Men and Masculinities at Play: The *Halı Saha* Football in İstanbul

Kadir Engil

A thesis presented to the

Atatürk Institute for Modern Turkish History
at Boğaziçi University

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

May 2019

Approvals

"Men and Masculinities at Play: The *Halı Saha* Football in İstanbul," a thesis prepared by Kadir Engil in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts from the Atatürk Institute for Modern Turkish History at Boğaziçi University, has been approved on 2 May 2019 by:

THESIS ADVISOR

Associate Professor Z. Umut Türem _____
Atatürk Institute for Modern Turkish History
Boğaziçi University

COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Associate Professor Berna Yazıcı _____
Atatürk Institute for Modern Turkish History
Boğaziçi University

Assistant Professor Yağmur Nuhrat _____
Sociology
İstanbul Bilgi University

Abstract

"Men and Masculinities at Play: The Halı Saha Football in İstanbul"

Kadir Engil, Master's Candidate at the Atatürk Institute
for Modern Turkish History at Boğaziçi University, 2019

Associate Professor Z. Umut Türem, Thesis Advisor

This thesis investigates halı saha as one of the main spaces where homosocialization among heteromasculine men takes place in the urban context of İstanbul. It specifically focuses on young men with urban, secular and middle-class backgrounds, and explores the general patterns and main dynamics in their relations with each other on and through halı sahas in their social milieu. It regards halı saha as a masculinized and heterosexualized space where these relations are crystallized in certain forms and where particular subjectivities are constituted and performed. It argues that homosocial relations of men, in general, are based on two essential dynamics: competition and bonding. In these relations, a strategical way to balance the simultaneous and seemingly conflicting co-existence of competition and bonding is the practice of teasing which, both requires rivalry and intimacy and prevents unwanted consequences of too much rivalry and too much intimacy. In the meantime, the thesis describes and analyzes the mainstream halı saha football on the basis of four important elements in the halı saha football – organization, squads, jerseys and goalkeeping – which are presented as processes where relations of power, rivalry and cooperation become more visible. Before discussing these dynamics and processes through autoethnographic data, halı sahas are sociologically contextualized, a theoretical and conceptual framework for the understanding of men and masculinities is presented, and the dimension of gender in sports and football is examined. The thesis ultimately questions the possibility and political significance of a more equal and inclusive halı saha football.

45,000 words

Özet

"Erkekler ve Erkeklikler Oyunda: İstanbul'da Halı Saha Futbolu"

Kadir Engil, Yüksek Lisans Adayı, 2019
Boğaziçi Üniversitesi Atatürk İlkeleri ve İnkılap Tarihi Enstitüsü

Doçent Z. Umut Türem, Tez Danışmanı

Bu tez, İstanbul'un kentsel bağlamında heteromaskülen erkekler arasında gerçekleşen homososyalleşmenin önemli mekânlarından birisi olan halı sahayı inceliyor. Odak noktası, kentli, seküler ve orta sınıftan genç erkekler ve bu erkekler arasında kendi sosyal alanlarındaki halı sahalar dolayımıyla kurulan ilişkilerin genel tezahürleri ve temel dinamikleri. Tez, halı sahayı, bu ilişkilerin belirli formlar halinde görünür olduğu, aynı zamanda da belli başlı öznelliklerin kurulduğu ve icra edildiği maskülenleştirilmiş ve heteroseksüelleştirilmiş bir mekân olarak ele alıyor. Tezin iddiası, erkekler arasındaki homososyal ilişkilerde genel olarak iki temel dinamiğin olduğu: rekabet ve bağlılık. Bu ilişkilerde rekabet ve bağlılığın eş zamanlı ve çatışmalı birlikteliğini dengeleyerek mümkün kılan stratejik bir yöntemse (şaka yoluyla) kızdırma edimi. Kızdırma, bir yandan yarışmayı ve yakınlığı gerekli kılarken, diğer yandan aşırı yarışmanın ve aşırı yakınlığın doğurabileceği istenmeyen sonuçları da engelliyor. Ayrıca, tez, halı saha futbolunu dört temel unsur üzerinden betimliyor ve analiz ediyor: organizasyon, kadrolar, formalar ve kalecilik. Bu unsurlar, iktidar, rekabet ve iş birliği ilişkilerinin halı sahada görünür olduğu noktalar olarak sunuluyor. Tüm bu dinamikleri ve süreçleri otoetnografik veriler aracılığıyla tartışmak için öncelikli olarak halı saha sosyolojik bir bağlama oturtuluyor, erkeklerin ve erkekliklerin ele alınmasına dair teorik ve kavramsal bir çerçeve sunuluyor ve genel olarak sporun, özel olarak da futbolun toplumsal cinsiyet boyutu tartışmaya açılıyor. Nihai olarak, daha kapsayıcı ve eşitlikçi bir halı saha futbolunun ihtimali ve politik anlamı sorgulanıyor.

45.000 kelime

Table of Contents

Abbreviations and Acronyms *xi*
Acknowledgements *xii*

1 INTRODUCTION 1

1.1 Glossary 7
1.2 Methodology 8
1.3 A Short History of (Men's) Football 10
1.4 Contextualizing *Halı Saha* 14

2 MEN AND MASCULINITIES 23

2.1 Critical Studies on Men and Masculinities 23
2.2 Theorization and Conceptualization of Men and Masculinities 31
2.3 Homosocialization and Spatiality 41

3 MEN, MASCULINITIES, SPORTS AND FOOTBALL 53

3.1 Sports, Gender, Politics 53
3.2 Football, Masculinity, Politics 69

4 MEN, MASCULINITIES, AND THE *HALI SAHA* FOOTBALL 79

4.1 The Attractiveness of *Halı Saha* 79
4.2 *Halı Saha* as a Homosocial Space 82
4.3 Homosocialization through *Halı Saha* 88
4.4 Mainstream *Halı Saha* Football 106
4.5 Queering the Field: An Alternative *Halı Saha* Football 119

5 CONCLUSION 127

APPENDICES 132

A The Interviewees 132
B The Interviewees and *Halı Saha* 133
C District-based Numbers of *Halı Sahas* 134
D *Halı Sahas*, Municipalities, and Average House Prices 136
E *Halı Sahas* and Socio-Economic Indexes 138

BIBLIOGRAPHY 141

Abbreviations and Acronyms

AKP	Adalet ve Kalkınma Partisi / Justice and Development Party
CHP	Cumhuriyet Halk Partisi / Republican People's Party
CİMER	Cumhurbaşkanlığı İletişim Merkezi / Communications Center of the Presidency
CUP	Committee of Union and Progress / İttihat ve Terakki Cemiyeti
FIFA	Fédération Internationale de Football Association
IAAF	International Association of Athletics Federation
IOC	International Olympic Committee
İBB	İstanbul Büyükşehir Belediyesi / İstanbul Metropolitan Municipality
MHP	Milliyetçi Hareket Partisi / Nationalist Movement Party
MP	Mini-football pitch
TÜİK	Türkiye İstatistik Kurumu / Turkish Statistical Institute

Acknowledgements

This thesis would not have been possible without the support, confidence, encouragement, contribution and guidance of my committee members, mentors, instructors, colleagues, respondents, friends and family members. It is impossible to mention all of these people or state all the ways they contributed to my study. I would like to gratefully acknowledge at least some of them.

First and foremost, I am deeply indebted to my thesis advisor Z. Umut Türem who patiently and carefully read many drafts of my work, gave thorough feedbacks, and helped me move on in the right direction, revise my arguments and consider issues I failed to notice beforehand. I am sincerely grateful to Yağmur Nuhrat who contributed invaluably to this thesis by guiding advices, insightful feedbacks and useful resources since its initial stages. I owe special thanks to Berna Yazıcı who very generously accepted to be one of my committee members and provided enriching critiques and profound suggestions.

I would like to express my gratitude to Veysi T. Kondu whose intellectual guidance not only provided me with a more critical social scientific understanding but also helped me deepen and mature my thinking ethically, politically and intellectually since I was a first-year undergraduate student. I am likewise grateful to Murat Özbank, Besim F. Dellaloğlu and Hakan Batur. They were helpful and inspiring mentors during my undergraduate years. I am thankful also to Cengiz Kırlı, Seda Altuğ, Duygu Köksal, M. Asım Karaömerlioğlu and Abbas Vali. I have been fortunate to benefit from their insightful courses as a graduate student. Additionally, I extend my thanks to Kadriye Aksoy, Dilek Tecirli, Leyla Kılıç and all laborers at Boğaziçi University for their tireless efforts which made my academic life easier.

I owe a great debt also to Deniz Nihan Aktan, Barış Güçlü and Tracy M. Lord. They read many pieces of this work, gave profound feedbacks, made enriching suggestions and helped me about my theoretical and terminological problems. Hande Erdem Möbius, Özge Altın, Mustafa Can Helvacı, Seyda Can Yılmaz, Mete Ulutaş, Can Evren, Mehmet Emin Boyacıoğlu, Remzi Altunpolat and Çınar Oskay contributed to this thesis in various ways. I sincerely thank them all. I would also like to thank Aybil Göker and Cansu Bakar for they

provided me with opportunities to gain practical experience in conducting fieldwork. I am deeply grateful to my interviewees who shared their time with me and patiently answered my endless questions. Unfortunately I cannot address them directly due to anonymity concerns. My special thanks go to Uğur Vardan, İbrahim Altınsay, Bağış Erten and Ümit Kıvanç for their generosity and willingness to share their time, opinions and advices with me in initial stages of my research.

I am grateful to my friends who always supported, encouraged and motivated me. I would like to thank especially Dina Hongell, Duygu Yıldız, Mustafa Akay, Elif Taşyürek, Mehmet Can Tunca, Gökçe Yeniev, Kıvılcım Değirmencioğlu, Ahmet Furkan Baş, Şeniz Öztorun, Süleyman Can Çelik, Esra Hızır, Mert Kaya, Kazım Kıyan, Samet Özer, Elif Bekler, Didar Karadağ, "Sisyphus", Yeter Tan, and my teammates from Karşı Radyo FC and the anonymous queer football community I mention in this thesis.

Last but not least, I am greatly indebted to my parents Leyla and İrfan Engil for their unconditional support and trust. They have always pushed me pursue my interests and ideals. I am foremost grateful to Gizem Dal who has patiently and supportively accompanied me not only throughout my research process but in every aspect of my life.

1

Introduction

Halı saha is a type of football field which may be come across anytime, anywhere in İstanbul.[1] A green field surrounded by high wire fences is easy to recognize. Goals on two sides, white lines on the surface and bright lamps at the top complete the landscape. Noise of people playing on the field sometimes accompanies this visuality. At first glance, these people may seem to run from pillar to post for no reason. However, people familiar with football and this environment would catch the dynamics at play. And all these dynamics would be more significant for critical eyes.

Halı sahas have so far been disregarded to a large extent in the intellectual contemplation in general, let alone the academy. These fields are, in fact, products of social, political, economic and cultural changes in Turkey. For this very reason, they also provide valuable materials speaking to these social, political, economic and cultural issues. Because *halı sahas* function as one of the most popular and prominent homosocial spaces of men in İstanbul, above all, they are worthy of critical examination in terms of masculinity.

I have been personally playing football for as long as I can remember. It was the main medium for socializing among *boys*, and I did socialize as a *boy.* During my childhood, in addition to streets, school yards, parks, some dirt and concrete fields, I sometimes played football also on *halı sahas* – albeit

1 By football, I refer to association football throughout the thesis.

much less often, because it required a payment. *Halı sahas* were already popular in İstanbul when I was a child in the 1990s and I was not aware yet that they appeared only in the previous decade. As I grew up, it was no longer possible or practical for me and my peers to play in streets, school yards or parks; and there were no longer accessible dirt or concrete fields around. Nor were there any grass or artificial grass fields which were free of charge. Therefore, *halı sahas* became main spaces to play football for me and my peers.

Also, I have been personally struggling against masculinity for as long as I can remember. My body was assigned as *male* at my birth, I was treated and raised that way, socialized as a *boy* and internalized hegemonic norms of masculinity. Yet, although I was unable to make sense of my experiences as a child, I always struggled in relations with other boys. Because I was "softer" and more "considerate" than I was expected, I was mocked, nicknamed and bullied often especially by older boys. I was not a pure victim though. I generally coped with such situations somehow, negotiated with gender norms, swore and fought when required. I sometimes even imitated the ways I suffered, and mocked, nicknamed or bullied some other boys to some extent when I felt powerful. In these relations, football functioned as a way in my life to be "stronger", to be recognized, respected and appreciated by my peers, older boys and men.

As I started studying at the university, I also started making sense of my negative experiences in homosocial relations and homosocial spaces as well as my struggles against masculinity. *Halı saha* was no exception. Throughout my BA and MA education, I was usually preoccupied with gender, with football, and with the relation between them in my daily life. Ultimately I came up with the idea of investigating the patterns and dynamics in men's homosocialization on and through *halı sahas*. It would be a self-examination as well as an intellectual and academic one.

Indeed, while I was doing this research I experienced something unpleasant which reaffirmed the intersection of football and masculinity through *halı saha* for me in my personal life. I would like to share this short anecdote which helped me, I believe, to understand the functioning dynamics of men's homosocial relations more thoroughly. One reason I prefer to share it is that this anecdote concretely exemplifies how masculinities and football can intersect

on and through *halı saha*. Moreover, as it has been emphasized repeatedly and in many contexts by feminists, I believe in the principle that *the personal is political* and what I personally experienced actually has a broader social and political significance. This principle also implies that "subjective experience is not only structured by existing political arrangements, but effects and structures those arrangements in turn" (Butler, 2003, p. 418).

The story started in 2012 when one of my colleagues invited me to play in a *halı saha* match with him and his friends. Then, I regularly played within that group for more than five years. Whenever we needed new players, I also invited some people that I knew. In this way, some of my older friends joined permanently to the group. I also met and became friends with many new people to various extents. Our friendships were not limited to football or match days. We chatted, met and spent time together in our daily lives, too. Our common grounds were rather non-political, and there were only a few people with whom I could comfortably talk about ethico-political issues.

There was also a WhatsApp group for the in-group communication. It was not only for football-related or organizational issues. It was actively used for many daily topics – in a *manly* way though. There was a vast usage of swear words, and of images, "jokes" and comments referring to sexuality. Beside sexism, there had already been some examples of homophobia. These were mainly the use of homophobic offensive words and some so-called "jokes". One day, after I witnessed a new example of homophobia I felt obliged to say something.

This new example was displayed by a man via sharing a video of himself where he made a spectacular defensive move in a match and saying "Whoever doesn't like this video is gay". This man had rarely played football within the group, but had been active in the WhatsApp group conversations, mainly by trying to crack "jokes". I wrote a message to the group, criticized such usages, said that I sometimes felt personally offended, and asked them to be more

sensitive and cautious because there were members from different social backgrounds, political views and ethical positions. I paid attention not to target anyone personally, but to emphasize an ethico-political standpoint.[2]

This intervention would end up with my separation from the group. Some members interpreted the case of homophobia as a "freedom of speech", some used the situation for driveling, some cracked further "jokes", and some argued that it was not a proper place to discuss on politics. Encouraged by these reactions, the agent of homophobic words then proudly self-identified as "homophobic". Jokes and drivel continued. I shared my disappointment with them and left the group. The most interesting part for me was that although there were many people whom I regarded as my friends nobody other than two persons ever contacted me again.

Eventually I understood that the general impression was that I acted in an "oversensitive" way. In other words, many men in the group did not really disapprove sexism or homophobia in their lives. It might also be related to the fear of conflicting with other men in the group and being labeled as "oversensitive", "gay" or "feminine" which could end up with their exclusion from the group, and, hence, losing the privileges of homosocialization through football.

Moreover, after a while, I noticed that there was a line between what was *speakable* and what was *unspeakable* in the group which, I believe, can be generalized to men's homosocial relations elsewhere. I, as an "oversensitive" person, had generally been a constant threat to the *unspeakable*, and been a source of unwanted criticism and self-control. In this sense, I had been acting against the very reason why men feel "comfortable" in such groupings as we will discuss later on.

I regard this personal anecdote as an example of how "[s]mall facts speak to large issues" (Geertz, 1973, p. 23). I believe that it speaks to relations in men's homosocial groupings in a broader social context. Directly or indirectly, such groups almost always impose the normative patterns of masculinity. Those who do not meet the expected hegemonic norms of masculinity have to find

2 This ethico-political standpoint I personally refer to is a never-ending process always in theoretical, moral, discursive and practical search of an ideal egalitarian life. It is against any kind of discrimation and exploitation – such as class-based, sexist, cis-sexist, heterosexist, racist, agist, ableist and speciesist.

some ways of negotiation – such as keeping quiet, ignoring or laughing off – to exist in such groups because they may any time be insulted, mocked, silenced, marginalized or excluded, even if they have friendly relations on and off the field with other men. Power of hegemonic norms is embedded in relations among men, and it also functions in silence and complicity. And until the incident, my existence in the group had in part depended on a kind of silence and complicity as well because I mostly ignored and "tolerated" previous examples of sexism, homophobia and transphobia. I somehow negotiated with them. Besides, the group "tolerated" my existence as a variance unless I crossed the line and insisted on it.[3]

Hence, to repeat, this thesis is not an outcome of a mere intellectual or academic interest; it is a self-examination and self-interpretation as much as a sociological research. In this sense, above all, I investigated the milieu I have been more familiar with – that is urban, secular and middle-class. To specify, this thesis is about young men in their twenties and thirties – who self-identify as cisgender and heteromasculine. More specifically, it is about such men with urban, secular and middle-class backgrounds. What I investigate is, above all, homosocial relations and dynamics among these men. In this regard, I look at *halı saha* as a space where these relations and dynamics are crystallized in certain forms through football. Considering the popularity of football in Turkey on the one hand and the importance of the homosocial and spatial dynamics in the construction and expression of male subjectivities on the other hand, in this thesis, I argue that *halı saha* serves as a space for these men, first, to constitute and perform particular subjectivities in relation with each other; second, simultaneously compete and bond with each other; and, third, regulate power relations among themselves.

For this purpose, this chapter will continue with a short glossary of words and concepts I make use of throughout the thesis (1.1), with some basic information about the methodology of the research (1.2), then, with a brief history of (men's) football (1.3), and, lastly, with the contextualization *halı saha* his-

3 I think I always had a "deviant" position within the group due to my critical distance from mainstream and normative sets of thoughts and behaviors in terms of masculinity, politics and morals.

torically and socio-economically (1.4). In this way, I hope to describe the conceptual and methodological ground of this study and to present the sociological and historical significance of football and *halı saha*.

The second chapter will include a short history of the Critical Studies on Men and Masculinities as a distinct field of study, and a short review of its literature (2.1). It will be followed by a further focus on theoretical and conceptual discussions on gender to elaborate and justify the conceptual and theoretical framework I adopt and use throughout this study (2.2). On the basis of these discussions, last part of the second chapter will be on homosocialization and spatiality – which are two important dynamics in the construction and expression of gendered and sexual subjectivities and in relations among them (2.3). This chapter, overall, will target to pave the way for further discussions on the patterns and dynamics in relations of men and masculinities with and through sports, football, and, in particular, the *halı saha* football.

The third chapter will start with a general discussion on various dimensions of relation between gender and sports (3.1). Next section will specifically be on the relation between masculinity and football (3.2). This chapter will aim to historically and sociologically present the general dynamics in the engagement of boys and men with sports and football, and the general patterns in relations among boys and men through sports and football. In this way, it will show, on the one hand, how sports and football came to be an important element in the construction and expression of particular subjectivities, and, on the other hand, in what ways it plays a normalizing and regulatory role in inclusive and exclusive power relations among boys and men.

The fourth chapter will be the ethnographic part of the thesis. It will start with the appealing and distinct characteristics of *halı sahas* for their participants (4.1); and continue with the conceptualization of *halı saha* as a homosocial space (4.2). It will be followed by a discussion on three basic and integrated dynamics which are at play in homosocial relations among men in this space: competition, bonding, and teasing (4.3). Next section will be on the description and analysis of the mainstream *halı saha* football of men with a particular interest on power through four main issues: organization, squads, jerseys, and

goalkeeping (4.4). Last part of the chapter will question the political significance of a more equal and inclusive *halı saha* football by focusing on an exemplary group (4.5).

And, finally, I will make some concluding remarks in the fifth chapter.

§ 1.1 Glossary

I believe that it will be useful to define some words and concepts I make use of in this thesis in the first place. These definitions will be very brief in this glossary. I hope to elaborate them throughout the thesis and locate them into a broader theoretical framework especially in the second chapter.

Self-identified: I use it in reference to an explicit self-definition by individuals about their gender and/or sexual subjectivities. I regard it as an ethical precaution not to take for granted any gender or sexual identities that are assigned at birth or socially assumed so. It is also noteworthy to add that I avoid using gendered pronouns, *he* and *she*, for individuals unless they self-identify as man or woman.

Fe/male-bodiedness: It refers to the medical and also cultural interpretation of a body as either male or female. I prefer to use it – and *male body* and *female body* as well – in italics because I am critical of the binary classification of bodies as such. With a similar reason, I use *sex* and *race* in italics, too, because I regard them as socially constructed rather than naturally or biologically given.

Cisgender: It refers to individuals who are not transgender. In other words, it is used for those who define themselves with gender that is assigned to them at birth.

Heteromale: Unlike "male" which refers merely to the dimension of gender, it takes the dimension of sexuality into consideration as well. I use it when I feel the necessity to emphasize the dominancy of heteronormativity in a space or in a group of people.

Heteromasculine: It refers to heterosexual masculine subjectivities. However, it is based not necessarily on heterosexuality in practice but on constructions and expressions of such subjectivities.

§ 1.2 Methodology

I am neither a mere outsider nor a mere insider in this research. I began it with problematizing what I was already closely familiar with in the first place. To prevent a mere autobiography as an insider, I also conducted an ethnographic research – including interviews, observations and participant observations – to observe and listen to different experiences other than mine.

Therefore, I methodologically adopted *autoethnography* which "combines characteristics of autobiography and ethnography" and which is "one of the approaches that acknowledges and accommodates subjectivity, emotionality, and the researcher's influence on research, rather than hiding from these matters or assuming they don't exist" (Adams, Bochner, & Ellis, 2011, pp. 274-275). I also tried not to impose myself or my experiences upon the interviewees or their experiences. Before, during and after interviews, I often reminded myself of the "co-construction of meaning [which] takes place" through the interaction between me and the interviewees, and between my experiences and theirs (Heyl, 2001/2007, p. 379). I tried to make room for and catch these meanings.

In this regard, I conducted thirteen semi-structured interviews in February, March and April 2018. Twelve interviews took place face-to-face in places preferred by interviewees and one of them took place online via Skype. The purpose of the research as well as the interview was clearly explained beforehand both verbally and through a consent form. The interviewees were informed that their names would be kept secret. An audio recorder was used during the interviews with the consent of the interviewees. On average, the interviews took around one hour. Information about self-identified genders of the interviewees was obtained through consent forms that they were asked to fill. Accordingly, ten of the thirteen interviewees self-identified as "man", while one as "woman" and one as "other". One person denied to self-identify with any gender. The list of the interviewees with some basic information about them (gender, age, education, job, district of residence, district of *halı saha* they play in and frequency of playing) is accessible at the end of the thesis (see Appendix A and Appendix B). Throughout the thesis, I will refer to the interviewees with the pseudonyms they are given in this list.

Besides these interviews, I made occasional visits to some *halı saha* facilities to observe random football matches as well as checking facilities themselves in the Beşiktaş, Şişli, Sarıyer, Büyükçekmece and Kartal districts. I also made additional semi-structured interviews with one *halı saha* owner in Kartal and two *halı saha* operators in Beşiktaş and Sarıyer. These interviews were shorter in duration (on average, half an hour) and more specifically about facilities and customers rather than social backgrounds and subjective positions of the interviewees. No audio recorder was used during these interviews; I rather took field notes during them as well as during my observations in facilities. I also played *halı saha* football as a participant observer with some groups other than my own regular groups to have a critical distance to my research and avoid false generalizations.

For I problematized my own milieu in the first place, the interviewees I selected were mainly from circles of friends and acquaintances I was in and from secondary circles that I accessed through people I knew. I tried to achieve a small diversity in terms of age, district, class, education, profession and urban background, especially for the secondary network. Nevertheless, my field was predominantly urban, secular and middle-class based mainly on the Beşiktaş, Şişli and Kadıköy districts which highly represent these characteristics. Hence, the data I obtained through the fieldwork were limited to this social milieu. I preferred to concentrate on this milieu to understand particular forms and meanings of (heteromale) homosocialization, detect and analyze the specific patterns and dynamics in relations among (heteromasculine) men on playfields, and catch their significance not in isolation but within a broader social context. According to Geertz (1973), this is the "microscopic" characteristic of ethnographic work.

> This is not to say that there are no large-scale anthropological interpretations of whole societies, civilizations, world events, and so on. Indeed, it is such extension of our analyses to wider contexts that, along with their theoretical implications, recommends them to general attention and justifies our constructing them. […] It is merely to say that the anthropologist characteristically approaches such broader inter-

> pretations and more abstract analyses from the direction of exceedingly extended acquaintances with extremely small matters. (Geertz, 1973, p. 21)

In this regard, above all, I benefit from feminist and queer theories, terminologies and studies. I also make use of literatures of sociology, anthropology, history, geography, and cultural studies to various extents. In the meantime, I have a further focus on the literature of the Critical Studies on Men and Masculinities which is a distinct and interdisciplinary field of study coinciding also with aforementioned disciplines.

§ 1.3 A Short History of (Men's) Football

There have been various discussions regarding "the origin" of modern football. Many peoples have claimed to have this "original root" in their history. There were, indeed, different examples of football-like games played by the peoples in different parts of the world at different times in pre-modern era. Names, rules and purposes of these games generally differed from each other as well as from modern football. Such games were seen, for instance, in China in the Neolithic Age, in the Central America and the Amazon in 1500 BC, in the Ancient Rome and Ancient Greek, in various parts of Britain around 1000, in Italy in the thirteenth century, in France in medieval times and in the North America in the seventeenth century (Giulianotti, 1999/2000, pp. 1-3).

However, there is less uncertainty about the emergence of modern football. Besides its folk versions, pre-modern football had regularly been played by students in England for centuries. According to Richard Giulianotti (1999/2000), by the mid-nineteenth century, its unregulated rules started to create some problems among these students: Some schools' students were opting for handling while some other schools' students forbade it (p. 4). Within the general context of the rationalization, bureaucratization and institutionalization of the society, this ambiguity was solved through an institutional separation within football: rugby football on the one hand and association football on the other. Those who initiated association football created laws regulating the game and founded the Football Association. These laws were to be

formalized in 1877 (Giulianotti, 1999/2000, p. 4). Then, (association) football started to serve as a popular urban leisure activity after "a huge vacuum had appeared in popular leisure" and "[o]ld bucolic pastimes like bear-baiting, cock-fighting and village folk football had largely disappeared as the general populace moved into the towns for work." (Giulianotti, 1999/2000, p. 5).

Modern football quickly gained broad attention in England and Scotland; and, by the end of the nineteenth century, it spread across regions and continents via travelers, students, teachers, sailors, traders, exiles, soldiers and the colonial elite – in a sense, as a "sportive imperialism" (Giulianotti, 1999/2000, p. 22). It was used to *educate* and *civilize* colonies, but would also be used by these people to challenge colonizers and integrated into post-colonial nation-building processes (T. Bora, 2013, p. 495).

Football was adapted to local dynamics and new football clubs were founded all over the world. Founders and supporters of these clubs varied in terms of class, ethnic, political and religious backgrounds. Many of them explicitly or implicitly claimed to or came to represent some identities which ultimately created local or regional rivalries among some clubs. In other words, existing social rivalries, tensions and conflicts were now to be witnessed in another domain. People – predominantly men – were now to identify themselves with these clubs on the basis of their social identities, and, thus, to reconstruct and reproduce these identities through football fandom. Successes of a football club, then, would symbolize the triumph of their identities over others. This diversity in social backgrounds even affected playing styles of clubs and values they emphasized. For instance, supporters of many clubs with a working-class background valued physicality, intensity and toughness – compatible with labor-intensive jobs they did – in opposition to the elegant and skillful playing styles of clubs with higher-class backgrounds (T. Bora, 2013, p. 504).

Although it has not so far been possible to surely know exactly when and where football was played for the first time in the Ottoman Empire, there is less uncertainty about its unsurprising initiators: the English. Mehmet Yüce (2014) traces the Ottoman football in the nineteenth century and finds out the earliest archived record about a football match so far: a match which took place in 1881 in İstanbul. Yüce also predicts that there were probably earlier

matches played at the late 1870s (possibly in İzmir, Thessaloniki and İstanbul simultaneously) which were either not archived at all or not discovered in archives yet.

The popularization of football would occur in the Second Constitutional Era, after the oppressive reign of Abdülhamid II was overthrown and the Committee of Union and Progress (CUP) gained political power in 1908. Beforehand, it was a privilege of the English, Levantines and the Ottoman ethnic groups who were in a close contact with them – especially Armenians and the Greek. Turks were rather followed by spies, discouraged from participating in football, and they sought clandestine ways of playing (Yüce, 2014, pp. 105-116). They would play football more freely and found clubs more actively from 1908 on.

As Yüce (2014) demonstrates, in the Ottoman Empire schools played an important role in the history of football. Students, graduates and teachers of Western-type of boys' schools (such as Galatasaray High School, St. Joseph High School and Robert College), which were attended predominantly by the youth from upper classes and with various ethnic backgrounds, were among first people to meet football and regularly play it. These schools provided them with a safe environment to play football and a social network to organize and found football clubs.

A national football league was yet to emerge, but a local mini league was organized in İstanbul from the early 1900s on (Yüce, 2014, pp. 139-145). It would be followed by many other local leagues in other cities through the late Ottoman and the early Republican era, and there would be different types of football organizations such as leagues, cups and tournaments at local and national levels. This remained until a national football league was gradually organized from 1959 on. Beforehand, the Republican political elite "had neither the financial capacity nor the organizational infrastructure to operate" a national league if they desired to do so at all (Emrence, 2010, p. 243).

According to Dağhan Irak (2010), the foundation and rise of Anatolian city-clubs supported by the local bourgeoisie was witnessed after a second division of the national football league was introduced in 1963 (pp. 61-62); and the top (İstanbul) clubs who had already opted for presidents with political connections also started to prefer wealthy businesspersons for the presidency

from the 1970s on (pp. 151-153). The 1980s started with a military coup and the military cadre also aimed a politically paralyzed society where people engaged in popular culture and consumerism so that politically authoritarian and economically liberal transformation of the society could be achieved. In this regard, football was an "acceptable leisure" to control and manipulate the masses; and the "raise of football fandom" was witnessed in this context of the 1980s (Kıvanç, 1993, pp. 389-399).

The integration of football with popular culture, consumerism and commercialization was, indeed, a global phenomenon from the 1980s on. Many top clubs' economic and social dependence on local fans was no longer a must. They exceeded local borders, gained national and international popularities, and had the ability to convert it into money through merchandising, advertising, sponsorship deals, betting, TV broadcasting, going on tours abroad, and organization of special friendly matches and tournaments. Football clubs further integrated into market economy and "started to operate under market forms" (Emrence, 2010, p. 245). With all other actors in and around football (such as media, sponsors, betting companies, football agents, national and international organizations), football economy grew enormously.

This process inevitably led to the middle-classification of football. Fandom started to be defined and described on the basis of consumerism rather than emotional loyalty and attachment. Or, in other words, the content of loyalty changed. Fans were now expected to buy season tickets and official materials of theirs clubs, and subscribe to TV broadcasters to support their clubs and prove their loyalty. This transformation was accompanied by the process of "sterilization" in stadiums, and direct or indirect exclusion of lower classes. A similar process would be witnessed in Turkey especially in the 2000s.[4]

4 The Law to Prevent Violence and Disorder in Sport, which was formalized and put into practice in 2011 by the Turkish Government, is noteworthy in this regard. According to Nuhrat (2016), "by prescribing intense police control and surveillance on the site of football to prevent violence, this law also contributes to the rising embourgeoisement of the game in Turkey" (p. 74) because "for the rulers and decision-makers of Turkish football, the goals of preventing violence and changing fan culture are intertwined" (p. 76).

§ 1.4 Contextualizing *Halı Saha*

Football is the most popular sport in Turkey and plays an important role in daily lives of many people – especially of boys and men. Even those who are not interested in football inevitably encounter it in different ways: in the school garden during childhood, in a park during a picnic, in a public transport before or after a professional football match, in the street as fans chant, in media, on social media, through friends or relatives.

However, although they are not isolated from each other but interact, there is a distinction within football: institutional and non-institutional. Institutional football refers to the type of football which is organized by a central authority and played with strict rules. It has many components such as players, managers, executives, referees, fans, media, sponsors, football agents and central authorities. These components as well as interactions among them can be observed in many spaces such as football fields, training grounds, stands, locker rooms, or spaces where fans gather or spend time – such as pubs, parks and streets.

On the contrary, non-institutional football is harder to describe. It simply refers to the area outside institutional football. This largely includes recreational activities regarding football in daily life. Playing football for fun, for health, for sportive reasons, for alternative and micro-level competitions, for solidarity, for political reasons, or for no reason at all are part of this non-institutional area. It can be a football match or various games derived from football. At this point *halı saha* shows up as a very common space for non-institutional football in Turkey, especially in the urban space.

