics both in Turkish and German. “I really love the tough tone of German language,” he says. His lyrics are about girls “who twisted him around their little fingers” and cheated him. “I hate them, but I can’t live without them [girls],” he says. In his free time, he loves walking around back streets of “fusty” İzmir with his “gang”. “We carry façata [a curved knife] and use it when necessary. Shanty life requires it. Outskirts of İzmir are dangerous,” he adds.

3.4. Thematic Analysis

In order to identify, analyze, and report themes within data, I undertook thematic analysis. I followed six phases of thematic analysis devised by Braun and Clarke (2006). Familiarizing myself with the data I collected was the first step I carried out. However, it is important to note that this stage did not begin with paper and pencil
because engaging with the literature on men and masculinities before forming the possible codes and themes enabled me to become increasingly aware of some features of the data that would have been barely noticeable. Therefore, becoming familiar with data was possible with having prior knowledge on literature and of the data. Also, the process of analyzing the data started during data collection. Actually, listening the experiences of participants was a good way to be familiar with the data because it was during the interviews I recognized the potential codes and themes. The possible codes and themes were reinforced while transcribing the recorded interviews. I do not regard putting the spoken sounds on paper as merely an activity of writing because putting the interviews in a written form informed me well about the core of this research. Finally, at this stage, I read the entire data set twice in order to have full knowledge of some details. Therefore, the preliminary analysis that included listening (conduction the interviews), writing (transcription), and reading (deciphering the written form of the interviews) was an indispensable process to be acquainted with the data.

The second step called *generating initial codes* begin when I was well equipped with the details and ready to make an initial list of ideas. Based on the initial list of ideas I noted, I generated initial codes. Herein the entire data set was arranged purportedly. When all data were coded, I move onto the next stage which is called *searching for themes* and I began to identify the themes embedded in long list of codes. Some codes were classified into possible themes and they were united to generate overarching themes. During this process, some codes were included in overarching themes while some others were categorized under the sub-themes. However, the initial themes needed to be more precise as some of them seem to be separated, combined or just cast aside. Therefore, *reviewing the themes*, which is proposed as the fourth phase of thematic analysis, became a necessity. In this phase, some sub-themes clustered and they formed just one theme, while some were separated to constitute different sub-themes. In order to ensure *internal homogeneity* and *external heterogeneity*, proposed by Patton (1990), extracts and codes under each theme were reviewed to be coherent, while salient distinctions in data under two different themes were catered. This process increased the discriminatory power of each overarching and sub-themes and resulted in forming a thematic map. However, creating a thematic map at this stage does not mean that analyzing the data came to an end. The
initially identified themes needed further refinement, which is called defining and naming themes. In this level, I noted some details about each theme and explained features that made them themes. When I have no difficulty in telling the story behind the themes in a couple sentences, this meant that the themes were finalized and they needed titles. In naming the themes, I elaborated on using participants’ wording; however, when this was not possible, I tried to choose words and phrases that are instantly appealing and embracing the meaning the theme encompasses. Finally, in producing the report, which is the final stage, I used extracts, examples, as well as some descriptions and narratives, to present the results satisfactorily and convincingly. Noting down the themes and giving adequate support for each was also implemented by contextualizing them within the arguments related to the research questions of this study.

The process of identifying themes that are embedded in interviews was driven by my theoretical interest in the subject, thus, the themes emerged by theory driven analysis. Meanwhile, although I say themes “emerged”, I cannot deny the active role I, as a researcher, played in identifying some patterns. I named some data extracts as themes only when I related them to this study’s theoretical position and my own values with regard to this research process. Based on this attitude in analyzing the data, though most of the themes appeared across the entire data set, the number of times they were repeated by different participants were not that important. When participants’ responses were patterned to a certain extend and these patterned utterances captured something crucial about the research questions, I counted them as themes. From the interviews, I identified two overarching themes with three subthemes for each. Emotional stoicism, heterosexual prowess, and ambivalent sexism together captured an important element of the way in which hegemonic masculinity prolongs its existence. Therefore, I named the first overarching theme “perpetuation of hegemonic masculinity.” On the other hand, in most of the participants’ individual talk, men, who fell short of masculine traits and practices, were stigmatized and excluded. As a result, “strong stigmatization and negation of non-hegemonic masculinities” emerged as the second overarching theme.
CHAPTER 4

PERPETUATION OF HEGEMONIC MASCULINITY

...How many deaths will it take 'til he knows,
That too many people have died?

Bob Dylan, Blowin’ in the Wind

Same-sex focused relations, male-male peer interaction and man talk are seen as indispensable elements by heterosexual men in general. All participants \((n=20)\) in the current research think in the same way. Some of them underlined the significance and the necessity of homosocial interaction with these words: “It is like water and bread. When I meet my friends, I feel like I meet my basic need” (Eymen). “Getting together with my friends is very important for me. I sometimes think that when we get married, I wish our wives get on well so we [friends] never get apart” (Çavuş). “When I meet my friends, I leave everything behind. I get relax” (Chef). “I become myself when I’m with my friends. I can swear as much as I wish and I don’t need to control myself” (Ironman44). “I’m looking forward to meeting my buddies every weekend. I can only get motivated in that way” (Scarface). “Bro, don’t get me wrong but for me there is no difference between orgasm and getting together with my friends. Both are so enjoyable and necessary” (Ezhel35).

It is undeniable that human person is a relational being and they try to fulfill their longing to belong, which is a basic human need. Within this context, it is highly understandable why participants want to get together and share something with their male friends. Male-male interaction might provide a space for intimate male friendship (Chen, 2012) and it highlights “shoulder to shoulder” friendship which is not based on competition (Hammaren & Johansson, 2014). However, some studies (Bird, 1996; Flood, 2008; Kiesling 2005; Lipman-Blumen, 1976; Segwick, 1895;...)
claim the opposite. When men get together, they are inclined to perpetuate some traits of hegemonic masculinity such as heterosexuality, competitiveness, aggression, strength, assertiveness and dominance because, as Flood (2008) emphasizes, men’s lives are organized by male-male relationships to a great extent. As it is mentioned in the theoretical framework and literature review part in detail, scholars cited above commonly reveal that male-male interaction -homosociality- is a social dynamic that might explain the perpetuation of hegemonic masculinity.

In the current study, I tried to reveal that strong homosocial bonds between men are beyond intimate and “shoulder to shoulder” friendship. These bonds are actually constructed by the traits of hegemonic masculinity. That is to say, the homosocial bonds are getting tighter as long as the traits of hegemonic masculinity are commonly shared and followed by the group members. In this process, a man in the homosocial group seeks for the approval of other men about his behaviors and when he is approved and supported by his mates, his behavior automatically becomes rational and legitimate. Therefore, homosocial behaviors, which are compatible with hegemonic masculinity, are perpetuated in homosocial interactions. In the current study, it is revealed that three traits of hegemonic masculinity have been perpetuated by the participants. These are (1) emotional stoicism, (2) heterosexual prowess, and (3) ambivalent sexism.

Under the title of “emotional stoicism”, I will discuss the reasons why men do not prefer sharing their emotions with their friends in homosocial groups and how homosocial group members affect one another in term of concealing or restricting their emotions. In the second part, called “heterosexual prowess”, I will show how homosociality configures men’s sexual relations, the meaning men attribute to heterosexual sex, and how men narrate their sexual involvements. Finally, in the last part, I will illustrate how men belonging to a homosocial group practice hostile and benevolent sexism.

4.1. Emotional Stoicism

Stoicism is a practice that requires not being affected by strong emotions and freeing oneself from emotional distress. When it comes to male stoicism, it can be defined as men’s preference for restricting or totally concealing some specific emotions such as
grief, fear, pain, and love. Male stoicism includes both “physical” and “emotional” connotations. Physical stoicism amounts to the necessity of being physically steady and tough in every circumstance. For instance, men are supposed to show high tolerance for pain and toughness when they participate in fights and compete in sports (Amin et al., 2017). On the other hand, emotional stoicism is a kind of detachment that makes men unable to connect to others at the emotional level. Fear of intimacy, coping with the problems alone, and not sharing the feelings—which are the traits of hegemonic masculinity—could be examples of emotional stoicism. A stoic man, therefore, is a man who “does not share his pain, does not grieve openly, and avoids strong, dependent and warm feelings” (Jansz, 2017, p. 168). Since this man feels obliged to live according to the standards of hegemonic masculinity, he tries to conceal his emotions such as fear, grief, love, and pain which are mostly associated with femininity.

In the current study, I tried to reveal male-male interaction plays very crucial role for the participants to inhibit or restrict the expression of their emotions in their daily lives. To start with, when I asked the participants whether they share their emotions with their friends in their homosocial interactions, some of them asked me these questions: “What do you mean by emotions? (Scarface) “Sharing emotions? How?” (Çavuş) “Like crying?” (Kelebek) “Emotions… I cried when my father died, you mean this? I don’t need to share it with my brothers; they had already seen me at my father’s funeral.” (Reis) “Well, sharing how I love them [laughter]?” (DJ Mendy)

When the participants asked me these questions, it seemed to me that they are not really aware of their emotions or they have limited repertoire of expressing some specific emotions. This finding confirms Levant’s study on gender differences in Alexithymia (Levant, 1995), which revealed that when men are to express their feelings, they are prone to lean on how they are expected to feel in particular conditions… I revised the question then and asked the participants whether they share their grief, pain, and/or fear with their friends. A couple of participants said, “hmm… that… OK,” “OK, these things,” or “you mean, debunking, huh [laughter]?” That is, it seems that these participants preferred to use these phrases instead of naming the emotions themselves. This result echoes the previous research, claiming that men avoid using the words about feelings, instead, they use “personal stuff.”
“those things,” and “those matters” (Bird, 1996, p. 125). Therefore, it can be concluded that some participants, both in the current and Bird’s study, abstained from using specific words referring to “feminine” emotions.

On the other hand, a few of the participants in the current study said that they did not have to share their feelings with their friends by using “these” words and they assumed that their friends in their homosocial group know them so closely that they can understand how they feel from their moods, facial expressions or body language. For example, one of the participants, Yargımachine said that:

When my best friends see my face and my face looks like shit, they can understand I’m not OK and they think something bad happened. Then, they ask me ‘what happened?’ I don’t remember they asked me or I asked them that ‘are you OK?’ It is certain that there is a problem and it needs to be solved. When it’s solved, I’ll feel OK, they know that. You can’t solve the problem by telling how you feel. It is not a solution. We, men, are rational, bro. We are realist and solution oriented.  

Another participant, Scarface, also underlined that “a person can show his grief without saying ‘I’m sad,’” and he continued that:

Bro, if I could use these words, I’d be a poet [strong laughter]. I’m talking about my kankas. I’m sure you know the meaning of kanka. It means kan kardeş. So, your blood brothers understand how you feel. I mean, they have to do it. For example, if one of my buddies is silent, I know, he is up to no good or if I’m sullen, they know that something happened at work. Best friends understand each other from eye contact. Men don’t need words, do they?

More than half of the participants stated that they did not share their emotions such as fear, grief, pain and love or they share their emotions in a limited way. Moreover, they noted that they did not share their emotions even with their friends whom they genuinely trust in their homosocial group. The reason behind their reluctance to

---


7 Blood brother.

share their emotions is that they find expressing their emotions overtly so non-masculine. That is to say, expressing any kind of emotion associated with femininity is regarded by the participants as revealing their vulnerabilities and weaknesses. For example, the participant named Kelebek stated that sharing emotions is a sign of weakness and it is so feminine. He stated that:

I don’t understand, bro… Are we gonna whine like women? If you want, we can knit and gossip about our mother-in-laws [laughter]. Bro, real men never talk about their emotions. It’s a shame! What will you say, for example? Will you say, ‘Bro, I got kicked out of my job and I want to cry on your shoulder [laughter]?’ It’s so funny, isn’t it? Vallaha, if you say this to my buddies, they will fuck you with no mercy [laughing]… Men will be men; women will be women… Men are not weak or fragile like women.9

Another participant, Reis, said that:

Only weak men show their emotions… This is what was handed down from our fathers. My father would adore his friends, for example. He would eat, drink, and laugh together with his friends. They would even go to brothel together… But I had never heard he said to his friend that ‘I love you.’ Why would he say this? Is that what you meant by sharing feelings, brother? Like my father, I can do everything for my buddies. I even give my life for them and they know it. But I never say them ‘I love you.’ I don’t say ‘I love you’ even to my daughters. We’re not a romantic group, brother. We’re real men coming from real life, understand? No need to act like chickstuff!10

Ironman44 also noted that:

…We’re not like women. They’re emotional creatures. They cry at everything. Men are not weak like women. Bro, we’re rational animals, aren’t we [laughing]? If you see a man crying in front of other people, run away from him because he tries to get women’s attention. Don’t believe him because he cries crocodile tears [laughing]. The women around him should be ready to be thrown on the bed [laughing]. Bro, can a man cry easily unless his mother or father is dead? Many things happen in our


lives. We have an accident, our girlfriends leave us or we lose our job, but we never cry. Why do we cry? Are we soft men?11

Another participant, Şeytan, narrated an anecdote about how he felt depressed when he broke up his girlfriend and he could not express his emotions to his friends openly:

Bro, it is too difficult to share your feelings with your buddies. You share everything with your buddies but when it comes to your emotion, you feel stuck, understand? For example, two years ago my girlfriend left me. She was right because I cheated her with her close friend. *Valla*, I couldn’t control my hormones… But, bro, girls are so bitch... OK, I’m a man and I couldn’t stop my dick but she is her best friend… Anyway… When she left me, I understood I loved her so much. I felt like shit then. My friends from the team asked me ‘what happened to you lan?’ I said, ‘nothing, just training matches exhausted me.’ The couch pulled my leg and said, ‘focus my son, can’t you get your dick up nowadays, what happened to you, focus more!’ Somehow, I lied many times and I couldn’t say I felt like a bag of shit… But I can’t make my buddies believe it. They persistently asked me a couple of questions like ‘what happened to you?’ ‘What is the problem?’ I said I felt so bad and told them the reason without giving details. They said, ‘is she the only girl in the world?’ ‘Stay strong, we thought that you got a health problem’ ‘You can find a better one!’ ‘When you fuck a chick, you’ll forget.’ Then, they took me to a tavern and we drank a lot… After that, we called a couple of girls and till the morning… We enjoyed [laughing]… I forgot everything, bro, *valla*, I forgot… My friends were right. We’re men bro, we forget easily. Maybe, that’s why we don’t talk about our moods so much…”12


Diriliş said that:

No, brother… I’m thinking now, but I didn’t cry even when my grandpa died… He died because of cancer. He was like my father. Actually, he was the father of our neighborhood… Believe me, maybe, he took care of me more than my father. But when he died, I felt nothing. I just felt empty, that’s all… Since the first day of grandpa’s illness, my brothers [his friends] were with me. They had already known my grandpa because the friends I mention are from our neighborhood in İzmir. We took him from his bed to morgue together. Then we buried him together. We prayed for him together… They were always with me… But we never cried… We never even talked; I remember this, for example. Sometimes men must be silent, brother, they should know how to be silent. We, men, should be sturdy, bro. I had to hold my head up there because my dad was there and also my grandma was there. I had to hold my head up for my grandma because this was the only way to calm her down… She had lost her husband. Her pain was far greater than all of us. She needed more support. I think my brothers think like me because they did the same thing for me. I mean, they supported me and then I supported my grandma… It was useless to cry there… Men don’t cry, bro, you know the song [laughing].

Jack Daniel said that:

Valla, we’re a tough group, bro! We’ll punch your lights out! Cunts are not allowed in our group! Doing justice to manhood is way out of everyone’s league. There are things to be done manly in the life… You’ll work; you’ll fight with treacherous people. There will be many liars around you. Life has no pity on you, bro. Once you start whining, it thumps you down. This doesn’t mean that we don’t have emotions, but we men have to be strong. We, as men, have to put our tails up. It’s not easy to be a man, I mean, to be a real man. Life shows no mercy to the weak; we have no mercy to anybody. If you want to be in our group, you’ll be men first.
The Protector said that:

I used to share my feelings with my buddies more often. But, now… I don’t talk about these things… By the way, even if I said that I used to share my feelings, I was talking about manly emotions like being tired, understand? I don’t exactly remember why I gave up sharing my feeling, but let’s say I say I’m so sorry for Syrian kids begging on the street and when I express my sadness, they would generally say that, ‘be the man of your mold!’ or they say ‘knit socks for him like women.’ Actually, they’re right, bro, understand? A man should control his feelings, then we can call him man. When they humiliate me about this issue, I may feel resentful, but actually they try to help me. If they don’t tease me, others will do it…

Some other participants in the current study underlined that they avoided expressing their emotions since showing their emotions means a sign of vulnerability for them. In other words, participants stated that they don’t want to share their emotions openly with their friends in their homosocial interactions in order to eliminate the chance of being attacked or harmed emotionally by their friends. At this point, some of the participants particularly emphasized that even if they shared everything with their close friends in the homosocial setting, they did not share their emotions with them or they share their emotions with just one member of the homosocial group to whom they feel closer. While telling their reasons why they conceal their emotions, three of the participants interestingly used the same sentence and they said that: “I don’t want them [his friends] to use my emotions against me.” For instance, the participant Sahne Adami stated that:

If I shared my feelings too much with my bros, I would feel naked… I have already shared so much about myself. Problems at work, girls, some family issues… But, I can’t share my feelings with them. Of course, I trust them endlessly, don’t get me wrong, bro, but you can’t reveal everything about yourself. Something should be secret. Otherwise, one day, your best friend uses it against you. I don’t want them to

---

use my emotions against me, understand? İnsanoglu çiğ süs emmiş! Today, you get on well with them, the other day, they dig a pit for you!17

Another participant Eymen noted that:

Even if there is a storm inside me; I always smile and walk away… We’re men bro, we have to put our tails up… For me, there is no difference between sharing secrets and emotions. When you share one of them, people use it against you. Even your friends will do it. Trust me. To be honest, I’ve never shared my emotions up to now. No matter how much I trust my buddies, I never share my emotions with them because I don’t want them [his friends] to use my emotions against me…

Diriliş also said that:

There is no guarantee that my friends won’t use my emotions against me… Let’s say, one day we argue about something, God forbid. He would say that ‘what a whiny man you are’ if they had seen me crying in front of them before, understand? I don’t want them [his friends] to use my emotions against me… It would drive me crazy. But as our ancestors said, ‘don’t trust even your father.’ One day, your best friend can be your enemy… We should be ready for everything.

DJ Mendy stated that if he revealed his emotions he would probably feel vulnerable:

Bro, imagine that you’re in the middle of a war but you have nothing to defend yourself. What happens then? Of course, your enemy will rip you apart with his sword. Some secrets are like shields and these shields protect you from any harm… Your emotions are your secrets. If you reveal them, you become open to any attack… Bro, you can share everything with your buddies, no problem. For example, I share my joy and troubles… I share my money. I share my drink. I share my coco… We even share women, bro [laughing], need I say more? But when it comes

---

16 A Turkish idiom stating that human beings are always not nice and wise, and they can behave decently.


18 İçinde firtınalar kopsa bile her zaman güler geçirim. Biz erkekler kardeşim kuyruğumuzu dik tutmak zorundayız… Benim için sırlarımı paylaşmamakla duygularımı paylaşmak arasında hiçbir fark yok. Bir duygunu paylaşan, insanlar sana karşı kullanabilir. Arkadaşların sadece buna yapar. Güven bana. İşin doğrusu, şimdiye kadar hiç duygularımı paylaşmadım. Arkadaşlarımı ne kadar güvenireşim güveneyim, onlarla duygularımı paylaşmadım çünkü hisleri bana karşı kullanmalarını istemem...

to your emotions, think it twice. Your friend whom you trust so much can turn into a vulture… I am sorry but this is real life.\textsuperscript{20}

A few of the participants, on the other hand, noted that they shared their emotions with one of the members in their homosocial group whom they feel closest. These participants particularly underlined that even if they share their emotions with one of their friends, they do it in a limited way. That is to say that they do not share their emotions in detail “like women do.” For example, a participant, Filinta, mentioned the “manly” rules of sharing emotions and said that:

…Not only women but also men need to share their emotions, but bro you should share your emotions with manly attitudes… A man should be cool while sharing his feelings, understand? I mean inappropriate manners like crying, showing affection, or, I don’t know, kissing are not appropriate for men… Women do such things… Of course, we have emotions, too. We are not made of stone… We need somebody to share our emotion. But bro a man should have just one friend and can trust him till he dies. This man will be real and trustworthy. He will be your closest confidant. Men don’t need many friends like women… Will we eat cakes and börek and then read coffee ground [laughing]?\textsuperscript{21}

Another participant, Ironman44, also asserted that every man needs just one best friend with whom he shares everything:

I’m a very social person bro, I have many friends. We eat together, we drink together and we shit together. Sometimes three or four of us fuck a girl together [laughing]. Let’s say I have more than twenty buddies, but among them I have just one real friend whom I can share everything. For instance bro, last month bastomu kırdık… I had slept with a whore when I was drunk. I think she got infected and she passed it to me. Fucking whore! Bro, I couldn’t piss, I mean it was painful. I was dying of pain in the balls… Anyway… I don’t want to remember those days… Bro, it isn’t


\textsuperscript{22} Slang: “I got the clap,” having Gonorrhea.
easy to say it to anyone, understand? I didn’t want them to tease me… I didn’t want
to listen their horrible jokes about this. So, I shared it with my buddy I mentioned.
We talked about this issue before I went to doctor because you know it is hard to say
it even to the doctor… I told my buddy that I felt horrible because I didn’t know the
exact time I’d be OK. We sat and thought about the solutions I could do to get rid of
this problem. Then I went to a doctor. Without him [his buddy], vallahi I would have
felt so lonely because you can’t share it with your dad and mum or your girlfriend.
You can never share it with other buddies, vallahi they would suddenly crowd
together like hyenas and pull my leg.23

Reis also stated that:

…If I don’t have a real friend I can trust, I go mad. We’re surrendered by liars,
brother. We can’t easily trust people. Of course, we have many friends around us,
but we can’t share everything with them. When I feel bad, I mean when bad things
happen, I share these things with my buddy. He knows everything about me.
Actually, we have a group of five, but I can share everything with just one of them.
I don’t feel safe enough to share everything about me with my friends. I can entrust
my car, my store and even my wife to my buddy I mentioned…24

As it is seen, participants in the current study tried to “control” their emotions such
as grief, pain, happiness, love and disappointment. I particularly use the verb
“control” because there are many emotions like anger, envy (of their sisters, mothers,
girlfriends and wives), hatred, and pride that are overtly expressed and not controlled
by the participants. The participants did not feel the necessity for restricting these
emotions. In contrast, they tried to display these “manly” emotions on every
occasion. What makes men “control” some specific emotions such as grief, pain, and
disappointment is the meanings “these” emotions imply because these emotions are

23 Ben çok sosyal birisiyim bro. Bir sürü arkadaşım var. Beraber yeriz, beraber içeriz, beraber şararız.
Bazen üzüntü ya da dördümüz aynı kızı sikeriz [gülüyor]. Diyelim ki yirmiden fazla arkadaşım var
ama aralarından sadece biriyle her şeyimi paylaşılabilirim. Mesela bro, geçen ay bastonu kirdik.
Alkolüyken bir orospu ile yattım. Bence kendi virüslüydü ve bana bulaştırdı. Soktüğümüz orospusu!
Bro, biliyorum musun işe yaramadı, yani çok acıوردum. Taşaklarınım ağrısından geberdim… Neyse… O
güneri hatırlamak istemiyorum… Bro, bunu birine söyleyemek kolay değil, anladın mı? Benimle alay
etmelerini istemedim… Bu konu hakkında berbat şakalarını dinlemek istemedim. Bu yüzden daha
önce sana bahsettüğüm kankamla paylaştım bu durumu. Doktora gitmeden önce bu konuyu onuna
konuştuk çünkü biliyorsun doktora bile söylemek çok zor… Kankama çok kötü hissettigimi söyledi.

24 Eğer güvencebileceğim gerçek bir arkadaşım olmasa, kafayı yerim. Abicim etramızı yalancılar
kuşattı. İnsanlarla kolay kolay güvenceyim yoktu. Tabii ki etrafımızda bir sürü arkadaş var ama onlarla
her şeyi paylaşımaçaz. Kendimi kötü hissettigimde, yani kötü bir şeyler olduğuunda, bunları en yakını
arkadaşına paylaşırım. Benimle ilgili her şeyi bilir. Aslında bizim beş kişilik bir grubumuz var ama
çalışmamızdan yarınca birlikte her şeyimi paylaşılabiliyorum. Her şeyimi arkadaşlarına paylaşacak kadar
güvende hissetmiyorum. Bahsettigim arkadaşına arabadan, dikkânımı hatta karımı bile emanet
edebilirim…
associated with femininity by the participants. Therefore, participants preferred to be stoic while sharing the emotions which are incompatible with the traits of hegemonic masculinity.

Most of the participants stated that they do not show any external clues of being affected by pain, danger or distress particularly in their homosocial interactions since they do not want to be evaluated as weak and vulnerable by the group members. Moreover, apart from themselves, participants expect other men to be stoic. In other words, men in a homosocial group assume that all men should be tough, aggressive and emotionally unexpressive, which are highly in tune with the traits of hegemonic masculinity. These findings confirm the previous research claiming that male homosociality perpetuate emotional detachment (Bird, 1996). In her study, Bird indicates that men in the homosocial group avoid expressing their emotions because giving verbal or other expression to what they feel denotes weakness and vulnerability. Also, since emotional detachment is seen as desirable and imperative by the homosocial group in a general sense, participants in Bird’s study emotionally detach themselves from their friends More specifically, they restrict or conceal their emotions in order to maintain control and protect their masculine dignity in the group.

As a result, emotional stoicism as one of the traits of hegemonic masculinity is perpetuated through homosociality. Developing and sustaining relationships based on emotions are not preferable among men because emotions denote a non-masculine image for them. It is not possible for hegemonic masculinity to be expressed and perpetuated through “excessive” emotionality. Therefore, not to go out of the “masculinity myth”, most of the time men try to avoid sharing their emotions clearly. All in all, emotional stoicism is one path in which gender hierarchies are perpetuated…

4.2. (Hetero) Sexual Prowess

Heterosexuality is the core principle of hegemonic masculinity (Connell, 1995; Jewkes et al., 2015). Heterosexuality is very significant in the construction and perpetuation of masculinity since it is a way of exercising power and domination. More specifically, heterosexual sex is regarded as an attempt to realize male
privilege, power and authority because it is associated with men’s prowess, strength and “distinguished” bravery. In this context, homosociality might contribute to perpetuating one of the most essential traits of hegemonic masculinity, which is heterosexuality. As Flood (2005) underlines, homosociality configures the heterosexual sexual relations, the meaning men attribute to heterosexual sex, and how men narrate their sexual involvements. In addition, homosociality can establish a common ground for a man to boast with his sexual prowess and thus prove his masculinity to other men whom he both identifies with and compete against.

In the current study, heterosexual sex is the trend topic in man talk in homosocial interactions. When I asked the participants what they understand from “man talk” or what they generally talk about with their male friends, almost all ($n=18$) gave similar answers: “Sex, for sure” (Filinta). “Fucking, as many men do” (Kelebek). “Kari kiz muhabbeti” (Eymen). “Seals and polar bears [laughter], of course we talk about sex. We start talking about weather, business, I don’t know, maybe sports but I don’t know how the conversation always turn into sex, butts, tits and pussies” said Yargimachine. Another participant, Ironman44, also stated that:

Even in 5-10 minute smoke breaks, we talk about girls. For example, when a woman walks down the street, we say ‘look at her tits or she would be in transport of delight if we fucked her from the back.’ It’s an ordinary man talk [laughing]. Bro, I read somewhere that men think of sex every five minutes. I always think of sex while working in the office. When women clients visit our bank, I imagine them naked, or I give mine [his penis] to their mouths. No lies…

Some of the participants ($n=8$) stated that in their homosocial interactions, they talk about their sexual prowess. “The best thing I can do in my life is fucking… Of course, I’ll share it with my buddies,” says Filinta. “Recently, the woman client has given me a blowjob in the taxi. I gave some strategies on how I make her go down on me [laughter]. They’re my bros, we work in the same taxi station… I can’t hide anything from them,” says Sarı Bela. “…I want to be referred as a really inspiring person in my buddies’ lives… Sex is art, bro. It requires ability and stability and I

---

25 Conversation about women.

know I’m a talented artist,” says Sexmachine. The act of heterosexual sex, therefore, is seen as prowess by these participants and thus the narration of sexual stamina in the homosocial interactions contribute to enacting homosocial bonds. When one of the group members in the homosocial group starts to share his sexual experiences, the other group members start to talk about their sexual performance, too. As the conversation about sex goes on, the intragroup identification turns into intragroup competition over sexual prowess because men in the group regard sex as an accurate measure of his masculinity. Therefore, this homosocial talk turns into a battlefield in which men display their “distinguished bravery.” All in all, intragroup dynamics with regard to heterosexual sex are constructed by some traits of hegemonic masculinity such as taking initiative and being strong, competitive and courageous.

In the current study, a majority of the participants \( (n=14) \) overtly mentioned their sexual experiences. Most of them focused on their sexual prowess while sharing their sexual experiences. They mentioned how skillful and experienced they are while having sex and how competent they are in having sex with more than three women at a night. They also noted that they know how to use their “enormous” penises effectively and their sexual dexterity to satisfy their partners. While these participants were narrating their sexual involvements, I discovered that they compare themselves with other men. More specifically, they compare their penis size, the length of their sexual activities, the time their penises remain erect, the number of sex they had and women they had sex with to those of other men’s. The men whom the participants compared themselves are mostly their close friends. That is, the man talk revolves around male rivalry in sexual prowess. Some of the participants stated that competition on sexual issues started immediately after they had their first sexual intercourse. For example, Jack Daniel said that he could not forget his first sexual intercourse and said:

…Friends from high school were talking about how they fuck girls from school or the neighborhood. One day, they asked me whether I had sex before. I said ‘no.’ Fuck me, why are you telling the truth? Then, they started to mock with me. They said many things: ‘Are you gay? Can’t you get it up? Poor you, haven’t you gone to a brothel house?’ I got really angry at them. I swore at them and I kicked them. Anyway, the next day, they took me to the brothel house… Bro, you can’t believe how horrible it was. There was a middle aged woman in a room like ass. She said, ‘undress!’ I was afraid of her. She was like my aunt. I started undressing, then, she opened her legs. It was horrible. I won’t give you the detail, but imagine it was like a dry plum. Mine [his penis] didn’t get up, for sure. My body was trembling. I felt sick
as if somebody had squeezed my stomach. I was about to cry. Then, she said, ‘let’s do it my son or fuck off.’ I still remember her masculine voice. Of course, I couldn’t erect. Then, I started to dress up right away and ran away from there. This time, I didn’t tell my friends the truth [laughing]...

Another participant, Pars, mentioned his first sexual experience and particularly underlined that he felt his cousins’ pressure to have a sexual intercourse with an eğreti gelin.28

Bro, when I went to my hometown, Kütahya, for summer holiday, my cousins told me that they had surprise for me. My uncles and my cousins love me so much or maybe they pity me because my mum died and my father got married again… Anyway… We are almost the same age with my cousins. They are all men. They said ‘we had a surprise for you.’ I was about 17 or 18… My uncle took me and my cousins to my grandpa’s house. When we arrived home, there was a woman in the house. I said to myself that ‘my uncle had found a woman this time’ and I got furious. Then, my uncle left us with this woman. We ate something and drank tea… My cousins had already known her… They were talking and laughing…I couldn’t understand what was going on there. Then, she started to dance. I got shocked. My cousins started to laugh when they saw my face. I didn’t understand anything. My body was getting hot, by the way. Then, the woman started to undress. Up until that day, I hadn’t seen a real woman undressing in front me. I started to sweat. After that, my cousins started to undress. I had never seen any of them naked before. Bro, you can’t believe how ashamed I felt. Of course, my dick was so hard that I couldn’t even stand up. By the way, my cousins were grasping the woman. They are kissing. The woman called me too but I refused her as I couldn’t stand up [laughing]. Then, she came and sat on my lap. I didn’t know what I was going to do… Bro, until then, I hadn’t had such an experience. I got very angry at my cousins. The woman was dancing on my lap. I lost myself, I swore at them, I said, ‘do you fuck her together, are you ibne29?’ and I pushed the woman. My cousins were laughing. They said ‘we fucked her many times, now it is your turn.’ They said, ‘Let your nightingale [his penis] make some noise.’ I was caught off guard. I wanted to kill them there, understand? I felt my heart beat in my throat. I said, ‘fuck off, lan’ and then I wanted to leave the house, but I can’t stand up. My boner was about to go out of my pants. Then the woman kicked them off from the room and locked the door. This time, I


28 Barrowed bride, the woman who is employed to teach young men some tricks about sexuality before they get married.

29 Slang: Faggot.
felt I was going to die. My cousins were hitting the door. They tried to unlock the door. They were about to die of excitement. I said my cousins ‘now I will come out there and fuck you.’ The woman said something to calm me down. I didn’t hear anything because I wasn’t there… We kissed then bang bang… After we finished it, I shit in their mouths, for sure. I hadn’t guessed that I would milli olmak in that way, but it’s OK.

The participant Scarface also mentioned his first sexual intercourse and shared his anxiety about his penis size and said that:

I and my buddies from the university went to Alanya for internship in a 5-star hotel. They were always talking about their first sex at school. Of course, I wanted to have sex, I was 19 years old and I hadn’t had it before. They were always teasing me by saying “you will die a virgin.” Then they always said, ‘we’ll do it together.’ I always understood that we would go to brothel and do it in that way. Actually, they meant group, understand? I was so shy and I didn’t want to talk about these things [laughing]. Anyway… In the second or the third week of the internship, one of my buddies said ‘I found a German and Russian for this night.’ ‘But, we are three people,’ another friend said. ‘What does it matter, enjoy it,’ he said. You can’t believe how hard the day was. I couldn’t focus on anything. I was thinking about the night. I was thinking if the girl would find mine [his penis] small. Of course, I didn’t know that rather than its size, its function is important. Now, I smash women with this little monster. By the way, it is not too small, let’s say it’s not like a negro’s tool.

30 Having first sexual intercourse. It is a cultural term that means having the first sexual intercourse, which has the implication of “becoming national” or “becoming first class person” (Keskin Korumaz, 2015, p. 432)


Anyway… My buddy brought one of the girls to the room that night. She was so drunk that she had trouble walking. ‘Here is the German one,’ my buddy said. Another friend asked the Russian one. ‘We will handle her,’ he said. I didn’t say anything. I had lost my tongue… Anyway… We drank something. My buddies got drunk but I was sober enough. Then both of them started to touch the girl. They were swearing the girl but the girl didn’t understand Turkish. Then they started to undress her… The girl was naked… My mind and my body were shaking. My buddies called and said ‘what are you waiting for, an invitation? Come here and start somewhere…’ Bro, I couldn’t do it. I couldn’t undress in front of my buddies and fuck her together. It was a shame for me, but they didn’t get embarrassed and they undressed their pants. Thank God, I was afraid of undressing because when I saw their tools, I got shocked because they looked like a shovel. I felt I was about to faint. Mine was so small. I thought they would mock with me; I mean when they see it. I left the room then. I wanted to fuck her there but I couldn’t. I was waiting in front of the door. By the way, I was dying of curiosity and then I listened at the door but I didn’t hear anything. After fifteen or twenty minutes, I entered the room. My buddies were smoking and laughing. The girl was lying on the couch. She was still naked. My friends started to mock with me… They accused me of being coward and gay. They also swore at me and said ‘you let us down; you know we’ll do it together. We brought the girl for you.’ Bro, I resented their words so much. I was about to cry. They drove me crazy. Then I started to undress in front them. This time, I didn’t feel embarrassed because I also wanted to fuck her like them. I did it, bro… I don’t want to say more but bro believe me they watched the best porno they could watch in their lives [laughing].

Milli olmak is a cultural phenomenon which “forces” young men in Turkey to have their first sexual intercourse out of marriage context. The time and place of the first sexual intercourse are not generally planned by the men themselves. Instead, older and “experienced” friends or male relatives of the young men voluntarily arrange a place for this “honorable” day, which is generally a brothel house. At this point, the readiness of the young man is mostly disregarded. That is to say, nobody cares whether the young man wants to have sex or where and with whom he prefers having sex. Therefore, it is possible for the young man to feel obliged to have sex. In a way, he is forced to do it because milli olmak is a very significant opportunity for him to prove his masculinity to other men and be initiated to the homosocial group.

After young men in Turkey prove themselves in their first sexual intercourse, now it is time to have a lot of sex in order to feel or be referred as “real men.” In this study, having lots of heterosexual sex with different women is identified with sexual prowess by the participants. Therefore, some participants tended to count the number of women and times they have had sex and keep a track of them. In this way, they compared their sexual performances to those of their friends’ in their homosocial groups. For example, Ezhel25 stated that:

Bro, maybe you’ll find it a little bit weird but I used to have a notebook in which I wrote the number of times I had sex in a week and the names of girls. You know, these things are important for men. It is especially important for the men in their twenties because you are fast and have to prove it to yourself and your bros. The more you give, the more you take [laughing]. Don’t get me wrong; I have also an active sexual life now but I don’t have a notebook [laughing]. Now, I write the numbers to my mind, I also do mental gymnastics [laughing]. I mean, nothing actually changed in men’s life, right? I am still sharing my fucking diary with my buddies, for example [laughing]. They also share theirs with me.33

---

Sex Machine also stated that he had been taking some notes about his sexual performance for a long time by using an application and he explained that:

…Have you ever heard about the Sex Speed and Score app? Bro, you are missing many things, then. I told my buddies to download it, but they didn’t download it because they’re afraid of comparing themselves with other users [laughing]. Bro, in this app, you can save the number of the sex you had, as well as the other details. In addition, you can read many things, I don't know, something about satisfying your partner. You can even see some graphics about how often men in the world have sex and how long it lasts [he is showing the application on his cell phone]. You don’t need to be afraid of it because it is anonymous, but my buddies are still afraid of it because they don’t want to face with their boring sex [laughing]. By the way, they have sex maybe once or twice a month. What a miserable number! I need a rival fucking four or five times in a single night to talk. My buddies have already admitted that they have been defeated. That’s why, they are successful neither in their professional life nor on bed. Men had better be ready for the war all the time. Men are born to make war and love [laughter]. Bro, one of my buddies has a negro dick but he has sex once a month, can you believe it? If I had a toy like that, you wouldn’t believe what I’d do with it.34

Ironman44 stated that:

Bro, I’m obsessed with numbers. I think, it is so normal because I’m a banker, right? [laughing] I take some notes about the number of women I’ve had sex with, the place we had sex, the positions, oral, anal and normal. I note everything. If I don’t note them, I will forget them… When I check them, I feel good. I feel safe. From time to time, I boast with it, no lies. I don’t need to be humble about this.35


DJ Mendy also said that:

Sex is meaningful as it is repeated, bro. I don’t mean having sex with the same women on the same bed. Gosh, it is so boring. The more [number of women], the better… Bro, **papaz her gün aynı pilavı yer mi?** You’ll discover new women. You’ll try it with different women: blonde, brunette, Russian, German, with big ass or tits, loving it from back, and so forth. And let me give you an advice, bro. The woman you get easily can’t satisfy you. You should make war for her. Beautiful girls are never alone. To be able to get the trophy at the end of the day, you should eliminate other perverted guys [laughing]. Look at the nature. For example, even female birds choose to mate with the male birds dancing best.

Pars also noted that:

…We always talk about our pussy and ass. What else can we talk about, bro? **Vallaha,** there is a sweet competition between us. I say I threw the girl on the bed last night. Another friend says he threw two girls. Other one says he fucking a whore until his dick ached. Anyone to challenge him? [laughing] It’s just like a match. There are winners and losers and we always tease the losers [laughing]. When we play PES, we’ve also sweet competition. It’s how we get motivated.

In an increasingly competitive homosocial group, apart from the sexual prowess, there is also a competition over romantic affairs or extramarital sex. In the current study, half of the participants explicitly and proudly said they have romantic affair or extramarital relationships and they also admitted that the group members mutually influence one another to have romantic affairs or extramarital sex. “I feel incompetent when my buddies have other relationships,” says Reis. “I would be laughing-stock among them if I don’t have another girl. They say ‘he can’t fly his bird,’” says Ironman44. “Bro, I encourage my buddies in our taxi station to screw many girls at the same time because life is too short to eat rice every day [laughter],” says another participant called Sari Bela.

---

36 Turkish proverb meaning that “don’t ask a person to do something too often.”


In their homosocial interactions, the participants who are married or have a relationship encourage one another to have extramarital or romantic affairs in many ways. These ways generally consist of having a dost or kadına gitmek. For example, two of the participants proudly say they have dost living in different cities. Sarı Bela explained the reason why he needs a dost by stating that:

Bro, you know, our wives are the mothers of our children. They are angels, but we need a Satan who will stir us up, don’t we? We also need satisfaction; we need to get some ass! [laughing] My Satan lives in Kilis. I visit her almost every week. She was working in a nightclub in Diyarbakır. I met her for the first time when I took my customer to that nightclub. I was smitten by her beauty. Then I offered her to live with me. Thank God, she accepted and we’ve been living in Kilis for two years. I provided for her. I buy many clothes, shoes, and bags for her… Bro, you can’t imagine the pleasure you can have, try once, you’ll never regret. We [taxi drivers] have a stressful and dangerous job. We need to relax and calm down. I don’t need to tell you how a man can get relaxed, right? [laughing] You can do everything you want with other women. Many men in our station have an affair. The man who says he has no affairs lies, trust me… Bro, I can’t do everything with my children’s mother. But with her… I realize my fantasies. Till morning… Thank God, I have my power and strength [laughing]. Thank God, I am enough for my wife and her. Bro, valla, she is exactly a whore, I swear, the single difference is that she is mine. She is infatuated with me. Bro, some women have been created to be whores and we need a whore on the bed, don’t we? They don’t bother it. Don’t get me wrong, bro, but we, men, need it. We need another life. How is it possible to deal with the problems, then? 42

---

39 Referring to a person with whom a married man or woman has an extra-marital affair.

40 Going to brothel house.

41 Having a mistress.

Another participant Reis underlined the necessity of having a “second” life and that’s why he said he had a *dost*, and he continued that:

…Kids, my wife, relatives, the house is full, understand? Moreover, I work a lot. I also need to get relaxed sometimes. I need a peaceful place and a woman who is not whining… Except my brothers, nobody knows it, now I will tell a stranger for the first time that I have a *madigudi*... Actually, the idea of another woman doesn’t sit well with me at first, but my friends forced me to do it. One day, we [he and his male friends] left home to play football but my friends take me to her house. They actually had prepared a surprise for me. My and my friends’ *madigudis* have been friends for a while. I appreciate they conducted about our relationship. I said, ‘*Ha siktir*’[^44], I can’t do it,’ but when I saw her for the first time I had ants in the pants… My brothers supported me so much because they were experienced about it; they had already had a woman. They insisted me and they said ‘Have a woman and live your life.’ They were already talking about their women but I always ignore them. Anyway… Then, I accepted. Some people can say she is a mistress or a whore… Everyone can say whatever they want… This woman makes me happy. That’s that. That’s enough for me. I don’t explain it even to my wife… Let the others eat shit. *Valla*, she takes my stress away all the time. She is so skillful at making me happy [laughing]. She does whatever I want. How can I say she is a bad woman? She is loyal to me… Of course, she sometimes creates economic problems, she wants jewelry, she wants to wear good clothes, but she is right. She deserves it. She puts up with me. I’m not an easy man, brother. So I buy everything what my wife and this woman [another woman] want. Why am I working for? For my family. *Eşek gibi çalışıp bey gibi yaşıyorum*[^45] and I don’t think I’m doing something wrong.[^46]
Actually, in Turkish culture, having a *dost* has different connotations when compared to romantic affairs because having a *dost* requires both sexual and economic potency. That is to say, the men having *dost* “must” meet all needs of their *dost*. As the participants narrated, they must set up a house, stock the pantry, and fill the closets with clothes. On the other hand, they must satisfy their partners sexually. In short, having a *dost* has two different competitive sides, which makes it “cooler” and “more prestigious” among the men in the same homosocial group. Having both sexual and economic prowess might have a double effect in proving their manhood and create opportunities to perpetuate hegemonic masculinity. Therefore, it is not a coincidence these two participants mentioned above especially boasted with their sexual and economic competency. Moreover, as it can be understood from the participants’ words, they mean to normalize extramarital affairs by encouraging one another to have relationships outside of marriage. They also seem to legitimize their actions through homosocial back up in their homosocial interactions.