Halı sahas are not unique to İstanbul or to Turkey. Indeed, similar fields do exist in some other countries, too. They are, however, seemingly less common outside of Turkey. This is hard to check and compare due to the lack of reliable resources. An online handbook (n.d.) published by the Fédération Internationale de Football Association (FIFA) informs us about small-sided football fields in many countries around the world – such as Norway, Finland, Sweden, Latvia, Holland, Germany, England, Ireland, Australia, Russia, Japan, Malaysia, Egypt, Greece and Turkey. Despite all their differences, throughout the handbook the FIFA refers to all these fields as "mini-football pitch" or,

shortly, "MP". The fields mentioned in the handbook differ in terms of form (indoor, outdoor, with or without fencing), surface (grass, artificial turf, asphalt, wood), dimensions (from 12x21 to 55x70, from four-a-side to ten-a-side games), primary purpose of usage (recreational, developmental, or both),[5] and operational style (commercial, non-commercial, sustainable). These fields are generally the ones installed and operated as part of projects initiated by national or local football associations or sports ministries which are also supported or encouraged by the FIFA. It is not easy to learn the density and popularity of such small-sided football fields in these countries apart from formal projects, or to generalize and compare them validly.

Keeping these differences in mind, I believe that we can identify some distinctive characteristics of such fields in Turkey, or, more specifically, in İstanbul. Although there are no publicly accessible official resources to make sure of or statistically prove them, we can nevertheless make some generalizations based on observations. Speaking of İstanbul, whereas their qualities change, we can observe that almost all fields have green astro turf surfaces.[6] Whether owned by entrepreneurs, schools, clubs, municipalities or other state institutions, most fields are commercial and profit-oriented. The most common usage of these fields is recreational rather than developmental, although the latter is also possible in some cases (such as trainings by young players of neighborhood football clubs or by children attending football schools). In terms of dimensions, the most common fields seem to be those suitable for six-a-side and those suitable for seven-a-side matches. Smaller and bigger fields also exist. Almost all fields have wire fences surrounding the field. Although the ones

5 "Recreational usage" refers to the leisure time usage mainly for enjoyment, whereas "developmental usage" refers to the more organized and planned usage for developing physical and technical capacities of players.

6 There are various technologies and products used for surfaces. They differ in terms of price, maintenance, endurance, durability, risk for injury and suitability for the comfortable movement of the ball and players. For further information, see European Synthetic Turf Council, n.d.

in or near the city center are all outdoor, the number of indoor fields increases as we go through suburbs.[7]

Considering these distinctive characteristics, I prefer to use the Turkish term *halı saha* for these fields in Turkey. Other possible usages such as "mini-football field", "small-sided football field", "artificial turf football field", "astro turf football field" or "neighborhood football field" sound more general. This is why I opt for *halı saha* which has a more specific and stronger connotation in Turkey, referring to its own mainstream culture, routines and common practices.

This mainstream *halı saha* culture of men in Turkey is highly hetero-masculine; and, indeed, *halı saha* itself serves as one of the most common (heteromale) homosocial spaces for boys and men in their daily lives in İstanbul. It helps them gather and homosocialize through football mainly on the basis of competition and bonding. At the same time, it allows them to constitute and perform particular heteromasculine subjectivities in relation with each other through football. This way of homosocialization is not restricted to playing football for a limited time in a limited space; it provides them with broader opportunities as well. *Halı saha* is a space which is influenced by hegemonic norms, values, ideals, discourses and practices of football, masculinity, and, hence, society. It is at the same time influential on these norms, values, ideals, discourses and practices in return. It helps boys and men to negotiate with, reproduce, challenge or resist these hegemonic patterns.

Halı sahas have a history of less than forty years in Turkey. They appeared in İstanbul in the 1980s, in the aftermath of the 1980 Coup and in the context of political authoritarianism and economic liberalism. The decade witnessed neoliberal policies, lack of channels for political expression, and high levels of urbanization, commercialization, consumerism and commodification institutionally transforming the society.

7 As far as I learnt from one of my interviewees (Erdem, who is a *halı saha* owner), this is due to the prohibition of indoor fields in the city center because their covered appearances "spoil" the view. Indoor fields are actually more useful since they are affected much less by weather conditions.

> Structural adjustment, liberalization, and privatizations signaled that internalization of capital was now an inescapable reality. It was gradually admitted by all that national regulation was compromised; that there would be no real challenge to the global logic of capital; and that the contours of the material world, ranging from the sites of investment to the patterns of consumption, from land development to building practices, were increasingly being determined by choices made by private capital that was rapidly being inserted into the accelerated flows of globalization. (Keyder, 1999, p. 13)

Meanwhile, there was another ongoing transformation in the cultural sphere:

> A thick fog spread over Turkey after the 1980 coup; doors closed, walls rose up, many things became invisible. But when the fog had dispersed a little, we realized that each and every thing had been transformed into a sharply focused image; the relationship between seer and seen had become one of spectatorship, and speech itself had become a shop window. Right from out of the fog there emerged a society in which many things existed because they were shown and to the extent that they were seen; they acquired value because they were displayed and to the extent they were viewed. It changed the relationship we constructed with the city, especially Istanbul; Istanbul was transformed right before our eyes, step by step, into a site of spectacle. (Gürbilek, 2011, p. 21)

In İstanbul, both the institutional and cultural transformation of the society were observed through a "liveliness" in the 1980s. Fast-food and world cuisine restaurants, boutiques of world brands, luxury hotels and big shopping malls were now open; international congresses were held; international film, music and theater festivals and a biennale of art were organized; the number of foreign tourists increased; international media companies had new bureaus; and foreign magazines, newspapers and TV channels became more accessible while new local ones also emerged (Keyder, 1999, pp. 15-16). In the meantime, due to lack of opportunities for political expression, for constructing and per-

forming political identities, a "rise" in the interest in football and football fandom as an "acceptable leisure" was witnessed throughout Turkey (Kıvanç, 1993, pp. 388-389).

The emergence of *halı saha* was part of this economic, political, and cultural transformation in the society. Very similar to new eye-catching restaurants, hotels, shops, shopping malls, newspapers and magazines, *halı sahas*, too, primarily emphasized an *image*. They, above all, represented the "real" (institutional) football with their surfaces, lines, goals and lights; and allowed people to play football in a *shopping window*. This does not necessarily mean the existence of an actual spectatorship though. It rather implies a possibility which can take place anytime and a presentation of a self-image as if one is being spectated.[8]

Not surprisingly, the first *halı saha* were born and operated in İstanbul in the mid-1980s, and soon proliferated in the city in the first place, and, then, elsewhere in Turkey.

> In the mid-1980s there were two widely-known privately-owned Astro Turf mini soccer fields in Istanbul, one in Topkapı, and one in Bostancı. The two were so popular that they had to be booked one month in advance at hours as late as 3:00 am. Even as excessive quantities of carbon monoxide were released into the sky by the ring road next door, the two fields filled to capacity. In total, tens of thousands of amateur soccer players throughout the city, tired of the mud and dust of improvised fields, embraced the new Astro Turf facilities as places where they could perceive and respect themselves as "professionals". Indeed, not long before, fields with clearly painted lines, goals with fitted nets, a green playing surface, and a scoreboard were things of dreams, even for professional players. (Erten, 2009, p. 174)

8 Indeed, there may occur some remarkable stories in terms of institutional football through such spectatorship in *halı saha* spaces. According to Bağış Erten (2009, 2011), Tuncay Şanlı (a former football player who played for clubs such as Fenerbahçe, Stoke City, Middlesbrough, Bolton Wanderers and Wolfsburg) was "discovered" while playing on *halı saha*. I, too, was invited to play for a neighborhood football club by its manager who spectated the *halı saha* match I played with my friends during my childhood.

A practical factor making *halı saha* attractive, desirable and popular in the urban context of İstanbul was especially lack of accessible areas to play football due to the neoliberal greed. On the one hand, the epidemic of construction exploited all suitable and profitable lands, and the high level of urbanization brought new roads and cars as well as a higher population density and excessive buildings. It ultimately ended up with the use of most of possible lands including those which previously served as football spaces.[9] On the other hand, especially for lands not suitable for construction (i.e. without a planning permission or with a restricted one) or not profitable enough for the construction, the capitalist logic functioned to find alternative ways of profit such as car parks and, in some cases, *halı sahas* (sometimes with a temporary planning permission). Even most of the local municipalities or other state institutions in the city saw *halı saha* as a business model to run, rather than a free recreational service or part of citizens' "right to the city" (Harvey, 2003; Lefebvre, 1996, pp. 147-159). Although they usually provided free spaces for basketball – even some of them did for tennis – they usually regarded football rather as a profitable paid service.[10]

Besides, considering the general avoidance from mud and dust and the interest in *halı sahas* which were elegant in comparison to dirt and concrete football fields, their proliferation were also related to the "[m]iddle-class perceptions of the new middle-class milieu [which] involve a powerful desire for escape from pollution, street life and social heterogeneity" (Ayata, 2002, p. 26). Indeed, they were popularized within this middle-class milieu along with

9 This neoliberal attack backed by the state still continues. It targets not only informal fields but formal ones used by amateur football clubs as well. For a short documentary on a recent example, see Işıl, 2018.

10 It is also noteworthy that free and active participation in non-institutional football has not been integrated into a discourse or practice of the "right to the city" by politically oppositional individuals and groups. Such participation has rather been identified nostalgically with football played in streets or on dust fields in the past, if articulated at all. There can be found various attempts around the world where football is directly or indirectly integrated into the "right to the city" through discourse or practice. One example is Beirut, Lebanon. As we learn from a research report (Hatem, 2016), in Beirut, there are some informal football fields freely accessed, experienced, appropriated, sustained without any institutional support and reproduced by the youth.

many other settings which imaged elegance, "hygiene" and safety. They also emphasized a symbolic or practical exclusion of otherness, and, in this way, minimized encounters with the unknown and uncanny.

Although *halı sahas* have been theoretically public and available for any persons regardless of their ages, gender identities, sexual orientations/preferences and class, ethnic and religious backgrounds, in practice, they have not been really so. Wire fences surrounding these fields to keep the ball inside also symbolize a distinction between who are invited in and who are kept out. In this sense, they resemble gated communities of the middle and upper classes in many aspects.

The fact that the usage of *halı saha* requires a payment inevitably makes class dynamics come into play. In addition to their restricted leisure time and physical energy due to heavy, long and unsecure conditions they work in if they do at all, the requirement of payment as well discourages the participation of people from the lower classes to the *halı saha* football. Spending time, energy, and, more importantly, money for playing football may seem as quite a luxury for these people.

Consequently, the *halı saha* football in general is played predominantly by people from the middle and upper classes. Yet, it does not mean that people from the lower classes are totally excluded from this environment. Rental fees of *halı sahas* depend on their locations, and those located in districts and neighborhoods where mainly the working classes live are unsurprisingly cheaper. Despite the remaining distinction between classes, this is a way for people from the working classes to play *halı saha* football collectively. Yet, Appendix C, Appendix D and Appendix E show that there are apparent differences in the density of *halı sahas* among the districts of İstanbul on the basis of their socio-economic conditions. These tables demonstrate that the density of *halı sahas* generally increases as the socio-economic level increases.[11]

Locations and rental fees of *halı sahas* do make a distinction between classes, but it is not a strict or clear-cut one. There are cross-class encounters tak-

11 Habits and strategies of people from the lower classes to play football in spaces other than *halı sahas* require further research. Unbusy streets, car parks, school yards, parks and roadside green areas seem to be some common spaces for these people.

ing place in these spaces as well. I witnessed some examples during my fieldwork indicating that these encounters may work against the lower classes. To mention them shortly, on the one hand, in such spaces people from the lower classes may undergo various types of negative experiences such as discrimination, humiliation, and stereotyping by people from the middle and upper classes. They may directly or indirectly be accused of making the space "unsafe" and "unsterilized" because they are thought to be more "violent", "noisier" and "dirtier". On the other hand, with similar negative attitudes against them, *halı saha* owners and operators may try to "sterilize" the space to profit more by making it more appealing to the middle and upper classes at the expense of the exclusion or discouragement of the lower classes. This can be through increasing the rental fee of the field, prioritizing or encouraging reservations by wealthier people, or, to some extent, making the facility a further middle-class recreational setting by additional spaces such as café – which may also welcome women (and children) to spectate matches as a "guest".

Socio-economic characteristics of *halı sahas*, class backgrounds of their participants, and similarities, differences and encounters among these people require further investigation. My focus will rather be on a particular group of men from the middle classes. I admit that class and gender are not two distinct categories, but they are interwoven and constituted together (A. Bora, 2005/2008, p. 184). Hence, I will investigate the dynamics and patterns in relations among these men by regarding gender as classed and class as gendered.

2

Men and Masculinities

This chapter will present a short history of the Critical Studies on Men and Masculinities as a distinct field of study and shortly review its literature in the first place. Then, it will continue with a closer look at theoretical and conceptual discussions on gender in general and on men and masculinities in particular. Lastly, it will focus on homosocialization and spatiality – as two important dynamics in terms of gender and sexuality. Accordingly, I will, first, indicate why this study is significant within the literature of the Critical Studies on Men and Masculinities; second, elaborate and justify the conceptual and theoretical framework I adopt and make use of throughout this thesis; and, third, demonstrate the importance of the dimensions of homosociality and spatiality in the construction and expression of gendered and sexual subjectivities and in relations among them. In this way, I hope to pave the way for a further focus on the patterns and dynamics in relations of men and masculinities with and through sports, football, and, ultimately, the *halı saha* football in the forthcoming chapters.

§ 2.1 Critical Studies on Men and Masculinities

Studies focusing specifically on men and masculinities as a new field of investigation occurred with the impact of the women's and gay liberation move-

ments, their academic reflections, and changing social conditions. These studies were not necessarily critical or thorough in the first place. They varied in a large scale, from anti-feminist to feminist and pro-feminist. However, there would later be a separation within the field. Feminist and pro-feminist studies critically evaluating men and masculinities would distance themselves from the rest. This was the emergence of the Critical Studies on Men and Masculinities as a new and distinct field of study.[1] Before focusing on its literature, it can be useful to have a look at the circumstances that made such a new academic field possible.

To begin with, first systematic studies on gender can be traced back to the second half of the nineteenth century. They were mainly biologically deterministic explanations on "the problem of women", based on the pre-assumption of the "sex difference", and inspired by or born as a response to women's changing socio-economic conditions and the women's movement (Carrigan, Connell, & Lee, 1985, p. 553). Whether having biological or social explanations, more studies on gender from psychological, psychoanalytical, anthropological and sociological perspectives followed them in the first half of the twentieth century (Kimmel & Messner, 2007, p. XVIII).

The field had long been dominated by studies on women; and with a few exceptions, academic and non-academic writings, researches and studies systematically and specifically focusing on men and masculinities as a subject of study were not present until the late 1960s (Carrigan et al., 1985, pp. 559-560). In other words, men regarded themselves as the "generic human" and their experiences are generalized as reference points to represent that of all human beings (Brod, 1987, p. 264). Men were not considered as a specific subject of investigation in themselves until the women's and gay liberation movements gained momentum at the late 1960s and in the early 1970s. In the meantime, sexist and heteronormative intellectual and epistemological pre-assumptions were strongly challenged.

These movements, especially feminist movement, successfully combined political activism and academic scholarship. Feminist scholars in particular

1 Hence, I refer to this specific field by the "Critical Studies on Men and Masculinities", rather than the "Masculinity Studies" (or the "Men's Studies") which has a broader connotation.

did not separate the two, nor did they separate activist and academic parts of their lives. They used opportunities of the academy for a feminist epistemology. By virtue of successful questions they raised and criticisms they made, male-dominated characteristics and pre-assumptions of society as well as the academy itself were now to be revealed and challenged. Feminist scholars from various disciplines criticized methodological and epistemological traditions within their disciplines and academic male biases. Feminist historians, for instance, no longer approved traditional methods of historiography which had misrepresented women in and excluded them from history. These scholars were now to strive for a new feminist social history to find out unwritten histories of women and to rewrite history as a political practice (S. Çakır, 2011, p. 506). Accordingly, not only studies on gender increased in number, but also new questions, topics, and political agendas related to gender were born.

However, there was not a single feminist movement but variations within – such as radical, liberal, and socialist feminisms. In addition to differences in ideological grounds and theoretical frameworks among various feminisms, opinions about the possibility of a practical and intellectual cooperation with men also varied. Many radical feminists, for instance, saw all men as "enemies". From their point of view, men could not accompany to feminist women in their struggle. However, there were contrary opinions, too. bell hooks (2000) criticized the idea of "men as enemies", argued that men "who actively struggle against sexism have a place in feminist movement" and saw those men as "comrades" (p. 80). Because men were the primary agents of women's subordination, in this understanding, pro-feminist men's contribution to the women's liberation movement was inevitably required to achieve a positive change from within, and, hence, ultimately in the gender order.

It was not just a matter of comradeship though. The ways heteromasculine cisgender men experience gender and sexuality, construct their subjective positions, reproduce, negotiate with or challenge the normative patterns of gender and sexuality, and contribute to or struggle against the subordination of

women and queers could also be useful in terms of feminist theory, epistemology and politics.[2] Such men's studies on men and masculinities sometimes had very practical advantages, too. Due to the gendered and sexual socio-spatial organization of social life, heteromasculine cisgender men have greater advantages to access heteromale homosocial spaces and groups compared to women. Therefore, this advantage could very well be used to exceed limited accesses of feminist women and queers, and provide empirical and insightful data to improve, broaden and elaborate feminist epistemology.

Pro-feminist men's immediate reaction occurred outside the academy in the first place. Consciousness-raising groups that began to be organized in the early 1970s – in the USA first, and then in Britain – were among their first reactions (Carrigan et al., 1985, p. 573). It was an important part and relatively activist dimension of these men's early engagement with feminism. These consciousness-raising groups were an inspiration from the similar groups of women which emerged a few years earlier. Distinct from anti-feminist and therapeutic ones, according to Michael Shiffman (1987), pro-feminist men's gatherings aimed to create a safe environment for themselves to share their experiences, discuss on sexism, heterosexism, gender discrimination and gendered violence, learn from and support each other, and talk about everyday issues such as work, family, fatherhood and health (p. 296).

On the one hand, "profeminist men constituted themselves as male supporters of the women's liberation movement, and they sought to disestablish sexism from within men's territory, sometimes by attacking masculinity" (Gardiner, 2002, p. 4). On the other hand, they also opposed the existing gender order because they thought and felt that they, too, were personally targeted, restricted and damaged by this gender order emotionally, physically and sexually (Gardiner, 2002, pp. 5-6).

Even if the first reaction occurred outside the academy, just like women from the women's liberation movement, most pro-feminist men were from university communities (Clatterbaugh, 2000, p. 887). However, Judith Newton (1998, as cited in Gardiner, 2002) states that "even progressive academic men

2 I do not regard "women" and "queers" as two fixed and distinct categories exclusive of each other. I rather regard them as unfixed, flexible, transitional and intersecting categories containing many subjective positions.

did not do much scholarly academic work on gender until the 1980s, when masculinity studies provided them a validating professional context" (pp. 4-5). Books, articles, journals, conferences, organizations and courses critical on men and masculinities proliferated from the 1980s onwards. Opportunities of the academy and academic networks helped the development and establishment of such a distinct field of study. Yet, it has also been restricted to the academy to a large extent (Clatterbaugh, 2000, p. 887).

Meanwhile, critical and pro-feminist studies finally got rid of the disarray and distanced themselves from the rest of studies on men and masculinities. The majority of the earlier studies were far from being pro-feminist or being theoretically and politically adequate. Many of them concentrated rather on "hazards" of being men; and argued that men were socially oppressed as much as, or even more than, women were (Carrigan et al., 1985, pp. 564-567).

In this respect, perspectives, theoretical grounds, criticisms, terminologies and themes feminism offered paved the way for pro-feminist studies on men and masculinities. These studies made use of the "revision" feminism provided in the "traditional academic canon" (Kimmel, 1987, p. 10). This would be followed by queer theory and queer politics which would make a similar impact on the theorization and conceptualization of men and masculinities. It is also worthwhile to note that the field has been unsuccessful to develop its own theories independent of feminist and queer theories.

The Critical Studies on Men and Masculinities can be regarded as an interdisciplinary field. There is a broad range of disciplines intersecting in and contributing to the field – such as sociology, anthropology, psychology, literature, history, political science, cultural studies, law, and criminology – and there is also a broad range of topics – such as sexuality, aging, illness, rape, pornography, fatherhood, family, work, media, and sports. Besides many conferences and many formal or informal organizations, a high number of critical books, articles and journals on men and masculinities has been published so far. It does not seem possible to know, follow or list all of them. I will, at least, mention some prominent scholars of the field and their studies related to my research.

As I will discuss in detail in the next section, the publication of "Toward a New Sociology of Masculinity" by Carrigan, Connell and Lee in 1985 was a

milestone in the literature of the Critical Studies on Men and Masculinities. The theoretical and conceptual framework they offered would be used, elaborated and developed further by Connell (1987, 2000, 2005) in solo studies, and revised together with James W. Messerschmidt (2005). This theorization and conceptualization of men and masculinities would dominate the literature in the years to come.

In the intersection of masculinities and sports, two scholars are particularly noteworthy: Michael A. Messner and Donald F. Sabo. Their solo (Messner, 1992, 2002), co-authored (Messner & Sabo, 1994), and co-edited (Messner & Sabo, 1990; McKay, Messner, & Sabo, 2000) books contributed also to the social scientific critical literature on sports which had been growing since the 1960s. In this literature, gender dynamics within sports were either missing or inadequately analyzed at the beginning, until feminists and pro-feminists started critically investigating this issue especially from the 1980s on. Early feminist emphasis on women in these investigations would be followed by the problematization of men and masculinities in and through sports.

Boys' and men's engagement with institutional sports, professional athletes, sports injuries and sports media were the primary issues in Messner's and Sabo's abovementioned studies. For both authors, sports is a social and ideological area which intersects with gender, class, ethnicity and *race;* and it also functions as a medium of socialization. The departure point for both scholars are the athletic experiences they personally had before. However, their focus has almost always been on institutional and professional sports, as it has usually been so in the literature in general.

To speak of Turkey, even though studies on gender increased in number from the 1980s on, they were mostly women-oriented, and a close look at men and masculinities was generally missing until the 2000s. Despite this growing critical literature on and intellectual interest in men and masculinities, it is still hard to argue that there is such an established and distinct academic field.

Deniz Kandiyoti was among the first scholars in Turkey who noticed the importance of the relational character of gender in the 1980s. Accordingly, Kandiyoti intended to exceed the restricted paradigm of patriarchy at the time (Kandiyoti, 1988), and to problematize men and masculinities to analyze the

subordination of women more thoroughly (Kandiyoti, 1987, 1994, 1995). However, in these writings or elsewhere, Kandiyoti's focus was generally on women, and it did not evolve into a systematic or elaborated investigation of men and masculinities. It rather paved the way for later studies by other researchers.

More specific academic works on men and masculinities appeared and increased in number in the 2000s. There have been studies from various disciplines such as sociology, psychology, history, political science, literature, cultural studies, communication studies, social services and sports science on various issues regarding men and masculinities such as sexual subjectivity (Özbay, 2010), aging and andropause (Erol & Özbay, 2018), family and domesticity (Baliç & Özbay, 2004; Bolak Boratav, Eslen Ziya, & Okman Fişek, 2017), male experiences and patterns in social life (Sancar, 2013), coffee houses (Arık, 2009; Demren, 2007; Polat, 2008), socialization (Koyuncu & Onur, 2004), local dynamics (Bozok, 2013), circumcision (Barutçu, 2015; Taşıtman & Toksoy, 2015), piety (Şefkatli-Tuksal, 2004), violence (Çelik, 2017; Özküralpli, 2012), nightlife (Özarslan, 2015), media and TV series (A. Bora & T. Bora, 2015; İ. Erdoğan, 2011), cinema (Arslan, 2005; Yücel, 2014), literature (Günay-Erkol, 2008; Saraçgil, 2000), and male intimacy (Delice, 2010).[3]

The high number of studies on men and masculinities in the context of militarism, military service and conscientious objection is easily noticeable in the literature (Akgül, 2011; Aktaş, 2014; Altınay, 2004; Biricik, 2006; Çınar & Üsterci, 2008; Selek, 2008; Sünbüloğlu, 2013). This is because of the particular socio-political context of Turkey, i.e. the obligatory military service for men, as well as strong nationalism and militarism. Even a primary focus on militarism in Turkey makes the problematization of masculinities inevitable.

Studies on the relation of men and masculinities with sports have been growing, but they are still limited in the literature in Turkey. Also, the ones investigating this relation mostly focus on the institutional part of sports. This relation was investigated in the context of wrestling by İlknur Hacısoftaoğlu

3 For a detailed list of critical studies directly or indirectly on men and masculinities in Turkey, see Topçu, 2018.

Közleme (2012) and taekwondo by Nagehan Tokdoğan (2015). Historical information on the relation of men and masculinities – or of *male bodies* – with physical education and gymnastics through politics at the late Ottoman and the early Republican eras was provided by Yaşar Tolga Cora (2013). A similar contribution was made to this discussion rather indirectly by Yiğit Akın (2004) and by Şakir Dinçşahin and Demet Lüküslü (2013). Also, athletic and bodily male aesthetics among urban middle-class men in the late Ottoman İstanbul was explored through photographs in the print media by Murat C. Yıldız (2015).

In terms of football in particular, Tanıl Bora intellectually elaborated the intersection of masculinities and football with its various dimensions such as sexuality, nationalism, militarism, class and ethnicity in solo (T. Bora, 2006, 2013), edited (T. Bora, 2001), co-edited (T. Bora, 1993), and co-authored studies (T. Bora & N. Erdoğan, 1993; T. Bora & Gökalp, 2010; T. Bora & Yüksel, 2013). Mehmet Bozok (2013) observed and analyzed the importance of football and football fandom in the construction and expression of local male subjectivities in Trabzon. Bawer Çakır and Burcu Karakaş (2013) focused on heteronormativity and homophobia in football through a case study: Halil İbrahim Dinçdağ, a former football referee who was sacked by the Turkish Football Federation due to his sexual orientation. Matthew Atencio and Canan Koca (2011) demonstrated the regulatory role of football in inclusive and exclusive power relations among students from a seventh grade class. Itır Erhart (2013) investigated the masculine football culture and women's strategies to exist at male-dominated stadiums. Yağmur Nuhrat (2017) discussed the relation between masculinity and fairness through swearing in football chants. Nuhrat (2019) also explored various male aesthetics on the basis of football jerseys and their relation with athletic and non-athletic *male bodies*. Deniz Nihan Aktan (2019) concentrated on sexuality politics and possibilities of resistance in and through football – including the *halı saha* football.

In fact, *halı sahas* have generally been disregarded in intellectual contemplation, let alone social scientific academic studies. In 1993 Ümit Kıvanç self-reflexively described the mainstream *halı saha* football of the time and tried to explain *halı sahas* in a broader social, political and economic context. Another person who saw *halı saha* worthy of intellectual interest was Bağış Erten.

Erten wrote a short introduction about *halı sahas* and prepared a map of these fields in İstanbul in 2009; and made a speech specifically on *halı sahas* within a program of broad events about contemporary İstanbul in 2011. Apart from these exceptional examples, *halı sahas* have so far been intellectually disregarded to a large extent.

§ 2.2 Theorization and Conceptualization of Men and Masculinities

As it was stated in the previous section, the problematization of men and masculinities started during the late 1960s with the impact of the women's and gay liberation movements. Men, who had been regarded as "generic humans", were now investigated as a distinct subject of study. Theoretical and conceptual frameworks of the critical studies within the field were provided by feminism in the first place. Queer theory would later make a similar contribution to the field.

In parallel with the women's and gay liberation movements, early critical studies which recognized the dimension of power in gender relations explained the subordination of women mostly in a holistic way through a coherent and fixed male power that *all men* benefiting while *all women* suffering. A single category of *men* and a single category of *women* were pre-assumed. This reductionist binary categorization of men and women even did "not concern how they [came] to be what they [were]" (Connell, 1985, p. 264). The main concept to analyze gender relations in a structural way as such was *patriarchy* – which was generally regarded as universal and almost ahistorical in search for a universal feminism at the time. It would later be revised, re-conceptualized and used in more elaborated ways though.

Whether conceptualized on a biological or social basis, this understanding of gendered power relations was unable to grasp and analyze their complex nature. It took gender binarism for granted, presupposed stable, coherent and fixed categories of "men" and "women", and ignored differences and relations even within these pre-assumed categories. It did not recognize the active participation of women in the maintenance of this gender order, let alone queers. Neither was it interested in how heteromasculine cisgender men experienced

the existing gender order; in other words, what strategies they adopted to reproduce, negotiate with or challenge it.

This perspective would be criticized strongly and be exceeded to a large extent in the 1980s. These criticisms and challenges were mainly from within the women's and gay liberation movements to go beyond the pre-assumption that there existed one single category of oppressed "women" and one single category of oppressing "men". Holistic categories would gradually lose their dominancy and differences within would gradually be recognized. Through feminism differentiating factors such as class, ethnicity, *race*, religion, age, disability and sexuality were emphasized as the basis of various female subjectivities, experiences, and femininities. Meanwhile, the gay liberation movement successfully demonstrated how sexuality had a differentiating effect among men. This shift of paradigm also made a direct impact on the understanding and conceptualization of men and masculinities.

A new rupture was about to emerge in the mid-1980s. The publication of the article "Toward a New Sociology of Masculinity" by Carrigan et al. in 1985 was a milestone in the literature of the Critical Studies on Men and Masculinities. In addition to a review and criticism of the previous literature, the authors also offered a new paradigm which would dominate the literature in the days to come. It was the idea of *multiple masculinities* and the concept of *hegemonic masculinity*. In this way, diversities among men were emphasized. Accordingly, they challenged the assumption that there existed one single masculinity or one single category of "men" in the gender order. They rather claimed a multiplicity of masculinities among which one of them is always normative and hegemonic. This was the recognition of power relations within genders as well. The authors also acknowledged the historical and cultural characteristics of masculinities. This meant that elements, bases and strategies of *hegemonic masculinity* change as social and historical circumstances change.

The conceptualization of *hegemony* owes much to Antonio Gramsci who contributed to the Marxist political theory in the early decades of the twentieth century.[4] Although Carrigan et al. (1985) did not refer directly to Gramsci in their remarkable article, it is obviously this Marxist understanding and terminology that they were inspired by while conceptualizing *hegemonic masculinity*.[5] They referred to hegemony as "a historical situation, a set of circumstances in which power is won and held" and defined its three characteristics: persuasion (for instance, by media and advertising), gendered division of labor, and the involvement of the state (p. 594).

The ultimate aim of the existing gender order, according to Carrigan et al., is the maintenance of the subordination of women globally. Therefore, among all masculinities in a social and cultural context, "hegemonic masculinity is hegemonic so far as it embodies a successful strategy in relation to women" (Carrigan et al., 1985, p. 592). However, only a small number of men are able to meet the hegemonic model (Carrigan et al., 1985, p. 592). Its power is not derived from the number of individuals meeting its standards but from its capacity to hegemonize great numbers of individuals and to provide active consent.

This new theoretical approach would be elaborated and developed further in the future studies of R. W. Connell (1987, 2000, 2005) Accordingly, Connell underlined the social factors such as class, ethnicity and *race* which play an important role in the shaping of masculinities and relations among them. Connell also revised the concept of *hegemonic masculinity*. Its historicity and

4 To very shortly summarize, Gramsci (1971/1999) made a distinction between the *political society* and *civil society* where the former is maintained mainly by *domination* based on coercion, while the latter is rather maintained mainly by *hegemony* based on consent. They are, however, not mutually exclusive categories; but continuously support each other. A total *hegemony* is achieved only when a social class consolidates its power both in *political* and *civil* societies economically, politically, ideologically and culturally. Then, they can also make use of the "apparatus of state coercive power which 'legally' enforces discipline on those groups who do not 'consent' either actively or passively" (Gramsci, 1971/1999, p. 12). Setting up *hegemony* by a social class is a long-standing process requiring a *position of war* and alliances with other social classes in *civil society*. It ultimately ends up with a *historical bloc* formed by "structures and superstructures" in specific historical circumstances (Gramsci, 1971/1999, p. 366).

5 R. W. Connell (1987, 2005) would later give direct references to Gramsci in some solo studies.

configurational practical character (rather than being a type of masculinity) were emphasized, and it was now redefined as 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" (Connell, 2005, p. 76). According to Demetrakis Demetriou (2001):

> This implies that some masculinities are subordinated not because they lack a particular transhistorical quality or because they are naturally inferior to others but because the configuration of practice they embody is inconsistent with the currently accepted strategy for the subordination of women. Gay masculinities, for example, are subordinated to the hegemonic model because their object of sexual desire undermines the institution of heterosexuality, which is of primary importance for the reproduction of patriarchy. (p. 344)

In addition to *hegemony*, Connell (2005) offered three other particular patterns effective in the shaping of relations among men and of distinct masculinities: *complicity, subordination,* and *marginalization* – ending up with *complicit masculinities, subordinated masculinities,* and *marginalized masculinities* (pp. 77-81). In this regard, *complicity* is the way a large number of men contribute to the maintenance of *hegemony* although they do not meet its standards. According to Connell (2005), such men embrace hegemonic model because they benefit from the subordination of women (p. 80). *Subordination* is what mainly gay men experience in the heteronormative gender order, but it is not restricted to them. *Marginalization* is a process where dynamics such as class, ethnicity and *race* come into play, and some men and masculinities are devalued on this basis. However, Connell (2005) also warned against the possible oversimplifications such as thinking that there is only one black masculinity or only one working-class masculinity.

These relations among various men and masculinities are determinative of the extent one can access, make use of and benefit from privileges and advantages of being a man. In other words, they are determinative of one's right to the "patriarchal dividend" (Connell, 2005, p. 79). In this sense, *subordinated* and *marginalized* men are not totally excluded from power positions or not

totally prevented from the "patriarchal dividend". According to Demetriou (2001), "the hegemonic model may authorize some elements of subordinated or marginalized masculinities" as well (p. 346).