Some other participants who are not married “confessed” that they have romantic or multiple affairs when they are still in a relationship with their girlfriends. In order to chase for an affair, they said they mostly go to brothel houses or call girls. At this point, they admitted that they sometimes raise to the bait and they are highly influenced by their buddies about having an affair. They added that they have never felt regretful after all because almost all of these participants noted that “as a man” it is so normal to have an affair. “*Anca beraber kancı beraber*”[^47],” said Filinta to explain how he “perverted” his friends to have an affair:

> ... I can’t enjoy anything without my brothers... Yes, it is true that I pervert my friends to call girls [laughter]. Bro, going to brothel house is old-fashioned. Women are contaminated there. Ugh, disgusting... They also have large pussies [laughter]. They are perfect for retired men [laughing]. Bro, the girls I call... Imm... Mamma mia! I and my two buddies call two or three girls... One of us is a little bit shy but when he starts fucking he becomes Terminator [laughing]. But he needs a backup a bit, understand? Men understand men very well, bro. Sometimes he has erection problem while doing it, but we say ‘get it up or we’ll call a passive for you’ [laughing]. He gets angry but it works all the time. Good tactic, ha? Then, when he is ready, we let the party begin [laughter]. Sometimes we make it separately, sometimes group sex. Sometimes Kama Sutra, sometimes hardcore. This is the life, bro. Of course, we can make it with our girlfriends but this is more risky and exciting [laughing]. You understand what I mean bro, right? Moreover, you can’t

[^47]: For better or for worse, under any conditions; no matter what happens.
make it with your girlfriend every time. She is not available. She doesn’t want to have it when you need it. She has a headache [laughing]. Reasons, reasons… We call girls and we do whatever we want…

Another participant, Scarface, also stated that it is so normal to have an affair because he said that:

Bro, can you eat the same dish every day? Thank God, He gave me the power to satisfy women. I’m a young man. Even if I’ve got a girlfriend, it doesn’t mean that I won’t smell other roses [laughter]. Am I a monk, ulan? No. I’m also not a husband of anyone. So? I need to meet my needs. We’re men bro, understand? All my buddies do it. They have more than one sometimes three girls at the same time. Am I an idiot? All men do it. This is in our nature. If I don’t meet my needs, I become an aggressive man. I can also mistreat my girlfriend. Nobody wants to see my dark side bro. I’m saying this but now I think that I’m so aggressive on the bed. I know I sometimes hurt my partner, especially the other one, but she likes it, I know. Now, don’t let me explain the details, but when it is over she sometimes cries and looks worn-out as if she made war. I make her cry, no lies…

Ezhel35 stated that:

My buddies talked me into having another girl. It’s not my fault [laughing]. They said, ‘will you be contented with one girl when you have 20 cm [7,8 inch] gun?’ Let’s be honest, every man has more than one girlfriend. OK, we watch porno, so we cheat our girlfriends, then. We dream other girls and then otez bir çekiyoruz. Do I cheat my girlfriend? I’m not married now. When I have a girlfriend, it doesn’t mean that I’ll get married with her… I used to be a more loyal boyfriend, but then I...
recognized that time flies. Then I think that why I have to hang out only with one
girl. Am I going to save the world? [laughing] With my buddies’ support, I found
another girl, let me say girls [laughing]. Now, I don’t need to go to brothel house
[laugher]. I don’t need to pay more money. Thank God, I satisfy all of them.
Nobody complains. I am a man bro, the one who thinks the opposite has his ass
fucked.51

Pars noted that:

…This is what was handed down from our father. Fathers can’t be mistaken. My dad
and his friends had a dost. At that time, I was very angry at him, but now I can
understand him. I’m not married now, but if I was married like my father, I’d go
mad. Don’t get me wrong, it’s not about my mother. She is like an angel, but you
know mothers are mothers. You can’t think these things [he means sex] with the
women of your children. Men are good at two things bro. One, making money. Two,
fucking. These are what make a man [a real] man. When I get married, maybe I’ll
act like my father. …Now, I’ve a girlfriend, I’m sorry but I have another girl. If I can
find a third one, I’ll be happy [laughing]. Little B [he means his penis] is hot enough
for every girl [laughing]. Every woman will taste my 21 cm [8.2 inch] [laughing].52

Yargımachine said that:

Bro, nowadays, it is so popular to have a fuck buddy in our office. You’ll say how
but bro what can men do in an office full of men? [laughing] We talk about sex, for
sure. We never talk about the things we’re doing with our real girlfriends because it
is a shame. But we share the blunders that we made. Bro, life is so boring. We need
some action… You have limited sexual life with your girlfriend. The society, her
family, values, bla bla bla… Can you tie your girlfriend, for example? I guess, no. I
can’t because she never let me do it. But your fuck buddy let you do it. She thinks
professionally [laughing]. People can say whatever they want but most of us -
marrried or in a relationship- have a fuck buddy. In this way, we get rid of emotional
burden because we have no emotional relationship with our partner and also we do
whatever we want with them. We could solve the problem completely… Of course,

Arkadaşların başka kadın konusunda beni ikna etmeye çalıştılar. Benim hatam değil yani [gülüyor].
’20 cm’lik silahımda bir kadını yetinecek misin?’ dediler. Dürüst olalım, her erkeğin birden fazla kız
arkadaş vardır. Namam, porno izliyoruz; o zaman kız arkadaşlarınızımız aldatsyoruz yani. Başka kızlar
hayal ediyoruz ve sonra otuzbir çekiyoruz. Ben simdi kız arkadaşa aldattım muyum yani? Şu anda
evli değilim. Bir kiz arkadaşım olduğunda, onunla evleneceğim anlamına gelmiyor… Eskiden daha
sadık bir sevgilimydi ama sonra zamanım çok çabuk geçtiğini anladım. Sonra neden sadece bir kızla
çıkınca zorundayım ki diye düşününüz? Dünyayı mı kurtaracağım? [gülüyor] Arkadaşlarınızın
deşegiyle, başka bir kiz bulдум; kızlar diyeşim [gülüyor]. Şimdi haberiniz gitmeye ihtiyacım yok
[gülüyor].

Baba tomarım da bize böyle geçşim. Babalarımız yanılışlamaz. Babamın da arkadaşlarının da dostu
vardı. O zamanlar ona çok kizardım ama simdi onu anlayabiliyorum. Şu anda evli değilim ama eğer
babam gibi evli olsam kafayı yerim. Yanlış anlama, anneleme hiçbir ilgisi yok. Melek gibi kadındır
ama anneler annendir biliyorsun. Böyle şeyler [cinselliği] çocukların annesiyle düşünebilecezsin. Erekler
dik şeyde iyidir kardeşim. Birincisi para kazanmak, ikincisi siyik. Bunlar bir adamı adam
yapan şeylerdir. Evlenirsem, belki babam gibi yapacagım… Simdi bir kiz arkadaşım var, üzgünüm
ama başka bir kiz arkadaşım daha var. Üçüncüyü bulursam da mutlu olurum [gülüyor]. Küçük B
[penisini kast ediyor] her kiza yetecek kadar atesli [gülüyor]. Bütün kadınlar benim 21 cm’mi tadacak
[gülüyor].
there are some spoilsports in the office. We advise them to use Viagra [laughing]. Maybe, they are still happy with watching free pornos and otuz bir [laughing].

DJ Mendy stated that:

I’m a party man, bro. I love parties so much. Sex parties are included. I’m a DJ and everything is OK in the entertainment world. Let’s say it is professional deformation [laughing]. For example, when I offered my last girlfriend to go to a sex party once, she refused me and left me, she also slapped me [laughing], but I had already said that I was fond of open relationship. This is my lifestyle, bro. We are an open-minded group. In this job, you can’t be conservative. I and my group chase for women. We bet and say ‘I’ll take this blonde to the bed,’ or ‘can you take these two girls to the bed?’

The Protector also said that:

How often can a man have sex with his girlfriend in Turkey? Once a month? Once in three months? Bro, I’m sorry, but nobody makes me believe that a man can live without sex for two weeks. I don’t even talk about otuz bir. While your friends are fucking women, are you going to look at the ceiling? Because you’ve a girlfriend, hah? Don’t make me laugh! Excuse my French, mine is 22 cm [8.6 inch] long, so I’ll of course use it. I can’t let it get rusty. Even Bamyalar throw Russian and Ukrainian women on the bed.


54 Ökra. Here, the participant offensively mentioned some men whose penises are extraordinarily small.
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As Keisling (2008) underlines, “heterosexual sex itself can be medium through which male bonding is enacted.” (p. 339). In the current study, heterosexual sex is also an important factor for the participants to make their homosocial bonds tighter. Most of them boast with their sexual prowess in order to reach a key path to masculine status. Sex with many different women, having affairs, dominating the women in the relationship and sexual exploitations are means of increasing status among the participants. In male-male peer interactions, a man could find a chance to show his masculine status by sharing his sexual prowess with the other men whom he both identifies with and competes against. These findings confirm the previous research in that male-male interaction has a great impact on men’s heterosexual experiences (Flood, 2008). In his research, Flood similarly indicates that male-male peer interactions are highly influential in “intragroup competition over sexual experience, surveillance of each other’s sexual activities, and encouragement of their pursuit” (Flood, 2008, p. 345).

In the current study, it is revealed that heterosexual prowess is used as a marker of manhood in the homosocial interactions and most of the participants boast with their sexual abilities through their sexual narratives. In their narratives, there is always a comparison between their sexual performances and those of their peers’. As the participants compare themselves with the other group members, the competition over sexual performance increases. That’s why, they preferred to focus on their penis size, average time their penises remain erect, and the number of sex and orgasm they had. According to participants, the competition over sexual experiences start immediately after they have their first sexual intercourse. Therefore, it is not surprising to see that young men in Turkey compete to have their first sexual intercourse when they are not even fifteen or sixteen because they know that the sooner the better. That is to say, if they engage in sexual intercourse at an early age, they would have a prestigious position in gender hierarchy and can be initiated to homosocial group earlier. After their first sexual intercourse, men need to have sex as much as possible to improve their sexual dexterity and prove themselves sexually to their friends. In the current study, sex is seen as an ability to boast with and compete over. Participants measure their sexual prowess through sexual scoring and having extra-marital or romantic affairs. At this point, it can be underlined that women as the other agents of the heterosexual sex are seen as the objects of male sexual desire and
their bodies commonly become the “material” both in the act of sex and in the homosocial talk. This result echoes the previous research, claiming that male-male peer interaction constructs and maintains sexual objectification of women (Bird, 1996). In her study, Bird asserts that the sexual objectification of women bestows a base on which male superiority is perpetuated. That’s why, most of the participants in the current study used some phrases such as “fucking,” “screwing up girls,” “bang, bang,” and “throw women on the bed” instead of saying “making love.” Similarly, they used “girl,” “another woman,” “women,” and “madigudi,” to call their wives or girlfriends. These results imply that the participants sexually objectify women through dirty talk in their homosocial interactions. By doing this, they hold their superior positions in their homosocial group.

All in all, for men in the current study heterosexual sex is one of the most important traits of hegemonic masculinity. Through engaging in heterosexual sex, they seek the approval of other men in their groups. In this way, sexual scoring, extra-marital or romantic affairs, and sexual objectification of women are rationalized and legitimized in male-male interactions. Therefore, it can be concluded that homosociality plays a significant role for facilitating the perpetuation of one of the most important traits of hegemonic masculinity, which is heterosexuality.

4.3. Ambivalent Sexism

In Merriam-Webster (n.d.), sexism is defined as “prejudice or discrimination based on sex.” Actually, sexism implies any kind of prejudice and discrimination based on one’s sex or gender, especially against women. However, for social scientists Peter Glick and Susan Fiske, sexism means more… It is more than a prejudice; it is “special case of prejudice marked by a deep ambivalence, rather than a uniform antipathy, toward women” (Glick & Fiske, 1997, p. 491). For a deeper understanding of sexism, Glick and Fiske focus on the multidimensional nature of sexism. To do so, they put forward the concept of “ambivalent sexism,” which comprises a mixture of two sexist attitudes that are hostile and benevolent. In other words, sexism, as a multidimensional construct, encompasses both a negative connotation -hostile sexism- and a “supposedly” positive one -benevolent sexism.
In order to figure out the concept of ambivalent sexism in detail, it is better to examine the nuances between the hostile and benevolent sexism. To start with, *hostile sexism*, as its name suggests, encapsulates a set of direct misogynistic attitudes. For example, hostile sexism is expressed through Regarding women, who reject traditional gender roles, as angry, sneaky and pervert. Since hegemonic masculinity views the rejection of traditional values as an attack on itself, it has no tolerance to the women rejecting traditional roles and expectations. Therefore, women who are economically independent, question patriarchy, and ask for gender equality are seen potentially dangerous for the hegemonic masculinity. Moreover, these women are also viewed as “temptresses” who actually seek to dominate men by using their sexual attraction (Glick & Fiske, 1997, 2001) and thus they are treated with hostility. On the other hand, *benevolent sexism* is defined as a set of attitudes which “polish” stereotypical and restrictive roles for women. It is realized through “subjectively positive in feeling tone” (Glick & Fiske, 2001, p. 491) for the sake of protecting women. “Women belong to home,” “men make houses, women make homes,” “men’s first mission is to protect their women,” “we [men] need feminine touch/vibes,” can be some of the specific utterances revealed by the participants of the current study which express their (benevolent) sexist attitudes. Even though etymologically the word “benevolent” refers to being generous and kind, benevolent sexism does not have positive connotations because it underpins gender stereotyping: man as the breadwinner and the provider, woman as homemaker.

In the current study, it was revealed that some participants treat women, who are against traditional gender roles, with hostility because these women are seen as dangerous for the dominance of hegemonic masculinity. On the other hand, “precious” mothers and housewives who do not go out of patriarchal order are regarded as deserving “benevolent” attitudes and “positive” discrimination since they are not a potential threat to patriarchy. More specifically, most of the participants \((n=19)\) belonging to any homosocial group practiced ambivalent sexism and perpetuate sexist attitudes in their homosocial interactions. Some of the participants overtly expressed hatred of and prejudice against women. It is clear that women who face *hostile sexism* on a daily basis are often economically independent and feminist women. On the other hand, some of the participants stated that some women such as mothers, sisters, girlfriends and wives should be protected because these “dependent”
women are caring, innocent and fragile. Therefore, these women are treated with *benevolence* by the participants. To make it short, the coexistence of benevolent and hostile sexist attitudes shows itself in this study. Moreover, these complimentary attitudes are shared in the homosocial interactions and perpetuated through the members of the homosocial group.

To start with benevolent sexism, some of the participants (*n*=12) “positively” discriminated their mothers, sisters, wives, and daughters in the name of protecting them. These “chivalries” are “subjectively positive in feeling tone” (Glick & Fiske, 1997, p. 491) and only “good” women deserve these benevolent attitudes. Some of the participants commonly shared the belief that these women belong to private sphere because of “safety” concerns and their “caring” responsibilities. For instance, one of the participants named Diriliş underlined the importance of staying at home for women in terms of women’s safety and the role of caring they are supposed to undertake:

> Woman belongs to home. Her home is her nest. Bro, home is the best place for women. Firstly, it is sheltered. Secondly, it is safe. Thirdly, it is their own spaces. They do whatever they want. They cook. They clean. Husbands are outside and they work... They’re relaxed without their husbands. They can watch TV; they can drink Turkish coffee. They feel comfortable. How nice!\(^{57}\)

Another participant, Sarı Bela, contributed to Diriliş’s argument by saying that:

> I always tell my wife that I am the Minister of External Affairs and you are the Minister of Internal Affairs. I have many things to do outside. For example, I have to work to sustain my family. Also, my wife has many things to do at home. She cooks, cleans the house and takes care of children. She has no time to go out. She can only go to Wednesday bazaar. Apart from this, there is no need to go out. I already meet the needs of the house from outside. Bro, you know, streets are so dangerous. They are full of *it kopuk*\(^{58}\). Home is good. Home is safe. What does a woman want other than a peaceful home? After all, she is the owner of the house, isn’t she?\(^{59}\)

---


58 Slang: troublesome and offensive people.

Kelebek, on the other hand, emphasized the “caring” role of mothers and noted that:

"Yuvayı dişi kuş yapar". The woman belongs to home, home belongs to the woman. There are things to do at home. Children need their mother’s care, for example… Women have maternal instincts, bro. They can’t live without their children. They don’t want be separated from their children for even a minute. They have merciful hearts. I get really surprised when I hear that some women want to work… Why? Doesn’t your husband maintain your family? If so, I’ll shit in that husband’s mouth. As a husband, you should hold your wife in high regard. She is your children’s mother…

Another participant, Scarface, stated that:

Every man wants to keep an eye on his women, doesn’t he? Whenever I find time, I try to take my wife out. I don’t know exactly but maybe almost every weekend, we go out together. We go to shopping malls; we go for a walk together… Bro, don’t get me wrong, but I never trust men outside. Men know men… For example, when you’re out, I’m sure, you stare at women’s butt or boobs. To be honest, I sometimes look at women, but what if a man stares at my wife? Valla, I’ll kill him. No, no, no, I don’t want my wife lose her dignity… She is beautiful when she is at home. She goes out with me. She is safe with me. I think it’s enough. We [men] should never chain women on the wrist.

Muttaki also noted that:

Women and children are the sacred trusts given by Allah. We should protect them all the time. Thank God, he gave us a good house and gives me a job so that I can sustain my family. So, why should my wife work? If she works, who’ll take care of our children? In these hard times, tell me bro, can you trust a babysitter? We watch every day on TV that babysitters beat babies. Even if my wife works, her salary will...
go to babysitter. So? Instead of being the queen of her home, why should she become a slave by working outside?\textsuperscript{63}

Finally, DJ Mendy stated that housework requires skills only women can possess by saying that:

\[\ldots\] I had a long-run relationship two years ago. It lasted six months [laughing]. We would live together. It was a perfect six months. She was such a housewife! She had graduated from a good university and she was a fashion designer but she never forgot her femininity. I mean, she was the best cook I had ever seen in my life, for example. By the way, she was a Goddess on the bed [laughing]. Bro, don’t get me wrong but I don’t like housework. Can you imagine me washing the dishes or mopping the floor? I am an open-minded person but I think men should not do housework because it requires handicraft and men don’t have it… My girlfriend had it, bro. You can’t believe how beautiful she folded my clothes… When I checked my wardrobe, I felt I was in Zara. It was so clean and organized. Now, come and look at my wardrobe. You’ll cry [laughing].\textsuperscript{64

As it is seen, participants, as modern chivalries, try to protect their “precious” women by using seemingly positive and caring words. When they say “women need to be protected,” “women should be at home,” “streets are dangerous for women,” “men outside home are dangerous for women,” they mean to take women’s safety into consideration. However, they actually captivate women at domestic sphere by adopting these “chivalry” attitudes. While keeping women at home, they use an implicit language, that is, they do not openly say that they captivate their mothers, sisters, wives or daughters at home. Although some of their expressions such as “my wife is the Minister of Internal Affairs” or “she is the queen of the house” seem to be positive, they actually perpetuate traditional gender roles. In this context, women are confined to private sphere assuming the burden of household tasks like cleaning the house, cooking and looking after children. Since these women cannot go out and


work, they become economically dependent on their main providers, who are mostly their fathers and husbands. Therefore, they have no chance to return the “generous” and “kind” compliments…

Apart from the “positive” discrimination which keeps women at home and makes them dependent, there are some other benevolent sexist attitudes which maintain traditional gender roles. This time, participants restrict or control women’s social and business life since they think that women are “emotional,” “fragile” and “vulnerable.” For instance, one of the participants called Şeytan mentioned why he was “obliged” to protect his girlfriend in every condition and he said that:

I have a girlfriend, bro. Thank God, he gave me a beautiful girl. Say Maşallah65, we get on well and we want to get married. Look, I just tell you about my girl, by the way. I don’t like mentioning my serious relationships to anybody. You know people bro; they are burning with jealousy. Moreover, I don’t want my buddies to imagine my girlfriend. We’re men bro, you know, whether you want or not, curves can come to your mind [laughter]. My girlfriend is so beautiful. She is blonde and has blue eyes. She is like Ukrainian models. I don’t want my buddies or any other men to dream of my girlfriend, understand? I’m jealous of my girlfriend like every other man. Bro, she is too beautiful to go out, understand? I really care her; she is so different from the other girls. I’m very jealous of her, I can’t help it. Every minute, I send her messages. I call her seven or eight times in a day because I’m so curious about where she is or what she is doing. When she says she wants to go out, I go mad. First, I ask whether she has to go out or not. Then she starts whining. I explain her, ‘you are pure like water, you’re so beautiful, I don’t want any man look at you.’ Then I say, ‘what about calling girls to your house instead of going out?’ As I said you before, I’m jealous of her, I can’t help it. I have to do these. These are what a man does when he loves a girl so much… A man who falls in love should be jealous of his girlfriend. Bro, aren’t you jealous of your wife? I’m not the only one, I know.66

65 Praise be!

Muttaki also said that:

Women are God’s trust. They are like precious jewelries. Is it easy to find a pearl in the oyster? You should dive deep into the see. Is it easy to find gold? You should dig deeper. Is it easy to find diamond? You should engrave it. That is, my dear friend, we should value our wives. We should protect them. Now, tell me, are precious jewelries worn every day? Is it necessary for a woman to go out every day? I think, no. What if these precious jewelries are stolen one day? Who wants this? My friend, in a nutshell, we should value our little girls first. We should guide them well because they are the future wives and mothers... We should protect God’s trusts.67

Diriliş said that:

Women are men’s precious ones. Men mustn’t break their wives’ hearts. Women should smile all the time. This doesn’t mean that we never argue with our wives… The man who says he never argues with his wife tells a lie. Bro, look, we always argue for others. We don’t have couple problems. She wants to stroll around shopping malls with her female friends. I understand her but I can’t let her go. Two women will get on the bus. The bus will be crowded. Men in the bus will touch them. Then I’ll be a murderer. When I say these things to my wife, she gets angry and shouts at me first, but later on she understands me. Bro, when a woman shouts, man should shut up. When a man shouts, woman must be silent. This is the golden rule of a marriage. Sometimes, in news we see some men beat their wives. They are so wrong. From time to time, men get perverted. Women are wise creatures. They are always good role models for the society. But first, they are good role models for their children. If a girl has a good mother, she will be a good mother and wife. If a boy has a good mother, he will choose a wife like his mother.68


Another participant, Filinta, mentioned the do’s and don’ts of women’s sexual life and said that:

My buddies always want me to give them some tactics about women. I always say that ‘be gentlemen.’ Women want care. They are emotional creatures. They are not like men. We care sex, they care foreplay. We care sex, they care roses. They like gifts, good wines. Why? Because we are so cool, we don’t need romantic sex. Sex is a need for men, but for women it is a gift. As long as they have a boyfriend or husband, they can have sex. They have their hearts, bro, they have tiny and pretty hearts. Virginity is very important for them. It should be. They can only have sex with men whom they trust and love. That’s why they are always sad and have broken hearts because they believe us [laughing]. Women are emotional. Bro, maybe I have sex with more than three different girls in a week, but I never feel attached to those girls because sex is not something emotional for me, but girls always think that I will be their long-running partners.