Connell (2005) also offered a three-fold model in the assessment of the gender order as a whole, as well as multiple masculinities: *power relations, production relations* and *cathexis* (pp. 74-75). In this model, *power relations* refer to relations of power in the gender order to guarantee the subordination of women by men structurally. *Production relations* are about gendered division of labor and its socio-economic consequences; and *cathexis* refers to emotional attachment, sexual desire and their reflections in relations among people as well as their social organization. All these have direct relations also with social, political and economic institutions – such as family, labor market and state (Demetriou, 2001, p. 341). This is how the gender order is institutionalized and maintained structurally.

However, Connell's theorization and conceptualization are not unproblematic. In an elaborated critical examination, Jeff Hearn (2004) draws our attention, above all, to the uncertainty about what *hegemonic masculinity* really is:

> Is it a cultural ideal, cultural images, even fantasy? Is it summed up in the stuff of heroes? Is it toughness, aggressiveness, violence? Or is it corporate respectability? Is it simply heterosexist homophobia? Is it the rather general persistence of patriarchal gender arrangements? (p. 58)

This ambiguity have been observed in studies on men and masculinities, as well. Although Connell emphasized the practical character of masculinities, too, due to the relatively blurred theorization and conceptualization, they have mostly been regarded and used as abstract categories in the literature. Defining *hegemonic masculinity* and identifying its elements in a social context have become a task and a big challenge in itself. It has generally and commonly been identified with heterosexuality, upper and middle classes, able-bodiedness, higher education, high-status jobs, white skin, urbanity, youth, aggressiveness, toughness, competitiveness and rationality in Western societies in

particular and in the global gender order in general.[6] Yet, it is not that easy to detect and confine it as a fixed composition, since the normative patterns of masculinity are flexibly due to a change within geographies as well as across them, interwoven with local dynamics and open to subjective appropriation, interpretation and negotiation. This makes it difficult to agree on *hegemonic masculinity* and its elements. It is alike for other "types" and patterns of masculinities as well.

Moreover, not only identifying a specific masculinity, but distinguishing between masculinities and classifying people on this basis are not easy tasks either. Kenneth Clatterbaugh (1998) rightly points this problem: "Masculinities are not like the number of shoes at the gathering, they cannot be counted, and unlike the shoes at the gathering, their kinds (pumps, loafers, etc.) are not apparent. There are no ready criteria that allow me to identify distinct masculinities" (p. 27). More importantly, Connell's theorization of four categories of masculinities "makes it difficult to account for more fluid or ambiguous subjectivities" (Pringle, 2005, p. 266).

All these attempts to define masculinities have mostly been at the expense of ignoring or overlooking individual men and their practices. To solve this problem, Hearn (2004) suggested a methodological and conceptual shift, from *hegemonic masculinity* to *hegemony of men*. This was a call to focus on "men" as agents rather than "masculinities" as abstract forms. According to Hearn (2004), *hegemony* was useful in studying men and masculinities, and it was more reasonable to revise rather than leave it, despite previous problems in the field. Considering aforementioned problems regarding masculinities as abstract forms, I believe, Hearn's critical intervention was sound.

Another criticism Connell received was by Demetriou (2001). This was about a strict binarism between *hegemonic* and *non-hegemonic masculinities* where *hegemonic masculinity* was seen as coherent, isolated and "never 'infected' by non-hegemonic elements" and about the disregard of the role these elements play in the establishment and maintenance of *hegemony* (Demetriou, 2001, pp. 346-347). Demetriou tried to re-conceptualize *hegemony* as a *hege-*

6 For such a discussion in the context of Turkey, see Özbay, 2013.

monic masculine bloc by referring further to Gramsci and the conceptualization of *historic bloc* in the Gramscian theory. Accordingly, *hegemonic masculine bloc* refers to an understanding of hegemony as a "hybrid" *bloc* which is an outcome of "dynamic" and "flexible" interplays among various masculinities through "translation", "appropriation" and "negotiation" (Demetriou, 2001, pp. 348-349). This was the recognition of the role played by *non-hegemonic masculinities* in the formation of *hegemony* and the maintenance of the gender order.

In Connell's model, there is, indeed, little room for agencies and subjectivities of men of *non-hegemonic masculinities*, let alone women and queers, in the perpetuation or changing of the gender order. These people seem to contribute to the reproduction of *hegemony* only by giving consent or only in a complicit way if at all. This understanding is therefore insufficient to recognize their active agencies and complex subjectivities to reproduce, negotiate with, challenge, resist or subvert the normative patterns of gender. These people's relations with each other and with the existing gender order are, in fact, more than a matter of *compliance*, *domination* and *subordination*. Independent of their assigned or assumed genders, self-identified genders and sexual orientations/preferences, any people can be an active agent to embrace, carry and perform hegemonic norms, values and ideals to various degrees in different contexts.

Deniz Kandiyoti's concept of *patriarchal bargain* seems noteworthy at this point. In a similar manner, unsatisfied with explanations of the subordination of women through a "monolithic" and "abstract" understanding of *patriarchy*, in which "men" were seen as active oppressors while "women" as passively oppressed, Kandiyoti (1988) conceptualized *patriarchal bargain* to recognize and concentrate on women's active and gendered subjectivities – so to say, the ways and strategies women make use of to cope with *patriarchy* (pp. 274-275). The concept acknowledged the relational aspect of gender relations and implied that these relations could not be understood one-sidedly and in isolation. Nevertheless, the concept was once useful to draw attention to an insufficiency; I believe that a theoretical and methodological awareness makes the use of the concept now redundant.

The complex nature of gender relations and gendered/sexual subjectivities would be recognized more thoroughly by queer theorists through new theorizations and conceptualizations. In this regard, the contribution of Judith Halberstam to the understanding of masculinity is notable. Halberstam (1998, 2002) rightly criticized the assumption that masculinity is a male privilege – the idea that it can be performed only by *male bodies* – and underlined the existence of *female masculinities,* as well as *male femininities,* in a broad spectrum.

According to Halberstam (2002), some examples of *non-male masculinities*, in general, "come in the form of lesbian fatherhood, butch identities, drag king performances, female sports icons, and so on" (p. 352). Yet, they do not always have to be such apparent, constant or consistent; they can rather be embedded in relations, can be performed and embodied contextually as well. Denial of the existence of female masculinity (or non-male masculinities, in general) can also be seen as an ideological strategy because alternative masculinities reveal the socially constructed and performative character of male masculinity which presents itself as the only real and possible masculinity "naturally" deriving from *male body*. In this regard, Halberstam (1998) stated, "female masculinity actually affords us a glimpse of how masculinity is constructed as masculinity" (p. 1).

In a similar vein, Judith Butler (1990) denied the broadly accepted separation between *sex* and *gender*, i.e. the idea that *sex* is "biologically given" while *gender* is "socially constructed". This distinction was, in fact, made to negate biological explanations of *gender* – the idea that *gender* derives "naturally" and directly from *sex* – and rather to emphasize its social basis. Despite its usefulness to exceed biologically determinist approaches and underline socially constructedness of *gender*, in this distinction, *sex* and biology still preceded *gender* and remained as a natural essence with some inevitable natural characteristics. Butler (1990) challenged this thinking by a warning that *sex* itself may be a product of *gender*; in other words, what we call as *male body* and *female body* may themselves be cultural interpretations of bodies rather than having their own natural essences (p. 6).

> When the constructed status of gender is theorized as radically independent of sex, gender itself becomes a free-floating artifice, with the

> consequence that *man* and *masculine* might just as easily signify a female body as a male one, and *woman* and *feminine* a male body as easily as a female one.[7] (Butler, 1990, p. 6)

Body, in this sense, does not necessarily correspond to a natural biological essence. It is rather a cultural and historical interpretation on the basis of gender binarism. The classification of bodies as "either" *female* "or" *male*, hence, is contingent and arbitrary. Then, a body does not have an inherent *sex*, but it is rather socially "sexed". Therefore, *male-bodiedness* and *female-bodiedness* refer not to a naturalness, but to a social process of interpretation.

Butler's theory of gender concentrates on bodily practices, rather than structural gender categories or their pre-assumed privileged agents. In this poststructuralist account of gender, unlike the structuralist one of Connell, there is no gendered self which is prior to these gender practices, discourses and identities. According to Butler (1990, 2003), gender is not a given predetermined fact, but a *doing*, a *performance*. However, it is never "self-styled" because "history conditions and limits possibilities" (Butler, 2003, p. 417). This understanding of gender is based on poststructuralist conceptualization of power – especially that of Michel Foucault – where power is seen not solely as oppressive and restrictive but also reproductive, constitutive, regulatory and non-possessable.

Butler rejected essentialist assumptions about gender, argued that gender identities are continuously produced and reproduced through bodily practices and discourses, and that "the body becomes its gender through a series of acts which are renewed, revised, and consolidated through time" (Butler, 2003, p. 418). Repeated and ritualistic characteristics of bodily practices as such provide them an appearance of normality, naturalness and essence; and, in the meantime, these practices are motivated by the very belief in their normality, naturalness and essence. This is how gender is continuously reproduced, how it obtains an essentialist shield to hide its dependence on repetitive acts and how "gender reality" is socially constituted.

Meanwhile, gendered subjectivities and practices are also "governed by […] punitive and regulatory social conventions" (Butler, 2003, p. 422) which

7 Italics in original.

make them look constant and consistent; and "those who fail to do their gender right are regularly punished" by these heteronormative and binary gender conventions (Butler, 2003, p. 417). These regulatory practices determine social "norms of intelligibility" which make a gendered subjectivity culturally intelligible when a person constitutes and performs a subjectivity conforming to the presupposed "coherence and continuity among sex, gender, sexual practice, and desire" (Butler, 2010, p. 17).

In this approach, sexuality, too, cannot be natural, but a historical and cultural interpretation supported by regulatory conventions. Indeed, it has been demonstrated by Foucault (1979) that sexuality and sexual subjectivity are historically and discursively constituted, classified and regulated, and that they came to be indispensable from power and knowledge. Then, there cannot be a fixed sexual desire or a fixed sexual orientation inherent in body either. For it is not possible to know one's sexual activities in practice, what really matters is how this person discursively and performatively constitutes a sexual subjectivity. In this sense, heteromasculinity refers not to one's practical heterosexuality, but to the heterosexual masculine subjectivity a person constitutes and performs. Because performing masculinity is not a male privilege, then, heteromasculinity cannot be a male privilege either. There can be both male and female heteromasculinities.

Connell's and Butler's theories may be at odds with each other on several counts. They obviously have different perspectives, reference points, concepts and analytical tools. However, Connell's prior focus on gender categories and Butler's prior focus on practical gender performances seem complementary for me to provide a reconcilable ground to work on for a more insightful investigation of men and masculinities. I personally prefer to move neither from abstract taken-for-granted gender categories to individuals, nor the contrary. Nor do I want to dismiss one of them on behalf of the other. A balanced position in between where each one is required to make sense of the other seems more insightful to me.

Considering problems regarding the concept of *hegemonic masculinity*, its ambiguous overuse and even sometimes misuse in the literature, therefore, I refrain from using it in this study. I agree with Richard Pringle (2005) that it

is based on "generalizations" and useful to see the "big picture", but also "problematic for understanding the constitution of individual subjectivities" (p. 267). However, I do not have a convincing answer to the question of what masculinity really is, or what masculinities really are; but I am on the same page with Halberstam (1998) who warns "about why masculinity must not and cannot and should not reduce down to the male body and its effects" (p. 1). Although I do not reduce the performances of masculinity to *male-bodiedness*, considering the focal point of my study, my focus will keep being on heteromasculine cisgender men and their practices to a large extent.

§ 2.3 Homosocialization and Spatiality

Homosocialization and spatiality are two essential dynamics in the construction and expression of gendered and sexual subjectivities and in the regulation of relations among them. This section will elaborate the role these dynamics play for heteromasculine men and their relations.

To start with, the term "homosocial" was conceptualized in the mid-1970s by Jean Lipman-Blumen (1976) to mean "the seeking, enjoyment, and/or preference for the company of the same sex [*sic*]", and the author used it especially in reference to men's socializing patterns and spaces to "derive satisfaction for their intellectual, physical, political, economic, occupational, social, power, and status needs – and in some circumstances their sexual needs – from other men" (p. 16). Although it was based on the limited sex-role theory and a gender binarism, the term has been useful in understanding men's socializing patterns, and has also been used in broader theoretical frameworks.[8]

By homosocialization, I personally refer to the kind of socialization which takes place among people who self-identify with the same gender. For me, it is not restricted to socialization among men or among women; it can also take place among people who self-identify with the same another gender because I do not confine gender with only two possibilities. I, however, focus specifically on the heteromasculine cisgender men's homosocializing patterns.

8 Such as Bird, 1996.

Homosocial activities and relations among (heteromasculine) men occur, above all, in spaces which are male-dominated, or which are male preserve. It would be worthwhile to underline in the first place that these spaces do not inherently signify maleness, heteromaleness or homosociality. Bearing in mind the discussion in the previous section, very similar to the repetitively performative and regulatory construction of gendered and sexual subjectivities, spaces, too, are constructed to have certain gendered and sexual meanings through some repetitive performances and regulatory practices. Moreover, these two processes are interwoven. In other words, spaces are gendered and sexualized; and, at the same time, genders and sexualities are spatial. Each makes a direct and crucial impact on the perception and experience of the other.

> The performance of gender in space not only shifts with each performance, but in a very real way each performance also changes the space in which it is performed. […] [E]ach performance is subject to the performer, the observer and the space in which it is performed […]." (Doan, 2010, pp. 638-639)

In this respect, according to Philip Howell (2007), "the identification of spaces as either *gay* or *straight* [as well as male or female] is fundamentally mistaken" (p. 310).[9] I, however, do think that some spaces can still be identified in that way as long as their constructedness is emphasized. I believe that to regard some spaces, for instance, as heteromale does not necessarily mean that they are inherently and inevitably so or that they have such permanently fixed spatial characteristics. Nor does it mean that there are not any non-normative gendered or sexual performances of any kind. These heteromale spaces are rather masculinized, heterosexualized and come to be associated with certain meanings through "the social production of space" in (Henri) Lefebvrian sense (van Ingen, 2003, p. 202). This implies that they can also be targeted, negotiated with, challenged and reinterpreted.

9 Italics in original.

> [I]t is important to recognize that lived space is both oppressive and enabling. Lived space is the site of discriminatory practices such as racism, sexism and homophobia and is where marginalization is produced and enforced. Yet, lived space also produces critically important counterspaces that are the spaces for diverse, resistant and oppositional practices. Created by both individuals and collectives, counterspaces are dynamic, counterhegemonic social spaces that enable alternative geographies. (van Ingen, 2003, p. 204)

Spaces are shaped through power relations as well as repetitive gender and sexual performances. To put aside possibilities of resistance and opposition for now, some spaces are shaped, regulated and controlled by and on behalf of some groups and individuals by "[gender] policing behaviors" (Doan, 2010, p. 649). Gender policing not only aims to control some spaces, ensure a gendered socio-spatial organization or reproduce the existing gender order in practice; it also enables the circulation and reproduction of (hetero)normative morals which discursively regulate the relation between gender, sexuality and space. Access to some spaces and ways of behaving in these spaces are, thus, conditioned and limited for some people who do not conform to standards of these spaces in terms of gender and sexuality.

Considering the focal point of this thesis, one can question to what extent homosocialization and homosocial spaces are required in the construction, expression and relations of heteromasculine subjectivities especially for men with urban, secular and middle-class backgrounds. Gül Özyeğin (2011), for instance, argues that heterosexual romantic relations are of crucial importance for neoliberal heteromasculine subjectivities in Turkey (p. 155). According to Özyeğin (2011), the emphasis on self-discovery, self-fulfillment, entrepreneurship and autonomy, and desire for upward mobility in the neoliberal era have an impact on the constitution of the flexible (heteromasculine) self which self-reflexively perceives its individual and class-based limits through (hetero)sexual and (hetero)romantic relations.

I admit the importance and, indeed, predominance of heterosocial relations in the constitution, expression and self-reflection of heteromasculine selves with urban, secular and middle-class backgrounds. However, I think that homosocial relations and spaces do still play an important role in these

men's lives – though possibly less often than lives of, for instance, men with conservative and lower-class backgrounds. Another question can be asked then: What does homosocialization promise men?

The homosocialization of (heteromasculine) men seems to have a number of functions, both on individual and socio-structural levels. First of all, there are practical needs in the construction and expression of their gendered subjectivities. In search of recognition, appreciation, status and respect, these men do perform, exhibit and express themselves before a male audience. As Pierre Bourdieu (2001) states, "manliness must be validated by other men, in its reality as actual or potential violence, and certified by recognition of membership of the group of 'real men'" (p. 52).

In some cases, according to Erol Sağlam (2018), *speaking* itself is a performance by (heteromasculine) men to claim to be a "knowing subject" and an "authority" before a male audience. Whether it is about politics or football, whether it is a creative unique statement or a pure cliché, whether it is based on a rational consistency or a conspiracy theory, the performance of *speaking* functions to construct a self-image of competency in pursuit of recognition. In this way, they also show their loyalty both to the group and to the hegemonic patterns of masculinity especially when they are expected or enforced to perform a *speech*. Besides, in these relations, there is always a non-formal and non-written distinction between *the speakable* and *the unspeakable* – which reifies when one does not say what he is expected to say, or when he says what he is expected not to say.

In the meantime, more practically, by excluding women, (heteromasculine) men get rid of the self-control in the language they use and the ways they act, and of the possible threat of being pulled into an emotionally intimate conversation which is mostly a source of discomfort for them. As Michael Meuser's (2000, as cited in Koyuncu & Onur, 2004) study with male amateur footballers shows, too, many (heteromasculine) men feel more "comfortable" and "freer" in their homosocial environments. This, I think, implies a multiplicity of (unfixed) selves some of which are in contradiction or in tension with each other in terms of gender. Which one of them predominates a person's way of speaking and behaving in a given context is not a matter of an arbitrary choice by the individual, but it depends on interactions with space

and other people. The privileged feeling of "comfort" and "freedom", therefore, requires the protection of some social spaces as a male preserve.

In this context, Nurhak Polat (2008) tells a story of exclusion she personally underwent as a self-identified woman in a heteromale-dominated space: As she waits for a bus to İstanbul at the bus terminal of Düzce,[10] she looks for an indoor seat to sit down and smoke a cigarette. Because there is no empty seat in the waiting room, she decides to get into a tea house (*çay ocağı*) just next to the waiting room, and does so. She does not realize in the first place that there are only men inside. Then she starts to notice there is something wrong. The owner of the tea house does not talk to her. Other men look at her in a strange way. The tension increases. Then one of the men dares to warn her rudely: "Mam, this place isn't the waiting room!" All men look at her by a relief, as if their discomfort was finally articulated. She understands that the warning is a collective rather than an individual one. Nevertheless, she answers as such: "So what? I'm sitting here." The same man does not give up and commands her: "There's a waiting room. Go and sit there!"[11] (Polat, 2008, pp. 148-149)

The story above is not a unique or surprising one. Homosocial spaces of heteromasculine men mostly serve as a "liberated territory" to them. They are "liberated" from women and queers. Men develop some strategies to protect these spaces and privileges they have there. In the story above, a woman crosses a border that she is expected to respect. Polat (2008) likens her "violation" to getting inside one's bedroom as a stranger (p. 149). When there is a "stranger" in such a (heteromale) homosocial space, it is very likely that there is also discomfort for men. They may feel that their rights are violated, they are under threat, afraid of losing their privileges or frustrated because they are unable to speak or behave in the way they could otherwise do.

Besides many other examples, the physical separation of (heteromale) homosocial spaces, too, falsifies the simplistic dichotomy between public space and private space. These spaces are obviously located somewhere in-between. Although they seem to be public, the entrance and participation are actually

10 A small town, approximately four-hours-away from İstanbul by bus.

11 My translation.

conditional. Primarily women and queers are excluded from these spaces, or, at least, their participation is restricted and conditioned to a large extent. Depending on the dominant group of men in a space, some other heteromasculine men may undergo a similar restriction or conditioning due to their age, class, ethnicity, *race*, religion or ideology. However, it is not possible to claim that these spaces are private either. They are not generally in a complete control of few specific persons who have the right to authorize one's entrance or participation. The in-betweenness of (heteromale) homosocial spaces is embodied in the language of (heteromasculine) men as they often attribute to them features they identify with private space such as "feeling at home", and, hence, "feeling comfortable", although they are not exclusively private. Whether it is so in practice or not, discursive references to domesticity imply that one can behave in these spaces as he wishes.

At a rather socio-structural level, (heteromasculine) men control and protect some spaces as their preserve not only to find opportunities to construct and perform particular gendered subjectivities, but also to make sense of their social experiences, directly or indirectly discuss on, check, negotiate with, verify, reproduce, challenge or reinterpret hegemonic norms, values, ideals, discourses and performances of masculinity altogether. Circulation of practical knowledge and useful information is also provided in this way. It would not be wrong to argue that such environments almost always reinforce the normative patterns of masculinity. Those who are unable to meet or prefer to avoid these patterns have to find some strategies of negotiation to exist there. Yet, this does not mean that all these spaces and groupings are totally "intolerant" of any variances. They are, in fact, mostly "tolerant" of some diversities to some extent as long as certain lines are not crossed.

However rare, a remarkable fact is the discursive rejection of the actual *homo*-socialization by some (heteromasculine) men. These men claim that they are solely together with some other men only by coincidence and argue that there could have been women as well (Arık, 2009, p. 182; Meuser, 2007, p. 41). This claim implies that male-dominated spaces and all-men groups do not exclude women but they are also open to women's participation, and that they, as men, spend time together not because they are men but they have more in common. Such arguments, however, seem discursive strategies rather than

having practical reflections. To speculate, one reason behind their articulation may be these men's presentation of themselves and their groups as inclusive rather than exclusive. To speculate further, these men may be afraid of a "misunderstanding" of homoeroticism; so to say, they may think that their heteromasculine subjectivities can be damaged when they admit they enjoy being exclusively with other men.

Indeed, one can find homoerotism in homosocialization. Marilyn Frye (1983), for instance, argues that heteronormative and male-dominated culture itself is so:

> The people whom they [heterosexual men] admire, respect, adore, revere, honor, whom they imitate, idolize, and form profound attachments to, whom they are willing to teach and from whom they are willing to learn, and whose respect, admiration, recognition, honor, reverence and love they desire . . . those are, overwhelmingly, other men. In their relations with women, what passes for respect is kindness, generosity or paternalism; what passes for honor is removal to the pedestal. From women they want devotion, service and sex.
>
> Heterosexual male culture is homoerotic; it is man-loving. (p. 135)

Putting aside the discussion on homoeroticism and looking closer at (heteromasculine) men's homosocial relations in general, Sharon R. Bird (1996) identifies three main characteristics in their homosocialization: "emotional detachment" (i.e. "withholding expressions of intimacy"), "competitiveness" and "sexual objectification of women". Although I agree with Bird about the importance of emotional detachment and sexual objectification of women in these relations, I offer a different frame. For me, (heteromale) homosocialization is twofold: *bonding* on the one hand and *competition* on the other. The former refers to solidarity and cooperation among (heteromasculine) men through which they support and help each other when required, and, thus, feel more powerful both individually and collectively; while the latter refers to the ways they compete to regulate power relations and positions among themselves also by constituting individual gendered subjectivities.

But, what is competition? According to Simmel (2008), it is "a peculiar [and indirect] form of fighting" (p. 958). Simmel criticizes the conceptualization of competition in non-economic spheres of social life only and one-sidedly in negative ways at the time, and states that competition also has positive effects for society through socialization and interaction among individuals in many parts of social life – such as family, romantic and erotic relationships, friendship, commerce, art, academy, religion, politics, and sport.

> [N]egative entries in the social balance sheet of competition pale beside the incredible synthetic power of the fact that competition in society is competition for human beings, a struggle for applause and attention, for acceptance and devotion of every kind, a struggle of the few to gain the many as much as of the many to gain the few; in short, a web of thousands of sociological threads brought about through concentrating the awareness on the wishes, feelings, and thoughts of fellow humans, through the sellers' adaptation to the buyers, through artfully multiplied opportunities to make connections and gain approval. (Simmel, 2008, p. 962)

In this understanding, the purpose of competition between two parties is always to gain the approval of third parties. Thus, "everywhere it appears, the antagonism of competition goes hand in hand with an offer or an enticement, with a promise or connection that creates a relationship between each of the two and the third" (Simmel, 2008, p. 963).

In the meantime, Simmel (2008) underlines the relation between liberalism, individualism and competitiveness. Competition, in its modern sense, seems to have derived from liberal political economy in the second half of the eighteenth century; expanded also into non-economic social spaces from the mid-nineteenth century on; and consolidated its importance and institutionalized in various social spaces from the 1970s onwards, in the era of neoliberalism (Werron, 2015). According to Türem (2016), this recent consolidation and institutionalization of competition in social life through neoliberalism has also been backed up by imposing legal regulations on the one hand and producing competitive subjectivities on the other (p. 35). As for the latter:

> [Competition] is for amassing as much human capital as possible. Of course, the neoliberal understanding of human capital can range from one's bodily integrity to the number of networks one belongs to. In short, individuals perceive themselves as enterprises who must compete with one another and try to acquire as much input as possible in their struggle to get (or stay) ahead of others. (Türem, 2016, p. 43)

Within this socio-political context, competition and competitiveness have been highly important especially for heteromasculine subjectivities. In other words, these subjectivities have been constructed through direct or indirect competitions with each other and a moral ethos based on competitiveness. Competition, obviously, came to be important for heteromasculine subjectivities not because of neoliberalism, but its existing importance for these subjectivities did further increase in the neoliberal age. Indeed, competitions, or the *serious games of competition* as Bourdieu (1990, as cited in Meuser, 2007) calls them, have long been an important element of relations among (heteromasculine) men.

> […] Bourdieu wrote that the male habitus is "constructed and accomplished only in connection with the space that is reserved for men, a space in which, *among men*, the serious games of competition are played". […] The games of competition are played in politics, in economy, in universities, in sports, in the religious institutions, but also in semi- or non-public realms where men are among themselves: in clubs or in circles of friends. What is the place of women in these games? According to Bourdieu, women are the audience, they play the role of spectators or of *"flattering mirrors"* (*"mirror flatteur"*) which reflect and confirm the men's self image. So far Bourdieu emphasized two interrelated features: the competitive structure of masculinity and the homosocial character of the settings in which the competition takes place.[12] (Meuser, 2007, p. 41)

12 Italics in original.

Following Bourdieu, whether it takes place in a serious, quasi-serious, or non-serious way and manner, I regard a game "serious" as long as it has a constructive role in heteromasculine subjectivities and a regulatory impact on relations among them. Accordingly, there are numerous types of such games played by men and boys, depending on culture, class, ethnicity, age, and context. Once popular duels among men from the upper classes, drinking alcohol competitions among male students and traditional sabre duels among men in dueling fraternities in Germany are some examples given by Meuser (2007) in this regard.

In terms of Turkey, playing football on *halı saha* or elsewhere, backgammon, *okey* and card games in traditional coffee houses *(kahvehane),*[13] PlayStation and computer games in PlayStation and internet cafés, billiards in billiard halls (*bilardo salonu*), and, in a sense, betting on football matches and horse races in betting shops *(İddaa bayii* and *ganyan bayii)* are some examples in this regard. (Of course, many other examples can be added.) *Serious games of competition* occur very differently in various spaces though, and they do not have to take place in an apparent game form. For instance, as we learn from Osman Özarslan's (2015) study, spending money has a similar function for some men to challenge and compete with each other as well as trying to attract hostess women at nightlife in a Turkish province. Moreover, a colleague of mine who was in prison for a short while observed that trying to do cleaning better and more often in men's dorm is a form of competition among men to construct and perform certain heteromasculine subjectivities in relation with each other.

However, the question of how the conflicting processes of bonding and competition coexist simultaneously in (heteromale) homosocial groupings remains. Regarding competition as a form of socialization and interaction – as it is argued by Simmel (2008) – is not a satisfying answer to this question. Similarly, Meuser (2007) regards competition also as a source of "conjunction", "comradeship" and "mutual affection"; yet, does not explain how it happens (p. 44). I claim that a way to balance in-group bonding and competition

13 *Okey* is a popular game in Turkey which is played in cafés, coffee houses or at home. It is a variant of card games, but played with boards and tiles instead.

is *teasing* – as a variant of humor. This is a strategy to prevent both too much individual competition which may dissolve relations and too much bonding which may create intimate, emotional and, in a sense, homoerotic relations.

Humor can be used in different forms with different purposes. For instance, it can be used "to help individuals avoid embarrassment or manage tension", "to enable individuals to avoid 'taking their problems too seriously'", "to objectify or laugh at others", or "to reduce or reinforce inequalities in power between people" (Williams, 2009, p. 74). As for teasing, it can both reinforce relationships and damage them, "can cause intense pain or serve as a means of bringing people closer together" or can be "used to entertain, to bond, to flirt, and to resolve conflicts" (Beck et al., 2007, p. 158). There are various purposes behind teasing and indeed various types of teasing. However, throughout the thesis, I will refer to it specifically as "provoking or annoying someone in a playful and friendly manner". In this sense, I regard teasing as a particular form of humor. I also see both intimacy and rivalry indispensable to the practice of teasing: A person can tease one another as long as there is an intimate relation and also as long as there is an explicit or implicit rivalry of any kind between them.

In the context of (heteromale) homosocial groupings, teasing has a double function regulating power relations and positions among men. First, it helps (heteromasculine) men perform funny and humorous personalities to entertain people, and, hence, be accepted and appreciated by others. This can be seen as a way to gain status and respect. "Having a laugh" altogether is, indeed, of crucial importance for heteromale groupings as well as creating and presenting certain subjectivities within the group (Chapple & Ziebland, 2004, p. 1131). Second, whether it is for short term or long term, whether it is derived from a micro achievement or from some socio-structural sources, teasing indicates and consolidates one's higher position, power and status in the group; and, at the same time, it enables another to challenge or subvert this very position. What reactions and consequences teasing creates depends on several factors such as who does it, who is targeted, how much authority and status these people have in the group, under what circumstances it is done, what it is authorized by and how offensive it is.

The use of teasing is in parallel with the "comfort" and "free of social constrains" (heteromasculine) men feel in the absence of women. Thus, they are able to make use of broader topics, acts and strategies to have fun with less self-control. In these jokes, they refer first and foremost to sexuality. The presentation of oneself as a heteromasculine subject usually goes hand in hand with the constant sexual objectification of *female body* and the feminization of some other men and some of their characteristics. Besides all other types of discrimination in offensive jokes, in terms of gender, sexism and heterosexism very often evolve into hatred, i.e. misogyny, homophobia, and transphobia. Women and queers, and characteristics attached to them are often insulted and mocked directly or indirectly. This is, in fact, not so much different in (heteromale) homosocial spaces than other parts of the social life for the society itself is characterized so to a large degree. Yet, these spaces allow many (heteromasculine) men not to suppress or hide their abusive language or hatred towards othered people. It would not be wrong to argue that even the subversive possibilities of teasing in terms of power relations are mostly in a limited area of hegemonic norms, values, ideals, discourses and performances of masculinity. Hence, the use of teasing as a variant of humor usually serves ultimately to the reproduction of the existing gender order in (heteromale) homosocial groupings because these groupings themselves underline and almost always impose the normative patterns of masculinity.

3

Men, Masculinities, Sports and Football

This chapter will discuss various dimensions, dynamics and elements of the relation between gender and sports in general in the first place. Then, it will pay particular attention to the relation between masculinity and football. Overall, it will present the dynamics in the engagement of boys and men with sports and football, and the patterns of relations among boys and men through sports and football in a historical and sociological context. In this way, I hope to demonstrate how sports and football came to be an important element in the construction and expression of particular heteromasculine subjectivities, and how it plays a normalizing and regulatory role in inclusive and exclusive power relations among boys and men.

§ 3.1 Sports, Gender, Politics

Sports is one of the social institutions where economic, *racial*, ethnic and gender inequalities are also observable. On the one hand, it is an arena affected and shaped by socially existing power relations. On the other hand, it is an instrument to reproduce these relations, justify and legitimize dominant ideologies, and produce and reproduce consent for moral values. Besides these restrictive characteristics, sports also creates some emancipatory possibilities and opportunities to challenge existing power relations, dominant ideologies and hegemonic values.

Sports-like rural folk games had long been part of social lives in various parts of the world in the pre-modern era. They can be traced back to thousands years ago. However, they were different than what we today call as sports. Their rules were flexible and changing among geographies and communities. They were not really performance-oriented and not always peaceful. The emergence of sports-like activities was based on humans' settlement, having leisure time and producing surplus, which inevitably required slavery and exploitation of labor. This was how the lower classes were forced to undertake the whole production process, while the upper classes went out of this process and had leisure time for artistic and sportive activities (Fişek, 1985, p. 12).

The Ancient Olympic Games, which were the origin of the modern Olympics, were made possible by such social and economic circumstances – intense slavery and strict class separation. Only "free citizens" – those except slaves, women and children – were able to participate in these games. According to Kurthan Fişek (1985), the games served to peace in the first place: For centuries, the Greek city-states traditionally agreed on an *ekecheiria* (truce) three months before these games started to guarantee people to travel safely before, during and after games which were lasting five days and including wrestling, boxing, running, long jump, javelin throw and discus throw (pp. 12-13). However, Fişek (1985) states, this peacefulness would change due to the impact of the Roman Empire and the participation of Roman gladiators in the games (p. 13). The late Ancient Olympic Games were rather violent, "live or die" games; and, unlike modern Olympics, they were serving as a preparation for wars, where only first placing was important, scores were not recorded, rules of games were not codified and bodily individual developments and challenges were not cared (Kidd, 1990, pp. 33-34).

The institutionalization of modern sports started in the mid-nineteenth century in Britain – and it was soon followed by the United States. What was new about modern sports, as part of the general rationalization and bureaucratization Britain and the United States were experiencing, was the codification of rules of games and foundations of central governing bodies. One of its distinctive characteristics was its performance-orientedness; scores were now recorded and placings other than first were also cared. Unlike previous folk

versions of sports-like games which were generally played for social and religious purposes, modern sportive activities have been "an end in themselves" and almost a "physical art for art's sake" (Bourdieu, 1978, p. 823).

Boys' public schools in Britain had an important role in the institutionalization of sports – especially of rugby football and association football. Sports had recently been attributed educational, disciplining and moral meanings and importance in boys' education by teachers, headmasters, innovators and organizers. At a pragmatic level, sports was used in these schools as "an economical way of occupying the adolescents", a way to decrease their potential of violence and "supervise" them (Bourdieu, 1978, p. 831). Sports was now regarded as "educational, preparing boys and young men for careers in business, government, colonial administration, and the military by instilling physical and mental toughness, obedience to authority, and loyalty to the team" (Kidd, 1990, p. 34). It was supported also by a quasi-scientific discourse on its necessity and benefits for *male body* in terms of the conservation of energy and regeneration of the body (Crosset, 1990, p. 50; Kidd, 1990, p. 35; Messner, 1994a, p. 46). Speaking in a large scale, sports provided the instrumental tools to consolidate bourgeois moralities and ideals in the era of industrialization and high level of migration from rural to industrial urban areas. The youth from the middle classes gained practical knowledge for their future careers, while the youth from the working classes internalized obedience through obeying higher authorities (such as coaches) within sports.

Such educational, disciplining and moral functions of sports and sportive activities would also be used for nationalist and militarist purposes – which are rarely independent of masculinities. Especially non-competitive and non-institutional sports were put into action accordingly; yet, competitive and institutional ones were not exempt either. Sports, in this sense, was seen useful to create or consolidate a cultural and political hegemony, produce certain subjectivities, and to control, manipulate and mobilize masses. Physical education and gymnastics were supported by many political regimes as a means of national solidarity through the active participation and mobilization of masses, and their collective activity for common national ideals. Competitive sports were rather risky in terms of idealized national solidarity because com-

petition within might divide people. Hence, it was generally kept under control. In some contexts, competitive team sports were used also to emphasize teamwork, division of labor, strategy and obedience. Its more important role was at international level: battle of honor and superiority among nations. Athletes and teams came to symbolize and represent power of their nations in such cases. This political interpretation of sports, overall, attributed an ideological importance to it.

Particularly in Germany in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries sports and physical education were an essential element of the nation-building process. Mainly gymnastics and scouting functioned as a way to shape both bodies and character traits of young men to prepare them for a possible future war. According to Yiğit Akın (2004), famous *Turnen Gymnastics* itself was created – in opposition to individual and competitive Anglo-Saxon sports – by Friedrich Ludwig Jahn, who was a German nationalist, for military purposes after Prussia was defeated by France in 1806 (pp. 127-128).

Many other regimes – mainly authoritarian ones – around the world took sports, physical education and gymnastics seriously, especially in the interwar period (Akın, 2004, pp. 30-33). They adopted various schools of gymnastics and various sportive bodily policies. However, their purposes were alike. Not surprisingly, they targeted to physically and morally shape men in the first place, since they saw men as active and primary participants of wars and economic production as well as the direct representatives of a nation's power. Women, too, were encouraged or forced to participate in sportive activities by some political regimes. However, their sportive tasks were generally "softer" and in parallel with social duties expected from them – such as fertility, domestic work, and being "complementary" of and "supportive" for men both in war and peace.

As for the Ottoman Empire, similar to the recent tendencies in the continental Europe, sports, gymnastics and physical education was part of education from the early 1860s onwards in newly established Western type of civil and military schools, and they became "a compulsory element of modern high school curricula" via a state regulation (*Maarif-i Umumiye Nizamnamesi*) in 1869 to reform the state and revive state power (Dinçşahin & Lüküslü, 2013, p. 197).

The political elite, reformers and nationalist intellectuals of the Second Constitutional era, too, saw physical education, gymnastics and scouting as a way to create a militarized nation composing primarily of physically and morally strong men. In this regard, they also supported the foundation and operation of nationalist youth organizations which mobilized boys and young men via gymnastics and scouting (Cora, 2004, pp. 59-63). Some of these organizations were further "paramilitary" ones where young men were almost militarily educated through sportive activities such as jogging, running, jumping, boxing, wrestling, horse-riding, rowing, javelin throwing, discus throwing, cycling, archery, football, tennis, golf and hockey as well as gymnastics (Toprak, 1979, p. 98).

Meanwhile, physical education came to be identified with public health; this idea would be adopted by the state elite and would affect the state policies on physical education in the early Republican era (Cora, 2004, pp. 88-121). This identification would coincide with discussions on the *new man* which was idealized in comparison to a stereotypical Ottoman man. Doing sports and sportive activities was an underlined element of the *new man* who was idealized as modern, patriotic, educated, industrial and athletic in the early Republican discourse (Köksal, 1998, p. 32).

According to Dinçşahin and Lüküslü (2013):

> [T]he Kemalist nationalists readily adopted physical education as an ideological apparatus of the state to transform the masses into strong, equal and substitutable citizens of the Republic. In the Ottoman educational system, physical education was limited with modern educational institutions, which only aimed at educating the imperial elite, whereas the Republican model physical education was integral to the structures and institutions of public education, which included virtually all segments of society. (p. 198)

An important figure in terms of gymnastics and physical education in the late Ottoman and early Republican era was Selim Sırrı Tarcan – whose life was dedicated to learning, practicing and teaching sports, and to expanding its sphere of influence both among people (including girls and women) and within education (Akın, 2004; Dinçşahin & Lüküslü, 2013). Tarcan had state

resources and support to seek and realize his social and sportive ideals especially in the early Republican era when these ideals intersected with political ideals of the elite and ideologues. In this regard, it is significant that the Swedish school of gymnastics Tarcan opted for made this intersection easier. This gymnastics "aimed at developing body harmoniously by strengthening each part of the body one by one rather than training the best athletes, or competitors" (Dinçşahin & Lüküslü, 2013, p. 201), and, in comparison to German school of gymnastics, it "seemed to be more compatible with idea of social harmony and solidarity" sought by the elite and ideologues (Dinçşahin & Lüküslü, 2013, p. 203). From the perspective of the state elite, physical education and gymnastics were important for demographic control and for having skilled, productive, loyal and obedient citizens (Akın, 2004, pp. 171-190).

In the 1930s, however, Swedish gymnastics would be replaced by German gymnastics in the context of rising German effect on the eve of the Second World War (Dinçşahin & Lüküslü, 2013, p. 204). In 1938, the participation in physical education became compulsory for Turkish citizens in a certain age range through the passage of the Law on Physical Education which was suggested and prepared by Carl Diem who was one of the German physical education experts invited to Turkey (Tarakçıoğlu, 2014, p. 1810).[1]

It, however, requires a further and comprehensive investigation to understand how these attempts were received by different groups of people, to what extent they succeeded or failed, and in what ways people engaged with sports. As we learn from Murat C. Yıldız (2015), for instance, there were some sports clubs where young men voluntarily met, exercised and homosocialized in Ottoman İstanbul at the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Yıldız demonstrated that there was also a new male bodily aesthetics originating from this athletic culture. This aesthetics was urban and middle-class, embraced and performed by many Turkish, Greek, Armenian and Jewish young men, and circulated through mostly semi-nude photographs in the print media during the Second Constitutional Era, thanks to newly proliferating cameras, photography studios and the physical culture press.

1 This age range was 12-45 for boys and men, and 12-30 for girls and women (Tarakçıoğlu, 2014, p. 1811).

> The defining characteristics of this new body were proportionality, a slim waist, defined biceps, a straight back and a broad and hairless chest. The new look was deemed 'beautiful' – because it was based on physical exercise as a personal effort, itself a new bourgeois value – and thus 'civilized'. (Yıldız, 2015, p. 193)

Of course, this new understanding of bodily aesthetics cannot be generalized. Probably many other aesthetic norms and many contrary reactions to sports simultaneously existed at the time and in the years to come. However, at least it is obvious that athletic *male bodies* started to be appreciated within particular social groups.

Returning to the mid-nineteenth century, the institutionalization of sports as a male preserve from the mid-nineteenth century on also seems to be a response by men to first-wave feminism, to women's calls for equality and to changing social relations in terms of gender in the first half of the century (Crosset, 1990, p. 46; Dunning & Sheard, 1973, p. 12; Kidd, 1990, p. 36). In the context of rugby football, Dunning and Sheard (1973) state that:

> [Men] responded [to women], among other ways, by developing rugby football as a male preserve in which they could bolster up their threatened masculinity and, at the same time, mock, objectify and vilify women, the principal source of the threat. (p. 12)

Whether it was a direct response by men or an unintended consequence of the same social changes, modern sports and sports spaces were soon masculinized and heterosexualized through both repetitive and regulatory practices, came to signify heteromaleness, privileged heteromasculine men, and provided them a safe homosocial environment – where they could compete with each other, establish and maintain social bonds, set up and perform particular athletic subjectivities, try to reproduce their manly values, seek manly ideals, remain their social privileges and reconstitute their social hegemony. Women and characteristics attached to them were excluded from this male environment. Athletic *male bodies* and athletic performances by men came to symbolize men's "natural" superiority against women.

> The institutional organization of sport embeds definite social relations: competition and hierarchy among men, exclusion or domination of women. These social relations of gender are both realized and symbolized in the bodily performances. Thus men's greater sporting prowess has become a theme of backlash against feminism. It serves as symbolic proof of men's superiority and right to rule. (Connell, 2005, p. 54)

Women were discouraged from and disapproved of participating in sportive activities to a large extent. As they criticized this exclusion, claimed their right to participate, and as their exclusion became impossible for men, a new solution to maintain men's privileges through sports was born: *gender segregation*. With a few exceptions, this segregation has been consolidated in institutional sports in general and has been one of the strictest and most powerful institutional gender segregation throughout the world. The idea behind it is that, in terms of physical capacities and potentials, men as a homogenous group are "superior" to women as another homogenous group, so that they need to compete separately which otherwise would end up with an inevitable defeat of women by men. If we put aside gender binarism it pre-assumes, this idea ignores, on the one hand, physical differences and heterogeneity among *male-bodied* people and among *female-bodied* people, and, on the other hand, physical similarities between *male-bodied* and *female-bodied* people.

This gender segregation in sports has been naturalized to the extent that it does not require further justification. A remarkable example was witnessed in football in the early 2000s:

> This desire to keep men and women separate was made very clear at the end of 2004. FIFA banned Maribel Dominguez (a Mexican woman who accepted a two-year playing contract with a second division men's professional club; Celaya) from playing in the men's professional league. The ban was immediate and within a few days of her accepting her contract with the club. In fact, FIFA held an emergency meeting to deal with this inaugural event, after which they issued the statement: 'There must be a clear separation between men's and women's football.' Frustratingly, FIFA's pithy statement reflects an absolute ruling

> and does not provide any rationale for the blanket decision – or, apparently, any recourse. (Caudwell, 2011b, p. 335)

Institutional sports has been shaped on the basis of gender binarism, assuming that there are only two genders directly deriving from two "natural" *sexes*, and, in return, it has powerfully and institutionally provided the regulation and reproduction of this binarism. Within the existing order, governing bodies in sports have been responsible for assigning individual bodies as "either" *female* "or" *male*. Bodies that do not conform to this simplistic and reductionist binarism challenge this gender segregation based on a pre-assumption. Transgender people, intersex people and any people who do not bodily comply with normative classification of bodies are often discriminated, marginalized, and undergo disturbing and humiliating "scientific" *sex* verification tests. To legitimize their decisions, governing bodies in sports have needed the authority of "science" in this issue. These so-called "scientific" verification tests check and analyze a range of variables such as chromosomes, hormones and genitalia which are identified with *male-bodiedness* or *female-bodiedness* and which are believed to be determinative of one's "inherent" and "biological" *sex*.

The primary purpose of governing bodies in sports to apply *sex* verification tests is to prevent *male bodies* (seen as "superior") from competing with *female bodies* (seen as "inferior"), because it is thought to be "unfair". Therefore, *sex* verification is seen much more important in women's sports, which are also more familiar with rumors and suspicions about some successful athletes' *sex*. From its beginning on, predominantly athletes competing in women's sports underwent such verification tests. Indeed, according to Sullivan (2011), this verification process was also known as "femininity testing" at the beginning, and firstly held by the International Association of Athletics Federation (IAAF) in the 1966 European Track and Field Championship, albeit in less "scientific" and more humiliating ways than those soon to be introduced by the International Olympic Committee (IOC). The test was formalized by the IOC in the 1966 Summer Games in Mexico and was obligatory for all female athletes. Only after their *sex* was verified and they got a "fem card" they were allowed to participate in competitions (Sullivan, 2011, p. 404).

Yet, *sex* verification has never been this simple because it was based on a false binarism. As Anne Fausto-Sterling (2000, as cited in Buzuvis, 2010) states, "The body's sex is simply too complex. There is no either/or. Rather, there are shades of difference." Thus, neither chromosomes nor hormones nor genitals were simply determinative of an "inherent" and "biological" *sex* because, as we discussed in the previous chapter, *sex* itself is a cultural and historical interpretation and classification of bodies. So, these tests did not guarantee verifications as expected. Some athletes failed to pass such tests, they were disqualified, their medals were taken away, and their records were deleted. In 2000, both the IAAF and the IOC decided to demand *sex* verification tests only if there was a "suspicion" about one's *sex* (Sullivan, 2011, p. 407). Yet, intersex people, transgender people and any people not meeting "scientific" expectations of femininity continued to encounter discriminative policies. In 2011, the IAAF introduced a new regulation which defined "androgenic hormones" as the factor that provides superior sporting performances, obliged female athletes with "hyperandrogenism" to reduce their levels of "androgenic hormones", and declared that "A female athlete who declines, fails or refuses to comply with the eligibility determination process under the regulations shall not be eligible to compete in women's competition".[2] Many athletes have been forced to conform to medicalized gender normativity through receiving hormone therapies or stopping their ongoing therapies (Longman, 2018).[3]

However, a question remained unanswered: What is the evidence showing that variables attached to *maleness* are more important than other variables such as age, weight, height, other physical characteristics, nutrition, social and class privileges about coaching and training, having sponsors and superior sportive equipment which are not taken into consideration on the basis of a "fair" competition among women (Buzuvis, 2010; Karaçam & Öztürk, 2017;

2 The IAAF (2011) defines "hyperandrogenism" as the "excessive production of androgens (testosterone)." For a detailed discussion on this decision by the IAAF, see Karaçam & Öztürk, 2015, 2017, 2018.

3 For a recent example, the Caster Semenya case, see Buzuvis, 2010; Hinsliff, 2019; Jordan-Young & Karkazis, 2019.

Longman, 2018)? Moreover, what is the "scientific" point to apply gender segregation in children's sports where there is even much less difference among bodies?[4] These are, of course, cultural and political rather than "natural" and "scientific" decisions, and exemplify the institutionalization of "punitive and regulatory social conventions" in terms of gender and sexuality (Butler, 2003, p. 422).

However artificial and superficial, there does exist a gender segregation in institutional sports and there is a big gap between two of them. This institutional difference is obviously part of existing socio-structural sexism, and an outcome of the continuous devaluation of athletic performances in women's sports. Performances of *female-bodied* athletes are generally ignored, dismissed, degraded or ridiculed; and they are usually misrepresented in media if at all. This process coexists with a pejorative and anxious discourse on "defeminization" of athletic and muscular *female bodies* because there is "a joint fear of lesbianism and masculinity" from them (Halberstam, 2002, p. 358), which has the potential to undermine the desired male privilege of performing masculinity and accessing sexually to *female body*.

In addition to the misrepresentation, social disdain and less public attention, women's sports often undergo institutional discriminations in terms of economic income and access to sports resources and facilities.[5] With some exceptions in particular sports that are described as "proper" for women,

4 An instance which shows that gender segregation is not "necessary" or "required" at least for children's sports is SB Frankfort U12 girls' football team. Because there was no other girls' football team to play against, they joined and won the boys' Devon Junior Minor League in Plymouth, England in April 2019 (Turner, 2019).

5 Women in many branches of sports have long been fighting for equal pay and equal treatment. In 2017, international football players and the national football federation in Norway signed an agreement that provided players in men's and women's national teams to receive equal pay – it required male players to accept a wage cut though (O'Connor, 2017). In March 2019, U.S. women's football team sued the national football federation for gender discrimination. "The discrimination, the athletes said, affects not only their paychecks but also where they play and how often, how they train, the medical treatment and coaching they receive, and even how they travel to matches. [...] The women's players argue that they are required to play more games than the men's team, that they win more of them, and yet still receive less pay from the federation" (Das, 2019). For more examples of women's fight for equality in sports, see Caron & Mervosh, 2019.

women's sports in general are overshadowed by men's sports. A sports is seen "proper" for women as long as it fits cultural norms of femininity; and because of this very reason, the same sports can be regarded as feminine in a cultural context while as masculine in another. In general, however, in comparison to "masculine sports" based on aggression, toughness and strength, "feminine sports" are rather based on "balance, co-ordination, flexibility and grace" (Hargreaves, 1986, p. 116).

At this point, it is also worthwhile to mention a remarkable interpretation of sports made by Brian Pronger (1999) who sees "competitive sports as a system of [sexual] desire" (p. 377). Accordingly:

> The most masculine competitive sports are those that are the most explicitly spatially dominating: boxing, football, soccer, hockey. In these sports, players invade the space of others and vigorously guard the same from happening to themselves. The only honorable form of desire in these competitive sports is domineering and protective; it is anathema to welcome other men into one's space. The team whose desire produces the most invasive phallus, which is called offensive strategy, and tightest asshole, known as defensive strategy, wins the game. (Pronger, 1999, p. 382)

From this perspective, not only sports field where competitive sports takes place is gendered and sexualized but competitive sports itself is characterized so. What makes the cultural connotation of a sports as masculine or feminine is the importance of spatial domination in that sports as well as similarities and differences between its requirements and cultural understanding of masculinity and femininity. In this sense, competitive sports is "masculinizing" for its performers – especially for successful ones (Pronger, 1999, p. 381).

As for cisgender male athletes in general, sports provides a ground to constitute and perform particular heteromasculine subjectivities. Socially appreciated values of masculinity such as strength, toughness, courage, aggressiveness, competitiveness, self-sacrifice, rationality and being strategical are also at the core of institutional sports. Besides, socially appreciated aesthetic standards highlight and idealize athletic and muscular *male bodies*. It enables male athletes to represent hegemonic ideals of masculinity.

An athletic career is never a bed of roses though. These very advantages are at the same time the biggest threat to these athletes. They are usually expected to push their bodily limits, look tough and powerful, get used to and deny pain, repress their emotions and hide their weaknesses. At the same time, they have to sacrifice many things they wish or like to do; discipline themselves in terms of their social lives, nutrition, resting and sexuality; and be committed to strict training and diet programs (Wacquant, 1995, p. 75). Hence, athletic body turns into a type of capital – *bodily capital*, as called by Wacquant – to invest, work on and protect. What Wacquant (1995) speaks of boxers can be seen as a general point for all athletic careers:

> The fighter's body is simultaneously his means of production, the raw materials he and his handlers (trainer and manager) have to work with and on, and, for a good part, the somatized product of his past training and extant mode of living. *Bodily capital and bodily labor are thus linked by a recursive relation* which makes them closely dependent on one another.[6] (p. 67)

The denial of pain is worth particular attention. Male athletes in institutional sports are strongly forced not to show any sign of mental or physical weakness, which is seen against the hegemonic sportive ethos. Learning and getting used to live in pain is, thus, an inevitable consequence. This issue has commonly been analyzed as the internalization of this hegemonic ethos to the extent that it ultimately ends up with violence against an athlete's own body. In this regard, Kaufman's (1987) conceptualization of *the triad of men's violence* – composing of "violence against women", "violence against other men", and "violence against oneself" – has provided a framework for such analyses. According to Kaufman (1987), all three are important in the construction of masculine self and maintenance of men's hegemony not only in sports but in society in general.

Don Sabo (1994), who had an athletic experience in the past, narrates his experience within this framework:

6 Italics in original.

> I "played" through grade school, co-captained my high school team, and went on to become an inside linebacker and defensive captain at the NCAA Division I level. I learned that pain and injury are "part of the game". I learned to be an animal. Coaches took notice of animals. Animals made first team. Being an animal meant being fanatically aggressive and ruthlessly competitive. If I saw an arm in front of me, I trampled it. Whenever blood was spilled, I nodded approval. The coaches taught me to "punish the other man," and to secretly see my opponents' broken bones as little victories within the bigger struggle. Little did I suspect, though, that I was devastating my own body at the same time. I endured broken noses, ribs, fingers, toes and teeth; torn muscles and ligaments; bruises, bad knees, and busted lips; and the gradual pulverizing of my spinal column, which, when I reached thirty and my jock career was long over, had caused seven years of near-constant pain. (84)

This, however, does not tell the whole story. It is not likely that all men in institutional sports always behave in such a reckless way. Indeed, such approaches were challenged by Markula and Pringle (2005) who, after a fieldwork with rugby players in New Zealand, argued that men "[know] of themselves in multiple ways" and that pain and injury do not always have to be masculinizing experiences for them (p. 484).

> Although the players appeared to accept pain and injury as relatively normal, they were not necessarily naïve or uncritical about corporeal damage. In fact, the men simultaneously normalized and problematized injury. (Markula & Pringle, 2005, p. 488)

The simultaneous normalization and problematization of pain and injury through the hegemonic masculine sportive ethos start in the early childhood as one participates in institutional sports. I can share a short autobiographic anecdote in this issue from the days I was playing football for a local club when I was 12. In one of the early training sessions of the season, we were playing an intra-team football match. However, during the match, I started suffering a rash in my groin area due to my underwear. It was restricting my ability to act comfortably. The coach (who was a former professional player played also for

the Turkish national team) realized that I was facing a problem. He blew his whistle, stopped the match, walked towards me and concernedly asked: "Are you okay, son?" I said, "Coach, I have a rash in my groin area. It really hurts." He was disappointed. He laughed at me insultingly, said "I thought you have a problem about your hamstring", immediately turned his back, re-started the match, and walked towards his place. I was ashamed as my teammates were looking and laughing at me. I kept playing and pretended that I was not suffering. That day I was once again lectured that I had to be more careful about expressing pain and weakness within the team because there were acceptable and unacceptable forms of them. I, however, never behaved recklessly to normalize any potential pain and injury, but rather avoided them as much as possible. They did occur anyway. In this sense, football was not a mere masculinizing experience for me.

When pain and injury are normalized, painkiller drugs and injections become an ordinary part of many athletes' daily lives. Rather than solving the problem, these medical interventions reduce or remove pain for a limited period of time, or, in some cases, delay an inevitable surgery (Messner, 2002, p. 57). Some athletes avoid immediate and permanent medical treatments because it may harm their reputations, make them be questioned, criticized or condemned in the framework of the hegemonic masculine sportive ethos, and, more practically, cause them to fall in rankings in individual sports or to lose their positions in team sports. In this way, however, injuries and pain chronically repeat, long-term damages occur on body, and emotional pressure and mental disorders (such as depression, anxiety and traumas) accompany physical problems. As in the case of Sabo, many athletes face and suffer these permanent damages especially after they retire from sports – if they are lucky enough to complete their athletic careers without big injuries.

This sportive ethos is, in fact, part of a general social emphasis on competition. As it was discussed earlier, competitions and competitiveness gradually expanded their dominance from economic to non-economic spheres of social life and became crucially important in the constitution and interaction of subjects in the neoliberal era. In this sense, modern competitive sports which appeared as "an end in themselves" (Bourdieu, 1978, p. 823) played an important role in the naturalization and consolidation of competitiveness. These sports

have not only been shaped by the competitive logic, but have also been one of the most powerful social spaces where this competitive logic has been normalized and reproduced strongly in return. Both advantages and damages of athletic careers occur within this broader social context.

Indeed, considering these high costs of athletic careers besides their advantages – especially for combat sports – a number social dynamics such as gender, class, *race* and ethnicity come into play. An athletic career is generally more appealing to people from the lower classes, rural areas, ethnic minorities, and for people of color. Structural barriers these people face in their lives, lesser opportunities they have, and their more limited access to social and economic resources can and do make an athletic career more attractive for them in terms of upward mobility, gaining social status and respect, and ways to express themselves, although it requires them to risk their health, discipline themselves, and sacrifice their social lives and desires (Majors, 1990, 114; Messner, 1990a, p. 105; 1990b, p. 212; 1994b, p. 78).

According to Wacquant (1995), this "self-denial" is indeed familiar to such boxers in their daily lives; and, again, it can be generalized to all athletes with similar social backgrounds from various sports:

> [F]or most fighters, self-denial has been woven into the fabric of daily life since childhood. Boxing gives a more systematic, codified, and (for some) profitable expression to an all-too-familiar experience of deprivation rooted in racial and class exclusion. (p. 81)

However, it is also noteworthy that structural barriers remain preventing upward mobilities of these people to a large extent, and success stories continue to be rather individual and exceptional ones.[7]

7 The relation of athletic careers with lower-class and/or rural backgrounds in Turkey has so far been demonstrated in the context of wrestling (Hacısoftaoğlu Közleme, 2012), taekwondo (Tokdoğan, 2015), football (Elmas, 2017), and, in part, boxing in a short documentary (Bayhan, 2018).

§ 3.2 Football, Masculinity, Politics

Although institutional football is not a merely male preserve on and off the field as much as it was half a century ago, it is, nevertheless, still a male-dominated domain for men's privileged use, access and control.

In terms of football fandom in particular, the engagement with football in this way allows (heteromasculine) men to be part of a general heteromale-dominated community or some heteromale sub-groupings where they can enjoy privileges of homosocialization, constitute and perform particular heteromasculine subjectivities in relation with each other, express themselves, establish homosocial bonds and compete in various ways – this competition may occur among themselves or against other individuals or groups perhaps indirectly through the team they support. By exhibiting themselves before a male audience through football and football-related activities, these men seek ways to prove their heteromasculinities (both to other men and to themselves) to gain recognition, status, respect and validation. Hegemonic norms of masculinity are apparent and regulatory in these relations.

Through football men also find ways to increase their social and symbolic capitals which is not limited to the football environment.[8] It makes a direct impact on their daily lives, or, in other words, their daily lives are shaped and re-shaped by social relations and social networks they have via football. This

8 According to Bourdieu, there are also some types of capitals other than economic capital – which are also influential on and convertible to each other. *Social capital:* "[T]he aggregate of the actual or potential resources that are linked to possession of a durable network of more or less institutionalized relationships of mutual acquaintance and recognition – or in other words, to membership in a group – which provides each of its members with a backing of the collectivity-owned capital, a 'credential' that entitles them to credit in the various senses of the word" (Bourdieu, 2011, p. 84). *Cultural capital:* "[...] cultural capital, or instruments of production and appropriation of cultural products, exist in three states: embodied in the owner (for example, language skills or personal familiarity with works of art), objectified (in books, paintings, machines, etc.) and certified, as with diplomas and formal credentials" (Wacquant, 1987, p. 69). *Symbolic capital:* "[It] consists in the prestige and the 'social credit' conferred by socially accepted or socially concealed uses of other types of capital: for instance, the repute accruing to those industrialists who 'grant' funds for professors or research programs (and sometimes entire universities) bearing their name" (Wacquant, 1987, p. 69).

is the case especially for some fan groups (*ultras*) who "imagine their subjectivity as 24-h fans who congregate whether or not there is a match" (Nuhrat, 2018, p. 873). Although it is not inevitable, the collective engagement of (heteromasculine) men with football also provides them with a justifiable social ground to break free from social restraints and self-control, apply verbal and physical violence, and perform extreme heteromasculine subjectivities. These activities seem to be enabled also by "comfort" and "freedom" these men feel during their homosocial relations.

Dominant fan cultures always have close contacts with the most appreciated ways of masculinity in society. Fans, who embrace the hegemonic patterns of masculinity, constitute their club's and their own self-images in opposition to femininity in the realm of football. In this way, football discursively and performatively appears as a power relation between the "oppressor" and the "oppressed", between the masculine and the feminine. Male rivals and male referees are often identified with femininity, and characteristics thought to be feminine are attributed to them. Misogynist, homophobic and transphobic chants, banners and slogans claim how truly masculine and powerful these fans are, while how weak, soft and feminine others are. Such chants, banners and slogans include many references to sexuality.

> The language contained within these chants helps produce 'rhetorical territory' within fan culture and stadia spaces, which is based on devaluing gay men's sexuality and the ridiculing of sexual activity that involves anal penetration. Through rhetoric, language and lyrical expression, football chants suggest male heterosexuality as the highly prestigious norm and gay men's sexuality as the trivialised 'Other'. Football chants are also laced with other (silent) expressions of dominance, for example, sexist, misogynist and racist language and lyrics. (Caudwell, 2011a, p. 126)

However, it should be noted that there is a double process. On the one hand, gayness and gay sexuality as a whole are constantly devalued, and heteromasculine fans embracing this language distance themselves from gayness and gay sexuality. On the other hand, it is noticeable that the devalued male sexual

activity is, in fact, being ("passively") anally penetrated, and these heteromasculine fans sometimes symbolically present themselves as ("active") anal penetrators against their feminized ("penetrable") rivals. In this context, winning, scoring and other particular achievements in football are celebrated as a sexual penetration.

Sexuality does not appear only symbolically or discursively in the realm of football or in dominant fan cultures. Whether individually or collectively, "sex tourism" often accompanies "football tourism". Tanıl Bora (2013) reminds us that some fan groups used to "ritually" visit brothels when they went to away matches of their teams in the 1970s and 1980s (p. 505). In this way, they perform one of the most important elements of their gendered and sexual subjectivities to symbolically complete their heteromasculine ideals through football. For many fan groups, going to away matches has connotations of a "raid" to "conquer" the enemy territory. And as we learnt from history repeatedly, desire to conquer the enemy territory militarily and desire to conquer *female body* sexually almost always go hand in hand. In practice, their strongest and most visible intersection is embodied in sexual violence towards women during war (Stetz, 2003). Furthermore, some nationalist fan groups which serve as paramilitary organizations may take part in wartime sexual crimes, too. Indeed, members of *Delije*, a fan group of Red Star which self-identified as Serbian nationalist, did so during the Yugoslavian Civil War (T. Bora, 2013, pp. 488-489).

Benedict Anderson's (1991) conceptualization of *imagined communities* has provided a suitable framework for the analysis of football fandom. Accordingly, fans locate themselves into and make sense of their experiences through an imagined and pre-assumed homogenous whole composing of all actors and supporters of their clubs, distinct from rival communities and identities. This is how they feel strong and feel the pride and the triumph of their identities over others. From this point of view, fandom can be regarded as a variant of nationalism. This "micro nationalism" is based on the distinction between *us* and *others,* and, indeed, a part or an outcome of the nationalistic mindset and worldview. Like nationalism, fandom, too, requires ritualistic practices (such as particular chants, banners and choreographies) and powerful symbols (such as emblems, flags, jerseys and heroes). These similarities

make a close relationship between them possible. Besides, as Kıvanç Koçak (2010) states, also "crowds" and "mass psychology" in football makes football a perfect land for the cultivation of nationalism (p. 29).

Football has obviously been a junction of nationalism, militarism and masculinity in many countries and contexts – although this is not inherent or inevitable. Bearing in mind how sports in general gained physical, educational and moral meanings and how it was used for ideological, nationalist and militarist purposes, we can say that football, too, was similarly influenced by such attempts and processes. According to T. Bora (2013), a handbook on football published in 1882 in Germany described football as a war per se (p. 490); and a textbook on football published in 1922 in Germany emphasized *manneszucht* in football – i.e. disciplining and training of manhood through football (p. 503).

Toughness, courage, competitiveness, aggressiveness, rationality, self-discipline and self-sacrifice at the individual level, and teamwork, division of labor and being strategical at the collective level have been essential to and required in football. These characteristics determining the hegemonic footballing ethos are not much different from that of the idealized man in nationalist and militarist worldviews. Nor are them much different from idealized, emphasized and sought hegemonic neoliberal subjectivities. In this regard, football has served also to the internalization of such values and production of such subjectivities directly or indirectly.

After football turned into an important international competition, players and teams displaying aforementioned characteristics came to symbolize and represent their nations and their nations' pre-assumed or idealized characteristics as well. These international meetings indeed made perhaps the biggest contribution to the reproduction of the relation between football nationalism, militarism and masculinity. Especially in cases of meetings between two countries who were in political conflict, the representative status sometimes intensified to the extent that the distinction between the "representor" and the "represented" disappeared.

A rather indirect impact of football to nationalism and nation-states was the foundation of national football leagues from the late nineteenth century on (T. Bora & N. Erdoğan, 1993, p. 225). Such leagues themselves had a political

significance and symbolized the national and territorial unity of states. They were organized and governed by national central authorities. Teams started to travel throughout their countries and play also against their non-local rivals. In this way, both local rivalries were moved into a national level and new rivalries at the national level were created.

The integration of football into the market economy in general and leisure industry in particular required a change in its relation with nationalism and militarism, too. According to T. Bora (2013):

> The strategic function of football was no longer the militarization of bodies or the preparation of the population for a military mobilization but being an instrument to produce nationalist consent in popular culture. Militarism would contribute to this ideological reproduction as a source of metaphor.[9] (p. 494)

The mainstream sports media have had an important role in the reproduction of this nationalist consent. This is the case, for instance, for football matches between Turkey and Greece at club team and national team levels. The media in both countries have made use of extreme war metaphors in a nationalist and militarist discourse (T. Bora and Gökalp, 2010, pp. 184-185). The role of the mainstream sports media, however, is not restricted to nationalism. It justified and naturalized existing unequal power relations in and through football, and also provided and popularized a football terminology making these very inequalities invisible.