DJ Mendy, on the other hand, opposed women’s driving by saying that:

Actually, I support women in every area. Women can do everything. But, for me, women shouldn’t drive… There are many maganda's in the traffic. How is it possible for them to deal with magandas in the traffic? Have you ever thought it before? You know bro, drivers are very bad in Turkey. Nobody obeys the rules. Some drift their cars, some are drunk, and others honk at other drivers. These are not nice things for women. Women can have an accident when those things happen. We all know, for example, for a truck driver, women can be a great view in the traffic jam, understand? I think women can be co-pilot, that’s enough!

---


70 Slang: An unsophisticated person, bumpkin.

Jack Daniel also stated that:

Driving and traffic, they are very dangerous issues for women. When I arrive home safe and sound, -I am man- I say ‘Thank God’ because driving in Turkey is so dangerous. We are not living in Switzerland; nobody cares rules here. Many times I see some men trying to abuse women verbally in the traffic. They swear women. They even harass women. Men in the traffic catch women off guard.72

Through using “generous” and “caring” words, some of the participants also contribute to perpetuating the gender stereotypes in the business context. They treated women with benevolence in the business environment to trivialize or nullify their efforts in a subtle way. At this point, I should underline that these participants are not opposed to working women, however, they emphasized that the nature of professional business is not compatible with traditional feminine traits. This means that women can work “for sure” but actually working conditions are too difficult for them to work. Instead of saying women are not really suitable for dealing with the professional business life, participants chose to be kind and polite to women who are supposedly fragile and vulnerable. For example, the participant named Yargı Machine stated that:

Women are emotional creatures. This is their fitrat73. They act instinctively. OK, we need feminine vibes in the office. As you know, our offices are full of men, full of testosterone [laughing]. We need beautiful girls; we love that feminine energy in the office, I accept it. On the other hand, business requires discipline, logic and wisdom, sorry but most of them [women] don’t have any of these properties. From time to time, we say ‘we need some women employee here’ but then we give up this opinion because women are offended easily. Their hearts are broken easily. We, men, should care it. They are women, understand? I can’t judge them. After all, men are like oxen. We’re created in that way, I accept it. Women have special days [he means menstruation]. They are so sensitive creatures; they can cry about trivial issues. They are created in that way. I understand them very well. However, I don’t want my office to turn into Turkish hamam for women. We actually produce solar panels, not off-prime time women programs [laughing].74


73 Fıtrat. Creation, human nature. In Islamic theology, fitra is used as a term to emphasize a characteristic which

Filinta underlined the “vulnerability” and “fragility” of women in the business environment and narrated an anecdote about a female colleague in the pharmaceutical company he works:

There are five women working in our firm and I work with two of them in the same department. We are responsible for representing probiotic supplements and so we visit many hospital, clinics, pharmacies, etc., etc. One day, one of them was crying in the office. I asked the reason why she cried. She said, “one of the doctors told me that ‘you can wear miniskirts because your legs are so beautiful.’” She said she felt so bad. OK, I see, but this is the business life. Bro, you can’t believe what doctors said to me. Some doctors utter such filthy swears that you have never heard in your life. What am I doing? Nothing, because I know this is a part of my job. I am a professional. You will get surprised when you see me complimenting wrinkled women doctor [laughter]. This is my job. Bro, believe me, some women doctors would like to sleep with me. What can I do? Will I cry? Never. Why do I cry? I am, thank God, a handsome men and women want to have a relationship with me. What’s wrong with it? Women are so fragile. Her legs are so sexy by the way and the doctor tried to compliment. That’s all for me. No need to exaggerate. Think professionally! Image the bonus you’ll earn at the end of the day. I think about it in that way. No need to be so emotional, but they are women, bro, you know. They are emotional and fragile by nature. We, men, should understand them. What if she had to work with a trouble maker doctor? I think she is actually lucky because she works in our firm. Our firm cares women workers and their rights.


The participant Scarface said that:

It is OK for me to work with women. For example, in our branch, there are women. I love them like my own sisters. They also respect me. For instance, they cook dishes and bring them to the hotel and we eat them together. They make delicious desserts… I try to protect them in the hotel. You know, most of the clients staying in the hotels are a little bit weird. Some of them are drunk, some of them are womanizer, and some of them are asshole… So I protect woman workers from them and I try to deal with those problematic clients. Bro, you know, women are so sensitive and they can suddenly become vulnerable. Even a bad word can destroy their whole day. Everything is OK, but I’m only disturbed by women when they are ill [he means menstruation], understand [laughter]? They are very angry in those days so I run away from there as soon as possible [laughter].

Ironman44 said that:

Bro, maybe you won’t believe, but I love working with women. After a while, we [men] got tired of talking about money, clients and competition. Even in our free time, we talk about politics, football etc. I need to relax sometimes… Bro, sometimes I want to have a woman’s mind so I couldn’t help but overhear women banker’s conversation in the office… They talk about clothes, sales, recipes, how nice! Men’s world is so harsh. It tires me so much. I think working women are lucky because they have many rights. For example, nobody expects so much from women because they are women, bro, understand? Your boss and your colleagues know their capacities. They have many things to do in the life, many responsibilities I mean. We, men, should regard this. Women are not like us. We only have business in our lives. Nothing more…

In contrast to benevolent sexism which is practiced in a positive “disguise in women’s social, sexual and business lives,” hostile sexism, as its name suggests, is delivered through vilifying and inciting hatred against women. In the current study,


half of the participant \(n=10\) explicitly revealed their hatred of and hostility towards women. Women who disobey traditional gender roles and have “courage” to get involved in masculine domains are treated with hostile attitudes. More specifically, some women are strongly humiliated and stigmatized by some of the participants of this study. For example, women were mostly stigmatized as “bad women,” “feminists,” “perverts,” “demon” and “orospu\(^78\)” by the participants since these “bad” women are economically independent and ask for their rights. For example, the participant called Reis explicitly express his anger and hatred to these women as he said that:

Brother, there is a proverb that says dayak cennetten çıkmıştır\(^79\). You’ve heard it, right? Some women are created to be beaten. You understand whom I’m talking about. Our president also says that feminists are dangerous. He is so right. These perverts are so dangerous. You are a woman. How is it possible for you to go out and partake in a protest? Brother, I have three daughters. If they protested something one day, God forbid, I would break their legs. A man should know his position; a woman should know her position. When the police beat them, they cry then. When the police arrest them, they shout at the police. Why? You [women] deserve it. These perverts become our kids’ teachers and they teach breaking moral values. I am already against girls’ education because schools can break some moral rules we are trying to teach our daughters. Women are born for giving birth. This is the law of nature. God created women in that way. Before they lose their fertility, they should give birth many times. As our ancestors told us\(^80\), ‘Kadının sırtından sopayı, karnından sıpayı eksik etmeyeceksin.’\(^81\)

---

\(^78\) Slang: Bitch.

\(^79\) It is a Turkish proverb stating that the act of beating is a holy method in education. It is generally used to underline the importance of beating in rearing, educating or disciplining somebody for something.


\(^81\) One of the sexist Turkish proverbs which can be translated as: “You should beat a woman all the time and always keep her pregnant.”
The Protector similarly expressed his hostility towards feminist women and said:

Nowadays, it is so popular to say ‘my body, my decision.’ Even some of them [women] write it on their bio on Twitter or Instagram. In no way do I understand feminist women. Their bodies don’t belong to them. They belong to God. But, how do these disbeliever women know this? Pardon me. It’s my mistake. They are even opposed to being mothers. How do they know Allah or the prophet? They will burn in the hell, they don’t know. How do you disobey the order of Allah? Who the fuck are you? Kevaşeler!82 When they are said they’re incomplete without children, they react very aggressively. But they are incomplete without children, let’s accept it. Bro, that’s why they are lonely and angry all the time. They are obsessed with rights, equality and men. By the way, they are fortunately not mothers because they lack maternal instinct.83

Another participant, Muttaki, said that:

My dear friend, women are sometimes dangerous for each other. They affect one another negatively. My wife has many female friends. They are supposedly followers of the prophet Muhammed and Allah but they gossip… And some of them misdirect other women. They try to set women against their husbands. Then the woman gives up serving her husband and caring her children. I can’t call them women. They are demons. Thank God, my wife is not stirred up by these demon women. By the time, I suddenly recognize every devilish thing, and if my wife does such things, she knows very well that even going out will be forbidden for her… Nowadays, I am already angry at her because of Indian soap operas. She learns something from the series and she tries to act like degenerated women in the series but it is so close to break the TV…84

---

82 Slang: Whores.


Participant named, Sahne Adamı, narrated an anecdote about his ex-wife and defined his divorced wife with sexist words:

Bro, I got divorced two years ago. When I brought her from her father’s house, she was very innocent. How on earth can I know she is a bitch? I would live with my mother before her. After we got married, my mother continued living with us. Of course, she was going to live with us. There was no other chance. My dad died many years ago, my brother is living in Germany. She has no home and nobody. This [his ex-wife] couldn’t accept my mum. She was always complaining about my mum. She didn’t want to take care of my mum. My mum is a woman an angel. She is an old woman. She has breakfast, smokes, drinks tea, and rests at home. That’s all. She’s not like a witch mother-in-law. This [his ex-wife] wanted to live in a separate home. She said once, twice, three times, but then I couldn’t stand her disrespectful attitudes and beat her many times. I have no lies, bro. I can’t cheat God, but she deserved it. Then, she said she wanted to work. She said, ‘I wanted to work as a cashier.’ Bro, I knew her intention. She got tired of my mother and wanted to find another man. If your husband meets the needs of family, why does a woman want to work? To be a whore! There is no reason… Of course, I never let her work. She insisted many times. Then I broke her nose and mouth and sent her to her father’s house. Now, I understand marriage is not OK for me. I wish I hadn’t got married. I work a lot. I work at nights. I also can’t stand whiny women…

Another participant, Diriliş, noted that he can’t stand women who cannot do any domestic work and said that:

…When I look at new generation, I feel disappointed so much. I see some girls and they say ‘we don’t even cook eggs.’ How? Look at your mother. Look at your grandmother. Didn’t you learn anything from them? They’re supposedly chasing their career, but their husbands won’t eat their career. At least, learn to make soup. Bro, normally, I am a patient person but I’m not tolerant to these issues. Nobody wants you [women] to cook börek, şarma and dolma. Your husband is hungry. Your children are hungry. I’ll shit in your career.


Filinta, on the other hand, complained about women who are sexually active and know “much” about sex and he said:

Bro, I am always afraid of women who openly talk about sex. They are generally feminists. I am an open minded person bro, don’t get me wrong, but I don’t like these women. In my life, I have always been disturbed by women who try to control me during the sex. I don’t know why but when they seem to know everything about sex, I feel uneasy. I think women should keep one step behind their boyfriend or husbands. I mean, during the sex. Men start fire bro, don’t they? I mean, they start the foreplay. They start the sex. Of course, women and men can decide the sex position, for example. I don’t mean this. I mean, women, for example should not say ‘I love doggy-style’ because this means that she has done it before. You’ll say, maybe she watches pornos, but bro women should not watch porno, either. They would want bigger dicks then [laughing]. Joking aside, I want my partner to discover the sex positions with me. Bro, I’m sure, you had slept with many girls before you got married. I’m sure, this would disturb you, as well. For me it is so wrong for a woman to talk about sex in front of many people. This means ‘I need fucking’ and it is not decent. Are you a whore? Are you a bitch, by the way, we call bitches, they don’t come [laughing]. I don’t know bro; I find these women so disgusting. It’s like begging for sex… I don’t know…

Apart from degrading the women who violate traditional gender roles, some of the participants strongly utter abusive statements against women for their “stupid” and “desperate” attempts to enter masculine and homosocial domains. For instance, one of the participants called Kelebek noted that “women shouldn’t intervene in every shit” and he continued that:

…One of my friend’s wife becomes involved in every speech, you know? We’re talking about cars, for example, she says ‘I don’t like this brand or that color.’ Did we ask you? We’re talking about new buildings and she, for example, says ‘it is not profitable to buy the house from that place.’ It’s none of your business. We are talking man to man. They are manly issues. Shut up. Go and talk about cakes and

---
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cookies. She is the most irritating women I’ve ever seen in my life. May God help my buddy [laughter].

Another participant, Ezhel35, also condemned women who “put their noses into men’s business” and he said that:

I see some women playing football. I just laugh. Why? By playing football, do they feel more feminist? Bro, there are some other sports which are more suitable for women. Volleyball, for example. I don’t mean that women shouldn’t do any sports; I’m just curious about why women have to do everything men do. Do men knit a scarf? Do you [women] feel more powerful or superior when you play football or do judo? Do you feel more intelligent? It is nonsense. I think it is so funny.

Şeytan also added that he feels uncomfortable when he sees some women watching football match in the stadium and he said:

...Why on earth you come there? There are thousands of men around you. Do you [women] think that men around you see you as a fan? No. Valla, men in the stadium imagine sex positions with you and you don’t know it. They watch your ass my dear sister. Go home and watch it on TV. For example, I never want my girlfriend to come and watch me while I play football. While she watches me, other men in the stadium will watch her. We’re not making a porno, are we [laughter]?

Zalim criticized women who are interested in politics and he said:

...Bro, do you find female politicians successful? I don’t, valla. Women can’t cope with children at home, how is it possible for them to run the country [laughter]? What can they do, tell me Allah aşkına. Will they coat the country with the lace cover [laughter]?

88 Another participant, Ezhel35, also condemned women who “put their noses into men’s business” and he said that:

I see some women playing football. I just laugh. Why? By playing football, do they feel more feminist? Bro, there are some other sports which are more suitable for women. Volleyball, for example. I don’t mean that women shouldn’t do any sports; I’m just curious about why women have to do everything men do. Do men knit a scarf? Do you [women] feel more powerful or superior when you play football or do judo? Do you feel more intelligent? It is nonsense. I think it is so funny.

89 Şeytan also added that he feels uncomfortable when he sees some women watching football match in the stadium and he said:

...Why on earth you come there? There are thousands of men around you. Do you [women] think that men around you see you as a fan? No. Valla, men in the stadium imagine sex positions with you and you don’t know it. They watch your ass my dear sister. Go home and watch it on TV. For example, I never want my girlfriend to come and watch me while I play football. While she watches me, other men in the stadium will watch her. We’re not making a porno, are we [laughter]?

90 Zalim criticized women who are interested in politics and he said:

...Bro, do you find female politicians successful? I don’t, valla. Women can’t cope with children at home, how is it possible for them to run the country [laughter]? What can they do, tell me Allah aşkına. Will they coat the country with the lace cover [laughter]?


91 For God’s sake.
Ironman44 stated that:

…I can’t stand female bosses and managers, brother. Let me give an example from the ex-branch I worked. I started working in Ostim branch and I had a female branch manager there. Oh my God, she was a total bitch! She was so nervous. She was shouting at men all the time, understand? I didn’t know why? Then, I learnt that she is single [laughter]. So she wanted a dick [laughter]. That’s why she is nervous and angry at men. May God forgive, she was so ugly that if I had ten dicks, I wouldn’t give one of them to her [laughter]. So, have you ever seen a female boss who is beautiful? I have never seen… After a while, even she got married, you know. We said, ‘thank God, she will get relaxed this time [laughter],’ but she never changed. Bro, women can’t deal with the burdens of stressful business life. Finally, they are emotional creatures. Is it easy to deal with the responsibilities of an enormous bank and problematic customers? Intelligence is not enough to become a banker. Controlling your nerves is also required. Women don’t have this ability. It is not the same like women’s gathering and making kısır.

As it is seen, the women who do not obey the traditional gender roles were viewed as threat to the power and dominance of men and they were treated with hostility. Since women only demanded their rights and protest the inequality between men and women; gave an opinion about cars, land and buildings; watched soap opera; wanted to be a politician and they knew different sex positions; they were stigmatized as perverts, whores and feminists. Moreover, according to the participants, these women should not be mothers and teachers of their children because they have the ability to misdirect the children and make them depraved. As far as I observed, the participants who practiced hostile sexism are especially intolerant to women because they are uncomfortable with the women who do not implement their traditional roles and “put their noses into men’s business.” Actually, they seemed to be uncomfortable with the possible existence of women in masculine and homosocial domains and they also think that these women seek to destroy masculinity. That’s
why, the participants tried to suppress feminist protests and engaged in domestic and sexual violence against women.

As it was revealed, discriminatory or abusive attitudes and thus misogynistic behaviors towards women are common among some participants. The disclosed sexism is marked by both benevolent and hostile attitudes. That is, on the one hand, some men in this study treat women with “seemingly” caring attitudes, but on the other hand they harbor hostile sexist attitudes towards women. However, it is important to note that whether it is “subjectively positive in feeling tone” or unkind and unfriendly, sexism makes a crucial contribution to perpetuating traditional gender norms and violence against women. For example, the benevolent sexism which was practiced in a subtle way by the participants plays an important role for confining women to private sphere and domestic roles and thus it makes women “accept” their inferiority. On the other hand, the participants who treated women with a strong hostility maintain sexual and domestic violence against women. At this point, the role of the homosociality is highly visible because both benevolent and hostile sexist attitudes are shared in the homosocial interactions. It is like a vicious circle because as these sexist attitudes are shared in the homosocial groups, they are internalized by the members of the group and then the group members get ready to exercise the complementary sexist (benevolent and hostile) attitudes. At the end, ambivalent sexism flourish and is perpetuated in the homosocial interactions by the homosocial group.
CHAPTER 5

STIGMATIZATION AND NEGATION OF NON-HEGEMONIC MASCULINITIES

...And how many ears must one man have,
Before he can hear people cry?

Bob Dylan, *Blowin’ in the Wind*

Internalization of gender order can create the need of shared meanings for social interaction; therefore, homosociality facilitates to establish a tight and close interaction between men by creating a common ground in which men can share their interests, beliefs, opinions, and practices and legitimize them. As Kimmel and Aronson (2003) underlines, men in the homosocial group appraise the group as “the collective actor” and this collective actor maintains the psychology of homosocial behavior and the homosocial solidarity. In order to legitimize their gendered practices, the closely knitted homosocial group tends to exclude other masculinities that could not fit into the group dynamics and meet the expectation of the same group (Bird, 1996; Connel, 2005; Lipman-Blumen, 1976). Therefore, the homosocial group members harshly stigmatize and negate non-hegemonic masculinities in order to make their homosocial bonds stronger.

In the current study, three forms of non-hegemonic masculinity as those of (1) “Nonoşlar,” Gay Men; (2) “Mülayim Tipler,” Nice Guys; (3) “Andropozlu Dayılar,” Uncles with Adropause are stigmatized and negated by male homosocial groups. These three types of non-hegemonic masculinities commonly share the subordinated position in the society as they are the misfits of traditional masculine ideology. More specifically, *nonoşlar* are seen as bad role models for the society since they are “unable” to display hegemonic character traits because of their sexual orientation. On
the other hand, even if they are categorized as “men”, mülayim tipler are seen as “inadequate” because they are “too gentle”, “too sensitive,” and complicit in supporting women’s and LGBT+ rights. Lastly, andropozlu dayılar are regarded as men who have already lost their psychical and mental strength and sexual potency. Therefore, these masculinities are brutally stigmatized with insulting words by the members of homosocial groups. Furthermore, they are physically and symbolically excluded from some homosocial settings and homosocial interactions based on the assumption that they are homosexual, too kind and old.

5.1. “Nonoşlar” – Gay Men

Throughout the study, participants answered the interview questions in a different manner. More specifically, they sometimes answered the questions explicitly and proudly, on the other hand, they sometimes abstained from answering some questions. For example, they want to skip a few of them or they wanted to leave some questions unanswered. However, almost all of them (n=19) agreed on one issue, which is the strong stigmatization and negation of gay men. Most of them agreed that they “never ever” include gay men to their homosocial group and share something with them. One of the participants named The Protector mentioned the impossibility of initiating a gay man to their homosocial group with these words: “you better cut me and my bros or kill us, but don’t expect us to accept their [gay men’s] friendship or something.” Some of the participants were so intolerant to gay men that they said they do not even want to talk to them since they can’t stand their existence. “When I come across a gay, I’d like to spit in his face and strangle him right away,” stated one of participants named Ezhel35 to describe his hatred and intolerance towards gay men.

The definitions or accusations used for gays by different participants were interestingly the same as if these insulting words had already been taught to the participants. I also recognized that many participants adopted same body language while mentioning gay men, which foreshadows a set of homosocial behaviors. Crossed arms, reddened skin, frowning and avoidance of eye contact are some of the same signs of their body language while talking about gay men or being gay. When it came to referring a gay in a sentence, most of the participants avoid using the word “gay.” Instead, they used some definitions, examples, and made-up words mostly
used in popular slang in order to refer gay men. For example, the participant called Çavuş preferred referring gay men as “those ones” since he avoided using the word gay. Besides this, some derogatory words such as “İbne,” “faggot,” “assgiver,” and “fudgepacker” are used by the participants to slur and stigmatize gay men. Interestingly, some of the participants (n=9) chose to refer gay men as nonoş (instead of ibne) which is a term used in Turkish slang to describe effeminate and homosexual men in a “softer” way (Arslan, 1993). When they started talking about gay men for the first time in the interviews, some of the participants preferred saying nonoş while referring to gay men; however, they continued stigmatizing them with more insulting words as they are used to doing in their homosocial interactions.

According to almost all participants, “there is no place for nonoş men” in their homosocial interactions because they think (1) the traits of gay men are not compatible with the “proper” male roles and thus gay men damage traditional masculine values and “endanger the future of real man” (2) gay men break the moral rules in the society and become bad role models for the society by portraying homosexuality as a normal behavior. Therefore, in their homosocial interactions, heterosexual men tend to exclude gay men through harsh stigmatization, hate speech and homophobia to benefit from the possible advantages of “maleness” and defend their privileges and positions in the society.

To illustrate his hatred, one of the participants Diriliş explained how gay men show unfavorable attitudes which are incompatible with the dignity of men and he said:

> Valla, you can’t become a man, you can be born as a man. People are born either as a man or a woman. This is the unchanging rule of the human nature. Others are perverted. I mean, I don’t want to even mention their names but you know these men [gay men] are perverted, understand? They are not men. They are creatures… God created men and women, brother. Only men and women complete each other. Man to man, huh? It makes me sick when I imagine, understand? Sometimes, I see them on the streets or TV. They talk like a woman and walk like a woman posing coquettishly, I can’t believe how a man accepts ass fuck. I don’t accept it. \(^{96}\) Allah ıslah etsin! \(^{97}\)

\(^{95}\) Slang: gay man.

Another participant, Yargı Machine, shared the same idea with Diriliş and explained reasons why the existence of gay men stands against human nature:

...In my life, I have always believed that people construct their lives through learning. For me, everything is learnt except biological sex. We all were born as either a man or a woman. This is a fact, right? Modern medicine has already proven this. A baby boy, for example, was not born as a gay, was he? Your values and opinions can be shaped, that’s OK, but your biological sex cannot be constructed because your body is so concrete, right? The life or your environment can make you a liar, hardworking person, a burglar or a successful dentist, but they cannot make you a gay. Sorry, but I don’t believe in gender. Don’t get me wrong, bro, you will think that this man has graduated from METU and had his master education in NY and how it is possible for him to think in that way. From time to time, I and my close friends discuss this issue so deeply. Don’t think we are a conservative group but we all know we are born either as a man or a woman and also we know women love men and men love women. This is all about biology and hormones [laughing]. If you are a gay man for example, and you’re interested in men, this means that you have hormone imbalance or something. You should visit a medical doctor. Real men, I am saying this to distinguish them from gay men, can’t find other men sexually attractive. Full stop. It is against human nature.98

The participant named Filinta stated that gay men damage the masculine norms and endanger the masculine honor by acting improperly and he said:

_Aman yarabbi,_ imagine that we have a _nonoş_ acquaintance, God forbid! I can’t imagine that one of them will come and sit with us. You know, they wear skintight clothes, they have different hair styles or they can even wear skirts and polish their nails. People would think that I and my bros are also secret gays if he sat with us.
Ayıkla pirincin taşını! 100 No, no, no, even thinking about this is disgusting. Look, I am the least angry man in our group. My buddies shit in his mouth if he dares to sit with us. By the way, what are we going to talk with these creatures? ‘Yesterday, I gave my ass and it was so good’ [changing his voice]. Tövbe estağfurullah! 101 [Laughing]. These men, I don’t know if they are men or women, will make me sin. Bro, as you know, there are some rules of masculinity but they break the rules. They are unfortunately in the category of men even if they don’t give a shit and they somehow represent manhood. Damn it, they bring shame on us, I mean, on real men. They dare to dishonor the masculinity given by Allah.102

Also, the participant named Ironman44 stated that:

When you talk to a homo, people will start to gossip about you. Who believes that one day a homo asks for an address on the street? People will ask ‘did he ask your address?’ [Laughing.] It is hard to make people believe that you are not a homo. Prove yourself, if you can. Even your best friends wouldn’t believe in you. You can be kicked from your group because every member in our group certainly knows that homos make everybody sick; they know homos dishonor men so you can be kicked off… Also, homos wear women clothes. Bro, they give their asses, it couldn’t be more shameful, could it? From then on, you will be a gay on their minds and remembered in that way. It is nothing more than shame.103

As gay men do not meet the expectations of hegemonic masculinity and thus endanger homosocial bonds, they are harshly stigmatized and negated from the homosocial settings and interactions. Furthermore, the negation of gay men is not only realized through verbal abuse, including swearing, insulting and hate speech but it is also realized through physical violence and sexual assault. More than a half of

100 Turkish idiom which means “Here is a pretty mess!”

101 God, forgive me!


the participants proudly said that they stigmatize gay men with insulting words and some of the participants ($n=8$) stated that they treat gay men cruelly with their male peers at one time in their lives to sustain their positions in the group and make their homosocial bonds tighter. For example, one of the participants called Kelebek mentioned how he and his male friends bully a gay boy when they were at high school and he said:

There was a kırık\textsuperscript{104} boy in our school. He always giggled with girls and rarely talked to boys. He would walk like a woman and drive us crazy. He had to be brought into line and I and my gang did it many times. At first, we warned him softly to give up these improper attitudes, but he ignored us. We started to tease him first and said, ‘Ilan, are you going to be new Bülent Ersoy\textsuperscript{105}?’ or we said, ‘Your dick is made of fabric? Did your mum sew it later?’ But, again, he did not understand and ignored us. Then, we slapped him a few times and we threatened him with saying to his father that he is a faggot. He started to escape from us, but I and my gang thought we had a mission to make him real man for the sake of manhood. Anyway… Then, every day, one of my buddies followed him and manhandled him on the street corners. After that, the buddy appointed sent us a text message and said ‘mission is completed.’ Finally, we took a deep sigh [Laughing]. Now, I am thinking that I wish I hadn’t done it, but you know bro, men eat\textsuperscript{106} for their bros. Didn’t you do it? We always support each other in whatever we do. Being a man is good, bro, isn’t it? This kırık didn’t know manhood. We wanted him to taste it. That’s it! I hope he had not been one of the men whore, or I don’t know, belly dancers or cocksuckers.\textsuperscript{107}

The participant Scarface narrated a story about a gay soldier whom he shared the same unit while doing his military service in Tunceli and proudly said how he and his friends in the same military unit teased him:

---

\textsuperscript{104} Effeminate, an adjective used in Turkish slang to describe gay men.

\textsuperscript{105} Turkish transexual musician.

\textsuperscript{106} Idiom: A person will do difficult or unpleasant things in order to gratify other people.

...We had a nonoş in our unit. I don’t understand how he escaped from the military check. He must have got his ass fingered [laughing]. He was moving like women. ‘Hayırdır,’ we always asked. He said, ‘no’, but we never believed him. One day, one of our best friends in the same unit said that ‘I know how we understand if he is gay or not.’ ‘Vallaha mı?’ we said. ‘Yes,’ he said. Let me teach you bro, too. Listen! You’ll spank a man’s ass to understand whether he is gay or not, okay? If he swears when you spank his ass, he is a normal and real man, for example if you spank my ass, I’ll say ‘what the fuck are you doing, mother fucker.’ If the man moans and says oh instead of ouch, he is absolutely gay. Anyway...That day, I and my buddies in our unit were waiting in bathroom line; by the way, our showers and toilets are outside the main building. For example, if you need to use one of them, you have to take the stairs down. Imagine that we were on the fucking fourth floor. I’ve recently learnt that new showers and toilets were established inside the building. Lucky bastards! The hardest military service was ours. Anyway, what was I saying? [waiting for a while]. OK, we were waiting in the line and this [the soldier they identify as gay] was waiting in front of us. Then, he entered one of the showers and started taking a shower. Three of us, as if we had agreed to do it, suddenly opened the curtain of his shower and spanked his ass. He was petrified with horror and astonishment. He got shocked. We almost died laughing but he didn’t swear, he didn’t fight with us or he didn’t even cast out from the shower. He didn’t do anything. Can you believe it? OK, he didn’t say ‘oh’ instead of ‘ouch,’ but he didn’t do anything. Anyway, he was a faggot and we proved it. He was absolutely a son of a bitch. As I remember that day, his attitudes in the shower make me sick, understand? Then, one of my buddies went mad and ‘Give a reaction ulan,’ he said. This [the gay soldier] did not respond. After that, I said ‘do we have to hold your dick to give us a reaction?’ Then, he started crying like a kancık. His crying drove us up the wall and we couldn’t stand more and we kicked and slapped him. He had deserved it. We all got relaxed then.
Another participant named Şeytan told how he broke a gay man’s nose in a café with a great pleasure and said:

Last summer, I and my bros went on a holiday to Ibiza. The weather was fantastic, the beach was incredible and girls in bikini were dancing in Happy Hour. Everything was very good. Then a group of gay men came to the beach. Now, you will ask how we understand they were gays. I and my bros can detect gays from a kilometer away. We are gay detectors [Laughter]. Joke aside, bro, we, footballers know gays very well because there are many gays who sent us their nudes on Instagram or want to meet us when they see us anywhere. It is so disgusting, isn’t it? They are footballer hunters. They can do everything for money. If you indulge one of them, they jump through hoops to be your slut… Anyway, they had worn their slip swim suits and started to dance like a woman. We laughed loudly. We teased them and swore in English loudly. Bro, we tried to disturb them, understand? Believe me, they were nothing than an eyesore. Later on, they exaggerated their behaviors. Some of them were hugging and kissing each other like real couples. OK, if you want to go on a holiday abroad, you should endure this kind of things. Finally, you are in Ibiza and you are there to get perverted a little [laughter]. But, we can’t stand gays, we hate them. They are all *döl israfı*[^112]. Anyway, one of them wanted to order a drink at bar. ‘But it was my turn,’ I said with my sketchy English. ‘No, I was waiting in the line for a couple of minutes,’ he said. I was already angry at them all and then I said *’Kes lan götveren’*[^113], in Turkish and hit him on the head. His nose was bleeding because of my head-butt. Policemen showed up and we were kicked of the beach club. But I could take revenge on him and his faggot friends. We had to go to another beach club, but fortunately my friends never got angry at me. They said, ‘never mind, they had already deserved it.’[^114]

[^112]: Waste of semen.
[^113]: Shut up, you faggot!
As is claimed by previous research by Connell (2005), all these stigmatizations, humiliations, physical and psychological abuse of gay men “are still a matter of everyday experience for homosexual men” (p. 78). Gay men are still manhandled in Turkey, too. They are nearly beaten to death. They are raped or gang raped. They are murdered in the middle of street. All in all, gay men are excluded from daily practices and actually from life itself. Many participants in the current study harshly negate gay men in their homosocial interactions for being bad role models for the society and the next generations because they think that gays portray homosexuality as a normal behavior. For example, “being a gay is the game of foreign conspiracies to poison our young generation and terminate the healthy nations,” said Muttaki and he continued:

They [gay men] are perverted children of the people of Lut. How is possible for a man to be interested in another man? Even thinking about this possibility is sinful. Men and women were created for each other. OK, you [gay men] are a sinful creature, but why are you eating this shit publicly? They are bad role models for our sons and daughters.115

The participant named Filinta said that:

Homosexuality is one of the most dangerous diseases and it needs to be treated by the medical doctors. Otherwise, new generations will be affected by these perverted people. In the past, they used to hide their identities and we would try to guess if they are gay or not, but now they explicitly and proudly say they are gays. Where is the world going to? These perverts are everywhere. They are on the bus and ferries, they are at parks and gardens, or they work in a shopping mall for example. They are everywhere! So, it is so possible for them to pervert our children. As you know, children and teenagers already tend to imitate the things which are immoral and abnormal. For example, if a boy saw a gay man on the street, he would say it to his friends. Maybe, one of his friends will be affected by him. Bro, don’t get me wrong, but from time to time, we talk about it in dost meclisi,116 too and we say that these creatures should be closed to a mental hospital. Till they recover and become a real man, they should not be discharged. This is the best solution.117


116 A group of best friends.

Another participant called Pars also stated that:

Gays are the disgrace of human beings. I can’t believe that they are walking and protesting something instead of being ashamed of their immoral things. You [gay men] don’t need to walk for fucking each other. You are already fucking each other. What is the reason behind doing this publicly? Kids are walking on those streets as well. How would these kids feel when they see two men are pinching each other’s asses or kissing? What if these kids want to try it? A boy can go and kiss his male friend, God forbids. In the end, boys play with boys, girls play with girls. Am I wrong, bro? If a boy kisses another boy in the group, what happens then? Can you believe it? I know, it is disgusting, but these issues should be spoken. Gays never think and speak about it because they have no eyes for nothing but fucking each other. God damn it! Sons of a bitch!

The participant named The Protector asserted that kids and teenagers try to imitate homosexuals when they watch “gay series” or follow them on social media. He puts the blame particularly on Netflix and Instagram and said:

I remember I and my buddies would play with marbles, playing football, walking down the parks and gardens when we were children. Since the Internet came up, everything has changed completely. Now, I see little children have cell phones or tablets. It’s so wrong. So, they don’t want to play outside or do something man to man. They have the Internet, Netflix, YouTube, Instagram... These damn things corrupt them. They watch gay series on Netflix and these series confuse their minds. So, young generation act like bad role models whom they watch on TV or follow on Instagram. For example, some kids follow Kerimcan on Instagram. You know him bro, right? They want to be like him. Boys started to wear makeup, dance like a woman, maybe you know, they even polish their nails, but why? Because of these fucking perverts. What happens, then? These improper habits and behaviors are like contagious disease, they spread from one to another. God forbid our children! But, look what we’ve done in our childhood. While we were playing games, we learnt friendship, brotherhood, real manhood and honesty, didn’t we?
To sum up, except one participant called Chef, all the research participants strongly insult gay men and physically and psychologically damage them. One of participants says he would like to spit on gay men’s faces. Another participant proudly says he broke a gay man’s nose. The other one insists on sending gay men to asylums to make them real men. One of them confesses if he had chance, we would kill a gay man. Another one reveals that he unwillingly damaged a gay boy at high school. The list goes on… Nineteen participants particularly highlighted that it is impossible for them to welcome gay men to their homosocial groups, while fifteen of them are even opposed to talking to gay men. Besides running away from gay men and “depriving” gay men of their homosocial talks, participants and their homosocial circle constantly reproduce hate speech and the traits of homophobia in their homosocial interactions because strong stigmatization and negation of gay men make homosocial tights stronger. In addition, insulting words and subordination of gay men help perpetuate the existing boundaries between heterosexual and homosocial men. (Britton, 1990). Therefore, in the patriarchal ideology, gay men are expelled from the homosocial interactions since they do not meet the expectations of hegemonic masculinity (Connell, 2005). As a result, the more grudge the participants bear against gay men in their homosocial settings or interactions, the stronger bonds they could establish at the end of the day.

5.2. “Mülayim Tipler” – Nice Guys

Mr. Nice Guy is a term commonly used in public discourse to generally define men who treat people kindly. More specifically, nice guy refers to men who abstain from causing problems, disagreement and confrontations. These men are sympathetic and friendly people acting pleasantly and respectfully (McDaniel, 2005). Apart from its literal meaning which has been “rarely” used, the term nice guy is especially used in a sarcastic way to emphasize the “non-masculine” traits displayed by a kind and pleasant man. In other words, the features of nice guy go against those of the “real” man since the nice guy does not follow the traits of hegemonic masculinity such as dominance, aggression, and toughness.

In the current study, some of the participants \(n=4\) sarcastically used the adjective mülayim which literally means gentle and good-natured in Turkish to define a person, generally a man, who is mild, gentle, and kind. Here, it is important to note
that mülayim was the softest adjective used by the participants to define the nice guys. Most of the participants harshly stigmatized genuinely kind, caring and cooperative men as “henpecked,” “pussy-whipped,” “cuckolds,” and “paper tigers.” A majority of the participants also stated that they definitely did not include these men in their homosocial interactions. “Mazallah\textsuperscript{120}, they [nice guys] can manipulate my buddies and misdirect them. Imagine that our kids [his friends] would be tempted and one day they start doing housework or take the baby out in the stroller [laughter],” says one of the participants named Diriliş. Therefore, after gay men in Turkey, mülayim tipler– participants deliberately used mülayim tipler, nice “ones”, instead of using mülayim erkekler, nice “men,” because they did not regard them as “real” men– are also strongly negated through homosocial interactions.

More specifically, most of the participants indicated their intentions to exclude nice guys both from their psychical homosocial settings and interactions.\textsuperscript{121} According to many participants, there are two reasons behind the strong stigmatization and negation of nice guys. The first reason is that mülayim tipler cannot meet the requirements of hegemonic masculinity and thus do not act like a real man. The second reason is that mülayim tipler are too affectionate and tolerant to “ones” including women and homosexual men, whom real men cannot stand, moreover, they are complicit in supporting the “ones” (women and homosocial men) by disregarding their masculine pride.

To start with, most of the participants noted that the traits of mülayim tipler are completely different from the traits of real men. For example, one of the participants named Scarface used the adjective clause mülayim tipler for the men who are kind and understanding, and will never fit into the traits of hegemonic masculinity. He defined them in detail:

\begin{quote}
…There are some mülayim tipler around us. They can’t sit with us, eat or drink. We never include them in our group. I don’t know why but we’re completely different. How can I say, for example, they don’t have many male friends to go out. They generally hang out with girls or girls and boys. Now, I will ask you, bro. Why on earth real men hang out with girls? To share something with them? No. So, for what
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{120} God forbids.

\textsuperscript{121} They only preferred including nice guys in their men’s talks as a source of their stereotypical jokes and insults.
then? For fucking [Laughter]. We’re men bro, here we talk man to man, no need to lie, okay? Now, both of us are married. Think about the old days. What were we doing at those days? I mean, I’m sure you did it, so, at least, I and my bros were doing it. We would call girls, and then drink something, and at the end of the night, we play with girls a little then we fuck them. Sharing, birds, butterflies, flowers, they are big lies. But let me tell you the truths about these guys. I think they are not courageous enough to hang out with boys because they avoid confrontation. They run away from fighting and toughness. They never ever fight like real men. They always negotiate. Lovely butterflies. Learn to fight back first, you bastard! Bro, I am so curious about whether they get a road rage in a heavy traffic because it is impossible for a man not to be aggressive in traffic congestion or something. Pardon me, okay, this time they would pretend to be calm. Yes, yes!122

Another participant called Zalim noted that:

I can’t stand men who look as if they were men. Either you’re a real man or not. No need to dance like a belly dancer! For example, brother, nowadays, I can’t stand intellectual ones... Too many intellectual men mushroomed around us, didn’t they? They supposedly read books, wear like an actor, then smoke expensive cigars or pipes, speak İstanbul Turkish. Fuck you, little liars. Act like a real man. Real men play football, I don’t know maybe they gamble, go to brothel house, smoke cigarette. If one of my buddies didn’t do one of these things I counted, vallaha, I would fuck him off form the group. Can you believe, bro, these guys [mülâyım tipler] don’t even swear. Swear, at least, you dickhead. Stop being soğan erkeği!123 Bro, don’t get me wrong, but do you know why I called them soğan [onion] erkeği? Hah, listen, because, onions have stems and we don’t use the stems. They are unnecessary and bitter. We directly cut them off. These stems are the useless tools [penises] of these men. I learnt it from a valuable brother whom I work with in the same nightclub.124

---


123 Paper tiger.

The participant named Kelebek specifically emphasized the broken relationship between the habit of swearing and mülayim tipler and he complaint that these nice guys prefer afili words to manly speaking and said:

Bro, men are inclined to swear. Of course, men will swear. I’m sorry but I can’t accept a man who doesn’t swear as a real man. I, my dad and grandpa, my buddies, we all communicate in that way. Am I wrong? Of course, we try to avoid swearing when we are with our families or girlfriends; we are not oxen. We also know politeness and good manner [laughing], but, other than these, we always swear. As you know, we all have yarrak kürek muhabbetler [laughing]. I think, it is sincerity deriving from manhood. For example, while greeting my buddies, I say ‘what’s up, lan’ or ‘why don’t you call me, you bastard?’ or when they see me they say ‘what’s up lan göt’ We communicate in that way. Men are like animals. We eat like animal, move like animals, fuck like animals. Nothing is complicated. No need to look like a person you are actually not. We are animals, my boy, let’s face it. We are not created as complicated creatures like women… For example, bro, you have a roommate in a dorm, let’s say, his feet smell so bad and it disturbs you so much. What would you do? How would you warn him? Will you say ‘excuse me, can you please wash your feet and change your socks [making his voice thinner]? Valla, your roommate will say ‘hey my love, come here, and he fucks you there [laughing]. OK, what does a real man say? ‘Hey buddy, your feet smell like Doritos, move and wash them, they make me sick. Understand? We men communicate in that way. Of course, if you are a bit hanımevladi, he makes you eat Doritos in a gentle way [laughing].


125 Ostentatious.
126 Bawdy talks.
127 Ass.
128 Sissy.
Another participant called DJ Mendy underlined the importance of swearing for creating strong homosocial bonds with group members and he said:

Swearing is like a password to enter our group. For example, we like calling each other ‘son of bitch,’ ‘puşt,’ and bastard. When we get angry at each other, we say ‘pimp’ and ‘fuck you’ or when we ask for something, we say ‘do it lan or taşışağım yiym lan.’ When we talk in that way, I feel safe and attached to my friends more because we speak the same language. I can’t stand fussy Istanbul beyefendileri. They are dull, I don’t know, they are boring and the most fake.

Pars also stated that “only muhallebi çocukları avoid swearing” because he said:

They don’t want to cause offense, but a real man is always open to offense, argument, fighting... You can see many mülayim tipler around you, our mothers or girlfriends always show them as good role models, but they’re not unfortunately real. Don’t be afraid of offensive men, bro. Trust me, real men understand each other through fighting. They are real. They are honest and sincere. They are not sneaky like men talking kindly. Vallahi, I and my bros are very happy in that way. We don’t need kindness. Let the ones searching kindness get their ass fucked [laughing]. We need real friendship and brotherhood, don’t we? No lies, no masks! Seem as you are!

As it is seen, men who do not follow traditional masculine traits, behaviors, and discourse, more specifically, do not tolerate violence, swear, sexually objectify women or hide their emotions could be easily excluded from the homosocial interactions. Many participants express their astonishment when mülayim tipler do

130 Asshole.

131 Slang: A phrase can be directly translated as “Let me eat your balls!” It is generally said to ask someone to do something.

132 İstanbul beyefendisi is a term used to define men who speak Turkish kindly and fluently, wear smart clothes and treat women kindly.


134 Namby-pambies.

not meet the expectations of hegemonic masculinity because all men must display traits of hegemonic masculinity for them. “Actually, they are not gays,” some of the participants underlined while positioning mülayim tipler in the gender order; however, “they are not real men, either,” they also added. Mülayim tipler, therefore, are also in the subordinated group (Connell, 2005) even if they are not homosexuals and they are “expelled from the circle of legitimacy” like homosexual men who were mostly categorized as subordinated (p. 79). Another participant called Ironman44 mentioned one of his male friends whom he and his male friends proudly expelled from their homosocial circle of “legitimacy” and he said:

Years and years ago, we had a friend in our kemik kadro. He was the weakest and the most emotional person we had ever seen. When we would go to cinema, he sometimes cried in sad scenes even in action movies, for example. Tell me, why on earth does a person cry in an action movie? Bro, valla, I am not exaggerating it, believe me. He never watched horror movies. He was afraid of darkness, for example. In short, he is not a man [laughing]. Now, you will ask me why I was his friend. Actually, he had been our friends for more than fifteen years. I mean, he was our childhood. Our families know each other. In short, we put up with him to a certain extent. Now, we broke off because we got tired of his whining like a woman. For example, we would say let’s play cards, he would say no and he read books instead. He drove us crazy. We would say ‘let’s drink out’, he said OK but he would drink fruit juice. By the way, he loves girls, he isn’t a gay man, but he was eccentric. For example, we would say ‘let’s go to brothel,’ he would say ‘no’ because he would say he believes love affairs. He was a completely misfit. Thank God, we don’t see him anymore. We are enough for each other. My mum said the other day he got married and had a child. God bless him. She said he could buy neither a house nor a car. He is still working as an accountant in a company. He couldn’t even set up his own business. He is the most coward and the most passive person you have ever seen so he is doomed to be a loser. Buying a house and car, they are masculine issues and they need courage and recklessness. Our boy has none of them. Valla, if I were a woman, I wouldn’t want to have such husband or father.
Secondly, some of the participants \((n=8)\) tend to exclude *mülayim tipler* from their homosocial interaction since *mülayim tipler* are “supposedly” kind to everyone regardless of their sex, ethnicity, religion, and age. That’s why, participants regarded that *mülayim tipler* are two-faced and they are also the real “enemies” of real men. The participant named Zalim mentioned *mülayim tipler* in an offensive way and he said:

…I wish they [*mülayim tipler*] had been gays, then we could say ‘OK they are gays, not real men,’ but unfortunately they are men. Even gays have a standpoint in life; they fuck one another [laughter]. You can’t understand their [*mülayim tipler’s*] standpoints. They are both on the women’s and men’s side. How on earth can a man be on the women’s side, I can’t believe this. I’m not sure whether you see or not, but there are some men walking with women for something. Can you believe this, bro? Walking with women? For what? So nonsense. Why? Women are already our enemies and they try to terminate us. How do they [*mülayim tipler*] underestimate these realities? Bro, we don’t need any enemies inside. We need allies and henpecked men can’t be our allies. These assholes, I’m sure, wash the dishes and clean the house. Fuck you, they are the disgrace of men. Now, I will ask you bro, is it possible to trust these men and welcome to your group?¹³⁸

Another participant The Protector narrated a short anecdote about his old friend who cares and takes into consideration his wife’s opinions in the decision-making process in any issues. The Protector stigmatized his friend as “henpecked” and gave some details about him by referring to “female characteristics”:

I follow one of my male friends from primary school on Instagram. He always posts something weird on his account. He was a weird person in the primary school, too. He would never play football or he rarely hung out with boys. He was so silent boy. All the time we would mock with him but he never responded back. Anyway, from time to time, he shares some posts about equality between men and women. He has twin boys and in his posts he says that he will teach his sons this equality so that they will help their future wives bla bla bla… What is this now? What a bad role model! I wouldn’t want to be in twin boys’ place. Such fathers can only be a source of embarrassment. He once said that before making any decisions in his life, he always

gets his wife’s opinion. So ridiculous! [Cynical laughing] Nobody can make me believe this. Sorry bro, but fuck his lies. OK, I also support that women can work, earn money, etc. but imagine you will buy a car or house. Why do you ask to your wife? What do you ask, fuck you? She has no idea about cars or houses. I wonder if his wife asks him what to cook for dinner [laughing]. I think everybody should know their places. You’re a man and you should act accordingly. Women and men are different and they are ever and never equal. Sorry, but it is against the nature of the human beings. Let’s face it! So sorry, but fuck that shit! Fuck that such masculinity!139

The participant named Jack Daniel also expressed his anger against men who are complicit in supporting women and underlined the impossibility of initiating “mülâyim tipler” into their homosocial groups and he said:

…Is it necessary to search for other enemies for God’s sake? Look, we were surrounded by kilbîk140 men. They are dying for their wives or girlfriends. If you let them, they would change their surnames and take their wives’ surnames. Bro, valla, if you welcome those men to your group, they will poison the group. Trust me, women poison them and then they poison us.141

The participant, Sarı Bela, also stated that:

…Some men are doomed to be cuckolded. Let me tell you the truths about women. Women hate henpecked men. They can just meet the domestic needs of women because these miserable men can cook, clean the house or even change a baby’s diapers. Women seem to enjoy it as these men make their job easier, but have you ever thought of the reality, bro? Women just use them, that’s all. Ulan, fucking dishes are being washed by the dishwasher, clothes are being washed by the washing machine, you [women] will just cook and take care of your children, but you need help? They are bitches! Women pervert these men. But, I am actually not angry at


140 Henpecked.

women; I’m so angry at these bastards! They allow women to use them. They don’t know women hate henpecked men. Women need real men. Women are as horny as men and they want to be fucked by a real man. They don’t want to be fucked by a man mopping the house. Why on earth does a woman have a sex with a feminine man? She would choose to be a lesbian [laughing]. That’s why, these men are doomed to be cuckolded. I don’t know, maybe, these men can enjoy seeing his woman being fucked by another man because they strive for [emphasizing the verb] the happiness of their women in any conditions. Dishonorable godoşlar!  

Another participant called Ezhel35 supported Sarı Bela and narrated a story about a nice guy at high school:

Bro, there was a hanım evladı in our classroom at high school. He would get on well with both boys and girls. In order to be friends with me and my buddies, he would always start a topic about football or politics. Bro, by the way, we were the most popular group at high school. Everyone, even the teachers, called us ‘troublesome.’ Everyone wanted to be in our group but we were so selective. For example, we didn’t accept the boy I mentioned because he would read some poems to the girls in the middle of the classroom, can you believe this? He was playing the guitar and one of my buddies had heard that he was even writing lyrics… He sometimes tried to protect girls from us –why, I don’t know– when we grabbed girl’s butts or boobs at hidden places in the school and we would beat him whenever he fucked up the conversation between us and girls. I know we were teenagers; hormones were so high at that time; you know [laughter]. Actually, girls would enjoy it too… I know, girls at school found him so romantic and they were even holding up him as an example. They would say ‘he is so nice’ and ‘he is so gentle,’ but they gave us [have sex] not to him. Women are like that, bro. You will never understand what they want. Believe me, girls never found him attractive. Girls want
real men. Our boy continued playing his romantic songs and Elizabeth\textsuperscript{146}, while we would screw girls... [Laughing].\textsuperscript{147}

Some participants such as Filinta and Diriliş harshly stigmatized mülâyım tipler because of the fact that mülâyım tipler support sexual minorities as well as women. Filinta noted that:

...I had a male cousin. He studies Sociology in Ankara. He does research like you. Antin kuntin işler\textsuperscript{148}. Last year, when we were in my aunt’s house, we were talking about Turkey’s economic conditions. I don’t remember now how the topic was opened, but he started to mention the murder of a dönme\textsuperscript{149}. He said they [transgender individuals] have the right to live bla bla... If I didn’t know that my cousin has a girlfriend, I’d say he is gay. OK, one of the dönme was killed. Allah rahmet eylesin\textsuperscript{150}, of course, Allah knows, but he will go to hell. ‘They have the right to live.’ ‘They deserve to live...’ Why do we need these sentences? Is it your duty to protect them? Bro, valla I said these to my cousin, too because I was so angry at him. He responded me calmly –as usual– and continued protecting them. I said 'don’t talk like gays, shut up!'\textsuperscript{151}

---

\textsuperscript{146} Slang: Handjob, masturbation.


\textsuperscript{148} Slang: Nonsense and trivial things.

\textsuperscript{149} Slang: Transgender

\textsuperscript{150} May God rest his soul.

Four or five years ago, *ibneler, lezler*[^152] and *translar*[^153] were walking in Alsancak. Maybe, you’ve heard this. The disgrace of human beings. Bro, maybe you won’t believe but there were some men among them. They didn’t look like guys. Some of them were holding their girlfriends’ hands. Maybe they are bi, maybe not, I don’t know, but they looked like men… Bro, I got tired of hearing words about equality and justice, understand? There is neither equality nor justice in the world. Kids are dying of starvation. Our black brothers are being murdered. Where is the equality? Where is the justice? People are behaving as if they were succeeded in these issues. I don’t care who fucks who, but I am so curious whether these bastards walking with the perverts will walk for starving kids.[^154]

The participant named Reis asserted that *mülayim tipler* consciously pull a nice guy act to get women’s attention and they strategically act like a gentleman to befriend women and then they have sexual relationship with them:

…To me, men behave gently and kindly only for finding pussies to fuck. All they want to do is fucking, nothing more. They seem so *mülayim*, but they are the horniest men you’ll ever see in your life. They do their best to get women into bed. They know the best wine, for example. They eat in expensive restaurants. They tell romantic words. *Aman yarabbi*[^155], these shameless guys even read romantic poems. You see them in movies, right? But girls are so stupid. They believe these sons of bitch.[^156]

Another participant Sex Machine said:

I will ask you a question bro; what is the thing a man can’t live without? We’re man to man here, let’s talk honestly. Let me answer. Fucking, fucking and fucking [laughter]. So, a horny man can do everything, you know. You and I said some beautiful words to bang them [laughter], didn’t we? We lied, I know, and acted like a

[^152]: Abbreviated form of “lesbian.”

[^153]: Abbreviated form of “transgender.”


[^155]: Oh my God!

gentleman for fucking. We had to do it. Every man does it. Think about male peacocks. They do everything to affect female peacocks for mating. Everything is for sex. By the way, don’t compare me with other men who are romantic princes, don’t even think about it. They are different. I’m not one of them. Lying and pretending to be a gentle man are the lifestyle of cuckolded men. Let’s say I do something for the foreplay [laughter] because normally, I am such a boorish person.\textsuperscript{537}

In conclusion, even though mülayim tipler meet one of the most significant expectations of hegemonic masculinity, which is heterosexual sex, this time they are strongly stigmatized and negated because of not meeting the other traits of hegemonic masculinity. They are “fortunately” positioned in the category of men; however, they are not seen as “complete” or “real” men because they are too respectful to be respected, too gentle to be treated kindly and too compromising to negotiate with…

5.3. “Andropozlu Dayılar” – Uncles with Andropause

Aging, known as the process of getting older, refers to the physical, psychological, and social changes in a human being. The meanings attributed to aging change according to individuals’ education, socio-economic class, ethnicity, religious beliefs, and personal interpretations (Kimmel & Aronson, 2003). In the context of the relationship between masculinity and aging, meanings attributed to aging are not compatible with the traits of hegemonic masculinity because old age is affiliated with the loss of strength, physical resiliency, and thus autonomy (Bennet, 2007). In other words, hegemonic masculinity is associated with power, dominance, physical and mental stoicism, and sexual prowess (Amin et al., 2017; Donaldson, 1993; Kagesten et al., 2016). Therefore, most of the elderly men are seen as the individuals who are not able to practice “idealized” masculinity and thus face a “masculinity” crisis when they are getting older.

In the current study, most of the participants \((n=16)\) revealed how they subordinated and negated elderly men in their homosocial interactions. In the broadest sense, they regard that elderly men lose their power, status and prestige as they get older and they fail to perform traditional masculine roles and expectations. Therefore, it is not possible for elderly men to be initiated to “young” homosocial groups. “There is no place for old men,” answered one of the participants called Jack Daniel when he was asked whom they cannot accept to their homosocial group. “Everybody should know their places. Grandpas hang out with grandpas in the coffeehouses or nursing homes. Davul bile dengi dengine, öyle değil mi? continued Jack Daniel. “I don’t like my bros smell like hacı yağğı [laughter],” said another participant named Sex Machine. “We [men] have already got tired of nagging and whining of women so we can’t stand elderly men’s cholesterol talks and obsolete advises,” said the participant called Yargı Machine. Besides excluding elderly men from their homosocial settings, most of the participants insult elderly men in their homosocial talk by stigmatizing them. In an offensive way, they call elderly men “moruk, old chap,” “battery outs,” “coffin dodgers,” “fuddy-duddies,” and “buffers.” On the other hand, some of the participants \((n=8)\) define elderly men around them as “uncle with andropause” to emphasize the “andro-pause” of elderly men’s masculinities and their position within the hegemonic order. One of the participants named Filinta defined the “uncles with andropause” in detail:

These guys are more than 65 years old. They are the grumpiest men you’ll ever see in your life. They are peevish and nervous. They snap at anybody they come across. They generally live on top of the apartments and they yell at children playing outside. Idiot guys! Most of the time, they are the ex-servicemen and the superintendents of the apartments, for sure [laughing]. They can read a newspaper for ages and they solve jigsaw puzzle carefully. Then… Some of them are oversexed but they can’t fly the bird, you know [laughter], so they are so cranky. Well, they also have prostate problems…

---

158 Birds of a feather flock together, don’t they?

159 A kind of strong perfume used by hajjis.

In medical terms, andropause is a syndrome associated with a gradual decrease in male hormones, including testosterone and dehydroepiandrosterone in middle-aged and aging men. (Singh, 2013). Some men suffering from andropause may experience psychical, emotional, and sexual symptoms. Psychical symptoms include decreased muscle strength, fatigue and increased body fat. Emotional symptoms of andropause also comprise concentration difficulties, sleep disturbance and depressive mood. Lastly, sexual symptoms of andropause include loss of libido, erectile dysfunction and reduced intensity of orgasm (Vermeulen, 2000). Although these symptoms seem to be commonly encountered in andropause syndrome, its clinical diagnosis is hard to measure “because of a lack of established normal testosterone levels for different age groups, as well as confusion regarding what subset of testosterone to measure, simply testing testosterone levels is inadequate” (Brawer, 2004, p. 9). Whereas the clinical examination and diagnosis of andropause are so difficult, participants in this study could easily classify almost all middle-aged and the older men around them as “the men with adropause.” Moreover, they used this syndrome as a tool to stigmatize and humiliate the acts of elderly men and thus nullify or deny the existence of elderly men in their homosocial interactions.

In this study, the negation of “uncles with andropause” comes into sight in two different ways. Firstly, in their homosocial talks, most of the research participants negate elderly men’s desire to live long and stigmatize elderly men as the individuals favoring “the denial of death.” For example, the participants called Pars and Şeytan shared their personal anecdotes about elderly men who “forget to die”:

…I and my friends from our neighborhood regularly go to gym. For two weeks, an old man has been doing sport in the same center. I guess he is in his fifties or sixties. We don’t understand what on earth he is doing there. His face is wrinkled. His balls are dangling while running on the treadmill. He is about to shit under his pants to when lifting weights. You should see him. As he is lifting the weights, we die laughing [laughing]. I wish you were there, bro [laughter]. Uncle, why? What is your purpose? You are an elderly man, most probably a retired man. Don’t you have any grandchildren? Go and love them. Why sports? …But, do you know why they [elderly men] act like that? They are all because of andropause. God forbid!161

Also Şeytan stated that:

There are many ex-footballers or ex-sportsmen in our club. One of them is our ex-trainer. We call him kadayıf \(^{162}\)Johnny \(^{163}\) [laughing]. He is sixty-two, but he wears like a young man. He wears the most expensive perfume. He is fit because he regularly goes to gym. He asserts that he can play football better than us. Bro, I think he is a miserable man. Whatever he does, he can’t hide his wrinkled face. From time to time, he visits our dressing room to give some tactics before the match or workouts. He wears tight jeans all the time and you see his balls reaching his knees, thanks him [laughing]. When he leaves the room, I and my buddies in the team laugh a lot. Bro, who can take this poor man serious, tell me? \(^{164}\)

Some other participants similarly criticized the elderly men’s lives when they “disobey” the traditional masculine rules. Some of the traditional expectations prescribed for elderly men are stated by the participant called Sahne Adamı:

…Young people should act their age. Old people should act their age. You are a grandfather or you will be. What does a grandfather do? He takes care of his grandchildren, I don’t know, he can give pocket money and candies to children on Bairam holidays. He sometimes eats out with his wife when he receives his retirement pension. He chats with his friends in public parks. \(^{165}\)

Also, Sarı Bela prescribed the things elderly people must not do:

…You [elderly men] are not a young man anymore, let’s face it. You can’t act like a young man. You were a young man years and years ago… Bro, last month we went to a tavern with my friends. There, we saw some old men drinking rakı till their faces were getting red as a beetroot. Disgusting! Vallaha, they made us lose our appetite. Dayı, you have diabetes, cholesterol and high blood pressure. Drink ayran

---

\(^{162}\) Tel kadayıf is a traditional Turkish pastry made of shredded wheat. The participant drew an analogy between tel kadayıf which is white and shredded and white body hair of his old trainer.

\(^{163}\) The participant refers to the cartoon character Johnny Bravo, who is depicted as smart, muscular and woman hunter.


or šalgam\textsuperscript{166}, instead of raki. Otherwise, you’ll have a heart attack, god forbids. Let young men drink raki. Let us do it. What on earth are you doing in meyhane?\textsuperscript{167}

Most of the participants in the current study also agreed on the point that elderly men lose their sexual potency along with their physical strength and they put sexuality into “not to do list” on behalf of elderly men. In contrast to the popular assumptions, more than a half of elderly men who are over 70 are sexually active and have satisfactory sexual lives (Lee et al., 2016) with or without medication. However, when an elderly man intends to express his interest about sexuality publicly, he is harshly criticized in an offensive way and stigmatized as azgon teke\textsuperscript{168} by some of the participants. Many research participants in this study (n=14) produced a negative discourse about the sexuality of elderly men in their homosocial interactions. For example, one of the participants named Kelebek said that:

You [elderly men] have already shot all your bullets. Even if you want, you won’t fly your bird. My grandpa always said that ‘eat it when your teeth can cut, wear it when it is looking good on you, and fuck her when your bird is flying.’ Everybody has to know their places.\textsuperscript{169}

Another participant called Sex Machine added that:

I can’t stand seeing elderly men holding their wives’ hands in the parks and gardens. There is no need for all these disgraceful actions. Some women find it so romantic and I am really unable to understand it. I just laugh because I’m sure every man who sees this scene will think that ‘how many Viagra did that man use to fly his dick?’ Uncles in the coffeehouses should stop playing cards as soon as possible and follow these guys [laughter]. They don’t need to wait for huri\textsuperscript{170} anymore. I think those men have no close friends. If they had close friends, they would warn them because good friends warn each other about some issues. For example, we have an older friend in our group. Maybe, he is in his forties. He has been hanging out with us for a long

\textsuperscript{166} Turnip juice.


\textsuperscript{168} Goat.


\textsuperscript{170} Very beatiful girl waiting men in paradise according to Islamic tradition.
time. He is married and he has two children. We sometimes go to woman\textsuperscript{171} with my buddies or call girls. This older brother wants to come with us, but we never let him. ‘Shame on you’ we say. ‘You are a hoary man, you have your children,’ we say. Okay, he wants to hang out with younger people but it doesn’t mean he can do everything that young people can do.\textsuperscript{172}

The participant named Ironman44 also narrated an anecdote about his grandfather and his friends living in the village:

…Bro, last Ramadan Bayram, I visited my grandfather. He lives in Laka village alone because my grandma died 2 years ago because of cancer. I visited my grandma’s cemetery then went to grandpa’s house. He and his friends from village – maybe they are friends for more than forty years– were sitting around a table and talking fiercely. We said, ‘Selamun aleykum,’ Then I asked what they were talking about fiercely. One of his friends said that ‘your grandpa is misleading us.’ I asked the reason but they couldn’t answer because they were laughing so much. ‘We ordered kudret nari\textsuperscript{173} and we are waiting for it. It will come after bairam,’ another friend said. ‘What are you going to do with it?’ I asked. ‘Let your grandpa explain’ said his friend. Bro, you won’t believe but these azgin tekeler bought kudret nari to lift it [penis]. Would you laugh or cry? Valla, I got mad… and said: ‘Shame on you, you’re seventy years old, what are you going to do with it after this time?’ Tövbe tôvbe… Bro, my grandpa is single but others are married. They said they sometimes called widow women from other villages, can you believe it? I’m sure they make group, too [laughing]. Bro, I am young, but I ask neither kaput\textsuperscript{174} nor lifting creams to my buddies. We never talk about them. I think they’ve all gone mad. From now on, eat fruits for your [his grandfather and his friends] health, for your rheumatism.\textsuperscript{175}

\textsuperscript{171} Slang: Phrase to be used to say going to brothel house.


\textsuperscript{173} Bitter melon.

\textsuperscript{174} Slang: condom.

Another participant named Reis also said that:

Your [elderly men] hands are shaking, you have many diseases, but you’re chasing for pussies. Perverted pimps! Bro, these old men are dangerous for the society. They are dangerous for our sisters, mothers and wives. What does a woman want from your wrinkled dick? They’d better eat small pickles instead.176

Also, the participant called Muttaki regarded the elderly men who express their intention to have sex as “faithless” and said:

…May God curse you! How dare you disrespect Allah! Stop muttering those words. Shame on you [elderly men]! You have children and grandchildren. You are already a grandfather. Stop dealing with worldly goods. Start doing something for ahiret177 or I don’t know, make some Muslim friends. Start growing your beard like them. Go to a mosque every day with them. Start praying five times a day. Read the Qur’an. Follow the holy prophet Muhammed who is the messenger of the God. Worldly satisfaction will not save you from going to hell, but praying for Allah will.178

Besides being harshly stigmatized in young men’s homosocial interactions, elderly men are also negated because their “wisdom” is trivialized. Most of the participants stated they fed up with listening the “preaching” of elderly men and they and their group members almost never take into consideration the elderly “preaching.” For this reason, most of the participants noted that they do not want to share the same homosocial settings with elderly people and they even abstain from talking to them in any other settings and interactions. Some of the participants also humiliated elderly men because they think that most of the advices of elderly men are “invalid.” More specifically, participants found elderly men’s recommendations “invalid” since

---


177 The life hereafter.

they are “outdated” and “irrelevant.” One of the participants called Şeytan exemplifies that:

My grandpa asked me where I found my girlfriend the other day. I said on Instagram. “So, on the Internet?” he confirmed. Yes, I said. Then, he let himself go. He said, ‘How can you trust a person you meet on the Internet, my son? ’Do you know her parents?’ he asks. ‘What do they do? Isn’t there any girl around you?’ He asked and asked. My grandpa is over 65, his mind has already gone. Maybe, he is on the edge of Alzheimer. I was about to say that ‘you can’t make your own decisions in this age and you still give me an advice, hah?’ But I didn’t. Instead, I said: ‘Grandpa, take it easy. I won’t get married to a girl whom I fall in love. So what if I get married to this girl, bro? Is it a crime? ‘I hope you don’t expect an arranged marriage from me like you did. I am footballer,’ I said. Footballers have many girls; does it matter where you find them? From time to time, I and my buddies in the team share how we suffer from our families, grandfathers [laughing] and their endless expectations. Fortunately, I am not the only one. Everybody has the same problem [laughing].