Nevertheless, there have been many counter-cultural and counter-political efforts and interventions in institutional football as well. For instance, there are examples of leftist, anti-fascist, and queer fan groups and their networks around the world. There are also some clubs, such as St. Pauli and Livorno, which are identified with the working classes and socialist values, and have international reputations. There also exist examples of alternative football clubs, such as Football Club United of Manchester, which was founded by fans objecting their club's (Manchester United) administration operating by market laws (Irak, 2010, p. 186). These fan groups and clubs show once again that

9 My translation.

institutional football is a domain of social power relations; and, besides its restrictions, it also has possibilities to challenge these very power relations.

Institutional football in Turkey has mostly been in a close contact and interaction with nationalism. As discussed previously, first football clubs were born within ethnic communities and matches among them were also ethnic competitions to some extent. The rising Turkish nationalism at the late Ottoman era had direct reflections in the realm of football, too. Ali Sami Yen, the founder of Galatasaray Sports Club in 1905, would later say: "Our purpose was to play together like the English, to have a color and name, and to defeat non-Turkish teams" (Yüce, 2014, p. 147).[10]

As we learn from Yüce (2014), in the early 1910s, the CUP took control of a football club named Progrés, changed its name as Altınordu in 1914, and decided to have a team consisting of only Turkish players (p. 235).[11] The club benefited political advantages especially during the First World War. Some of their players were privileged not to do their military services, and while other clubs were already in trouble to find the required number of players to play, they even transferred some players in from their rivals (Yüce, 2014, pp. 295-296). As a result, they won three consecutive İstanbul League titles (Yüce, 2014, p. 392).

The raise of Turkish nationalism was also seen in the administration of the İstanbul League. Strugglers Club, which was founded by the Greek in 1908, was forced by the administration of the league to change its colors which were blue and white in reference to the Greek flag; however, the club did not accept this compulsion and abolished itself (Yüce, 2014, p. 288). Matches against foreign teams in this period – especially the ones against teams of the occupying states after the First World War – would also be important in terms of nationalism and nationalist historiography in the years to come (T. Bora & N. Erdoğan, 1993, pp. 223-224).

10 My translation.

11 Although there was a relation between them through their initiators, abovementioned Altınordu Sports Club which was founded in 1910 in İstanbul was different from present Altınordu Football Club which was founded in 1923 in İzmir (Yüce, 2014, p. 238).

The ideologically constitutive role of Turkish nationalism in the early Republican era helped the maintenance of the relation between football and nationalism. Football as a competitive sports was indeed generally disapproved by the political elite and nationalist ideologues who rather opted for non-competitive sports, gymnastics and physical education which were, in their opinion, necessary for national solidarity, public health, a physically and morally educated youth, their mobilization, and economically productive masses. In this regard, competitive sports was dangerous against such purposes because it reduced masses into passive spectators and divided them into micro identities. Therefore, for the political elite and the ideologues were expecting obedience and self-sacrifice through sports as such, they regarded football as "degenerated" and "egoist" (Akın, 2004, pp. 154-155). However, they did not or could not prevent football either. They rather tried to keep in contact with clubs and to keep them under control.

As T. Bora (2013) states, early in the 1940s, football would be objected similarly but in a more radical way by Nihal Atsız – a famous Turkish racist ideologue – who saw football not inherent in or proper for the "Turkish essence" which is "warrior". Atsız would say that football is a "feminine" and "meaningless" sports that prevented active mass participation and harmed national unity by dividing people through fandom; and that it should have been replaced by more "manly" and "meaningful" sports fitting the "Turkish essence" and allowing active mass participation (T. Bora, 2013, p. 494).

Focusing on football fandom, it has usually been in interaction with nationalism in Turkey, too. Rituals and symbols identified with Turkish nationalism as well as nationalist chants, banners and slogans have been observable in the intersection of football, nationalism, militarism and masculinity. The rise of Turkish nationalism in society has always made an immediate effect in stadiums, and, in return, it is embodied and reproduced there. T. Bora (2013) points out that the existing roots of nationalism in stadiums were discovered and manipulated intentionally by supporters of the Milliyetçi Hareket Partisi (MHP, or Nationalist Movement Party) in the early 1990s – in the context of the further militarization of the Kurdish Question. They dominated terraces through nationalist and militarist chants, banners and slogans, and more importantly, they invited or imposed other fans to sing the national anthem. This

would later gain a ritualistic characteristic, be formalized, and even be a "taboo" to the extent that whoever offers to abolish it would easily be labeled as a "traitor" (T. Bora, 2013, p. 501).

Nationalism at both macro and micro levels still maintains its hegemony in the football environment in Turkey. On its intersection with gender, however, there is a dilemma of nationalist mindset and discourse. On the one hand, the nation and the club are masculinized (sexually "active" and powerful), and, hence, claimed to be more masculine than other nations and clubs. On the other hand, they are feminized (romantically "passive" and powerless), and, hence, seen in need of a continuous male protection against "enemies". Chants, banners and slogans about the nation or the club shuttle between these two poles – between its strong masculinity and capacity to "penetrate" in comparison to rivals, and its femininity as an object of heteromale desire and romantic love, also in need of protection.

As football became part of the popular culture and leisure industry, and as it got predominated by the middle classes, new channels for women's participation in football were also opened. However, to participate in football environment, women had to accept that it was still a male-dominated space and they had to somehow adapt to its highly masculine culture. They individually and collectively bargained with existing football culture and applied various strategies. As Itır Erhart's (2013) article shows, performing female masculinity, participating with male companies, and joining to some fan groups or creating their own groups are some of the strategies adopted by women. However, there have still been many cultural barriers preventing women's participation in the football environment because "normative femininity reduces and restricts women's relationships with football" (Caudwell, 2011b, p. 340).

Football has also been an essential element of heteromasculine subjectivities and relations among boys and men in Turkey. Boys start being interested in football at an early age through socialization, both by playing it (in schools, streets, parks) and supporting a football club (possibly the one their elder relatives or idols support). Very similar to the functioning of rugby which "is a prime normalizing practice" for boys and "mark[s] boys' bodies as appropriately masculine" in New Zealand (Markula & Pringle, 2005, 481), football in

Turkey functions to validate, refute or classify masculinities of *male bodies* especially during boyhood. As Atencio and Koca's (2011) study demonstrates, too, in football-dominated socialization processes among boys, those who are uninterested or less skilled in football are likely to be marginalized and to seek ways to constitute and perform alternative gendered subjectivities to be recognized and accepted within their peer groups while those who are more involved and skilled in football are more likely to be reputable members within these groups. Football helps boys compete in serious or quasi-serious ways, regulates inclusive and exclusive power relations among them (along with class, age, *race* and ethnicity), and provides them with a social domain to learn and internalize the most appreciated norms and values of football, masculinity, and society.

The interest in football does not disappear in adulthood, and football maintains its regulatory role in relations among (heteromasculine) men and its important role in the construction of heteromasculine subjectivities. Men engage with football in various ways and at various levels. Many of them keep supporting a professional football club in their adulthood. Some of them also follow and support some neighborhood football clubs. More importantly, if we remember the argument by Sağlam (2018), most of them *speak* about football as a performance to claim to be a "knowing subject" and an "authority" because football is one of the most popular topics and common grounds in relations and dialogues among (heteromasculine) men.

Constructing and performing heteromasculinity in and through football, of course, do not occur in vacuum, and integrate with other power relations. Local dynamics also come into play. In terms of Trabzon, for instance, Mehmet Bozok (2013) argues that the interest in football – especially, supporting Trabzonspor – is a constitutive part of local heteromasculine subjectivities in general along with Turkish nationalism and sexual practices with foreign sex workers. Men's Trabzonspor fandom is performed with a pride of being from the city of Trabzon and with a nostalgia to "good old days" of both the city and the club. Moreover, due to the mass unemployment, men seek ways to spend their time. Following neighborhood football clubs and watching their matches are a common way for many men to spend time and homosocialize (Bozok, 2013, p. 204).

However, again, very similar to New Zealand where "physical involvement in rugby [is] no longer a prime means of gaining masculine status" for men in adulthood (Markula & Pringle, 2005, 488), adult men's physical involvement in football decreases in Turkey, too. Some men remain their physical involvement in football though. They actively play football, construct and perform particular subjectivities, and homosocialize in and through football. In this way, they also find opportunities for competing and bonding with other men, and for regulating power relations among themselves. This case will be discussed in detail in the next chapter in this context through *halı saha* – which is the main space of non-institutional football in the urban context.

4

Men, Masculinities, and the *Halı Saha* Football

In this chapter, I will concentrate specifically on the *halı saha* football by making use of my own experiences and the data I obtained through my fieldwork. First, I will describe the appealing characteristics of *halı sahas* for their participants. In the second part, I will contextualize *halı saha* as a (heteromale) homosocial space. On this basis, the third section will be on the patterns and dynamics of relations among men in and through *halı saha* spaces. Then, I will continue with the description of the *halı saha* football in relation to its gendered power dimensions. The last section will question the political significance of a more equal and inclusive *halı saha* football and *halı saha* space.[1]

§ 4.1 The Attractiveness of *Halı Saha*

Non-institutional football can be played in various spaces (such as recreational areas, streets, school yards, parks, gardens), with various equipment (stones instead of bars, any kind of ball or anything symbolizing ball). Required conditions to play football can easily be met. Indeed, this easy accessibility may be one of the reasons behind the development and popularity of

1 By "men" I will refer specifically to heteromasculine men and by "homosocial" I will specifically refer to heteromale homosocial spaces or groups in this chapter.

football globally. It, however, does not mean that the pleasure of playing football is independent of external conditions. Contextually, some spaces and equipment can be more preferable than others. As it was discussed earlier, *halı saha* is one of the most common and most preferred spaces by men and boys to play football in the urban context of İstanbul.

The most popular usage of *halı saha* is to reserve it for one hour to play a football match. Its main differentiating characteristic from the rest of the spaces accessible to people wishing to play football is its being designed for football. A green and suitable surface, lines determining the area of play and dividing it into meaningful parts, nets of goals and wire fences preventing ball to escape are some common answers by the interviewees to the question of the attractiveness of *halı saha*. Its usage for a limited time by reservation also seems to be important for some people because this minimizes the possible factors to interrupt the play. Besides, dressing rooms and showers are appealing for people who want a safe space to leave their personal belongings as well as dressing, and who want a (relatively) clean shower with hot water to take a quick shower after matches. Also, some *halı saha* facilities have a scoreboard and a camera to record the match. These two features, too, are emphasized as appealing characteristics by some people.

Above all, *halı saha* provides a "real" football atmosphere, i.e. that of institutional football. It is physically designed already in reference to professional football fields with its green (artificial grass) surface, goals, touch lines, goal lines, penalty areas, penalty arcs, penalty spots, halfway line, center circle and center spot. There are many direct references by the interviewees to the resemblance of *halı saha* to professional football fields, to the "seriousness" this resemblance provides to matches, to getting "in the mood" for football as one plays there, and to the feeling of "leveling up" in one's debut.[2]

> Goals have nets. It's a different place, a nice place, an attractive place. The surface's green. […] A beautiful, smooth surface. […] There're penalty spots, lines for penalty areas. [Lines are] White. (Murat)

2 "Seriousness" was emphasized many times during interviews in the context of the *halı saha* football. It directly refers to treating something as very important and reminds us of *serious games of competition.*

> It's a proper area for football. Lines are given. It gets you in the mood [for football]. You feel it when you play there for the first time. You feel that you've leveled up. It's a totally different excitement. (Onur)

> The area's clear. Your teammates are clear… you put on jerseys. It's more serious. […] The game isn't interrupted. When you play outside [in the street], an old woman passes by, you wait for her; a car passes by, you wait for it. This isn't the case there [on *halı saha*]. (Arda)

> The ball can't escape. It makes you feel that you're playing in a special place. Plus… if you're playing football… not in the street… when you go to *halı saha*, it makes you feel that you've leveled up. (Selim)

This seriousness, feeling of leveling up and feeling in the mood for football on *halı saha* make some people behave in certain and "required" ways, and "feel just like a footballer".

> It can make you feel just like a footballer. You get in the mood [for football] as you step on the field. Just like footballers you watch. The goal's a real goal. Field's grass, however artificial. Lines and so on… You can play neighborhood football [elsewhere] even with your jeans, but when you go to *halı saha* you need to wear shorts… something… you need proper shoes, you need proper socks. Perhaps it's because it makes you something like a footballer. (Uğur)

Beside its inspiration from institutional football, as Ümit Kıvanç (1993) very rightly points out, one of the reasons behind the attractiveness and popularity of the *halı saha* football is its complex perception by people. Although it is usually seen as a sportive activity, unlike other sportive activities being done regularly, it does not require people to discipline themselves in terms of social lives or to apply strict training or diet programs. Therefore, it allows more people to attend, play football, enjoy, and feel the satisfaction of doing a sportive activity without making any changes in the rest of their lives. This, in fact, may be dangerous and risky for health. Serious injuries and hearth attacks sometimes occur in the *halı saha* football, especially when bodies not disciplined for or not accustomed to regular sportive activities are forced to give full performance in a highly competitive way (Kıvanç, 1993, p. 396).

Main motivations of men attending the *halı saha* football seem to be attachment to football, wish for a sportive activity and socialization. For some men, desire to experience nice moments similar to those of professional football matches or to identify with some professional footballers is also a source of motivation.

> I want to experience those moments I watch. I want to spin the ball just like they [professional footballers] do, to score a beautiful header goal, to give a beautiful through pass. […] Or, say, one of my teammates scores a beautiful volley goal. I want to witness it there. It's nice. (Emre)

Proper physical conditions for a *serious game of competition* inspired by institutional football are generally supported by rules of the game as well. These rules differ among groups of men and depend mainly on a group's level of competitiveness, seriousness, and inspiration to institutional football. Usually the more seriously a group take *halı saha* matches, the more strictly they adopt rules of institutional football. These rules of the game can be about proper goal kicks, kick-offs, the half-time break and the back-pass rule.

§ 4.2 *Halı Saha* as a Homosocial Space

Halı saha, as a homosocial space, allows men to homosocialize, construct and perform heteromasculine subjectivities in relation with each other through football. They individually seek ways for power, status, appreciation, recognition and respect before a male audience on and off the field. In the meantime, they compete in various ways to regulate power relations among themselves as well as constituting their subjectivities. Besides, they also make sense of their individual experiences, check, verify or falsify their world views within a male group, consult and help each other, establish and maintain social bonds, and discuss on, negotiate with, reproduce or challenge hegemonic norms, values, ideals, discourses and performances of masculinity.

Just like many other examples of homosocial spaces, *halı saha* as well provides many men a feeling of "comfort" and "freedom".[3] They speak and behave in the ways that they would otherwise avoid or hesitate. Their experiences or fear of being misunderstood, judged, criticized or condemned by women require them to apply a relative self-control and be selective about words they use, topics they speak about, jokes they crack, and ways they behave.

> You speak more comfortably when there're no ladies [*bayan*].[4] [...] When you're with ladies you use less dirty words. (Hakan)

In this sense, like similar spaces, *halı saha* serves as a "liberated territory" to these men to escape not only from women, femininity and self-control but also from their daily problems.

> You're able to relieve stress [there]. You're able to behave comfortably. You know... You don't hold your tongue. You're able to say comfortably whatever you want to say. You know... Because we're together with our familial friends, with our cousins… at least you don't think "Do they find it odd or say something if I make something wrong?" We're very intimate. We're comfortable. We're able to relieve the work stress. (Selim)

Besides many other homosocial spaces not fitting the simplistic binary opposition between public space and private space, the complex position of *halı saha*, too, was sometimes emphasized directly or indirectly in the interviews. Due to its relatively physical and symbolic isolation providing comfort to

3 In the interviews, there were many direct references to dis/comfort, being dis/comfortable and acting or speaking dis/comfortably in homosocial spaces in general and *halı saha* spaces in particular: *rahat, rahatsız, rahatlık, rahatsızlık, rahatça, rahatlıkla.*

4 *Bayan*: A word which is widely used to avoid saying *kadın* (woman) because it is thought to be "rude". Behind this perception there is a sexist cultural distinction between *kız* (girl) and *kadın* (woman) where the former is sexually identified with being virgin while the latter with being not. *Bayan* is seen rather as a "soft" and "neutral" word not referring to sexuality. Feminists and pro-feminists have been claiming that the usage of *bayan* does not recognize women's subjectivities or agencies, that it humiliates all women through sexual and gender norms, and reproduces sexism. Instead, they suggest the usage of *kadın* for adult women as the politically correct one to deconstruct its negative connotations.

some men by excluding some other people, one form of this emphasis is to liken *halı saha* to home which is identified with privacy.

> We use swear words outside the *halı saha* as well, but we do it there more comfortably. It's because we're alone there. It's equal to being alone at home altogether [man to man]. (Arda)

Bearing in mind a previous discussion, these quotations from the interviewees imply a multiplicity of selves which conflictingly differ in processes of homosocialization and heterosocialization. This conflict is experienced more tensely by this interviewee, Arda:

> When I'm with a girl, I can't express myself enough to her. I'm more comfortable when I'm with a man than a girl. She may misunderstand me and so on. For example, when we're man to man, we generally use slang, we use swear words, we crack jokes and so on. I can't do the same to a girl. This is why I'm more comfortable when I'm with a man. This is why I'm more comfortable in an environment with men than with a girl. I can't have a comfortable communication with a girl, in comparison to a man. (Arda)

Another interviewee, Emre, regards this conflict as a personal problem and self-consciously states his intention to get rid of it.

> In fact, what I try to do is to be the same [person] when there's a girl and when there's no girl. (Emre)

Being in homosocial spaces does not necessarily mean that every man enjoys being there, has to think or feel exactly the same, or experience such a conflict. There are, for instance, some men who are critical towards these spaces, or, at least, who do not enjoy being there as much as some others do. In addition to people who are critical of the normative and hegemonic patterns of masculinity, this seems to be generalizable to those with higher economic and cultural capitals as well. Speaking of the urban secular middle classes, I have had some findings through my fieldwork which suggest that the higher one's economic and cultural capitals are, the less inclined he is to discursively praise, prioritize or enjoy such homosocial spaces – which indicates a class *habitus* and can also

be interpreted as a way for him to *distinct* himself from the lower classes (Bourdieu, 1979/1986). Their higher economic and cultural capitals are apparently in parallel with their accustomedness to and perhaps preference for mixed-gender socialization. They are critical of homosocial spaces to various extents especially on the basis of ways some men behave and speak in these spaces.

This is not because of *serious games of competition* or homosocial spaces these games take place are not important for men with higher economic and cultural capitals. Bearing in mind that these games do not have to be in a direct and apparent game form and that competitiveness is of crucial importance for neoliberal subjectivities and ethos, these men possibly prioritize some other direct or indirect forms of competitive games which may take place in other spheres of their lives such as business, and also with some other means such as rationality, intelligence and knowledge. Furthermore, embracing hegemonic neoliberal ethos and regarding competitiveness as a principle of life, they may find spatiality of competition optional and unrequired. Perhaps this is one reason why they discursively pay less attention to homosocial spaces including *halı saha.* They, however, do participate in the *halı saha* football as well, take part in homosocial relations on and through *halı saha,* and somehow adapt to this space.

Speaking in more general terms, however hard it is to reject or challenge the normative patterns of masculinity in *halı saha* spaces, one can still find some room for negotiation, have flexible subjective positions, and develop some practical strategies to cope with disturbing situations – such as ignoring, playing down, laughing off, keeping quiet, or moving away.

However rarely expressed, some men who are seemingly uncritical of the normative patterns of masculinity, too, may sometimes feel awkward, not "tolerate" being in such spaces in some cases, and may opt for mixed-gender socialization. One of the interviewees, Emre, justifies his occasional "intolerance" for homosocialization by saying that spending his childhood with his mother, sisters and female friends made him closer to women and accustomed to mixed-gender socialization. He, nevertheless, voluntarily participates in homosocial relations and spaces to some extent, and avoids them only when they start being "intolerable".

> In a space where there're only men, if you want to make someone laugh, if you want to crack a joke, just do it through sexuality, swear, imply sexuality, say "Oh, that's big!", "Fuck!", "Suck it!" and so on... [...] When there're too many men... I did my military service... after a while, you say "Eww!" Conversations get disgusting. (Emre)

Women and queers are excluded from *halı saha* spaces to a large extent. Their active participations in the *halı saha* football and even their physical existences in such spaces itself can sometimes be regarded as a direct challenge to this homosocial environment. As it will discussed in the last section, the in-betweenness of *halı saha* in terms of public-private dichotomy and its relatively isolated status, in other words, the very factors excluding these people, also provide some opportunities for them to create an alternative football environment.

It would not be wrong to say that the exclusion of queers from these spaces are severer, because they are seen as uncannier or more threatening against heteronormativity as well as individual heteromasculine subjectivities. As for women, their existence in this environment is generally limited to a "guest" status if at all and they are usually welcomed as long as they are friends, girlfriends, wives, sisters or relatives of men from the group. The existence of a woman in a *halı saha* space usually makes a direct or indirect impact on relations among men, the language they use and the way they behave. This seems to be a mixture of discomfort and "respect". A relative self-control operates to some extent, sometimes depending on who that woman is.

> Of course, when there's a lady [*bayan*], you pay attention to what you say. (Selim)

> If there are ladies [*bayan*] outside the field, you try to watch your mouth. […] However, if a lady comes there, she'll hear it [a swear word]. Nothing to do. You'll say it anyway. I mean, it may happen. […] There may be something interesting in the match… anything… you may swear then. (Caner)

> When there's a woman... If she's someone we know, if we invited her, or if she's a friend or girlfriend of one of us, in order not to cause a

> disgrace, we don't behave comfortably. But if someone we don't know watches us, we keep being comfortable. (Arda)

For women a sexist attitude is also in effect: protectiveness. This attitude is used to justify their exclusion on the basis of the improperness of men's homosocial spaces for them because such spaces have slang, competitiveness, possible physical violence, and vast sexual metaphors and topics. When women enter *halı saha* spaces, many men regard them in need of male protection in order not to undergo disturbing characteristics of this "separate" world of men. In terms of language, for instance, these men believe that "when they expose women to this language [swearing], they 'corrupt' innocent women" (Nuhrat, 2017, p. 37). Hence, "innocent" women's existences as a "guest" in these spaces are conditioned, limited and discouraged, let alone their active participation in the *halı saha* football as players.

> It's nice when there's a crowd watching the match. But if there's only one girl, I feel sorry for her. I feel sorry for that girl. What's she doing there, with all those men? If there's another girl with her, it's okay. If there're two more girls and a man, it's better. (Emre)

For some men, especially for those with lower economic and cultural capitals, this protective attitude may go hand in hand with the very practice of keeping the lover out of this space. In the case of an interviewee, Arda, this practice is motivated and justified by a suspicion from his own male friends' intentions.

> She [my girlfriend] wants to come and watch our matches, but I don't want it. I can't be comfortable if she comes. [...] I would feel uncomfortable [about using swear words, too]. Except this, I don't know... I don't want the girl I love to be with other men even if they're my friends. It's because I can't know what they have in mind. (Arda)

This quotation may sound marginal and paranoid. However, I think, it is not against but part of the mindset producing and justifying the gender segregation in a sexist way. At the same time, it demonstrates there are various dynamics at play in men's homosocial relationships. In the next section, I will describe them in the context of men's *halı saha* groupings.

§ 4.3 Homosocialization through *Halı Saha*

If we look more closely at the homosocializing patterns of men on and through *halı saha*, we see that a complex network of bonding, competition and teasing is at play. It is obvious that homosocialization via *halı saha* cannot be reduced to a one-hour-football. It refers to a wide range of activities including those taking place on days other than match days as well as pre-match and post-match activities. More importantly, it also refers to a social network. Through daily communication and additional activities, men construct, reconstruct and reinforce friendship, fraternity, solidarity, bonding and cooperation in their relations. The competitive part of these relations is already in force via *halı saha* matches to a large extent; yet, they can come into play anytime and anywhere at various levels in their relations. In this context, teasing operates as a strategy to balance bonding and competition among men and within men's *halı saha* groups.

4.3.1 *Bonding*

Although the primary purpose of people attending the *halı saha* football is to play football, the group of men to play with is usually of crucial importance. This is because socialization through *halı saha* is not spatially or temporally limited to *halı saha* matches and because levels of quality and fun on the football field differ among groups.

> I do like playing football. It's okay. But men you play together with must be decent [*düzgün*] men. You can't play with awkward [*dandik dundik*] ones. You can't enjoy it. (Caner)

Bonding, in this sense, refers to intimacy and attachment built on common grounds between two or more people, and to their relations to help and support each other. Direct references to such relations among men are seldom directly expressed as an emotional intimacy, but rather as manly morals and solidarity.

> [When the girlfriend of a person from the group comes to watch a match] We do treat him differently. We try not to insult him even if he

> makes a mistake. We try to let him play football. We do it for him today, and the same will be done for me tomorrow. (Arda)

Through *halı saha* men become part of a social network which helps them increase their various types of capitals, meet new people, find common grounds, keep in touch, do some other activities related or unrelated to football, and build close relationships exceeding match days and *halı saha* spaces. This network also allows them to help and support each other for their material and nonmaterial needs.[5] Bonding is constituted and reinforced especially through further homosocialization through additional daily activities and continuous daily communication.

One of my interviewees, Onur, is a very exceptional example in this regard. This person was regularly attending a *halı saha* tournament in İstanbul ten years ago while studying at the university in another city which took around five hours from İstanbul.

> We played many football matches that summer [in İstanbul]. When I heard there would be a tournament and the matches would be at weekends... I said: "Okay, I can come here every week. It's just a matter of a train trip, after all. So what? What can I possibly do in . . . [the city he studied] at weekends?" […] I was coming here only for the matches. I was playing football, staying with my mom at nights, and going back then. I was sometimes returning to . . . just after matches. (Onur)

This person may be thought to be starving for football in the city he studied, but he says that he was playing football there once a week as well. So, this was not the case. Or he may be thought to have attended the tournament because

5 Personally, through the *halı saha* network I was in, I met so many people from various classes, jobs, cities and even countries – people who were also mobile in terms of class, occupation and settlement. In addition to increasing my social and symbolic capitals and having intimate relations, this network also helped me, for instance, come across some job opportunities, contact some people from secondary circles when needed, find free accommodations in other cities and countries, and have friends from different jobs (such as lawyer, dentist, business person, public servant, travel agent, translator, teacher and academician) whose positions, knowledge, specializations and connections were directly or indirectly helpful for me in my daily life.

there was a prize at the end. Yet, there was no prize except a symbolic cup for the winner team. So, this was not the case either. Might he use the tournament as a reason to come and visit his mother? Apparently no; because he did not always visit her. What actually made him spend ten hours on the way every weekend was, as he states, "the valuable group of people" that he was attached to. He enjoyed socializing, playing football and spending time with those people. As I said, he is very exceptional, but this example manifests why homosocialization through *halı saha* should not be restricted to a football match and how far it can serve as a medium for homosocialization in one's life.

If we rather focus on more ordinary people and their homosocializing patterns, eating or drinking something before or after matches is the most common way of further homosocialization. As we discussed previously, even though *halı saha* makes people feel the satisfaction of doing a sportive activity, it does not require them to discipline themselves or apply strict training or diet programs. Hence, it is not surprising but common to see people eating heavy meals such as fast food, kebab wrap or *pilav* especially after matches.[6] Nor is it surprising to see them going to have some beer.

> The purpose is to sit somewhere and eat something, to have a talk while eating, to make the conversation longer. (Selim)

However, the most familiar way of further homosocialization seems to be drinking tea before and after matches. Tea is easily accessible, cheap, appealing for more people, and, hence, seems more practical. It allows people to take a rest, have a talk about the match and other topics, and not to spend too much time.

> There's a "tea issue" that I don't understand. "Let's have some tea after the match." They sit there and have some tea. I don't normally drink tea either. (Serkan)

Homosocialization before or after a *halı saha* match can be a football-themed one as well. Watching a professional football match on TV in the *halı saha*

6 *Pilav:* A traditional dish made of rice.

facility or elsewhere is an ordinary activity. Some men may also watch some other *halı saha* matches or do some other activities in the same facility.[7] The hot topic for those socializing activities before and after matches is usually the *halı saha* match of the day. Predictions are made beforehand and reviews are made afterwards. Past or future matches can also be issues to talk about.

> We go there [to the *halı saha* facility] before our match, we watch the previous match, have a talk and so on. […] We altogether become like a collective manager. We make decisions. "You'll play in that position", "I'll play in this position", "It'll be like this" and so on. It's very enjoyable indeed. We do it before every match. (Arda)

Recently, WhatsApp groups and social media have been one of the main spaces for men to keep in touch with each other not only to organize matches but also to socialize constantly. They crack jokes, help each other and discuss on various topics. Further discussions and comments on *halı saha* matches are made in these online spaces.

In a similar vein, another issue regarding further socialization may be cameras recording matches in some *halı saha* facilities. To understand their popularity, it is enough to look at Sosyal Halı Saha [Social *Halı Saha*].[8] When a football match takes place on a field which is a member of this network, its video is uploaded to the official website of Sosyal Halı Saha approximately in one hour. People are allowed to watch this match for free anytime they wish. On the website, people have options to cut any part of the video and share it easily on social media. What makes this technological service desirable for facilities and customers seems to be its suitability for the *zeitgeist*. The construction, reconstruction, representation and idealization of oneself and one's

7 To encourage people spend more time and money, some facilities have further recreational services such as PlayStation, table football and café – perhaps with a paid subscription to the official TV broadcaster of institutional football matches.

8 It is a network providing technological service to record *halı saha* matches by cameras located in facilities. In return, as far as I learnt from my interviewees who were *halı saha* owners or operators, they demand either a fixed monthly fee or a share from hourly rental fee a facility earns. On their official website, there were 156 *halı saha* facilities from İstanbul as active members of the network by 8 February 2019. These 156 facilities seemingly have at least 255 fields in total.

subjectivity through social media have been a strong, popular and widespread phenomenon globally. In this context, many people attending *halı saha* want not only to play football, experience enjoyable moments or socialize in person, but also to watch themselves, constitute ideal self-images, share their positive experiences online, and express their subjectivities through football.

> It's nice that matches are recorded. You can watch them later on. […] I watch the matches I play. I played in two such matches, on fields with a camera. I watched them both then. I also downloaded one of them to my computer. […] [I watch them, because] I want to see myself. I wonder how I look like. […] I guess I shared a part from a match to my [Instagram] *story*. A moment that I dribbled with the ball beautifully. […] I even played on the right side of the field in that match because the camera was there. I played as a right-back and it was weird. Because I was used to play on the left side, I felt awkward on the right. I couldn't play well enough there and went back to my own position. (Emre)

Not everybody is keen on watching their own matches though. Some people watch them partially and only when there are interesting moments.

> I don't watch all the matches I play; but if I score a goal, I watch it. Or if somebody is fouled, if something happens, something interesting happens, I watch it; but I don't watch the entire match. (Serkan)

These cameras can also be regarded as another way of socialization to perform subjectivities through football, and, more importantly, they help *halı saha* matches and some moments from these matches be evidenced, remembered, and keep being a topic for the group for a longer time. Such match videos or parts of them circulate among members via their online communication channels. They are also sometimes watched and interpreted by some group members together in person, too. These videos provide material resources to appreciate, challenge or mock some members.

4.3.2 *Competition*

If one indispensable part of men's homosocial groupings is relations of intimacy, attachment, solidarity, fraternity, cooperation and bonding, the other one is rivalry and competition. Through competition, certain heteromasculine subjectivities are constituted, reconstituted and expressed in relation with each other. A desire to be powerful and respected or the presentation of oneself as such is observable in this competitive process. This, however, does not necessarily mean that men always have such fixed self-images in advance. On the contrary, they "[know] of themselves in multiple ways" (Markula & Pringle, 2005, p. 484), and seem to be aware of their deficiencies, weaknesses and fragilities. They act self-consciously to get over these problems if possible. This self-understanding helps them adopt some strategies in search of empowerment.

During the interviews, some interviewees told their stories of failures and implied how they cope with such situations in the context of the *halı saha* football. Being aware of one's own capacity may sometimes be integrated with a fear and avoidance of possible individual mistakes on the football field. An interviewee, Selim, explains why he did not enjoy playing within a group other than his own regular one and why he does not want to play with them again:

> That group was like professional. They play better. […] A mistake you make isn't noticeable here [in his group], but it's noticeable there [in the other group]. […] The forward barely dribbles with the ball, scores a goal. That goal is… [neutralized] with a simple mistake you make. (Selim)

This quotation also demonstrates that competition does not take place among "any" men. It requires a self-awareness to know one's own capacities to choose possible rivals to compete as well as choose possible *serious games of competition* themselves. Avoidance of obviously better rivals and of games one is not good at has a strategical significance in this regard. It is not the only pattern though. In terms of the *halı saha* football, for instance, if one's football skills is below the average of the group he plays within, he may try to find some alternative ways of competition and empowerment. In this sense, to be a "man

of duty" on the field seems to be a strategy especially for those who are less-skilled in football or, more generally, less-powerful in a *halı saha* group.