Also, the participant named Sahne Adami stated that:

The other day, I and my friends from my orchestra went to the pub to drink something. It is a perfect thing to get relaxed and feel free from your troubles. Anyway, there was an old dayı drinking something all alone. And then he wanted to sit with us. Normally we don’t accept elderly men to the conversation because they fuck up the conversation but that day our kids [members of orchestra] were so sorry for his loneliness; therefore, we accepted him. I wish we had not done it. We deeply regret having accepted him. God damn him. He started criticizing our job. He advised us to find another job. For him, we shouldn’t have been musicians. We should have worked in an insured job. ‘If you are not a famous singer, the entertainment sector will devour you’ he also said. Lan, who the fuck are you! Are you a singer or violinist? He drove us crazy. Then, we said, ‘dayı you are overdrunk and don’t know what you’re saying. You fucked our brains, so fuck off.’ I’m sorry but time has changed. There was a belief in the past that ‘elderly knows the best.’ There is no such thing anymore.

179 Açıta ağzını yumdu gözünü.


Another participant named Sex Machine noted that “whenever I come across old men, I have goose bumps.” He continued:

I swear, I wish I could see old men only in wedding ceremonies or funerals. Maybe, in their funerals, hah? [Laughing] I can’t stand their existence because they ask many questions or constantly advice something. “Don’t drink so much.” “Isn’t it the time to get married and settle down?” “Don’t waste your money.” “Buy a house, at least.” “Guarantee yourself.” Fuck off, lan. Anyone who sees them supposes that they are mosque imams. Stop preaching! We all know that they are ex-drunkens, ex-brothel regulars and ex-gamblers and now they give me advices. Don’t make me laugh! They make me really sick. Maybe, you had already done about everything you’ll ever do but it’s me and my friends’ turn dayı. We will live our lives as you did.

As it is seen, many participants regarded that aging plays a very significant role in weakening man’s masculine identity because they believed that men could be “in their prime” between the ages of 20 and 45 and they could be actively engaged in social, business, and sexual life in this period of time. According to the ageist participants, elderly men are not in their prime anymore because they have already lost their physical, sexual, mental and economic potency. That is, they were portrayed as if they had already retired from their masculinities. As men get older, they are treated less like a “real” man. They are now grandfathers who are at the end of the last station of masculinity. That’s why elderly men are excluded both from male homosocial interactions to which they really belonged to while they are not compatible with the traits of hegemonic masculinity anymore.


Ununu eleyip eleğini asmak.

CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSION

The answer, my friend, is blowin’ in the wind
The answer is blowin’ in the wind.

Bob Dylan, Blowin’ in the Wind

6.1. Summary and Conclusions

When I was a child, there was a red round table in the middle of the living room. This table was surrounded only by my male relatives and their acquaintances. They would come back home after a tiring day at work and would be ready to dine and drink Turkish Raki with their “besties” around red round table. They would look forward to getting together with their male friends and relatives every Friday. As a boy sitting under the red round table, I could find a chance to hear everything my male relatives were talking and see their reactions. I remember how cheerful they were around red round table. From time to time, their laugh is music to my ears; however, this mostly evokes negative connotations because their laughter would always come after they scolded, negated or stigmatized someone. For instance, one day one of them threw the pot full of sarma\textsuperscript{184}, out the window because he found it a little bit salty and he then scolded his wife in front of the other men for failing to cook the dish. Another Friday night, my other male relative did the same thing for an over fried chicken…

In my childhood, the men around red round table were not only cruel to women, but they were also cruel to men around the table. That is to say, the communication between men was not positive all the time as it was seen and expected. For example,

\textsuperscript{184} Stuffed grape leaves
they would mock the man who could not set up his own business because this meant that he was economically dependent on someone else, which was so degrading for a “real” man. In addition, some of my male relatives would stigmatize other men who did not have any extra-marital relationships as “henpecked husbands.” I remember the henpecked husbands were humiliated with insulting words just because they were loyal to their wives. On the other hand, some of my male relatives around red round table would try to exclude some other men because of their religious and political views since they were highly intolerant to different points of view. All in all, if someone from outside the house had observed my male relatives and their acquaintances; they could have admired the strong bonds between them. Nevertheless, when someone scrutinizes, they could understand the hierarchy, competition and power conflicts among them.

Patriarchy which predominantly oppressed my childhood was practiced by my male relatives and their acquaintances around the red round table… Throughout my life, I could find a chance to sit with male friends around many different tables. The types and shapes of tables have changed but sad to say, the things happening around the tables have never changed. That is to say, patriarchy did not change. Patriarchy persists… The features of patriarchy have metamorphosed. For example, around a coffee table, I saw how the homosocial group degraded gay men and used hate speech towards them. Around a bar table, I also witnessed how hard they tried to convince one another to have an extra-marital affair and how they ridiculed the men who did not want to cheat their wives. In addition, around a dining table, I saw how they flaunted their properties and investments and teased the men who do not own any property. Furthermore, around a conference table, I witnessed that a homosocial group in academia mansplained things to women in a condescending manner…

As far as I observed in my whole life, mutual characteristic of different homosocial groups has been the desire to dominate somebody, which might be the comprehensive trait of hegemonic masculinity. As a pro-feminist researcher, I have been aware of the fact that members of homo-social groups immensely affect one another’s points of view, decision-making processes, and the ways of living. That’s why I intended to take a critical stance against the concept of homosociality and with my pro-feminist lenses I tried to examine the relationship between homosociality and
hegemonic masculinity. To do so, I asked two research questions which guided the current study. The research questions were:

1. How do strong homosocial relations between men influence hegemonic masculinity in Turkey?
2. In what ways masculinities in Turkey are affected by homosociality?

In order to find the related answers to these questions, I conducted semi-structured in-depth interviews with twenty male participants who mostly seek for socializing with men and have at least one homosocial group. While analyzing the data, I used thematic analyses (Braun & Clarke, 2006). That is, after I completed conducting in-depth interviews, I noted down the themes and gave adequate support for each by contextualizing them within the arguments related to the research questions of this study. As a result, from the interviews, I identified two overarching themes with three subthemes for each.

The first overarching theme is the “perpetuation of hegemonic masculinity.” According to the findings, research participants had an inclination to perpetuate some traits of hegemonic masculinity in their homosocial interactions. The traits perpetuated by the participants were (1) emotional stoicism, (2) heterosexual prowess, and (3) ambivalent sexism. When most of the participants get together both in homosocial and heterosexual settings, they tended to conceal some of their specific emotions such as fear, pain, love and grief since they thought these feelings are associated with femininity. The first reason behind the participants’ reluctance to share their feelings is that they viewed sharing their emotions as a sign of vulnerability and weakness. Since hegemonic masculinity requires toughness, aggression, assertiveness and dominance, the participants abstained from sharing their emotions both in their homosocial interactions and in their daily lives. The second reason that caused the participants to conceal their feelings is that their friends in their homosocial group could use their intimate feelings against them. According to the participants, their emotions are their Achilles heels and if their friends become aware of their “feminine” emotions, they might hurt them by using their emotions against them. However, there are some participants who noted that they could share their emotions with just one member they trusted most in the
homosocial group. These participants particularly underlined that the emotions they share with their friends are not “feminine.” That is to say, they stated that they share their “real” and “manly” emotions when they come across real problems in their daily lives. One of the traits of hegemonic masculinity is men’s being emotionally and physically stoic (Donaldson, 1993) and as it is seen in the current study most of the participants have this trait. At this point, homosociality plays very significant role for the participants to feel obliged to be stoic. Most of the participants particularly noted that they did not want to initiate the men who are emotional to their homosocial group because they view emotional men highly feminine and they thought that these men could make the group effeminate and spoil the group dynamics. It can be understood from this part that developing and sustaining relationships based on emotions are not favored by the participants in a homosocial group because emotions denoted a non-masculine image for them. In this way, concealing the emotions or sharing them in a limited way becomes a common practice in the homosocial groups. Therefore, it can be concluded that participants of the current study have to conceal their emotions such as grief, pain, fear and love in their homosocial interactions. Actually, for the sake of maintaining their positions in the homosocial group, the participants deny showing some of their feelings they characterize as feminine.

Secondly, it was revealed that homosociality plays a crucial role in perpetuating heterosexuality, which is the core element of hegemonic masculinity (Connell 1995; Jewkes et al. 2015) Homosociality, as a powerful practice, have huge potential for determining how group members make decision about sexuality, what meanings they give to heterosexuality, and how they narrate their sexuality. It also provides a common ground for the participants to boast with their heterosexual prowess. At that part, I specifically used the word “prowess” because the act of heterosexual sex was seen as a masculine “ability” which must be actively practiced, improved, boasted with, and competed for within the homosocial interactions. I also specifically named this subtheme as the “perpetuation of heterosexual prowess” instead of the “perpetuation of heterosexuality” because when the participants get together, they do not only perpetuate the trend topic which is heterosexual sex but they also maintain viewing sexuality as a masculine ability… While narrating their sexual stories, most of the participants focused on their sexual prowess. More specifically, they stated
that they are very experienced in having sex with different women and skillful at different sex positions. The also noted that they know how to use their “enormous” penises effectively to satisfy their partners... As most of the participants were mentioning their sexual dexterity, I recognized that they constantly compared themselves to their close friends. For instance, they compared their penis size, erection time, the number of women they have sex with to those of their close friends’, which results in constant rivalry between the members of a homosocial group. According to participants, sexual competition between them started when they had their first sexual intercourse. Some of the participants noted that they competed with their male friends in their homosocial group to be the first person who would have sex for the first time because milli olmak -first sexual intercourse- as a cultural phenomenon in Turkish culture, was so prestigious for them to prove their masculinity. Also, milli olmak is viewed as the first step to be initiated to a male homosocial group. For the sake of belonging to a homosocial group, men feel forced to have their first sexual intercourse as soon as possible. It was revealed that the participants who shared their first sexual experiences in in-depth interviews felt forced to have their first sexual intercourse because they were caught unprepared for it and they stated that they “felt like a dying duck” while having sex for the first time. Although these participants said that they dreamt their first sexual intercourse so different, they never objected to their friends or relatives who decided the time and place they had sex and the person they had sex with on behalf of them. At the end, they “had to’’ prefer proving their masculinity by having unwanted and undesired sex to having their first sexual intercourse in a much more desirable way... After having their first sexual intercourse, most of the participants had to maintain their sexual performance. The current study approved that the more the participants maintained their heterosexual performance, the more they maintained their status in the homosocial group. According to participants, having lots of sex with many different women meant heterosexual prowess and these participants noted that they kept a track of the number of sex they had. In this way, they could find an opportunity to compare their sexual ability to those of their friends in the same homosocial group... Furthermore, some of the participants competed with each other in having extra marital or romantic affairs and they explicitly and proudly stated that they influenced their friends in the homosocial group to have an affair. These participants also noted
that they feel incompetent when their friends in the homosocial group have affairs but they themselves do not. Therefore, they have extra marital or romantic affairs. However, according to participants, having an extra marital affair –having a dost– was much more prestigious than having a romantic affair because men having a dost was courageous enough to have an extra marital relationship even if he is still married. Moreover, it meant to participants that men could prove their both economic and sexual potency when they have a dost. In sum, it can be concluded that competition over heterosexual prowess contributes to enacting homosocial bonds. When participants reduced the act of sex to competition over penis size, the quantity of sex, erection time, and orgasm, the homosocial bonds between them got tighter. As the homosocial bonds between men get stronger, heterosexuality and the narration of heterosexual prowess are perpetuated. Therefore, it can be concluded that heterosexuality and homosociality are interconnected. That’s why; it is not surprising that most of the participants do not initiate the men who are not heterosexual into their homosocial group. Maybe, the most interesting thing is that it is so normal for the participants to keep a track of their sexual intercourses, have affairs and objectify women sexually. They viewed these practices as normal, ordinary and common. In this way, it becomes easier for them to legitimize and perpetuate these practices.

Ambivalent sexism is the third trait of hegemonic masculinity which was perpetuated by the members of the homosocial groups. In the current study, I particularly used the concept of ambivalent sexism (Glick & Fiske, 1997) to underline the different facets of sexism and give meaning to the “benevolent” and “hostile” attitudes practiced by the research participants. Within their homosocial interactions, participants treated women with benevolent and hostile attitudes. For instance, some of the participants stated they did not want women, especially their mothers, sisters, wives and daughters, to go out because they think that streets are dangerous for women. In addition, according to these participants, women are too emotional and fragile to work or drive a car. Although these attitudes seem to be “subjectively positive in feeling tone” (Glick & Fiske, 1997, p. 491) and maintained by a desire to protect and preserve women, they actually confine women to private sphere, more specifically, to the burden of household tasks like cleaning the house, cooking and looking after children. Thus, they actually maintain the traditional gender roles. On
the other hand, some women are treated with overtly misogynistic attitudes by some of the participants. More specifically, women who are economically independent, question traditional gender roles, and ask for gender equality are seen potentially hazardous for the hegemonic masculinity and treated with hostility. Some participants revealed their hatred of and hostility towards women in an explicit way and harshly stigmatized women as “bad women,” “feminists,” “perverts,” “demon,” and “whore” because they were not comfortable with the existence of women in masculine domains and viewed these women as threat to the power and dominance of men. Therefore, harsh stigmatization of women and hate speech against women produced in homosocial interactions result in domestic and sexual violence. As it is seen, whether sexism is practiced in a benevolent or hostile manner, it maintains traditional gender roles and domestic and sexual violence against women. If today many women are still brutally killed by men although many conscious raising campaigns about violence against women have been held, it means something goes wrong and some other trajectories in this issue needs to be examined. Here, homosociality can be one of the trajectories to be examined because homosocial knowledge, attitudes and behaviors which are produced, shared, internalized and transferred in homosocial interactions by the homosocial group members might maintain the cycle of violence. Moreover, in male-male relationships, no matter what group members do, they unconditionally support each other, thus, they easily legitimize their actions. At the end of the day, they suppose that their sexist attitudes are so normal and commonly shared by every man.

Second overarching theme I identified from the interviews is the “stigmatization and negation of non-hegemonic masculinity.” Internalization of the traits of hegemonic masculinity provided a base of shared meanings for homosocial interactions. Therefore, in their homosocial interactions, most of the participants tended to stigmatize and exclude the non-hegemonic masculinities that refused or were unable to internalize the traits of hegemonic masculinity. More specifically, three different forms of non-hegemonic masculinities have been identified in the current study. These masculinities are (with the participants’ words) *nonoşlar*, gay men; *mülaviptipler*, nice guys; *andropozlu dayılar*, uncles with Andropause. To start with, gay men are excluded from the homosocial groups because most of the participants claimed that gay men are not suitable for Turkish culture and gay men are bad role
models for the society since they portray homosexuality as normal. Almost all participants are opposed to homosexuality as they thought homosexuality is against human nature and they stated they found gay men disgusting because of this reason. Also, the way gay men dress, talk and even walk make some participants disturbed and annoyed. Therefore, they stigmatized gay men with insulting words such as “nonos,” “faggot,” “assgiver,” and “fudgepacker.” While some of the participants were stigmatizing gay men, I saw the hatred in their eyes. They were so intolerant to homosexuality and gay men that some of them even said they would kill gay men if they had a chance… Unfortunately, apart from verbal abuse, gay men were also subordinated through physical violence and sexual assaults. Some of the participants proudly narrated how they and their friends from the homosocial group bullied, kicked, beat and sexually abused gay men. Moreover, these participants said that they were supported by the members of their homosocial groups to mistreat gay men. The boy who was bullied at high school, the soldier who was harassed in the shower, the man whose nose was broken in Ibiza, a gay man whom one of the participants spit on, were all harshly insulted and physically damaged because their traits were not compatible with the traits of hegemonic masculinity and they “endanger” the masculine dignity. It can be understood from the narrations of the participants that as the participants hate gay men, their homosocial bonds get stronger because it is so clear that homophobia and hate speech against gay men and are perpetuated in the homosocial groups.

The second group that were strongly stigmatized and excluded from the homosocial groups consists of mülayim tipler, nice guys. The men stigmatized as mülayip tipler by the participants refuse to follow the traits of hegemonic masculinity such as dominance, aggression, and toughness. They are inoffensive, mild, and understanding men and they are also kind to everyone regardless of their sex, ethnicity, religion, and age. These traits are completely incompatible with the traits of hegemonic masculinity, thus, most of the participants expelled mülayim tipler from their homosocial interactions. Some of the participant particularly noted that they found mülayim tipler unnatural, “supposedly” kind and understanding because for them it is impossible for a “real” man to be understanding and kind to everyone. For example, according to these participants, a real man should not support women and LGBT individuals and their rights. However, mülayim tipler does. Therefore,
they were categorized as “supposedly” kind men by the participants. Participants also declared that mülayim tipler are their enemies because they are complicit in defending women and LGBT individuals’ rights instead of supporting “manly men.” They are very angry at mülayim tipler and the anger is totally the same with the grudge participants bear against gay men since mülayim tipler stand by women and LGBT individuals although they are heterosexuals. According to these participants, the reason behind “acting like a gentleman” is actually to get women’s attention and “throw them on the bed.” With the participants’ words, mülayim tipler insult the masculine pride for the sake of “chasing pussies.” Therefore, they were called as “pussy-whipped.” On the other hand, they were also stigmatized as “henpecked,” “cuckolds,” and “paper tigers.” At the end, some of the particularly noted that it is impossible for them to welcome these men to their homosocial interactions or initiate them into their homosocial group because mülayim tipler are not tough, aggressive, and dominant enough to be initiated to any homosocial groups. In short, according to participants mülayim tipler are not manly enough to be included in homosocial groups and they are merely source of stereotypical jokes and insults in homosocial interactions.

The last group which was stigmatized and expelled from the homosocial interactions includes elderly men. Before I started to conduct the interviews, I presumed that there would be some group of men who could be excluded by the members of the homosocial groups. However, I have never estimated that elderly men would be in the group who are stigmatized with insulting words by the participants because I have always thought that respect to elderly people is one of the fundamental social norms in Turkey. Nevertheless, when I asked the participants whom they do not include in their homosocial groups; they, without hesitation, said “elderly men.” The first reason why participants exclude elderly men from their homosocial interactions is “andro-pause” of elderly men’s masculinities and their position within the hegemonic order of the patriarchy. That is to say, according to participants, elderly men have already lost their physical and mental steadiness and sexual prowess and thus their power, prestige and status. Therefore, the elderly man who wears jeans, goes to gym, holds his wife’s hand in public, drinks alcohol and wants to have sex
was stigmatized with insulting words such as “moruk”, “battery outs,” “coffin dodgers,” “fuddy-duddies,” and “buffers,” by the participants because these habits and behaviors do not fit to the expectations from elderly men. Some of the participants especially called elderly men as Andropuzlu dayılar, uncles with Andropause, since they stated that andropause comprise all non-masculine traits in itself. At the end, Andropozulu dayılar are not counted as real men anymore by the participants. Therefore, they could not be the members of “hegemonic” homosocial groups since they could not meet the standard of hegemonic masculinity.

All in all, as far as I could understand, the reason behind the strong stigmatization and negation of non-hegemonic masculinities is the intolerance to different masculinities. There is a single type of masculinity for the participants and it is hegemonic masculinity. Also, on their minds, there is a prototype of a man tailored by the hegemonic masculinity. When participants come across different masculinities following non-hegemonic traits, they do not feel comfortable and safe because they think that these “different” men are potentially dangerous for their masculinity. They strongly stigmatize and negate non-hegemonic masculinities in order to minimize or eliminate the possibility of confronting different masculinity-ies. In their “secluded” homosocial settings or homosocial interactions in heterosocial settings, they constantly reproduce hate speech towards non-hegemonic masculinities and this collective hate and subordination unite them more. Thus, the more homosocial solidarity they have, the more hegemonic attitudes and behaviors they legitimize in their homosocial interactions.

6.2. Limitations of the Study and Recommendation for Future Studies

This study has some conceptual and methodological restrictions. Therefore, the findings of the current study must be evaluated in the light of these two main categories of limitations.

Firstly, in the current study, using the concept of homosociality is limited with “male” homosociality. That is to say, strong socials bonds between men have been examined. The main focus on male homosociality was purposive because my aim was to understand how male-male interactions affect hegemonic masculinity in

---

185 Old chap.
Turkey and explain how homosociality help men legitimize men’s dominance in the society. However, it does not mean that hegemonic masculinity can merely be understood through male homosociality. The concept of female homosociality can also be very effective to give meaning to the dynamics of hegemonic masculinity in Turkey. Therefore, the possible contributions of female-female peer relations to the construction and internalization of gender roles can be investigated by future research. More specifically, future research can question and examine the female homosocial settings such as Turkish hamam, matinee and kadınlar lokali, women’s clubhouse, and female homosocial interactions such as home gatherings in order to understand women’s role in perpetuating and/or resisting patriarchy.

On the other hand, in the current study, while understanding hegemonic masculinity through male homosociality, social bonds between alternative masculinities are not included. This means that the present study has been conducted by using the data coming from heterosexual men and their tight bonds. Therefore, the concept of homosociality used in the current study is limited with heterosexual homosociality, which can be regarded as reducing homosociality to a heteronormative term. Nevertheless, gay friendship, homosexual homosocial interactions and strong bonds between gay men can be the subject of the future studies. Examining the socializations of alternative forms of masculinities thus might prevent homosociality from being a heteronormative term.

The concept of homosociality has been used to give meaning to hegemonic masculinity and its contributions to the perpetuation of hegemonic masculinity have been examined in the current study. That’s why the use of homosociality is limited with its possible effects on hegemonic masculinity. However, strong bonds between men may not always perpetuate the traits of hegemonic masculinity such as aggression, strength and dominance. In contrast, it might create intimate male relationship which is not based on competition and hierarchy, and contribute to shoulder to shoulder brotherhood. Intimate and affectionate bonds between men might deconstruct the traditional understanding of homosociality. That is to say, in future studies, the concept of homosociality can be questioned and investigated in the context of “bromance” which is the combination of two words, “brother” and “romance.”
Secondly, in the current study, in order to better reveal how men in homosocial interactions experience hegemonic masculinity, I tried to conduct qualitative research. Among many data collection techniques in qualitative research, I preferred to conduct semi-structured in-depth interviews with 20 men who belong to a homosocial group because my aim was to explore every man’s individual experiences in their homosocial interactions. As the current study depends on a small sample size, it might be incapable of generalizing the findings, which is the common criticism of qualitative studies. That’s why more qualitative research with a larger sample size on the effects of homosocial interactions\textsuperscript{186} on hegemonic masculinity is necessary to ensure that men perpetuate the traits of hegemonic masculinity in their homosocial interactions. On the other hand, besides in-depth interviews, focus groups can be used to obtain multiple perspectives on how homosocial group members experience hegemonic masculinity. Even though the participants come from different homosocial backgrounds, focus group discussions can nurture the disclosure because men who belong to a homosocial group might feel more relaxed and share more in the homosocial environment provided by the moderator.

\textsuperscript{186} There have been many studies conducted on homosocial “settings” in Turkey. However, I particularly underline homosocial “interactions” because men can prefer to homo-socialize in heterosocial settings.
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B. INFORMED CONSENT FORM


Çalışmanın Amacı Nedir? Araştırmanın amacı çoğunlukla erkek erkeğe sosyalleşen erkeklerin kendi öznel deneyimlerini kendi ortamlarında nasıl anladıklarına ve tüm bu anlatıların Türkiye’deki hegemonik erkekliğe katkıına dair bilgi toplamaktır.

Bize Nasıl Yardımcı Olmanızı İsteyeceğiz? Araştırmaya katılma kararınızı verdiğinizde, sizden beklenen, araştırmacı tarafından yönlendirilen bir dizi soruyu yanıtlamanızdır. Bu çalışmaya katılım ortalama 45 dakika sürmektedir.


Araştırmayla ilgili daha fazla bilgi almak isteriniz: Bu çalışmaya katıldığınız için şimdiden teşekkür ederiz. Araştırmada hakkında daha fazla bilgi almak için Enver YUNUSOĞLU (E-posta: yunusogluenver@gmail.com) ile iletişim kurabilirsiniz.

Yukarıdaki bilgileri okudum ve bu çalışmaya tamamen gönülü olarak katıldığımı verir

(Formu doldurup imzaladıktan sonra uygulayıcıya geri veriniz).

İsim Soyad Tarih İmza
----/----/-----
C. SOCIODEMOGRAPHIC QUESTION FORM

Yaşınız : 
Eğitim durumunuz : ☐ İlkokul ☐ Ortaokul ☐ Lise ☐ Üniversite 
☐ Yüksek Lisans ☐ Doktora
Çalışıyor musunuz? ☐ Evet ☐ Hayır
Mesleğiniz : 
Gelir düzeyiniz : ☐ Düşük ☐ Orta ☐ Yüksek
Medeni durumunuz : 
Çocuğunuz var mı? ☐ Evet ☐ Hayır Evet ise kaç tane:
Şu anda yaşadığınız şehir:
Yaşamınızın büyük bir bölümünü nerede geçirdiniz? ☐ Köy ☐ Kasaba
☐ İlçe ☐ İl ☐ B. Şehir
1. Erkekliği nasıl tanımlarsınız?
2. Sizce bir erkeğin hayattaki rolü nedir?
3. Bir erkeği toplum gözye “erkek” yapan özellikler nelerdir?
4. Sizce hayatta tek tip erkeklik mi vardır? (Hayır ise, başka tip erkekliklerden bahsedebilir misiniz?)
5. Kadın erkek eşitliğine inanıyor musunuz?
6. Kadınlarla erkekler yakın arkadaş olabilir mi?
7. Erkek erkeğe takılmak sizin için ne ifade ediyor?
8. Kaç tane farklı erkek grubunuz var?
9. Erkek arkadaş grubunuzdaki/gruplarınızdaki kişilerle ne zamandan beri tanışıyoruz?
   • Nerede tanışınız?
   • Grubunuzda kaç kişi var?
10. Erkek erkeğe genellikle nerede buluşursunuz? (Erkek ortamı diye bir ortam var mıdır? Varsa özellikleri nelerdir?)
11. Erkek erkeğe sohbeti nasıl tanımlarsınız? Bu sohbette en çok nelerden bahsedersiniz?
12. Erkek grubunuzla beraberken neler yaparsınız? Beraber yapmayı en çok sevdiğiniz şeyler nelerdir?
13. Beraberken ne gibi paylaşmlarda bulunursunuz?
14. Erkek grubunuz içinde konuşmaya çekindiğiniz konular var mıdır? (Varsa nelerdir?)
15. Duygularınızı erkek grubunuzdaki arkadaşlarınızla paylaşır mısınız? (Ne gibi duygularınızı paylaşmayı tercih edersiniz? Ne gibi duygularınızı paylaşmaktan çekinirsiniz?)
16. Erkek grubunuzun kendi içerisinde grup alışkanlıkları var mıdır? (Varsa bunlar nelerdir?)
17. Grubunuzda yeni kimler dâhil olabilir? Grubunuzda katılma kısıtlamaları nelerdir?
18. Grubunuza kimler asla dâhil olamaz? Neden?

19. Çoğunlukla erkek erkeğe zaman geçirmenin sizin üzerinde yarattığı etkiler nelerdir?

20. Hayatınızı etkileyecək kararları alırken sürekli zaman geçirdiğiniz erkek arkadaş grubunuza danışır mı? (Erkek arkadaşlarınızın verdiği fikirler karar verme sürecinde etkiler mi? Evet ise, ne derece etkili olur?)

21. Erkek arkadaş grubunuz ile yaptığınız, konuştuğunuz veya tartıştığınız her şeyi onaylar mı? (Hayır ise, ne tür tutum ve davranışları onaylamazsınız? Bu tür tutum ve davranışlara tepkiniz ne olur?)

22. Sürekli görüşen bir erkek grubunun içerisinde bulunmak sizin için ne anlam ifade eder?

23. En nihayetinde erkek erkeğe takılmak size kendiizi nasıl hissettir?

24. Karma bir grupla takılmak size erkek erkeğe takılmının yerini tutar mı? (Tutar ise size ne gibi katkıları olur?)
Bu araştırma daha önce de belirtildiği gibi Atılım Üniversitesi Öğretim Görevlisi ve ODTÜ Toplumsal Cinsiyet ve Kadın Çalışmaları Bölümü yüksek lisans öğrencisi Enver YUNUSOĞLU tarafından yürütülen bir çalışmadır. Çalışmanın amacı erkeğe sosyalleşmenin/takılmanın katılımcılara olan katkılarını kendi kelimeleri ile ifade edebilmelerine olanak sağlamaktır.

Bu amaçla katılımcılara bir dizi soru sorulmuştur. Bu sorulara verilen yanıtlar ışığında, çoğunlukla hemcinsleriyle sosyalleşen heteroseksüel erkeklerin yaşadıkları homo-sosyal ortamlarda birbirlerini, hayat görüşlerini ve karar verme süreçlerini etkileyip etkiledikleri anlaşılmasına çalışılacaktır. Bunun yanı sıra, homo-sosyal ilişkilerin Türkiye’deki geleneksel cinsiyet rollerini pekiştirdiği ve dolayısıyla Türkiye’deki hegemonik erkeklik olgusuna katkı sağladığı sonucuna ulaşmak planlanmaktadır.


Araştırmının sonuçlarını öğrenmek ya da daha fazla bilgi almak için aşağıdaki isimlere başvurabilirsiniz.

Prof. Dr. F. Yıldız ECEVİT (E-posta: ecevity@metu.edu.tr)
Öğr. Gör. Enver YUNUSOĞLU (E-posta: yunusogluenver@gmail.com)

Çalışmaya katkıda bulunan bir görevli olarak katılımcı haklarınızla ilgili veya etik ilkelerle ilgi soru veya görüşlerinizi ODTÜ Uygulamalı Etik Araştırma Merkezi’ne iletebilirsiniz.
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1. Çalışmanın Arka Planı

Homososyalite, aynı cinsiyetten kişilerin özellikle erkeklerin aralarında herhangi bir romantik veya cinsel ilişki olmadan sürdürdüğü sosyalleşme biçimi olarak tanımlanabilir. 1975 yılında Jean Lipman-Blumen tarafından ortaya atılan homososyalite terimi, erkeklerin özellikle kendi cinsiyetlerinden kişilerin arkadaşlıkları üzerine odaklanmıştır. Lipman-Blumen (1975), erkeklerin “erkek” alanı olarak tanımladıkları iş, spor, politika ekonomi gibi alanlarda kadınları istememeleri üzerine yazdığı makalesinde, erkeklerin kendi alanlarında sıkı sıkı ilişkilerde olması ve çoğu zaman erkek erkeğe ilişkiler arayışında olma çabalarının aslında uyguladıkları esit olmayan pratikleri meşrulaştırmak ve kadınların “erkek” alanlarındaki “düşük” statüsünü pekiştirmek olabileceğinin altını çizmiştir.


1. Erkekler arasındaki kuvvetli homososyal ilişkiler Türkiye’de hegemonik erkekliği nasıl etkiler?
2. Türkiye’deki erkeklikler homososyalite tarafından nasıl etkilenir?

1.2. Çalışmanın Amacı ve Önemi

Bu çalışma homososyalite kavramını kullanarak hegemonik erkekliği anlamaya çalışmaktadır. Erkek erkeğe sosyalleşmenin/takılmanın, erkekler arasındaki güç ilişkilerini nasıl etkilediği ve kadın ve erkek arasında olduğu kadar erkeklerin kendi aralarındaki eşitsizliklere olması katkıları üzerinde durulmaya çalışılmıştır. Bu yüzden, bu çalışmada Türkiye’deki erkeklerin neden ve nasıl homososyal bağlar kurmaya çalışıklarını ve kurdukları bu bağlar sayesinde hegemonik erkekliğin belli başlı özelliklerinin nasıl yeniden üretilip pekiştirildiğini göstermeye amaçlamaktadır.
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TEORİK ÇERÇEVE

2.1. Erkeklik Çalışmaları


2.2. Hegemonik Erkeklik

Ataerkillik ile kıyaslandığında, hegemonik erkeklik daha dinamik bir kavramdır çünkü kendisini zamana, mekana ve kültüre göre çevirebilme yetisine sahiptir (Connell, 2005). Bu yüzden hegemonik erkeklik toplumsal cinsiyet çalışmalarında kullanılan vazgeçilme bir kavramdır.


Bu çalışmada hegemonik erkeklik homososyal ilişkiler vasıtasıyla pekiştirilen bir kavram olarak ortaya çıkmıştır. Ayrıca hegemonik erkeklik, bu erkekliğin özellikleri taşımayan veya taşımayı reddeden farklı erkekleri damgalayan ve dışlayan bir mekanizma olarak kendisini göstermektedir.
3.1. Profeminist Araştırmalar

Kadınlar tarafından, kadınlar hakkında ve kadınlar için yapılan feminist araştırmalar, farklı zaman, mekân ve seviyelerde oluşan toplumsal cinsiyet eşitsizliğini ortaya çıkarmıştır. Bu feminist araştırmalar çoğunlukla feminist kadın araştırmacılarca gerçekleştirilmişdir. Feminist bakış açısıyla erkek araştırmalarca erkekler hakkında yapılan çalışmalar görece daha azdır (Robertson, 2006).

Pro-feminist bir araştırma yapmak çeşitli metodolojik sorunları doğursa da, tüm erkeklerin hegemonik erkekliğin özelliklerini taşımadığı dolayısıyla hegemonik erkekliğin inşası ve pekiştirilmesinde rol oynamadığı göz önünde tutularak, yine de profeminist bir çalışma yapmak mümkün olabilir. Yani feminist ve patriarka karşıtı bilgi, hegemonik erkekliğin öğretiklerini kabul etmeyen erkekler tarafından üretilebilir. Bu bağlamda, pro-feminist bir araştırma önem kazanabilir çünkü bu tip bir araştırma ataerkilliğe karşı durmayı sağlayabilir aynı zamanda erkeklerin toplumdaki ayrıcalıklı pozisyonlarını değiştirebilir.


3.2 Araştırmaya Deseni ve Prosedür

Homososyalitenin hegemonik erkekliği nasıl etkilediğini anlamak için sıklıkla homososyal etkileşimde bulunan erkeklerle bir nitel araştırma yapılmıştır. Birçok veri toplama yöntemleri arasından, erkeklerin homososyal ilişkilerini daha yakından anlamak için, yarı yapılandırılmış derinlemesine görüşmele r görülmüş ve veri analizi için tematik analiz yöntemi kullanılmıştır.


3.3 Katılımcılar

Katılımcıların yaşları 24 ile 40 yaş arasındaşdır. 1 katılımcı dışında tüm katılımcılar Türkiye’de doğmuş ve yetişmiştir. Bahsi geçen katılımcı ise Almanya’da doğmuş
ancak Türkiye’de büyümüştür. Her bir katılımcı en az bir homososyal gruba sahiptir. 20 katılımcıdan 7’si, birden fazla homososyal gruba sahiptir.

3.4. Tematik Analiz

Veriler içerisindeki temaları bulmak, analiz etmek ve raporlamak için tematik analiz yöntemi kullanılmıştır. Veri analizinde verilere aşina olma, başlangıç kodları oluşturma, tema arama, temaları gözden geçirme, temaları tanımlama ve rapor oluşturuma gibi tematik analize ait altı aşama kullanılmıştır (Braun & Clarke, 2006).
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HEGEMONİK ERKEKLİĞİN PEKİŞTİRİLMESİ

Erkekler bir araya geldiklerinde hegemonik erkekliğin belli başlı özelliklerini pekiştirirler (Bird, 1996; Flood, 2008). Bu çalışmada yer alan katılımcıların kendi homososyal gruplarıyla bir araya geldiklerinde hegemonik erkekliğin şu özelliklerini pekiştirdikleri ortaya çıkmıştır: (1) Duygusal metanet, (2) Heteroseksüel hüner ve (3) Çelişik Duygulu Cinsiyetçilik.

4.1. Duygusal Metanet


4.2. Heteroseksüel Hüner


4.3. Çelişik Duygulu Cinsiyetçilik
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HEGEMONİK OLMAYAN ERKEKLİKLERİN DAMGALANMASI VE DIŞLANMASI

Araştırmada, katılımcıların çoğunun, erkek erkeğe “takıldıkları” zamanlarda hegemonik erkekliğin belli başlı özelliklerini pekiştirmek dışında hegemonik
老百姓an erkeklikleri damgaladıkları ve dışladıkları gösterilmiştir. Katılımcıların
damgaladıkları ve dışladıkları erkekler, kendi deyimleriyle, (1) Nonoşlar, (2)
Mülayim Tipler (3) Andropozlu Dayılar olarak sıralanabilir. Katılımcılar hegemonik
erkeklik özelliklerine uymayan veya bu özellikleri reddeden bu erkeklikleri kati
surette kendi homososyal grupları içerisinde görmek istemediklerini belirmişlerdir.

5.1. Nonoşlar
Katılımcılar, “grubunuza kimler giremez, kimleri almazsınız” sorusu sorulduğunda,
20 katılımcının 19’u tereddütsüz bir şekilde homoseksüel erkekleri gruplarına kabul
etmeyeceklerini belirmişlerdir. Bunun için iki sebep sunmuşlardır. Katılımcılar göre,
bunlardan ilki gey erkeklerin homoseksüel olmalarıdır. Katılımcılar için
homoseksüellik, insan fıtrata aykırı olup hegemonik erkekliğin özellikleriyle taban
tabana zıttır. Bu sebeple, homoseksüel erkekler “nonoş,” “yaratık,” “kırıtık,” “ibne,”
götveren” gibi aşağılayıcı sözlerle damgalanmışlardır. Katılımcıların çoğu göre
ikinci sebep ise, homoseksüel erkeklerin, homoseksüelliği normal bir davranışı olarak
göstermek suretiyle topluma kötü örnek olmalarıdır.

Heteroseksüellik hegemonik erkekliğin en önemli özelliklerinden biridir (Connell,
1995; Jewkes et al., 2015). Dolayısıyla, katılımcıların çoğu homoseksüel erkekleri
“gerçek” erkek kategorisinde görmedikleri için onları kendi homososyal
gruplarından dışlamakta ve de homoseksüel erkeklerle hareket etmekte bir beis
görmezler. Katılımcılarдан bazıları görüşmeler sırasında homoseksüel erkeklerden
bahsederken tahammülsüzlik söylemelerini zaman zaman nefret söylemi ve
homofobiye dönüşmüşlerdir. Bu katılımcılarдан bazıları homoseksüel erkeklerle
sert hakaretler dışında fiziksel şiddet ve tacizde bulunduklarını gururla
anlatmışlardır. Katılımcılar birisi bir kafe'de gey bir erkeğin burnunun kırıldığı,
diger bir katılımcı askerde gey bir erkeği tertipleryle beraber banyoda
“kıstırdıklarını,” başka bir katılımcı ise lisedeyken gey bir oğlu dövdüklerini
gururla anlatmıştır. Aynı katılımcılar tüm bunları yaparken arkalarında
arkadaşlarının olduğundan, -hatta bazılarını beraber yaptıklarından-, onlardan hep
destek gördüklerinden ve doğru yanlış ne yaparlarsa yaparlar ve yaparlarsa
arkadaşlarının olduğundan bahsetmiyorlardı.
Kısacası, sadece bir katılımcı dışında tüm katılımcılar homoseksüel erkekleri homososyal etkileşimlerinde “hoş” karşılamayacaklarını söylemişlerdir. Homososyal ortamlar veya etkileşimlerden dışlamak dışında, gey erkekleri kendi homososyal ilişkileri içerisinde nefret söylemi ile anarlar. Araştırmanın sonuçları, katılımcıların kendi aralarındaki homososyal bağları gey erkekleri damgalayıp dışlayarak güçlendirdiğini göstermiştir.

5.2. Mülayim Tipler

Mülayim kelimesi TDK (Türk Dil Kurumu) Sözlüğünde göre, “yumuşak huylu” anlamına gelmektedir. Mülayim insan ise genel olarak yumuşak mızıçlı, nazik, kolay anlaşılabilir ve uzlaşılabilir olarak tanımlanabilir, ancak katılımcıdan bazıları bu tanımlamayı bazı “tip” erkekleri kinayeli bir şekilde anmak için kullanmışlardır.

Katılımcıdan birkaçı sessiz, sakin, nazik erkekleri “mülayim tipler” olarak tanımlamışlardır. Bu katılımcılar mülayim erkekler yerine “mülayim tipler” tamlamasını tercih etmişlerdir çünkü mülayim olarak adlandırılan bu erkekler onlar göre “gerçek” erkek değildir.

erkeklerin grup dinamikleri negatif etkileyeceği ve grup elemanlarını yanlış yönlendirebileceğinden bahsetmiştir. Araştırmanın sonuçlarına göre, mülâyım tipler sert bir şekilde damgalanmış ve de homososyal gruplara dışlanmıştır.

5.3. Andropozlu Dayılar
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SONUÇ

6.1. Genel Değerlendirme

Araştırmanın sonuçları, homososyalitenin hegemonik erkeklik üzerindeki etkilerinin oldukça büyük olduğunu göstermektedir. En az bir homososyal gruba ait erkekler, homososyal etkileşimlerinde hegemonik erkekliğin belli başlı özellikleri pekiştirmektedirler. Ayrıca, bu erkekler hegemonik olmayan erkeklikleri damgalamakta ve aralarından dışlamaktadırlar.


Sonuç olarak, katılımcılar kendileri gibi olmayan kimseyi aralarında istememektedir. Katılmcılar için sadece hegemonik erkeklik özelliklerini taşıyan erkekler sosyalleşmeye değerdir. Farklı tip erkekleri kendi erkeklerini bozacak veya değiştirecek potansiyel olarak tehlikeli göremektedirler. Farklı erkekliklere karşı o kadar tahammüsüzlüklerdir ki onları dışlamannın yanı sıra bir de aşağılayıcı sözlerle damgalamaktadırlar. Kendi homososyal etkileşimleri içerisinde ne kadar çok
hegemonik erkekliği pekiştirirlerse, o kadar çok paylaşacak şey bulurlar. Kendi homososyal etkileşimleri içerisinde kadınları ve farklı erkeklikleri ne kadar çok damgalarlarsa, homososyal bağlantıları o kadar kuvvetli olur.

6.2. Çalışmanın Sınırlıkları ve Sonraki Çalışmalar için Öneriler

Bu çalışmanın kavramsal ve metodolojik sınırlılıkları bulunmaktadır. Bu çalışmada homososyalite konsepti sadece erkek homososyalitesi olarak ele alınmıştır. Erkek erkeğe takılmının ve çoğu zaman erkek erkeğe zaman geçirmenin hegemonik erkekliğe olası etkilerini anlamak için özellikle erkek homososyalitesi incelenmiştir ancak Türkiye’deki hegemonik erkeklik dinamiklerini anlayabilmek için kadın homososyalitesi de incelenebilir. Hegemonik erkeklik özelliklerinin üretildiği ve içselleştirilmesinde kadın kadına etkileşimler sonraki çalışmalar tarafından konu edilebilir.

Öte yandan, hegemonik erkekliği homososyalite kavramı vasıtasıyla anlamaya çalışırken, alternatif erkekliklerin homososyal etkileşimleri çalışılmamıştır. Diğer bir deyişle, bu çalışmada sadece kendini heteroseksüel olarak tanımlayan erkeklerin arasındaki kuvvetli bağlar incelemiştir ki bu da homososyalite kavramını heteronormatif bir terime indirgemektedir. Bu sebeple, sonraki çalışmalar homoseksüel homososyal etkileşimleri ve gey arkadaşları konu edilebilir ve böylece homososyalite kavramını heteronormatif bir konsept olmaktan kurtarabilir.

Homososyalite konsepti ile alakalı bir diğer kavramsal sınırlılık, homososyalite kavramının hegemonik erkeklik özellikleri pekiştiren bir kavram olarak ele alınmasıdır. Erkek erkeğe takılmak sadece hegemonik erkekliğin özelliklerinden olan agresiflik, heteroseksüellik, tahakküm vd. özelliklerini pekiştirmeyebilir. Tersine, kuvvetli bağların bulunduğu arkadaşlıklar ve rekabete dayalı dostluklar yerine omuz omuza dostlukları ele alabilir.

Çalışmanın metodolojik kısıtlılığı ise yürütülen nitel araştırmanın doğası gereği ortaya çıkan bir takım sınırlılıklarla alakalıdır. Çalışma 20 kişilik küçük bir örneklemle ile yürütülmüştür. Bu küçük örneklemle elde edilen sonuçlar hakkında genellemek oldukça güçtür ki bu da nitel araştırmayı yöneltiilen yaygın eleştirilerden biridir. Dolayısıyla, homososyal etkileşimler üzerine daha büyük örneklem kullanan
nitel araştırmalar yapılabilir, böylece homososyalitenin hegemonik erkekliği pekiştirdiği genellemesi yapılabilir.

Öte yandan, homososyal grupların hegemonik erkekliği nasıl deneyimlediğini anlamak için, derinlemesine görüşmelerin yanı sıra, yine nitel araştırmanın metotlarından olan odak grup metodu da kullanılabilir. Katılımcılar farklı homososyal çevrelerden gelseler de, odak grup içerisinde zaten alışık oldukları erkek erkekeğe muhabbet ve homososyalleşme sayesinde düşüncelerini daha kolay açığa vurabilirler.
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