> I could never play football well. They [other boys and men] always mocked me. I was usually a goalkeeper. I mean… I was unable to do what I had in mind on the field. But, recently… I mean in the matches I played in my twenties… Okay, I never played very well, but I became a man of duty. I didn't lose the ball. I learnt it. This is why they told me "Come on, play in our team" and asked me to play in defense. (Emre)

Competition is obviously crucial for the men's mainstream *halı saha* football in general. The importance and necessity of winning even the most ordinary *halı saha* matches are naturalized and emphasized often by these men in their discourses.

> Winning makes you feel "Ah, it's a beautiful evening!" as you go home and lay down on your bed. (Ümit)

The meaning of a win, however, is not the same for everyone. I have some findings through my fieldwork which suggest that there may a relation between one's economic and cultural capitals and his perception of winning in the Bourdieusian (1979/1986) sense. In this regard, those with lower economic and cultural capitals seem to prioritize winning in itself and to attribute stronger meanings directly to it. In the meantime, being ambitious is highlighted as an important part of their subjectivities to justify their desire to win.[9]

9 Throughout the interviews, there were so many references to *hırs* and *hırslı* both with positive and negative connotations. Moreover, this positive (controlled behavior) and negative (uncontrolled behavior) connotations were sometimes flexible and transitional. I failed to find a satisfying translation for *hırs* and *hırslı* in English. Hence, considering this ambivalance, I preferred to use "rage" and "rageful" when there is a negative emphasis, and to use "ambition" and "ambitious" when there is a positive one. (It is also noteworthy that the positive connotation of *hırs*, in this sense, is almost synonymous with another Turkish word, *azim*, which can be a direct translation for "ambition" indeed.)

> When you play on *halı saha*, you focus on winning. You don't accept losing very much. You want to win. (Selim)

> Of course [I care about winning]. There's a game. The name of the game we play is football and we have to win this game. A person wants to win while playing backgammon, too… or, say, wants to win while playing *okey,* too. You can enjoy without winning, too, for sure. […] Of course, I want to win. It's because I'm ambitious. (Emre)

> I do my best to win a match. […] I'm ambitious for anything which is competitive. (Arda)

At a broader societal level, the meaning of a win on the football field can be a symbolic compensation of the feeling of a deficiency or lose derived from practical social and economic conditions – an issue possibly experienced by the lower classes in general, and, perhaps to some extent, by the lower-middle class. What an interviewee, Selim, says about playing PlayStation games with his friends looks generalizable in this regard:

> You forget everything [while playing]. You lose your contact with the world. Your job, your problems, your debts… You forget the financial difficulty you have. You focus only on winning. When you win, it's a temporary happiness. Then, returning to life... (Selim)

On the other side, for men with higher economic and cultural capitals, winning seems to be an outcome of some other requirements. Furthermore, in some cases, these requirements are an end in and for themselves – perhaps even more important than a win. This seems more meaningful within a broader context of the hegemonic middle-class milieu, mindset and subjective positions which prioritize responsibility, rationality, flexibility and autonomy within a general organizational order and teamwork.

> I do care about winning. I do care. You may lose a match, but what's more important is how you lose it. If opponents play very well and we play as required, and we lose... I have no problem with that. But if our left-back goes to the right-wing position, watches the match as he

> stands while you face opponents' attacks, concede goals... It stresses me. [...] I care more about playing as required than winning. (Onur)
>
> I care about playing well of the team. I expect everyone in the team to do their best. As a result, if our opponents haven't played better than us... I mean... if we're capable of winning when everyone does their best, I want to win the match. Not to win such matches makes me unhappy. (Ümit)

Ideally, a win should be deserved on the playfield; and if there will be a defeat, it should be an honorable one. Competitiveness usually goes hand in hand with an emphasis on "seriousness", i.e. playing football in a "serious" manner. In this sense, "doing one's best", "doing the best as a team" and "playing as required" are very common and interwoven expressions voiced especially by those with higher economic and cultural capitals but also shared by many men with various social backgrounds and with various levels of capitals.

The emphasis on seriousness in the *halı saha* football naturally recalls the *serious games of competition*. However participators generally claim that they play football for fun, health or socialization, many of them also see it as a serious job and behave so in practice. This seriousness is also a reference to institutional football which inspires the *halı saha* football. To have an experience similar to that of institutional football, many men think that it is necessary to behave in an organizational way as a team, and in a committed way inspired by professional players as an individual.

Although the meaning of winning in the *halı saha* football is usually symbolic, it has a direct or indirect role in the regulation of power relations among men as well as in the construction and presentation of subjectivities. This symbolic meaning of winning is sometimes embodied in *iddia* (challenge).[10] For groups using this method, there is generally a prize decided in advance. This prize is, too, generally symbolic, rather than a valuable one. Depending on groups, it can be a meal, dessert, beer or something else. As a "punishment", players of the defeated team buy this prize to players of the winner team. The

10 It is generally referred to as *bir şeyine oynamak* which literally means "to play for something".

prize may also be the payment of the rental fee of the *halı saha*, and, accordingly, entire fee may be paid by the defeated team. Albeit rarely, such *iddias* may also take place between two or more persons individually.

> In seven or eight of every ten matches we play [there's an *iddia*]. [...] We play either for soup, or for dessert… for *baklava*…[11] or for cigarette... but there're some people who don't smoke... or for the rental fee of the field. […] I actually like playing matches with *iddia;* but even if there's no *iddia*, my performance doesn't change. I always play as if there's an *iddia*. I play that way because I love so. I have the ambition that Quaresma has.[12] (Arda)

Obviously, the function of a prize is to directly indicate the winner and, hence, the "superior". Obtaining it as an outcome of an achievement flatters the self of the winner. By affording it, the loser somehow acknowledges the opponent's "superiority" to himself. His accessibility to this prize held by another man depends on the big-heartedness of the winner. Indeed, if it is something edible or drinkable, it is usually consumed altogether by the winner and loser – a point which also reinforces bonding as well. An interviewee, Caner, emphasizes the collaborative part of this dual process – again, as manly morals rather than emotional attachment – and the symbolic meaning of the prize obtained through an *iddia*:

> [In case of a defeat] When you buy that dessert, you eat it together. When you buy *çiğ köfte*, you eat it too.[13] When your friend asks you "Can you buy some *çiğ köfte* for me?" anytime, you don't ask any money from him anyway. (Caner)

11 *Baklava* is a popular dessert which is also commonly used as a prize in such challenges.

12 Ricardo Quaresma: A Portuguese football player who was playing for the club the interviewee supported, Besiktas, when the interview was made.

13 *Çiğ köfte:* Literally, "raw meatball". A traditional meal made of bulgur, generally without meat. It has recently been adapted to the fast-food culture by opening of many *çiğ köfte* restaurants.

Competitiveness and seriousness are unsurprisingly connected to "ambition" on the field. References to ambition point out the necessity to win and to play as required while also emphasizing its risks to turn into "rage" anytime.

> Of course, I used to care about winning [when I was playing football].[14] It's my spirit. To do the best and be successful at whatever you do… it's my strongest… it's my character. I want to be successful when I do something. I have such an ambition. […] But on condition that… to never get your friend or opponent into trouble for the purpose of winning. […] I don't get defeated by my own rage. Never. (Yusuf)

> For some people it's [winning] very important, for sure. Some of them are too ambitious. Everybody wants to win, for sure, it's very nice; but what would you... ragefully do... Some people get angry when they can't win. Some people do ugly things when they can't win. Besides them... from the first minute on... some people change the rules as they can benefit. The ball doesn't go across the line, they say "It's out"; there's no foul, they say "It's a foul", and so on. [...] [For me, winning is] Not so much important. Not my priority. But, when I play, I want to win, for sure. After all, I don't intentionally score an own goal. I do my best, but don't break anyone's heart for that. (Serkan)

For an interviewee, Uğur, there is a distinction between two levels of ambition/rage: one at the level of individual and one at the level of team. In this sense, he identifies the individual one with rage while the other with ambition. Rage, in this sense, signifies selfishness.

> There's team ambition, but there's also individual rage. For instance, the ball accidentally touches your hand, okay? One says "It's a handball!" You say "Bro, okay, it's a handball, but I didn't intend it." He says, "Doesn't matter, bro. It's a handball." I get angry then. It may touch my hand, after all. I turn my back on him and say "Come on, give them their cup!" I say "Seems like we play for a cup!" This is [the individual] rage that I mentioned. […] Winning is important, winning is always

14 He is forty-six years old and does not play football anymore.

> important; but it's important to win without rage. […] I don't like rage. I don't like rageful people either. I like team ambition, not the individual [rage]. (Uğur)

Markula and Pringle (2005) observed in New Zealand that as men get older "the discourses of masculinity that dominated in the teenage years – which celebrated aggression, toughness, and pain tolerance – lost their exalted status and were no longer typically thought of as masculinizing" in their relations with and through rugby. (p. 489). In a similar vein, another interviewee – Hakan, who is fifty-nine – repeatedly pointed out how the level of ambition/rage decreases in football due to one's age.

> For most of us, it isn't important to win or not. Ambition, desire to win and its [a win's] pleasure decrease after a certain age. It's higher when you're young, then it decreases. […] But there're still a couple of people who want to win. They don't like their teams [when squads are set up], they try to set up a stronger squad for themselves. (Hakan)

Ambition, with a positive connotation, refers to a strong desire and determination to win in the *halı saha* football, and is not generally seen as a problem in itself as long as it is kept under control. Indeed, it is required for a competitive and serious football to some extent. Yet, when the self-control is lost and someone acts too ambitiously, in other words, when ambition turns into rage, problems occur. Rage is ideally expected to be prevented or restrained by fair play customs and by a sense of respect to the opponent. Those who act ragefully, lose self-control during a match, or selfishly use every means possible to take some advantages and win that match are generally disapproved and condemned discursively. To what extent these articulations are internalized and put into practice by articulators is another question though. In practice, it can be observed that rageful behaviors usually produce counter-rage for opponents, and they increase the overall level of physicality, aggression and competition in a match. It sometimes causes verbal or physical violence, too.

Besides, the importance of winning and the level of competitiveness may increase due to the opponent and to the meaning of the match. For instance, daily tensions among some men are sometimes carried to the football field. I personally knew two middle-aged brothers who were not on speaking terms

with each other although they were playing football on *halı saha* on a weekly basis. It continued for years. They were always in rival teams and never talking to each other. When one had the ball, the other was tackling more strongly and aggressively than usual. They were yelling, swearing, complaining, and ragefully desiring to win. Winning a match meant to overcome each other to them. This was a very *serious game of competition* for them.

One of the interviewees, Emre, however, finds such situations very annoying. The case he mentions is a bit different though. In his example, there is a high level of simultaneous individual competition and bonding between two men which ruins the collective activity:

> Some people are going there not to have fun, but rather to prove they're personally superior to one another. [...] There's a competition between them [referring to two men he played with] in life in general... via PlayStation and so on... They're intimate. Just because of this, whenever one of them had the ball and the other defended him, he tried to dribble to beat the other unnecessarily. It bothers me. (Emre)

Playing against some other men that one does not know or is not intimate may heat up the overall level of competition, ambition/rage and seriousness as well. The possibility of losing such matches may also indicate the fragility of one's heteromasculine self.

> When we play with our relatives, with our cousins, I don't care about winning. […] But when we play against an opponent… [against] people that you don't know… […] you want to win much more. You want to make less mistakes. […] When there's an external opponent, winning makes you feel more proud. […] It isn't nice to be humiliated by someone you don't know. At least, for me. To concede a goal from someone you don't know, to lose… after that… to undergo looks with contempt as that person walks through the door… It isn't nice. (Selim)

Similarly, playing in a *halı saha* tournament makes some people take matches more seriously and care much more about winning. This is the case, for instance, for an interviewee, Yusuf, who has a rural background, lives in a social

network through his village, and now manages a team in a *halı saha* tournament where there are sixteen teams composing of players solely from his own village:

> I take very seriously such… successes [winning a tournament] in society. Why not win the title? Why not succeed? Why not be talked about? […] I care very much [about the tournament]. I motivate the kids in this way. This might be a *halı saha* tournament; but more than that… it should be our and our village's brand. We… we're the best… in terms of sportsmanship, in terms of football… we'll say "We're here." We have to say that. (Yusuf)

It is not much different for those with urban backgrounds though. Both young and older men with urban backgrounds underline how the level of competition and seriousness increases in such tournaments:

> Normally I never play with physicality. The purpose is, after all, to play football. But during tournaments, and when I was at the university, I wasn't really so. The purpose was to win there. (Onur)

> I play for half an hour in the tournament, not more. Because it's a tournament, it's not like this [their in-group match]. There's a tournament, there's an opponent. We're all friends here, not opponents. You change and become more ambitious there. It gets harder to control yourself. This is why [I play] for half an hour, without pushing the limits. If I get into trouble, I won't be able to play again.[15] (Hakan)

To sum up, two seemingly conflicting dynamics, competition and bonding are simultaneously apparent in men's *halı saha* groupings and football. These two dynamics intersect through the practice of teasing which strategically balance their tense and problematic co-existence.

15 He refers to his age (fifty-nine), a minor injury he has, and matches he plays in the *halı saha* league for "veterans".

4.3.3 *Teasing*

As I underlined earlier, I regard teasing as a particular form of humor and refer to it as provoking or annoying someone in a playful and friendly manner.[16] Through the practice of teasing, men avoid risks of too much competitiveness on the one hand, and emotional consequences (perhaps, homoeroticism) of too much intimacy on the other. In this way, they also make use of symbolic or material outcomes of *serious games of competition*, and regulate power relations in their homosocial spaces and groupings. To repeat, what reactions and consequences teasing creates depends on several factors such as who does it, who is targeted, how much authority and status these people have in the group, under what circumstances it is done, what it is authorized by and how offensive it is. These very factors also enable, restrict or prevent the practice of teasing.

In the context of *halı saha,* one way to investigate the joint co-existence of relations of power, rivalry and cooperation is to look at practices of teasing because they are embedded in these practices. The symbolic meaning of winning a match or of particular individual achievements during a match is an in-group source for teasing because it has direct or indirect impacts on reinforcing or subverting existing power positions. In this way, consequences of competitions are not wasted, but used, embodied and legitimized through this practice. Even a win in itself can be identified with teasing or with the right to tease someone.

> [The meaning of winning is] Just teasing the opponent. Nothing else. And to be teased by the opponent. Nothing else. […] Of course, you like teasing your opponent. But, responsibly, for sure. (Caner)

> That's [teasing the opponent] the purpose [of the match]. That's the purpose indeed. (Yusuf)

16 During the interviews, teasing was generally referred to as *kızdırmak*, and sometimes as *takılmak* synonymously. Both can be translated as "to tease (someone)" in this specific usage.

Because teasing requires an intimacy and a trust in one's good intentions to take a joke and not to feel offended, men also reinforce bonding and attachment among themselves through this particular practice.

> It's [friendship] another factor beautifying matches. We tease each other, we socialize. […] It's [winning] nice, of course. Beside its importance, it's nice. You tease the opponent. Perhaps a little bit… you sometimes tease them. […] I don't care [about winning]. Really, believe me. If we win, the only important thing for me is to further tease a few friends from the other team. That's all. (Hakan)

There are various strategies and forms of teasing. A practice of teasing may target an individual or a group of people directly or indirectly. It may be practiced through clichés or through creative humor. Its target usually gets determined to be the next one to tease back for a revenge.

> [We tease] Like, "Don't let Ahmet play… He ruins your team every match!" and so on… We actually tease Ahmet, they aren't aware of this. Perhaps Ahmet's played very well. Like, saying "Don't let Ali play… He's such a problem. He ruined your team today!" (Caner)

Teasing, even when sourced particularly from *halı saha* matches, does not have to be temporally or spatially restricted to match days or to *halı saha* spaces. It is usually maintained in daily conversations as well and used to keep competitive and cooperative relations simultaneously alive in the group and among individuals.

> When we win… "Oh, losers!"… You know, needling and so on… "Is there a problem?"… You know, "Oh losers! You lost! Is there a problem?" Such daily conversations. It happens when we win. And they do the same when we lose. It happens anyway. It's [*halı saha*] juiced up our lives. (Uğur)

By teasing, many men try to construct and perform winner, successful, strong, tough and sexually "active" subjectivities, while presenting targets of teasing as losers who are unsuccessful, weak, soft or sexually "passive". The target does not possibly mind this provoking as long as it is done in a playful, intimate

and responsible manner; or does get provoked anyway, but somehow deals with it. Hence, teasing reinforces both competition and bonding in relationships at the same time unless it is too offensive or aggressive to damage these relationships.

The basis of teasing is a power position. Whether it is originated from broad socio-structural sources or from small achievements/failures during a match, a man who is empowered by his superior power position makes use of teasing to emphasize and reify his own higher or one another's lower power position. His "superiority" can be long or short term, deep or superficial, fixed or unfixed. Teasing can be used to discursively and symbolically consolidate an existing power position, or, on the contrary, to subvert it. From the standpoint of the less powerful, it provides an opportunity to claim supremacy by means of a particular resource – such as a win, a successful dribble, a beautiful goal, an assist, a tackle, or a save. Rather than making a big impact in itself on behalf of him in short term, teasing functions as an empowering strategy in search of power, status and respect, and as a representation of power relations on a discursive plane. Authorized by the right to tease somebody, an individual is sometimes allowed to say the words he would not or could not otherwise say in a serious manner, and to claim something he would not or could not seriously claim otherwise.

If we look more closely at men's power relations on and through the *halı saha* football, there are a number of sources on and off the field to influence them – such as football skills, age, class, social status, profession, education, cultural capital, religion, ethnicity, *race*, ideology, character traits, familial ties, and relations with the hegemonic and normative patterns of masculinity. Their complex interactions constantly regulate these men's relations both vertically and horizontally.

Men do not keep their non-footballing subjectivities, relations, or various capitals and capacities out of the football field but carry them in. In some groups, this may have a direct impact on in-group power positions and determine them in strict and decisive ways to a large extent.

> If we think company-based, there's a parallel between the position one has in the company and voice he has in the *halı saha* group. [...] Our

> boss is very rageful on the field. He plays tough, yells, swears to opponents after he scores a goal and so on. We can't do anything in return. It isn't nice. I sometimes feel that we play just because we want to entertain the boss. (Emre)

The maintenance of existing daily power relations in *halı saha* spaces mostly operates on the basis of consent rather than imposition or coercion though. A man may be asked or expected to make use of power and authority originated from his power position. He may contextually and occasionally avoid or make use of advantages and privileges he has in the group. For instance, a particular form of this dynamic is apparent in a *halı saha* group composing of men from an extended family with very close familial ties:

> There's a hierarchy on my father's side of the family. […] When I go… I'm older than most of my cousins… […] they give their seats to me, stand up, [and say] "Please, you sit down, elder brother." If I go somewhere to buy something, [they say] "Give me, elder brother, I go and buy it." […] They generally look to us. For instance, we're about to set up squads or to make a decision, they look to us; but we say "You've organized everything, you do it." We say "Keep us out." […] For example, when they argue with each other, I yell: "That's enough!" This is enough indeed. I don't say it seriously, I say it with a smile. They collect themselves anyway. (Uğur)

> [When there is a problem, it is solved] On its own. Whatever elders say goes. If it's a foul, we [elders] say so. (Selim)

Also, consent in power relations usually goes together with "respect" which is generally perceived and referred to in a hierarchic way rather than in a relation between the equals in the Turkish society in general. Hence, whether it is explicitly stated or not, in practice, it directly indicates to know one's place and to accept another's higher power, status and authority originating from various sources. In the narrative of an interviewee, Arda, age, football skills and being the organizer of *halı saha* matches have such impacts on respect in a *halı saha* group of men possibly with lower economic and cultural capitals:

> There's no captain [in the group], but we have a man like a captain. He's the one who plays the best. [...] He has a say in decisions, as if he knows more about football, we do what he says. [...] He makes decisions and says "Bro, let's do this and that." [...] Except him, elder people have a say [in decisions]. We respect them. They say "Do this and that." We say "Okay." We respect them, don't oppose them. Those who're elder and those who play better have a say in the group. We do have as well, but not as much as them. They organize the match and invite us. (Arda)

Direct transitions of existing power positions based on specific and definitive sources from daily life (such as the examples of family and work) to *halı saha* spaces is not a general or common pattern in the middle-class milieu. Because members of *halı saha* groups are generally more heterogeneous also in terms of class, status, social backgrounds and various forms of capitals, more factors and dynamics interact and take part in the construction and operation of these power relations and positions. These relations and positions are constantly negotiated, consolidated, reproduced, resisted, challenged and subverted through a complex of discourses and performances. In these processes teasing operates as a powerful strategy to regulate power positions among men while also protecting and reinforcing their collaborative relations.

§ 4.4 Mainstream *Halı Saha* Football

The mainstream *halı saha* football of men in the general middle-class milieu can be described and analyzed through its various dimensions, general tendencies, processes, dynamics and practices. I personally prefer to focus on four of them: organization, squads, jerseys, and goalkeeping. I regard them particularly important in the construction, expression and interaction of heteromasculine subjectivities and in the regulation of power relations among men on and off the field in their *halı saha* groupings. I will elaborate them also in a descriptive way to show their significance within a broader process.

4.4.1 *Organization*

The organization of a *halı saha* match is not as easy as it seems. The organization of a one-hour football match may take several days especially for a group of people not frequently playing together. Usually one person takes high responsibility for the organization. The organizer spends some time, makes extra effort, books the field, contacts people, finds new players if necessary, and solves problems to make sure that the required conditions for a football match are met.

In addition to the love and joy of football, an important reason for people who take this responsibility, make effort and spend time for the organization is status, respect and authority it provides within or via the group. Because many people do not have time or energy for this task or because they are not willing to do so, organizers are generally highly appreciated people. It provides them to have a say in the group and in decision-making processes; and may privilege them to overcome some handicaps originating from their age, class, status, ethnicity, football skills or their relations with the hegemonic patterns of masculinity. Beside this special and privileged position, being part of such a heteromale grouping itself is appealing and beneficial for many men in terms of the necessity of homosocialization. In this regard, more practically, a man may initiate the creation of a new *halı saha* group or take responsibility to maintain it.

For a new group, most of possible problems start being anticipated, reduced and solved fast as these men play together frequently. Once a group of people makes sure that they are willing to play football and capable of organizing matches frequently, they may decide to reserve a field on a weekly basis. The most common frequency among such groups is to play once a week. It makes the organization easier and generally provides a discount on rental fee. Groups playing frequently are likely to have their own ways of an easy and habitual organization – such as websites, social media platforms, e-mail or text messaging groups.

Groups playing football frequently need to have either a large number of members to play in rotation or sufficient number of players playing regularly. The latter is very optimistic though. However loyal the members are and however big the group is, it is very likely to experience a recruitment process

sooner or later, since it is not realistic that all members have time and desire to play football every single week. When the number of members is insufficient, a new circle composing of friends of members starts to emerge. As the time goes by, the number of these circles may increase and new members may merge in the group to the extent that people do not remember when and how a person joined the group. Whether slowly or fast, this generally means an ever-changing and ever-increasing network. It enables men to be in a broad social network, homosocialize further and find ways to increase their social and symbolic capitals. At the same time, it adds new actors and factors to dynamic power relations among them. Existing power relations which have already been in motion move in a further complexity as this network widens and changes.

For some groups, recruitment may also mean or require a "reference". A person may play football within a group with an explicit or implicit reference of an existing member. Therefore, the person who recommends or invites somebody may feel responsible for the actions of the newcomer. This means to protect or increase his own status in the group as well as the "common good". However, in cases of emergency, any unknown person may be invited to play by a last minute call to achieve the required number of players. Members may find a new player through their social networks, through announcements on social media platforms or through contacts of the *halı saha* personnel. There are also some websites and online groups to create online networks to help people contact and find players in such cases.[17]

Some enterprising people – especially those from the lower classes – benefit from this situation by playing in *halı saha* matches for money.[18] When a

17 For an example, see Adam Eksik [Man/Player Wanted], n.d.

18 This entrepreneurship can also be interpreted on the basis of neoliberal ethos and neoliberal subjectivities as well. The investment in and usage of "bodily capital" (Wacquant, 1975), and conversion of this "bodily capital" also into economic and symbolic capitals through entrepreneurship might not have started with neoliberalism, but have obviously come to be a common pattern encouraged and sought in the neoliberal era. This individual entrepreneurship requires both a self-awareness about one's own capacities and a creative awareness of external possibilities and opportunities. It may sometimes take part in existing formal or informal sectors in the market, or may initiate a brand new one.

group of people cannot achieve the required number of players, they may opt for a paid-player because they do not want to play a less enjoying match or to cancel the match – it may also end up with losing the deposit paid in advance in some facilities. Therefore, paid-playerness was born as an informal sector as a result of certain necessities, partly formalized, and came to be a popular one especially for goalkeeping – which will be discussed later.[19]

Beside the most common way of organization described above, another pattern is to organize only one team. This means playing football of a group of people with another group of people. In this way, each group has its own process of organization and preparation. The level of intimacy between players of rival teams varies; depending on their relations, they may or may not be in a direct contact before and after matches. This type of organization is useful especially for people not able to mobilize the required number of players for an in-group match. However they are able to do so, some groups still prefer matches against unknown or less acquainted rivals because it heats up the level of competitiveness and intensifies in-group bonding. For such cases, aforementioned websites and online groups also function to find rival teams.

4.4.2 *Squads*

When the required conditions for an in-group *halı saha* match is met, setting up two squads is the last important preparation. Although this is often done just before the match starts, some groups prefer to do it earlier. A balance between two squads in terms of football abilities is ideal. Otherwise, when a team is obviously better than the other, a match is very likely to be one-sided. Some people may enjoy winning such a match anyway. In general, however, for a serious and competitive match inspired by institutional football, a balance between two squads is ideally sought and discursively emphasized. Winning such matches is more satisfying for many people.

> To enjoy [a *halı saha* match], teams must be almost equal. The most beautiful matches are those whose final score is 1-0, 2-0, 3-1 or 2-1. [Or] Those end in a draw. (Caner)

19 For a newspaper article on this sector and its formalization, see Ünal, 2018.

Sometimes a lack of balance between two teams can be noticed or be disturbing during a match and some players may be traded to overcome this problem.

> Generally nobody objects [to squads]. Sometimes it happens on the field [during a match]. We trade [some] players. (Hakan)

In the process of setting up squads, some men may prioritize winning at the expense of a balance and competitiveness. In this regard, they may have a stronger and selfish desire to play within a better squad to defeat their opponents. To remember a previous quotation:

> [T]here're still a couple of people who want to win. They don't like their teams [when squads are set up], they try to set up a stronger squad for themselves. (Hakan)

If players and squads are not fixed permanently, ways of setting up two squads before a match differ among groups of men. If there is one person to do this task, usually he is also the organizer of that match, or another respected and high-status member of the group. There may also be more than one such member to handle it in negotiation. Another familiar method is being picked one by one in a row by two respected members of the group. Not surprisingly, those who are more talented in football and more desirable in a team (such as goalkeepers, defenders and "men of duty") are very likely to be picked early. Some other sources of in-group power positions may also play a role in this process and may affect one's rank to be picked. This picking order, in part, coincides with power positions in the group.

If one reason behind few people to fulfill this task is authority, another one is other members' avoidance of taking responsibility and having a say in the matter. Even if more men are invited to take part in the decision-making process about squads in some groups, some of them hesitate to do so. Taking responsibility in this particular job means also to endure possible negative outcomes – such as a tense negotiation, dissatisfaction, criticism, objection and complaint afterwards. It is mainly because setting up two squads in balance is a difficult task. Furthermore, some men who took part in the process may any time be accused of acting for their own benefit.

> There're one or two people who like setting up squads. I don't mess with it. They do it. [...] "Oh, it's [one team] stronger!" and so on. I don't want to have that discussion. [...] Those who organize matches, who speak more, who're more dominant also do the setting-up-squads task more. Also, when we are in need of more players, they try to find players as a duty. (Serkan)

Albeit rare, this process can be used for some members to gain authority to challenge existing power relations. More generally, however, high-status members are willing to do this task and even dominate the process because it is a good way to consolidate and reproduce their authority in the group. Many other men may also expect and consent them to do so. A trust in their knowledge about football and about the players in the group, as well as in their fairness, is the basis of this consent.

> One or two people do it on their own. No problem. They know who's strong [good at football] and who's weak [bad at football]. They know and distinguish [players]. Perhaps I'm strong for him, perhaps I'm weak for him. (Caner)

Also, men responsible for picking players or setting up squads may be fixed permanently or may change weekly. Even though they are rarely called as captains, they generally act in this way. They do not have to be nominated, selected or appointed. It usually happens by its own on the basis of existing power relations originating from many in-group and broader social sources. Besides, however seldom, deciding on squads collectively where many or all men have a say in the process more equally is sometimes witnessed, too.

4.4.3 *Jerseys*

If we come across a random *halı saha* match, we are very likely to see that most players on the field wear jerseys of professional football clubs or sometimes of national teams. These jerseys may be original or imitation. Whether men actively support or just have a sympathy, these jerseys are very likely to belong to their favorite clubs. By wearing them, men not only constitute and perform ideal self-images and subjectivities through football on the field, sometimes

they also reconstruct their fandom or identify with their favorite players. These jerseys also refer to the relation between institutional football and the *halı saha* football, where the former inspires the latter. As Nuhrat (2019) points out, "When fans wear football jerseys that are intended as uniforms for athletes, there is surely a component of desiring to be included in this athletic sphere" (p. 14).

However, when everyone wears some clothes or jerseys on their own, the complexity of colors causes a difficulty to distinguish between teammates and rivals on the football field. The most common solution is the use of jerseys provided by *halı saha* facilities. The problem is solved when players of one team wear them. Yet, it is not easy to decide which team to wear these jerseys for people are generally unwilling to do so. Considering the patterns of justifications behind this reluctance in general, I suspect that masculinity may have an impact on this reluctance.

One popular and relatively naïve justification behind this unwillingness is hygiene. Although facilities are responsible for their cleanness and although they are generally clean indeed, some people do suspect whether or not they are clean enough. These jerseys have a bad reputation especially because of their "bad smell". Rather than dirtiness, this seems to occur, if at all, mainly due to being insufficiently dried and ventilated after being washed. However, it looks more like a justified and exaggerated excuse, rather than a real reason for the objection.

A practical reason behind the "overweight" men's rejection in particular is the standard size of these jerseys emphasizing "ideal" *male bodies*. They are designed to fit an "average" *male body* – which is an inevitably exclusive categorization. When a jersey is too small for someone, it also restricts his ability to move comfortably on the field. Besides, he can also mind his appearance and self-image.

Appearance and self-image are indeed a general matter. Many men prefer to play football with their own clothes or jerseys, and to look as they wish. Especially jerseys have a representative role for their subjective positions, in their construction and expression on and off the field. Also, more practically, the number of spaces one can wear his own jerseys is limited. *Halı saha* is one of these legitimate spaces, and many men want to use this opportunity.

> I buy a jersey. I pay money, buy an original jersey. Sometimes I pay 300 liras… I paid 270 liras this year. Previous years, too, I bought many jerseys. I bought them because I want them to be seen on me. When I wear another jersey [that of the facility] over it, it's blocked. I don't like it. (Emre)

As far as I observed and experienced, the more competitive a *halı saha* group is, the more problematic the jersey issue gets. If players of one team do not mind to wear them, there is no problem at all. Yet, this is seldom witnessed. Even if some players do not mind, their teammates possibly object. Thus, its fast, simple, unproblematic and voluntary solution is rarely seen in the mainstream *halı saha* football.

If *halı saha* jerseys will somehow be worn by one team and no team wants to do so, there are two patterns: This can be solved either before the match starts or after the match starts. As for the former, in some groups, players may try to persuade or impose those from the other team to wear them. High-status persons may use their authority in this process. Another solution is mini competitive games such as rock-paper-scissors, toss-up, variants of these games, or some football-themed ones such as penalty shootout, hitting the bar and juggling the ball. These mini games are generally played between two persons representing their own teams, and teammates of the person who loses the game are subject to wear those jerseys. These mini games affecting and regulating power positions recall the *serious games of competition*.

However, the second pattern – to handle it after the match starts – seems much more common. This is simply to play without such jerseys until the first goal is scored in the match. Not surprisingly, players of the team which concedes the first goal wear these jerseys. It causes not to identify teammates properly until the first goal is scored, and may get more problematic as it takes longer to score for the first time. During this period of the match, the level of ambition/rage and competitiveness can be much higher. In this sense, it is like a *serious game of competition* within another *serious game of competition*. Moreover, in some groups, the first goal does not count on the scoresheet for it only means to be decisive of the jersey problem for those people.

> There's a rule. You can't violate this rule. If you concede the [first] goal, then you'll wear those jerseys. Even if they're dirty. (Caner)

In this general framework, a rather speculative argument may also be posed regarding the reluctance to wear *halı saha* jerseys: the symbolic negative meaning of these jerseys in the mainstream *halı saha* culture of men. This was, indeed, articulated by an interviewee as a reason behind his own unwillingness to wear it.

> It [the *halı saha* jersey] reveals who conceded the first goal… or reveals which team is weaker because its players wear jerseys. (Selim)

These words obviously refer to the symbolic meaning of these jerseys. When this person wears it, he feels weak and thinks that he looks like a loser to other people on or off the field, since it is generally regarded as a punishment in the dominant *halı saha* culture. No other interviewee made or implied a similar remark. Nor have I heard it elsewhere. It, nevertheless, makes sense when we consider the common avoidance – which is sometimes non-rational and unconvincing. There may be such an unconscious or unexpressed factor challenging heteromasculine subjectivities men ideally seek, try to construct and perform.

4.4.4 *Goalkeeping*

Goalkeeping is one of the biggest challenges in the *halı saha* football. It is very hard to find any two persons to be goalkeepers for the entire match, let alone talented ones. This is mainly because there is a very limited number of people willing to be a goalkeeper. I think this situation is worth examining in terms of masculinity, too.

First of all, being a goalkeeper is totally different from playing at any other position on the field and it requires different football skills. Many men think that they do not have these particular skills. As a result, they do not feel self-confident about it and simply do not enjoy it. This seems to be an important motive and justified reason not to do it.

> I don't like being a goalkeeper. It comes together with… I'm not a good goalkeeper. If I was, I'd like it. (Serkan)

> I think I'm not good at it. If I were good at it, if I did the thing I was good at, and if I succeeded in doing it, I would enjoy it. (Selim)

Perhaps the most common perception of goalkeeping is its boringness – which originates from its peculiarity, limiting the number of touches with the ball and restricting one's freedom and activeness on the field.

> I like playing with the ball more. I like spending time with the ball. It isn't possible as a goalkeeper. When you save the ball, you have to give it to someone immediately. (Caner)

> I want to be more active. Goalkeeper's more passive in football. (Hakan)

The emphasis on boredom and lack of freedom implies a disturbing passivity although many men wish to be a more active, unrestricted and independent agent on the field. These wishes, indeed, are not so much different from their wishes in their lives in general. Hence, goalkeeping can work against their ideal subjective positions.

An interviewee, Arda, points out similar factors behind his reluctance to do goalkeeping, which reduces one's role on the field to that of a "spectator". He also adds that he actually does enjoy it when required conditions making it a more active and more important task are met.

> I do [like goalkeeping], but I don't like waiting. I don't want to spend whole watch at the goal. […] It's because you rarely touch the ball, it's because you rarely play with the ball, it's because you look like a spectator. […] If the other team's playing better than our team, if they're attacking all the time, then I like [goalkeeping]. (Arda)

Besides these rational and self-conscious reasons, however, once again, we hear a confession which indicates that emotions and unconscious factors may be in effect to make goalkeeping challenging for one's heteromasculine subjectivity or "honor".

> When you concede a goal, it's a bad feeling. I feel bad. It's nice to score a goal, it's nice to give a pass, it's nice to dribble the ball past oppo-

> nents; but I don't like conceding a goal. […] Being defeated by the opponent is just against my character. You can concede a goal collectively; but when you concede it because of your own individual mistake… because of the thing your opponent does… it hurts me a little bit. (Yusuf)

This interviewee does not conceal or suppress his emotions but makes them explicit in this matter. He feels bad and weak as he concedes a goal. There is also a reference to his own fragility: "It hurts me a little bit."[20] I believe that this fragility can also be generalized to many men and many heteromasculine subjectivities. Idealized subjectivities and self-images of men as strong and winner usually do not have correspondences in practice. Despite all their attempts to constitute and perform such subjectivities, they very often encounter experiences which make them feel weak, helpless or desperate. Such experiences sometimes "hurt" them. It is not easy to investigate these encounters because men rarely talk about their emotions, and talk selectively when they do so. We can, nevertheless, assume that they avoid such challenging and risky situations and experiences as much as possible.[21] The avoidance of goalkeeping, too, may be interpreted in this way.

Moreover, bearing in mind the interpretation of sports on the basis of sexual desire by Pronger (1999) and considering metaphoric and symbolic references of scoring a goal to sexual penetration in the mainstream football culture of men and boys in general, we can question whether these metaphoric and symbolic meanings also play an unconscious role in the reluctance towards goalkeeping. However speculative, we can suspect that one reason behind feeling bad and weak when a goal is conceded may be feeling also as "sexually penetrated" at a metaphoric and symbolic ground. Perhaps this is the reason for some men why it emotionally "hurts".

---

20 *"O, beni biraz incitiyor."*

21 For instance, "nutmeg" [*beşlik* or *bacak arası*], passing of the ball between one's legs, has a very strong symbolic meaning signifying being sexually penetrated in football in Turkey – especially in non-institutional football. According to T. Bora (2009), the anxiety of being nutmegged [*beşlik yeme kaygısı*] is part of the general anxiety of losing one's masculinity and male honor, and of being on the alert against such threats.

Focusing on the patterns to solve the goalkeeping problem in the *halı saha* football, the most common solution is to be the goalkeeper of team members in rotation. Players rotate usually in an estimated period of time, or every one or two goals they concede. Yet, there are some people who do not wish to do goalkeeping at all, or who are privileged by their teammates not to do it thanks to their high status. Meanwhile, people less talented at football than other players, people with lower stamina, and people with lower status in the group may prefer or may be forced by their teammates to do goalkeeping for longer periods in matches. Just like being a "man of duty", being a goalkeeper, too, can be used as a strategy of enforcement by some men.

In some groups, where the level of competition is low and where players do goalkeeping in rotation based on the number of goals they concede, some men may concede some goals rather intentionally and "sneakily", or, in other words, may not do their best to save shots because they want to leave the goal early and be in play.

> I don't like spending time at the goal. I pay money [for playing]. I concede that goal instantly. Those dummies say, "He scored an own goal!" Why did he score an own goal? Do you understand? They don't [understand]. They don't know what sneakiness [*kurnazlık*] is but I do know. I said to myself: "I should concede a goal and leave the goal". (Caner)

The interviewee proudly narrates a story of his "sneakiness" in another *halı saha* group than his own regular group. This story may be at odds with the importance of competitiveness that we discussed earlier. However, I personally do not think so. According to the interviewee, this group is more "amateur" than his own group – which has a higher level of seriousness, football skills, football knowledge and "quality", and always has two fixed goalkeepers. It appears to me that how, against whom and under what circumstances a competition takes place can be more important than competition itself. Rather than acting selfishly at the expense of competitiveness, I believe, the interviewee thought that the required conditions for a competition were not met in that group, and, hence, he did not see himself in a competition to win the

match at all. Having two fixed goalkeepers is one of those required conditions for him.

Some groups which have fixed goalkeepers – who are obviously very "valuable" players in the *halı saha* football – also have a custom to privilege these men not to pay any money for the rental fee of the field to encourage and reward them.

> Goalkeepers are always present in our matches. They can't ever leave their goals. End of discussion. They have to stay at their goals. […] You don't let goalkeepers pay money [for the rental fee]. This is the rule. It's the rule of *halı saha*, rule of everything. You don't let goalkeepers pay money. Why? A goalkeeper stays at the goal, saves you, saves goals you're about to concede. Goalkeepers don't pay money. When you play on *halı saha*… it may be winter or summer or cold… you run and get warm while he is frozen at the goal. This man never pays money. (Caner)

Moreover, as it was discussed earlier, this common problem led to the birth of the informal sector of paid-goalkeeping (and partly its formalization) as a specialization within a more general enterprise of paid-playerness. These men – mainly from the lower classes – find customers by using their social capitals in person or online networks they join. They try to prove that their goalkeeping talents worth paying money. They may be unemployed, students, football players in amateur football clubs, or may have other formal or informal jobs. Money they demand for a one-hour-match depends on some factors such as their ages, skills, locations of *halı sahas* and the general socio-economic profile of men playing there.[22]

According to some men, besides personal reluctances, playing with a fixed goalkeeper is useful for a team because it provides a consistency and a better division of labor, and, thus, increases both the collective and individual pleasure of playing serious football. This seems to be another reason to pay money

22 I came to know some paid-goalkeepers doing it for 40 liras in a *halı saha* facility in the Beşiktaş district while another person was doing it for 15 liras in another facility in the Sarıyer district by 2018. Although I did not meet the one in Sarıyer, those in Beşiktaş were students, amateur football players, or adults also employed elsewhere.

to someone for goalkeeping rather than doing it in rotation. Also, if a team has a fixed goalkeeper while the other team does not have, it is also seen as a problem in terms of an equal, serious and competitive match.

> It's [paid-goalkeeping] something which totally changes the match. It's a great invention. […] Nobody wants to be a goalkeeper. So, there're very few of them. What'll you do when he doesn't come to a match? Will a team play with a goalkeeper while the other [team] in rotation? […] Having a good goalkeeper is important, for sure; but [when there is a goalkeeper] everybody knows their own positions, it's more critical. (Serkan)

Hence, both for more serious and more competitive matches – also inspired by institutional football – having two fixed goalkeepers are seen by many men as one of the required conditions to be met in men's *halı saha* football.

§ 4.5 Queering the Field: An Alternative *Halı Saha* Football

Despite the functioning of *halı sahas* as heteromale homosocial spaces and despite the dominance of heteromasculinity in football in general, there are also some collective efforts by some women, queers and critical men to resist, challenge or transform these spaces and the dominant football culture. It is remarkable that the very reasons and factors excluding women and queers from *halı sahas* seemingly create some opportunities for them as well. In this section, I will elaborate this idea by focusing on a particular *halı saha* group which politicizes and queers *halı saha* spaces.

This *halı saha* group is open to any people willing to play football regardless of their gendered and sexual subjectivities as well as their class, ethnic, *racial*, religious, ideological, educational or occupational backgrounds. One's football skills are not an issue either. Although there is a high heterogeneity of people in the group in terms of their social backgrounds and subjective positions, they share a similar ethico-political ground in general. Any kind of social, political, economic, gender, sexual or football-related discrimination is disapproved on and off the field.

The gathering of the group for the first time traces back to the Trans Pride 2015. A *halı saha* match was organized in the Şişli district in honor of the Trans Pride 2015 and then some participants had the idea of playing football further and regularly.

> After that match, [we said] "How beautiful it was", "The field was also nice", and so on. I guess we were motivated by… "If we can play a football match on this field for the Trans Pride, then let's play here." We regarded it as a safe place. Then we started [playing]. […] It grew as a group of friends in the first couple of months. […] Then we created the Facebook group. The number of members slowly increased. (Gökçe)

It is not only a socially and politically alternative *halı saha* group though. Unlike the mainstream *halı saha* football of men which is highly competitive, serious and ambitious, the group aims an alternative football. In practice, a football *game* rather than a football *match* is played. Above all, in this *game,* there is no scorekeeping at all. This is in itself a total objection to the competitive logic of the dominant football culture in which a play without scorekeeping seems impossible. In this way, this *game* is distanced from *serious games of competition* played among men. Moreover, powerful shots, harsh tackles and too much self-centeredness on the field are disapproved while teamwork and collectivity are sought. Amusing *games* rather than serious and ambitious *matches* are targeted. Goalkeeping is almost always done in rotation without any specific pattern and without causing any problems. Similarly, *halı saha* jerseys are almost always worn by players of a team voluntarily without playing any mini competitive games or applying the first goal rule.

On the field, there is not a strict or organizational intra-team division of labor inspired by institutional football but a rather free-flowing football. In terms of the rules of the *game*, however not totally rejected, that of institutional football are applied in a very arbitrary and flexible way. These rules sometimes change even during *games* spontaneously, as well as among different *games*. The number of players on the field also changes. A *game* can be played five-a-side while another *game* is played nine-a-side on the same field. There is no strict rule about the number of players. It rather depends on people

willing to play that day. In case of a big crowd making it impossible to play together at the same time, people play in rotation.

Games are not regularly organized though. Their frequency depends on the number of people wishing to play football, weather conditions and whether there are any available and voluntary persons to organize it. *Games* may be organized for weeks in a row or may not be played for months. For the organization, usually an online survey is conducted on Facebook or WhatsApp in advance to see how many people are willing to play. Members of the group also bring their non-member friends, especially in case of the requirement of more players. There is no formal membership though. Any people can join to the Facebook group (although it is not necessary), and attend *games* any time they wish, without any "reference" or any previous contact.

Socialization through *halı saha* is very obvious in the group. Because members gather not only on the basis of football but also around political activism and ethical sensibilities, they have much in common. Many people who come together with the purpose of playing football meet, get to know each other and have an intimacy off the field. In addition to pre-*game* and post-*game* conversations in the *halı saha* space, there is also a ritual of drinking beer after *games* in a pub in the same neighborhood. A review of the last *game* and funny or interesting moments from this *game* are generally a hot topic. Yet, conversations are not limited to football and there are topics from a broad spectrum. Moreover, members stay in touch, have daily conversations and make announcements via the WhatsApp group. Also, whether they are through various activities or spontaneous gatherings, many members meet in their daily lives as well.

In the group, the distribution of tasks and responsibilities among many people rather than one or two persons is ideally sought. People are encouraged to take responsibility in the organization of *games* and to have a say in decision-making processes. Any kind of in-group hierarchy is unwanted and being minimized in this way. Yet, it does not always work well in practice. Many people do not prefer to have a say in decision-making processes or to share tasks. It seems to be about unwillingness to spend time and energy for such things, and about avoidance of taking responsibility. However unwanted, this

ultimately causes the same few people to be more visible in taking responsibilities, handling tasks and participating in decision-making processes. Nevertheless, although a similar situation generally functions to give and have consent for power and authority in heteromale *halı saha* groupings, it does not end up so in the group because it is politically and ethically undesired. In the meantime, this sensibility inevitably causes decision-making processes to be longer, if a decision is eventually made at all.

On the field, too, efforts to create an alternative *halı saha* football are not always a bed of roses. Although men's mainstream *halı saha* football is disapproved and rejected, examples of that type of football and characteristics attached to it are sometimes witnessed. These examples are displayed especially by self-identified men who are used to the dominant form of football.

> There was a guy, running all the time. […] He gives a pass to someone, receives it back, turns around, goes forward and gives another pass. I once told him "You don't really need to play that well. Calm down." But you can't say "What are you doing?" It would be an intervention. He should watch and understand the type of football being played there. I mean, rather than being told by us… (Derya)

It is, however, not restricted to self-identified men because performing masculinity is not a male privilege. Any people, regardless of their gender identities, sexual orientations/preferences and social backgrounds, may perform masculinity, display passages from the mainstream football, or dominate a *game* to various extents. Indeed, some people do so during *games* in the group. However, something remains exclusive to heteromasculine men: "hidden sexism" – which has both positive and negative variants on the field towards those who are self-identified, assigned or assumed as women. On the negative side, there are examples of distrust towards these women on their own teams. Some men intentionally avoid giving passes to women footballers due to the fear that they may lose the ball or make a mistake, and they prefer some other men to give passes instead. Also, some of them try to prove their superiority to women on the field through tackling harsh, shooting powerfully or giving them some football-related orders on the field.

On the positive side of sexism, there are both "protectiveness" and "gentlemanliness". In terms of protectiveness, some men behave oversensitively not to "harm" women on the field because they are physically "inferior". As for gentlemanliness, those who display its examples try to do some "favor" to women in a "heroic" way.

> Another thing which irritates me is… that a man good at football… besides testing his strength through a woman… on the contrary, giving her the ball, playing slowly, and so on… trying to help her be part of the game by doing some things that show she isn't equal… or dribbling the ball past all opponents on his own, and giving the ball to a woman by the goal at the last moment… She scores and screams with joy. I remember such scenes. It's because she's there for the first time, plays football for the first time. Scoring a goal may make her happy, but I think it humiliates all women through her. (Gökçe)

Considering the dimension of political activism, there are many friendly *games* they play with other groups of people. These are organized sometimes in solidarity with some other groups, sometimes as part of alternative football tournaments or of more general activities in honor of a special event, or sometimes just for fun. However, bearing in mind a previous discussion about the parallel between competition, seriousness and ambition/rage, aforementioned problems become more visible and problematic in such *games*, especially when they are *matches* instead of *games*.

> If our opponents were taking it too seriously and playing to defeat us, we were getting angry and starting to feel bad. Like, "Why are we in such a football match?" But it sometimes turns into "Let's try to beat them!" as well. You can't just tell them [opponents] "What are you doing?" One of the reasons to play football for some people is to win. You can't just say "We're against anything about winning." (Gökçe)

As it was discussed earlier, the relatively isolated status of *halı saha* and its in-betweenness in terms of the public-private dichotomy are the basis for its construction and the protection as a heteromale homosocial space through the symbolic and physical exclusion of women and queers, or, at best, giving them

only a role as a passive audience. At the same time, however, these very characteristics of *halı saha* seem to make a direct challenge to this space possible. For people and groups whose active participation in football is disapproved or discouraged, *halı saha* serves as a relatively "safe" environment to play football in comparison to other public or relatively public spaces (such as streets, parks and school yards) where unwanted external influences (such as interruption, and physical or verbal harassment) are more likely to occur. In this sense, *halı saha* is at least reserved for one hour and less open to such influences, interventions and harassments. In addition to people who play football for the first time thanks to *halı saha*, it also serves to re-playing football of many people who played football in their childhood, but were excluded from footballing spaces by direct or indirect social pressure as they grew up.

> [Neighborhood football] isn't a space that women and girls can go and easily play. You know, social pressure. […] It's at least more systematic on *halı saha*. You pay money and enter a limited space reserved for one hour. In terms of both time and space. It looks safe indeed. There's still an awareness of being a woman or LGBT because it's a male environment. You feel it there… that either you're doing something revolutionary or you're unwanted or you look strange. (Gökçe)

> When you say *halı saha*… It used to sound like a space where only men were going. […] The [male] youth were going there, and at most, their mothers, girlfriends and wives were watching them. Besides them, it was a space where only men played. We were playing [with boys] at the school, but they [boys] probably kept playing outside the school, on *halı sahas* afterwards. We didn't. It wasn't our space. It changed for me then. (Derya)

Nevertheless, women and queers collectively and regularly playing football in *halı saha* spaces still encounter many problems. Sexist, homophobic and transphobic verbal abuses, creepy stares and sarcastic laughter by boys and men in and around these spaces are not surprising or unusual. These "[gender] policing behaviors" (Doan, 2010) are motivated not only by male and heteronormative gazes but also by masculinized and heterosexualized characteristics of

these spaces. Such disturbing experiences, however, seem to minimize especially as the same *halı saha* space is being used regularly. Boys and men who find women's and queers' active participation in the *halı saha* football weird start gradually getting used to it through their encounters.

To remember an earlier quotation from van Ingen (2003):

> [I]t is important to recognize that lived space is both oppressive and enabling. Lived space is the site of discriminatory practices such as racism, sexism and homophobia and is where marginalization is produced and enforced. Yet, lived space also produces critically important counterspaces that are the spaces for diverse, resistant and oppositional practices. Created by both individuals and collectives, counterspaces are dynamic, counterhegemonic social spaces that enable alternative geographies. (p. 204)

Therefore, *halı saha* spaces, too, do not only restrict and exclude women and queers, but do also create some liberating and empowering opportunities at both individual and collective levels. Through the creation and protection of "safe" *halı saha* spaces, women and queers, who had previously been discouraged from the football environment, can have new ways of constituting and expressing their subjectivities. By aiming "safe" spaces through football, attempting to create and protect such spaces, claiming the right to play football and alternatively offering a more equal and inclusive football, *halı saha* spaces are used politically indeed – in a way which has a potential to make broader social impacts when it is part of a broader ethico-political agenda seeking an equal life and rejecting any kind of discrimination.[23]

23 For a detailed discussion on sexuality politics and potentials of resistance on and through the football field, see Aktan, 2019.

5

Conclusion

Although studies on the relation between masculinity and football have been increasing, the non-institutional part of football has been paid less attention. Such studies usually focus on institutional football, its agents and spaces. *Halı sahas*, as the main non-institutional footballing spaces in the urban context, too, have been disregarded in the academy, or, more generally, in intellectual thinking in Turkey since they appeared in the mid-1980s. However, they are a product of political, economic and cultural changes in the society, and provide a vast amount of valuable materials to examine and analyze – particularly in terms of class and gender.

I argue that (heteromale) homosocialization in general is based on two essential dynamics: competition and bonding. A man's heteromasculinity is validated, above all, by other men (Bourdieu, 2001). Hence, (heteromasculine) men seek ways of recognition, respect and power in their relations with other men. In this sense, *serious games of competition* allow them to race their masculinities in various sites of their social lives in search of power and status. Meanwhile, through bonding, they establish and reinforce collaborative relations to help and support each other for material and nonmaterial needs, make sense of their experiences, and check, verify or reinterpret their values and ideals. This double process, as a whole, also helps them regulate, consolidate

or reorganize power relations among them. However, the conflicting coexistence of competition and bonding needs to be balanced. Teasing, I argue, appears as a strategical and balancing dynamic between them in this respect.

Considering the close relation between masculinity and football in Turkey on the one hand and the crucial importance of the homosocial and spatial dynamics in the construction and expression of gendered and sexual subjectivities on the other hand, *halı sahas* function as a space for (heteromasculine) men to gather and homosocialize through the active participation in non-institutional football as a *serious game of competition*. *Halı sahas* are, above all, masculinized and heterosexualized spaces. Just like other (heteromale) homosocial spaces, they, too, enable men not only to constitute and perform their subjectivities but also to regulate power relations among themselves in spaces which are preserved for their privileged use. These processes are worth critical examination to understand the reinterpretation and reproduction of the normative patterns of masculinity.

Highly heteromasculine football culture in Turkey is not independent of but reproduced also through masculinization and heterosexualization of *halı saha* spaces – by discouraging and excluding women and queers. These discouraged and excluded individuals and groups also claim their rights to play football, look for possibilities, and strive to create a more equal and inclusive football environment not only as a leisure activity but also as political activism. *Halı saha* enables these people to seek their rights and ideals as much as it discourages and excludes them. Indeed, the participation of these people in the *halı saha* football or elsewhere is not challenging or resistant in itself. It is rather their standpoints, discourses and sets of behaviors which determine their subversive or reproductive potential for existing exclusive, unequal and heteromasculine football environment. Hence, such efforts look challenging and subversive as long as they are integrated into a broader ethico-political agenda – which pays attention not only to the gender and sexual exclusion but to economic, ethnic and *racial* exclusions from the football environment as well and considers more inclusive ways and spaces to practice the "right to play football" as part of the "right to the city".

As I specified in advance, this study is about young men – who self-identify as cisgender and heteromasculine. As I specified further, this study is

about such men with secular, urban and middle-class backgrounds. To repeat, I chose *halı saha* as a space where homosocial relations among these men are crystallized in certain forms. In this regard, I presented the dynamics and patterns in these relations taking place on and through *halı saha* and demonstrated their social significance. The autoethnographic data I have are based mainly on the Beşiktaş, Şişli and Kadıköy districts – which have secular, urban and middle-class characteristics in general. However, I interpret these data neither solely as individual experiences nor as sourced from an isolated social milieu nor as the representative of general social facts but rather as small matters meaningful in a broader framework and also speaking to broader issues – as Geertz (1973) puts it. I see this bilateral shuttling as a principle of understanding rather than merely a matter of methodology.

Besides, even though the theoretical and conceptual paradigm suggested by Carrigan et al. (1985) which have been dominant in the literature of the Critical Studies on Men and Masculinities is useful to see the general picture, it fails to recognize and analyze complexities, flexibilities and contradictions of subjectivities (Pringle, 2005). With the help of queer theory, this limitations can be exceeded. The data I have, too, show that men do not constitute or perform fixed and monolithic subjectivities, but that they rather "know of themselves in multiple ways" (Markula & Pringle, 2005) and behave so. While they seek ideal heteromasculine subjectivities and recognition by other men, they also know their own capacities, limitations and fragilities and refrain from situations which may "hurt" them. In the meantime, their ideals, values, performances, discourses and relations indicate their class positions, because gender is not independent of class. In fact, gender is classed as much as class is gendered.

This study can be extended in some respects. First, I kept my focus on men and masculinities in and through *halı saha* spaces, rather than *halı sahas* themselves. Even though I socially, politically, economically and culturally contextualized them in the first place and prepared some additional socio-economic lists about *halı sahas* (Appendix C, Appendix D and Appendix E), I did not prefer to go into more detail. Further investigation of *halı sahas* in a broad socio-economic context can provide a better contextualization and understanding of them. Second, I concentrated exclusively on *halı sahas* as the

main space of non-institutional football in the urban context. Researching other spaces of non-institutional football can be useful to compare findings. Third, encounters taking place in and through *halı saha* spaces are worth closer attention. Such encounters among various social groups and individuals differing on the basis of class, ethnicity, religiousness, gender and sexuality can be examined further. Fourth, the data can be extended to other social groups, classes, cities, milieus and homosocial spaces.

Through further investigation and successful connection of theory and data a more profound understanding of the homosocial patterns and dynamics of masculinity will hopefully be achieved. This study can be seen as a step taken to demonstrate the social, intellectual and academic significance of an issue which has so far been dismissed to a large extent; and I hope to have made a small contribution to the literature so far in this respect.

Appendix A The Interviewees

Pseudonym	Self-identified gender	Age	Education	Job
Murat	Not stated	23	BA student	BA student
Derya	Woman	26	BA Student	BA student
Onur	Man	29	PhD candidate	PhD candidate, engineer
Ümit	Man	34	BA degree	Lawyer
Arda	Man	20	Distance education high school student	High school student
Emre	Man	29	Associate & distance education BA degrees	Logistics operator
Gökçe	Other	28	MA student	MA student
Serkan	Man	35	MA degree	Economic consultant
Hakan	Man	58	Associate degree	Insurer
Caner	Man	35	High school dropout	Barber
Uğur	Man	33	BA degree	Elevator installer
Selim	Man	36	BSc degree	Elevator installer
Yusuf	Man	46	Elementary school dropout	Window installer
Erdem	-	-		*Halı saha* owner
Bülent	-	-		*Halı saha* worker
Halil	-	-		*Halı saha* worker

Appendix B The Interviewees and *Halı Saha*

Pseudonym	*Halı saha* status	Frequency of playing	District of residence	District of *halı saha*
Murat	Player	Irregular	Sarıyer	Beşiktaş, Şişli
Derya	Player	Irregular	Eyüp	Şişli
Onur	Player	Once a week	Beşiktaş	Beşiktaş, Kadıköy
Ümit	Player	Once a week	Sarıyer	Beşiktaş, Kadıköy
Arda	Player	Twice or three times a month	Kartal	Kartal
Emre	Player	Twice a month	Büyük-çekmece	Büyük-çekmece, Avcılar
Gökçe	Player	Irregular	Beyoğlu	Kadıköy, Şişli
Serkan	Player	Once a week	Beşiktaş	Beşiktaş, Sarıyer
Hakan	Player	Twice or three times a week	Kadıköy	Kadıköy
Caner	Player	Twice a week	Kadıköy	Ataşehir
Uğur	Player	Twice a week	Kadıköy	Kadıköy, Ümraniye
Selim	Player	Once a week	Tuzla	Ümraniye, Ataşehir
Yusuf	Manager, ex-player	Irregular	Ümraniye	Maltepe
Erdem	*Halı saha* owner	-	-	Kartal
Bülent	*Halı saha* worker	-	-	Sarıyer
Halil	*Halı saha* worker	-	-	Beşiktaş

Appendix C District-based Numbers of *Halı Sahas*[1]

Districts	No. of *halı sahas*, 2012	Population, 2013	Persons per *halı saha*, 2012/13	Area of district (km²), 2012	Area (km²) per *halı saha*, 2012
Adalar	1	16.166	16.166	11,05	11,05
Arnavutköy	4	215.531	53.883	506,65	126,66
Ataşehir	7	405.974	57.996	25,20	3,60
Avcılar	18	407.240	22.624	42,01	2,33
Bağcılar	14	752.250	53.732	22,37	1,60
Bahçelievler	28	602.931	21.533	16,61	0,59
Bakırköy	24	220.974	9.207	29,64	1,24
Başakşehir	6	333.047	55.508	104,30	17,38
Bayrampaşa	13	269.677	20.744	9,61	0,74
Beşiktaş	12	186.570	15.548	18,01	1,50
Beykoz	6	248.056	41.343	310,36	51,73
Beylikdüzü	10	244.760	24.476	37,78	3,78
Beyoğlu	5	245.219	49.044	8,91	1,78
Büyükçekmece	18	211.000	11.722	157,72	8,76
Çatalca	1	65.811	65.811	1.040,38	1.040,38
Çekmeköy	8	207.476	25.935	148,09	18,51
Esenler	8	461.621	57.703	18,43	2,30
Esenyurt	11	624.733	56.794	43,13	3,92
Eyüp	16	361.531	22.596	228,32	14,27
Fatih	17	425.875	25.051	15,59	0,92
Gaziosmanpaşa	13	495.006	38.077	11,76	0,90
Güngören	10	306.854	30.685	7,21	0,72
Kadıköy	30	506.293	16.876	25,09	0,84

1 Information about the district-based number of *halı sahas* was obtained from *Istanbul Sports Inventory* (2012) published by the İstanbul Büyükşehir Belediyesi (İBB, or İstanbul Metropolitan Municipality). Considering some *halı saha* facilities have more than one field, numbers of fields rather than facilities were used in the table. Information about district-based areas was obtained by a personal application to the İstanbul Metropolitan Municipality via the Cumhurbaşkanlığı İletişim Merkezi (CİMER, or Communications Center of the Presidency). Because I could not find any official data about district-based populations in 2012, that of 2013 is used. This data rest upon *Address Based Population Registration System Results 2013* (2014) by the Türkiye İstatistik Kurumu (TÜİK, or Turkish Statistical Institute).

Districts	No. of *halı sahas*, 2012	Population, 2013	Persons per *halı saha*, 2012/13	Area of district (km²), 2012	Area (km²) per *halı saha*, 2012
Kağıthane	15	428.755	28.584	14,87	0,99
Kartal	33	447.110	13.549	38,54	1,17
Küçükçekmece	34	740.090	21.767	37,54	1,10
Maltepe	14	471.059	33.647	52,97	3,78
Pendik	34	646.375	19.011	179,99	5,29
Sancaktepe	5	304.406	60.881	62,42	12,48
Sarıyer	19	335.598	17.663	151,30	7,96
Silivri	6	155.923	25.987	869,52	144,92
Sultanbeyli	17	309.347	18.197	29,10	1,71
Sultangazi	14	505.190	36.085	36,30	2,59
Şile	1	31.718	31.718	781,72	781,72
Şişli	12	274.420	22.868	34,80	2,90
Tuzla	5	208.807	41.761	123,63	24,73
Ümraniye	37	660.125	17.841	45,38	1,23
Üsküdar	36	534.636	14.851	35,33	0,98
Zeytinburnu	11	292.313	26.574	11,59	1,05
İstanbul	573	14.160.467	24.713	5.343,22	9,32

Appendix D *Halı Sahas*, Municipalities, and Average House Prices[2]

Districts	Persons per *halı saha*, 2012/13	Number of *halı saha,* 2012	Party won the local elections, 2014	Average house prices (TL/100 m^2), 2012
Bakırköy	9.207	24	CHP	209.433
Büyükçekmece	11.722	18	CHP	101.189
Kartal	13.549	33	CHP	138.690
Üsküdar	14.851	36	AKP	173.812
Beşiktaş	15.548	12	CHP	292.281
Kadıköy	16.876	30	CHP	255.126
Sarıyer	17.663	19	CHP	240.423
Ümraniye	17.841	37	AKP	149.907
Sultanbeyli	18.197	17	AKP	69.443
Pendik	19.011	34	AKP	108.750
Bayrampaşa	20.744	13	AKP	133.924
Bahçelievler	21.533	28	AKP	126.040
Küçükçekmece	21.767	34	AKP	144.191
Eyüp	22.596	16	AKP	133.828
Avcılar	22.624	18	CHP	104.852
Şişli	22.868	12	CHP	210.913
Beylikdüzü	24.476	10	CHP	104.341
Fatih	25.051	17	AKP	152.035
Average	18.674	22,67	9 CHP, 9 AKP	158.288
İstanbul	24.713			

2 The average of persons per *halı saha* in İstanbul is used to divide districts into two groups: those above this average and those below it. Three districts – Adalar, Çatalca and Şile - are left out of this divide because each of them has only one *halı saha* and it could have been misleading. Information about average house prices on the basis of districts was obtained from Küresel Rekabet Veritabanı (Database of Global Competitiveness) published in 2012.

Districts	Persons per *halı saha*, 2012/13	Number of *halı saha,* 2012	Party won the local elections, 2014	Average house prices (TL/100 m²), 2012
Silivri	25.987	6	CHP	93.495
Çekmeköy	25.935	8	AKP	120.828
Zeytinburnu	26.574	11	AKP	127.896
Kağıthane	28.584	15	AKP	142.550
Güngören	30.685	10	AKP	115.443
Gazi-osmanpaşa	38.077	13	AKP	117.901
Maltepe	33.647	14	CHP	139.724
Sultangazi	36.085	14	AKP	99.847
Beykoz	41.343	6	AKP	232.842
Tuzla	41.761	5	AKP	141.809
Beyoğlu	49.044	5	AKP	170.161
Bağcılar	53.732	14	AKP	107.126
Arnavutköy	53.883	4	AKP	89.018
Başakşehir	55.508	6	AKP	186.032
Esenyurt	56.794	11	AKP	86.043
Esenler	57.703	8	AKP	97.208
Ataşehir	57.996	7	CHP	146.015
Sancaktepe	60.881	5	AKP	114.242
Average	43.012	9,00	3 CHP, 15 AKP	129.343

Districts	Persons per *halı saha*, 2012/13	Number of *halı saha,* 2012	Party won the local elections, 2014	Average house prices (TL/100 m²), 2012
Adalar	16.166	1	RPP	213.004
Şile	31.718	1	JDP	123.573
Çatalca	65.811	1	RPP	88.410

Appendix E *Halı Sahas* and Socio-Economic Indexes[3]

Districts	Persons per *halı saha*, 2012/13	Global comp. index (0-100), 2010/11	Transp. & access. index (0-100), 2010/11	Economic activity index (0-100), 2010/11	Social life index (0-100), 2010/11
Bakırköy	9.207	54,01	81,66	39,44	33,58
Büyükçekmece	11.722	37,75	22,35	30,31	5,05
Kartal	13.549	40,65	42,35	29,64	6,90
Üsküdar	14.851	48,27	58,46	33,30	23,29
Beşiktaş	15.548	62,13	81,61	45,99	28,40
Kadıköy	16.876	64,90	91,74	55,85	37,55
Sarıyer	17.663	41,39	43,20	28,40	12,25
Ümraniye	17.841	37,18	6,99	44,64	5,83
Sultanbeyli	18.197	22,66	5,34	17,75	1,58
Pendik	19.011	38,74	37,89	37,64	8,66
Bayrampaşa	20.744	35,35	28,99	32,25	3,74
Bahçelievler	21.533	44,06	44,92	41,81	5,64
Küçükçekmece	21.767	41,83	40,25	43,80	4,45
Eyüp	22.596	38,12	59,93	30,67	4,74
Avcılar	22.624	36,57	48,63	29,79	5,54
Şişli	22.868	56,12	47,28	69,44	37,72
Beylikdüzü	24.476	33,14	2,56	27,11	6,99
Fatih	25.051	57,02	71,43	57,91	35,20
Average	18.674	43,88	45,31	38,65	14,84
İstanbul	24.713				

3 Similar to Appendix C, the average of persons per *halı saha* in İstanbul is used to divide districts into two groups and the same three districts are left out with the same reason. Indexes were obtained from the same source, Küresel Rekabet Veritabanı (Database of Global Competitiveness) published in 2012.

Districts	Persons per *halı saha*, 2012/13	Global comp. index (0-100), 2010/11	Transp. & access. index (0-100), 2010/11	Economic activity index (0-100), 2010/11	Social life index (0-100), 2010/11
Silivri	25.987	27,52	0,63	16,52	3,43
Çekmeköy	25.935	27,16	2,38	16,88	2,58
Zeytinburnu	26.574	40,06	62,40	26,92	2,90
Kağıthane	28.584	34,55	39,95	26,66	1,90
Güngören	30.685	34,14	26,33	23,51	3,70
Gazi-osmanpaşa	38.077	29,96	7,35	27,34	5,44
Maltepe	33.647	41,72	41,40	31,03	5,68
Sultangazi	36.085	24,08	14,64	23,42	1,43
Beykoz	41.343	36,49	27,06	25,51	13,14
Tuzla	41.761	36,32	20,85	27,46	4,37
Beyoğlu	49.044	53,00	76,75	36,49	69,66
Bağcılar	53.732	34,00	22,63	36,39	6,74
Arnavutköy	53.883	26,36	1,63	18,12	3,10
Başakşehir	55.508	31,29	1,95	35,85	3,58
Esenyurt	56.794	29,89	1,90	33,26	1,90
Esenler	57.703	25,71	17,64	26,45	2,58
Ataşehir	57.996	36,22	6,41	36,17	2,74
Sancaktepe	60.881	26,73	1,85	24,46	3,05
Average	43.012	33,07	20,76	27,36	7,66

Districts	Persons per *halı saha*, 2012/13	Global comp. index (0-100), 2010/11	Transp. & access. index (0-100), 2010/11	Economic activity index (0-100), 2010/11	Social life index (0-100), 2010/11
Adalar	16.166	33,80	27,35	12,42	1,38
Şile	31.718	26,92	1,08	14,97	-
Çatalca	65.811	27,28	1,24	12,54	3,74

Bibliography

Adam Eksik [Man/Player Wanted]. (n.d.). Retrieved from https://adameksik.com/blog/

Adams, T. E., Bochner, A. P., & Ellis, C. (2011). Autoethnography: An Overview. *Historical Social Research / Historische Sozialforschung,* 36(4), 273-290.

Akgül, Ç. (2011). *Militarizmin Cinsiyetçi Suretleri: Devlet, Ordu ve Toplumsal Cinsiyet.* Ankara: Dipnot Yayınları.

Akın, Y. (2004). *"Gürbüz ve Yavuz Evlatlar": Erken Cumhuriyet'te Beden Terbiyesi ve Spor*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Aktan, D. N. (2019). *Sexuality Politics on the Football Field.* (Unpublished master's thesis). Boğaziçi University, İstanbul, Turkey.

Aktaş, F. O. (2014). *Being a Conscientious Objector in Turkey: Challenging Hegemonic Masculinity in a Militaristic Nation-State.* Saarbrücken: Lambert Publishing.

Altınay, A. G. (2004).*The Myth of the Military-Nation: Militarism, Gender, and Education in Turkey.* New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

Anderson, B. (1991). *Imagined Communities.* London; New York, NY: Verso.

Arık, H. (2009). Kahvehanede Erkek Olmak: Kamusal Alanda Erkek Egemenliğin Antropolojisi. In A. Alkan (Ed.). *Cins Cins Mekân* (pp. 168-201). İstanbul: Varlık Yayınları.

Arslan, U. T. (2005). *Bu Kâbuslar Neden Cemil? Yeşilçam'da Erkeklik ve Mazlumluk.* İstanbul: Metis Yayınları.

Atencio, M., & Koca, C. (2011). Gendered communities of practice and the construction of masculinities in Turkish physical education. *Gender and Education*, 23(1), 59-72.

Ayata, S. (2002). The New Middle Class and the Joys of Suburbia. In D. Kandiyoti, & A. Saktanber (Eds.). *Fragments of Culture: The Everyday of Modern Turkey* (pp. 25-42). New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Baliç, İ., & Özbay, C. (2004). Erkekliğin ev halleri! *Toplum ve Bilim,* 104, 89-103.

Barutçu, A. (2015). "Ucundan Azıcık"la Atılan Sağlam Temel: Türkiye'de Sünnet Ritüeli ve Erkeklikle İlişkisi. *Masculinities: A Journal of Identity and Culture*, 3, 129-155.

Bayhan, K. (Director). (2018). *altyapı: boksör*. Retrieved from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=odzHRi8vOxo>

Beck, S., Clabaugh, S. E., Clark, R. A., Kosovski, M. C., Daar, R., … Suri, R. (2007). Teasing Among College Men and Women. *Communication Studies*, 58(2), 157-172.

Bird, S. R. (1996). Welcome to the Men's Club: Homosociality and the Maintenance of Hegemonic Masculinity. *Gender & Society*, 10(2), 120-132.

Biricik, A. (2006). *Diagnosis… Extremely Homosexual: (Re)Constructing Hegemonic Masculinity Through Militarized Medical Discourse in Turkey.* (Unpublished master's thesis). Central European University, Budapest, Hungary.

Bolak Boratav, H., Eslen Ziya, H., & Okman Fişek, G. (2017). *Erkekliğin Türkiye Halleri.* İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları.

Bora, A. (2008). *Kadınların Sınıfı: Ücretli Ev Emeği ve Kadın Öznelliğinin İnşası.* İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları. (Original work published 2005).

Bora, A., & Bora, T. (2015). Bir Erkeklik Fantezisi: Kurtlar Vadisi. In A. Özman, & S. Coşar (Eds.). *Milliyetçilik ve Toplumsal Cinsiyet: Edebiyat, Medya, Siyaset* (pp. 175-194). İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Bora, T. (Ed.). (2001). *Takımdan Ayrı Düz Koşu.* İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Bora, T. (2006). *Kârhanede Romantizm.* İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Bora, T. (2009, June 6). Erkeklik ve Futbol: Beşlik Yeme Kaygısı. *Bianet.* Retrieved from https://bianet.org/bianet/diger/115037-erkeklik-ve-futbol-beslik-yeme-kaygisi

Bora, T. (2013). Futbolda Erkeklik, Militarizm, Milliyetçilik: Tek Kale. In N. Y. Sünbüloğlu (Ed.). *Erkek Millet Asker Millet: Türkiye'de Militarizm, Milliyetçilik, Erkek(lik)ler* (pp. 487-512). İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Bora, T., & Erdoğan, N. (1993). "Dur Tarih, Vur Türkiye": Türk Milletinin Milli Sporu Olarak Futbol. In T. Bora, R. Horak, & W. Reiter (Eds.). *Futbol ve Kültürü* (pp. 221-240). İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Bora, T., & Gökalp, E. (2010). Futbolda Sıradan Milliyetçilik: "İşte Böyle Böyle Türklüğümüz Yok Oluyor…" In H. Millas (Ed.). *Sözde Masum Milliyetçilik* (pp. 179-199). İstanbul: Kitap Yayınevi.

Bora, T., & Horak, R., & Reiter, W. (Eds.). (1993). *Futbol ve Kültürü.* İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Bora, T., & Yüksel, T. (2013). *Çizgi Açığı*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Bourdieu, P. (1978). Sport and social class. *Social Science Information*, 17(6), 819-840.

Bourdieu, P. (1986). *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*. (R. Nice, Trans.). London: Routledge. (Original work published 1979).

Bourdieu, P. (2001). *Masculine Domination*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Bourdieu, P. (2011). The Forms of Capital. In M. Granovetter, & R. Swedberg (Eds.). *The Sociology of Economic Life* (3rd edition, pp. 78-92). Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Bozok, M. (2013). *Constructing Local Masculinities: A Case Study from Trabzon, Turkey.* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Middle East Technical University, Ankara, Turkey.

Brod, H. (1987). A Case for Men's Studies. In M. Kimmel (Ed.). *Changing Men: New Directions in Research on Men and Masculinity* (pp. 263-277). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

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

Butler, J. (2003). Performative Acts and Gender Constitution: An Essay in Phenomenology and Feminist Theory. In C. R. McCann, & S. K. Kim (Eds.). *Feminist Theory Reader: Local and Global Perspectives* (pp. 415-427). New York, NY: Routledge.

Buzuvis, E. E. (2010). Caster Semenya and the Myth of a Level Playing Field. *The Modern American*, 6(2), 36-42.

Caron, C., & Mervosh, S. (2019, March 8). 8 Times Women in Sports Fought for Equality. *The New York Times.* Retrieved from https://www.nytimes.com/2019/03/08/sports/women-sports-equality.html?module=inline

Carrigan, T., Connell, B., & Lee, J. (1985). Toward a New Sociology of Masculinity. *Theory and Society*, 14(5), 551-604.

Caudwell, J. (2011a). "Does your boyfriend know you're here?" The spatiality of homophobia in men's football culture in the UK. *Leisure Studies*, 30(2), 123-138.

Caudwell, J. (2011b). Gender, feminism, and football studies. *Soccer & Society*, 12(3), 330-344.

Chapple, A., & Ziebland, S. (2004). The Role of Humor for Men with Testicular Cancer. *Qualitative Health Research*, 14(8), 1123-1139.

Clatterbaugh, K. (1998). What is Problematic about Masculinities? *Men and Masculinities*, 1(1), 24-45.

Clatterbaugh, K. (2000). Literature of the U.S. Men's Movement. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 25(3), 883-894.

Connell, R. W. (1985). Theorising Gender. *Sociology*, 19(2), 260-272.

Connell, R. W. (1987). *Gender and Power.* Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Connell, R. W. (2000). *The Men and the Boys*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Connell, R. W. (2005). *Masculinities.* (2nd edition). Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Connell, R. W., & Messerschmidt, J. W. (2005). Hegemonic Masculinity: Rethinking the Concept. *Gender & Society*, 19(6), 829-859.

Cora, Y. T. (2013). Asker Vatandaşlar ve Kahraman Erkekler: Balkan Savaşları ve Birinci Dünya Savaşı Dönemlerinde Beden Terbiyesi Aracılığıyla İdeal Erkekliğin Kurgulanması. In N. Y. Sünbüloğlu (Ed.). *Erkek Millet Asker Millet: Türkiye'de Militarizm, Milliyetçilik, Erkek(lik)ler* (pp. 45-74). İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Crosset, T. (1990). Masculinity, Sexuality, and the Development of Early Modern Sport. In M. A. Messner, & D. F. Sabo (Eds.). *Sport, Men and the Gender Order: Critical Feminist Perspectives* (pp. 45-54). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

Çakır, B., & Karakaş, B. (2013). *Erkeklik Ofsayta Düşünce: Futbol, Eşcinsellik ve Halil İbrahim Dinçdağ'ın Hikâyesi.* İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Çakır, S. (2011). Feminist Tarih Yazımı: Tarihin Kadınlar İçin, Kadınlar Tarafından Yeniden İnşası. In S. Sancar (Ed.). *Birkaç Arpa Boyu... 21. Yüzyıla Girerken Türkiye'de Feminist Çalışmalar* (pp. 505-533). İstanbul: Koç Üniversitesi Yayınları.

Çelik, G. (2017). *Öldüren Erkek(lik)ler: Eşine Şiddet Uygulamış Cezaevindeki Erkekler.* İstanbul: NotaBene Yayınları.

Çınar, Ö. H., & Üsterci, C. (2008). *Çarklardaki Kum: Vicdani Red: Düşünsel Kaynaklar ve Deneyimler.* İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Das, A. (2019, March 8). U.S. Women's Soccer Team Sues U.S. Soccer for Gender Discrimination. *The New York Times.* Retrieved from https://www.nytimes.com/2019/03/08/sports/womens-soccer-team-lawsuit-gender-discrimination.html?module=inline

Delice, S. (2010). Friendship, sociability, and masculinity in the Ottoman Empire: An essay confronting the ghosts of historicism. *New Perspectives on Turkey*, 42, 103-125.

Demetriou, D. Z. (2001). Connell's concept of hegemonic masculinity: A critique. *Theory and Society*, 30(3), 337-361.

Demren, Ç. (2007). *Kahvehane erkekliği: Ankara'da bir gecekondu mahallesi örneği.* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Hacettepe University, Ankara, Turkey.

Dinçşahin, Ş., & Lüküslü, D. (2013). Shaping Bodies Shaping Minds: Selim Sırrı Tarcan and the Origins of Modern Physical Education in Turkey. *The International Journal of the History of Sport*, 30(3), 195-209.

Doan, P. L. (2010). The tyranny of gendered spaces – reflections from beyond the gender dichotomy. *Gender, Place and Culture*, 17(5), 635-654.

Dunning, E. G., & Sheard, K. G. (1973). The Rugby Football Club as a Type of "Male Preserve": Some Sociological Notes. *International Review of Sport Sociology*, 8(3), 5-24.

Elmas, S. (2017). *"Bi Futbolcu Olursak…": Futbolda Profesyonellik, Sınıf Atlama ve Hayal Kırıklığı.* İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Emrence, C. (2010). From elite circles to power networks: Turkish soccer clubs in a global age, 1903-2005. *Soccer & Society*, 11(3), 242-252.

Erdoğan, İ. (Ed.). (2011). *Medyada Hegemonik Erkek(lik) ve Temsil.* İstanbul: Kalkedon Yayınları.

Erhart, I. (2013). Ladies of Besiktas: A dismantling of male hegemony at Inönü Stadium. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, 48(1), 83-98.

Erol, M., & Özbay, C. (2018). No andropause for gay men? The body, aging and sexuality in Turkey. *Journal of Gender Studies*, 27(7), 847-859.

Erten, B. (2009). Midpoint of Istanbul is the Astro Turf pitch. In P. Derviş, & M. Öner (Eds.). *Mapping Istanbul* (pp. 174-179). İstanbul: Garanti Gallery.

Erten, B. (2011, November 18) Halı Saha, İstanbul'da Sokak Futbolunun Dönüşümünde Son Halka mıdır? *90,* SALT Beyoğlu, İstanbul. Retrieved from https://vimeopro.com/saltonline/90/video/32514962

European Synthetic Turf Council. (n.d.). Synthetic Turf FAQs. Retrieved from https://www.estc.info/synthetic-turf-faqs/#toggle-id-1

Fédération Internationale de Football Association [FIFA]. (n.d.). *A Guide to Mini-Football Pitches*. Retrieved from https://www.sportslabs.files.wordpress.com/2013/09/guide-to-mini-football-pitches_e.pdf

Fişek, K. (1985). *100 Soruda Türkiye Spor Tarihi*. İstanbul: Gerçek Yayınevi.

Foucault, M. (1979). *The History of Sexuality: Vol. 1. An Introduction.* (R. Hurley, Trans.). London: Penguin Books.

Frye, M. (1983). *The Politics of Reality: Essays in Feminist Theory.* Trumansburg, NY: Crossing Press.

Gardiner, J. K. (2002). Introduction. In J. K. Gardiner (Ed.). *Masculinity Studies & Feminist Theory: New Directions* (pp. 1-29). New York, NY: Columbia University Press.

Geertz, C. (1973). *The Interpretation of Cultures: Selected Essays by Clifford Geertz.* New York: Basic Books.

Giulianotti, R. (2000). *Football: A Sociology of the Global Game*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press. (Original work published 1999).

Gramsci, A. (1999). *Selections from the Prison Notebooks.* (Q. Hoare, & G. N. Smith, Eds. and Trans.). New York, NY: International Publishers. (Original work published 1971).

Günay-Erkol, Ç. (2008). *Cold War Masculinities in Turkish Literature: A Survey of March 12 Novels.* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Leiden University, Leiden, Holland.

Gürbilek, N. (2011). *The New Cultural Climate in Turkey: Living in a Shop Window.* (V. Holbrook, Trans.). London; New York, NY: Zed Books.

Hacısoftaoğlu Közleme, İ. (2012). *Burası Er Meydanı: Güreşte Erkekliğin İnşası.* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Hacettepe University, Ankara, Turkey.

Halberstam, J. (1998). *Female Masculinity*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Halberstam, J. (2002). The Good, the Bad, and the Ugly: Men, Women, and Masculinity. In J. K. Gardiner (Ed.). *Masculinity Studies & Feminist Theory: New Directions* (pp. 344-367). New York, NY: Columbia University Press.

Hargreaves, J. A. (1986). Where's the Virtue? Where's the Grace? A Discussion of the Social Production of Gender Relations in and through Sport. *Theory, Culture & Society*, 3(1), 109-121.

Harvey, D. (2003). The Right to the City. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 27(4), 939-941.

Hatem, J. (2016). Planning the City through Play: Youth Efforts in Making Communal Football Fields in Beirut. Public Works Studio. Retrieved from https://publicworksstudio.com/en/projects/informal-football-fields-alternative-use-urban-space

Hearn, J. (2004). From hegemonic masculinity to the hegemony of men. *Feminist Theory*, 5(1), 49-72.

Heyl, B. S. (2007). Ethnographic Interviewing. In P. Atkinson, A. Coffey, S. Delamont, J. Lofland, & L. Lofland (Eds.) *Handbook of Ethnography* (pp. 369-383). London: Sage. (Original work published 2001).

Hinsliff, G. (2019, May 3). Is fair play in running more important than fairness to Caster Semenya as a human? *Guardian*. Retrieved from https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2019/may/03/caster-semenya-fair-play-running-athletics-south-african-ethics-sport-science?CMP=share_btn_tw

hooks, b. (2000). *Feminist Theory: From Margin to Center.* (2nd edition.). London: Pluto.

Howell, P. (2007). Foucault, Sexuality, Geography. In J. W. Crampton, & S. Elden (Eds.). *Space, Knowledge and Power: Foucault and Geography* (pp. 291-315). Aldershot, England; Burlington, VT: Ashgate.

International Association of Athletics Federation [IAAF]. (2011, April 11). IAAF to Introduce Eligibility Rules for Female with Hyperandrogenism. Retrieved from https://www.iaaf.org/news/iaaf-news/iaaf-to-introduce-eligibility-rules-for-femal-1

Irak, D. (2010). *The Transformation of Football Fandom in Turkey since the 1970s.* (Unpublished master's thesis). Boğaziçi University, İstanbul, Turkey.

Işıl, V. (Director). (2018). *Şantiye Sahası: Kentsel Dönüşüm Futbolun Peşinde*. Retrieved from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=bolc8XQRQjU

İstanbul Metropolitan Municipality [İBB]. (2012). *Istanbul Sports Inventory 2012*. İstanbul: İstanbul Metropolitan Municipality.

Jordan-Young, R. M., & Karkazis, K. (2019, May 3). The Myth of Testosterone. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from https://www.nytimes.com/2019/05/03/opinion/testosterone-caster-semenya.html

Kandiyoti, D. (1987). Emancipated but Unliberated? Reflections on the Turkish Case. *Feminist Studies*, 13(2), 317-338.

Kandiyoti, D. (1988). Bargaining with Patriarchy. *Gender & Society* 2(3), 274-290.

Kandiyoti, D. (1994). The Paradoxes of Masculinity: Some Thoughts on Segregated Societies. In A. Cornwall, & N. Lindisfarne (Eds.). *Dislocating Masculinity: Comparative Ethnographies* (pp. 197-213). London: Routledge.

Kandiyoti, D. (1995). Patterns of Patriarchy: Notes for an Analysis of Male Dominance in Turkish Society. In Şirin Tekeli (Ed.) *Women in Modern Turkish Society* (pp. 306-318). London: Zed Books.

Karaçam, M. Ş., & Öztürk, P. (2015, August 8). Nitekim Testosteron da Olmadı! *Bianet*. Retrieved from https://bianet.org/biamag/spor/166642-nitekim-testosteron-da-olmadi

Karaçam, M. Ş., & Öztürk, P. (2017, August 12). Sen Neymişsin Be Androjen! *Bianet*. Retrieved from https://bianet.org/biamag/toplumsal-cinsiyet/189027-sen-neymissin-be-androjen

Karaçam, M. Ş., & Öztürk, P. (2018, May 12). Kahrolsun Bazı Niyetler. *Bianet*. Retrieved from https://bianet.org/biamag/toplumsal-cinsiyet/197042-kahrolsun-bazi-niyetler

Kaufman, M. (1987). The Construction of Masculinity and the Triad of Men's Violence. In M. Kaufman (Ed.). *Beyond Patriarchy: Essays by Men on Pleasure, Power, and Change* (pp. 1-29). Toronto, ON; New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Keyder, Ç. (1999). The Setting. In Ç. Keyder (Ed.). *Istanbul: Between the Global and the Local* (pp. 3-28). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Kıvanç, Ü. (1993). Seyircinin Sahaya İnişi. In T. Bora, R. Horak, & W. Reiter (Eds.). *Futbol ve Kültürü* (pp. 385-400). İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Kidd, B. (1990). The Men's Cultural Centre: Sports and the Dynamic of Women's Oppression/Men's Repression. In M. A. Messner, & D. F. Sabo (Eds.). *Sport, Men and the Gender Order: Critical Feminist Perspectives* (pp. 31-43). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

Kimmel, M. S. (1987). Rethinking "Masculinity": New Directions in Research. In M. S. Kimmel (Ed.). *Changing Men: New Directions in Research on Men and Masculinity* (pp. 9-24). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Kimmel, M. S., & Messner, M. A. (2007). Introduction. In M. S. Kimmel, & M. A. Messner (Ed.) *Men's Lives*. (7th edition, pp. XV-XXIII). Boston, MA: Pearson Allyn and Bacon.

Koçak, K. (2010). Milliyetçiliğin Bir Av Sahası: Futbol. *Cogito*, 63, 27-42.

Koyuncu, B., & Onur, H. (2004). "Hegemonik" erkekliğin görünmeyen yüzü: Sosyalizasyon sürecinde erkeklik oluşumları ve krizleri üzerine düşünceler. *Toplum ve Bilim*, 101, 31-49.

Köksal, D. (1998). Yeni Adam ve Yeni Kadın: 1930'lar ve 40'larda Kadın, Cinsiyet, Ulus. *Toplumsal Tarih*, 51, 31-35.

Küresel Rekabet Veritabanı [Database of Global Competitiveness]. (2012). Retrieved from http://www.kureselrekabet.com/harita/istanbul/harita.aspx

Lefebvre, H. (1996). *Writings on Cities*. (E. Kofman, & E. Lebas, Eds. and Trans.). Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.

Lipman-Blumen, J. (1976). Toward a Homosocial Theory of Sex Roles: An Explanation of the Sex Segregation of Social Institutions. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 1(3), Part 2, 15-31.

Longman, J. (2018, April 25). Track's New Gender Rules Could Exclude Some Female Athletes. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from https://www.nytimes.com/2018/04/25/sports/caster-semenya.html

McKay, J., Messner, M. A., & Sabo, D. F. (Eds.). (2000). *Masculinities, Gender Relations, and Sport.* Newburry Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Majors, R. (1990). Cool Pose: Black Masculinity and Sports. In M. A. Messner, & D. F. Sabo (Eds.). *Sport, Men and the Gender Order: Critical Feminist Perspectives* (pp. 109-114). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

Markula, P., & Pringle, R. (2005). No Pain Is Sane After All: A Foucauldian Analysis of Masculinities and Men's Experiences in Rugby. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 22(4), 472-497.

Messner, M. A. (1990a). Masculinities and Athletic Careers: Bonding and Status Difference. In M. A. Messner, & D. F. Sabo (Eds.). *Sport, Men and the Gender Order: Critical Feminist Perspectives* (pp. 97-108). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

Messner, M. A. (1990b). When Bodies are Weapons. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, 25(3), 203-220.

Messner, M. A. (1992). *Power at Play: Sports and the Problem of Masculinity*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

Messner, M. A. (1994a). Women in the Men's Locker Room? In M. A. Messner, & D. F. Sabo (Eds.). *Sex, Violence & Power in Sports: Rethinking Masculinity* (pp. 42-52). Freedom, CA: The Crossing Press.

Messner, M. A. (1994b). Why Rocky III? In M. A. Messner, & D. F. Sabo (Eds.). *Sex, Violence & Power in Sports: Rethinking Masculinity* (pp. 74-81). Freedom, CA: The Crossing Press.

Messner, M. A. (2002).*Taking the Field: Women, Men and Sports*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Messner, M. A., & Sabo, D. F. (Eds.). (1990). *Sport, Men and the Gender Order: Critical Feminist Perspectives.* Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

Messner, M. A., & Sabo, D. F. (1994). *Sex, Violence & Power in Sports: Rethinking Masculinity.* Freedom, CA: The Crossing Press.

Meuser, M. (2007). Serious Games: Competition and the homosocial construction of masculinity. *Nordic Journal for Masculinity Studies*, 2(1), 38-51.

Nuhrat, Y. (2016). The Violence Law and the Governmentalization of Football in Turkey. In M. Erol, C. Özbay, A. Terzioğlu, & Z. U. Türem (Eds.). *The Making of Neoliberal Turkey* (pp. 73-86). London: Routledge.

Nuhrat, Y. (2017). Fair to Swear? Gendered Formulations of Fairness in Football in Turkey. *Journal of Middle East Women's Studies*, 13(1), 25-46.

Nuhrat, Y. (2018). Ultras in Turkey: othering, agency, and culture as a political domain. *Sport in Society*, 21(6), 870-882.

Nuhrat, Y. (2019). Bodies, Football Jerseys, and Multiple Male Aesthetic through Football in Turkey. *Fashion Theory*. DOI 10.1080/1362704X.2018.1544195.

O'Connor, P. (2017, October 7). Norway to pay male and female internationals equally. *Reuters*. Retrieved from https://uk.reuters.com/article/uk-soccer-norway-equality/norway-to-pay-male-and-female-internationals-equally-idUKKBN1CC0IQ

Özarslan, O. (2015). *Masculinities at Night in the Provinces.* (Unpublished master's thesis). Boğaziçi University, İstanbul, Turkey.

Özbay, C. (2010). Nocturnal queers: Rent boys' masculinity in İstanbul. *Sexualities*, 13(5), 645-663.

Özbay, C. (2013). Türkiye'de Hegemonik Erkekliği Aramak. *Doğu Batı*, 63, 185-204.

Özküralpli, İ. (2012). *Male as the victim of rape: An ontology of rape out of the ethical critique of power.* (Unpublished master's thesis). İstanbul Bilgi University, İstanbul, Turkey.

Özyeğin, G. (2011). Arzunun Nesnesi Olmak: Romans, Kırılgan Erkeklik ve Neoliberal Özne. In C. Özbay, A. Terzioğlu, & Y. Yasin (Eds.). *Neoliberalizm ve Mahremiyet* (pp. 151-178). İstanbul: Metis Yayınları.

Polat, N. (2008). Cinsiyet ve mekân: Erkek kahveleri. *Toplum ve Bilim*, 112, 147-157.

Pringle, R. (2005). Masculinities, Sport, and Power: A Critical Comparison of Gramscian and Foucauldian Inspired Theoretical Tools. *Journal of Sport and Social Issues*, 29(3), 256-278.

Pronger, B. (1999). Outta My Endzone: Sport and the Territorial Anus. *Journal of Sport and Social Issues*, 23(4), 373-389.

Sabo, D. (1994). Pigskin, Patriarchy, and Pain. In M. A. Messner, & D. F. Sabo (Eds.). *Sex, Violence & Power in Sports: Rethinking Masculinity* (pp. 82-88). Freedom, CA: The Crossing Press.

Sağlam, E. (2018, 23 February).*Trabzon'da Erkekliklerin İzini Sürmek: Toplumsal Hafıza, Kamusal Mekânlar ve Komplo Teorileri Ekseninde Toplumsal Cinsiyet İnşa ve İcrası.* Paper presented at the İstanbul Toplumsal Araştırmalar Grubu (İSTAG), Mimar Sinan Fine Arts University, Bomonti, İstanbul.

Sancar, S. (2013). *Erkeklik: İmkânsız İktidar*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları

Saraçgil, A. (2000). *Bukalemun Erkek.* İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Selek, P. (2008). *Sürüne Sürüne Erkek Olmak.* İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Shiffman, M. (1987). The Men's Movement: An Exploratory Empirical Investigation. In M. Kimmel (Ed.). *Changing Men: New Directions in Research on Men and Masculinity* (pp. 295-314). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Simmel, G. (2008). Sociology of Competition. (H. J. Helle, Trans.). *The Canadian Journal of Sociology / Cahiers Canadiens de Sociologie*, 33(4), 957-978.

Sosyal Halı Saha [Social *Halı Saha*]. (n.d.) Retrieved from http://www.sosyalhalisaha.com

Stetz, M. D. (2003). Wartime Sexual Violence against Women: A Feminist Response. In C. R. McCann, & S. K. Kim (Eds.). *Feminist Theory Reader: Local and Global Perspectives* (pp. 138-145). New York: Routledge.

Sullivan, C. F. (2011). Gender Verification and Gender Policies in Elite Sport: Eligibility and "Fair Play". *Journal of Sport and Social Issues*, 35(4), 400-419.

Sünbüloğlu, N. Y. (Ed.). (2013). *Erkek Millet Asker Millet: Türkiye'de Militarizm, Milliyetçilik, Erkek(lik)ler.* İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Şefkatli-Tuksal, H. (2004). "İslâmcı erkekliğin inşası – Geleneksel rollerin ihyası." *Toplum ve Bilim*, 101, 81-88.

Tarakçıoğlu, S. (2014). A Failed Project in Turkey's Sports History: The Law on Physical Education of 1938. *The International Journal of the History of Sport*, 31(14), 1807-1819.

Taşıtman, A., & Toksoy, N. G. (2015). "Ceremonial Circumcision" as One of the Mechanisms Which Enables the Regeneration and Intergenerational Transmission of Manhood Culture in Turkey. *Masculinities: A Journal of Identity and Culture*, 3, 156-188.

Tokdoğan, N. (2015). Dövüş Sporları ve Erkeklik: Tekvandocu Erkekler ve Erkeklik Üzerine Bir Etnografi Denemesi. In F. Akcan, N. Bulgu, & İ. Hacısoftaoğlu (Eds.). *Oyunun Ötesinde: Spor Sosyolojisi Çalışmaları* (pp. 231-265). Ankara: NotaBene Yayınları.

Topçu, Ş. (2018). Erkeklik Çalışmaları Kaynakçası. *Toplum ve Bilim*, 145, 289-330.

Toprak, Z. (1979). İttihat ve Terakki'nin Paramiliter Gençlik Örgütleri. *Boğaziçi Üniversitesi Dergisi - Beşeri Bilimler*, 7, 95-113.

Turkish Statistical Institute [TÜİK]. (2014). *Adrese Dayalı Nüfus Kayıt Sistemi Sonuçları 2013 / Address Based Population Registration System Results 2013*. Retrieved from https://kutuphane.tuik.gov.tr/pdf/0021987.pdf

Turner, C. (2019, May 2). Girls football team wins boys league in Plymouth. *Plymouth Live*. Retrieved from https://www.plymouthherald.co.uk/news/plymouth-news/girls-football-team-win-boys-2821414

Türem, Z. U. (2016). Engineering Competititon and Competitive Subjectivities: "Self" and Political Economy in Neoliberal Turkey. In M. Erol, C. Özbay, A. Terzioğlu, & Z. U. Türem (Eds.). *The Making of Neoliberal Turkey* (pp. 33-52). London: Routledge.

Ünal, O. O. (2018, March 27). Halı sahaya adam olunur. *Yeni Şafak*. Retrieved from https://www.yenisafak.com/ekonomi/hali-sahaya-adam-olunur-3190798

van Ingen, C. (2003). Geographies of Gender, Sexuality and Race: Reframing the Focus on Space in Sport Sociology. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, 38(2), 201-216.

Wacquant, L. J. D. (1987). Symbolic Violence and the Making of the French Agriculturalist: An Enquiry into Pierre Bourdieu's Sociology. *The Australian and New Zealand Journal of Sociology*, 23(1), 65-88.

Wacquant, L. J. D. (1995). Pugs at Work: Bodily Capital and Bodily Labour among Professional Boxers. *Body & Society*, 1(1), 65-93.

Werron, T. (2015). Why do we believe in competition? A historical-sociological view of competition as an institutionalized modern imaginary. *Distinktion: Scandinavian Journal of Social Theory*, 16(2), 186-210.

Williams, R. (2009). 'Having a laugh': masculinities, health and humour. *Nursing Inquiry*, 16(1), 74-81.

Yıldız, M. C. (2015). 'What is a Beautiful Body?' Late Ottoman 'Sportsman' Photographs and New Notions of Male Corporeal Beauty. *Middle East Journal of Culture and Communication*, 8(2-3), 192-214.

Yüce, M. (2014). *Osmanlı Melekleri.* İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Yücel, V. (2014). *Kahramanın Yolculuğu: Mitik Erkeklik ve Suç Draması.* İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları.