

## Chapter 2

# Masculine Capital, Homophobia and Homoeroticism

*Ernesto Vasquez del Aguila*

### 2.1 Introduction

Masculinity is a constantly changing collection of norms and meanings embedded in gender relations between men and women, and among men (Kimmel, 2005). Masculinity is composed of many masculinities, always struggling for power and dominance in inter- and intra-gender relations. In every society there is a hierarchy of masculinities with versions of being a man that are encouraged and others that are forbidden. Masculinity varies across time and cultures, and also different versions of masculinity can coexist within the same group. Masculinity is created through discourses and repeated performances in everyday life, and as a social construct, is always subject to change.

Masculinity is something that men have to achieve through performances. Men construct their gender identities through tests and rites of passage to the “man’s world”, through the demonstration of male achievements such as the ability to protect and provide resources for the household (Gutmann, 1997; Borneman, 2010). These gender performances are usually part of male sociability in which a man has to “become a man” through the rejection of the feminine world and homosexual practices. Hence, masculinity is constructed through the rejection of femininity and homosexuality (Lancaster, 2003; Glick, 2003; Kimmel, 2005). Young men have to constantly demonstrate that they embrace “proper boyhood” through cultural resources such as social relations, sexual performances, humor, violence, and physicality (Manninen et al., 2011). Boys and men come to know what it means to be a man in a particular culture by setting definitions in opposition to a set of others: racial minorities, sexual minorities, and above all, women (Kimmel, 2005).

Heterosexuality is central to the constitution of masculinity; it is a practice that involves social performances. Through heterosexuality, boys and

men are expected to demonstrate a particular masculinity that could be used to command respect and gain status for some men while oppressing others (Kehily, 2001). The male group constitutes a fundamental aspect in the process of becoming men. These men-only groups have no sexual aims, and while homophobia is an important component that ensures heterosexual male bonding, homoeroticism, and even same-sex practices, are not absent among boys' and men's social interactions. Several scholars have demonstrated the centrality of homophobia in masculinity. In order to protect themselves, men have to repudiate homosexuality in every homosocial relationship (Kimmel, 2005; Pascoe, 2007). Homophobic jokes and teasing often characterize masculinity in adolescence and early adulthood. Additionally, performing and invoking homoerotic attitudes act as a disciplinary mechanism. As Pascoe (2007) recounts in the US context, the "fag" category is not only an identity linked to homosexual boys, but also an identity that can temporarily adhere to heterosexual boys as a way of ensuring compulsory heterosexuality and masculine behaviors.

The literature on masculinity describes the intense pressure on men to be "masculine", or more accurately, to adopt the normative version of masculinity prescribed in a particular group (Adams & Savran 2002). Hegemonic masculinity is an ideal representation of being a man, around which men constitute their gender identity. As Connell (1995) and Connell & Messerschmidt (2005) point out, hegemonic masculinity is an "aspirational goal" rather than a lived reality for ordinary men, and it is sustained by conflicted hierarchies of power relations in constant tensions, struggles, and negotiations with "subordinated" and "marginalized" masculinities. Hegemonic masculinity is neither static nor monolithic nor unalterable, but rather dynamic, and relational (*Ibidem*). Hegemonic masculinities are actively promoted throughout society, and men who appear to exemplify these ideals are most likely to be placed in positions of power and trust (Clatterbaugh, 1997). Howson (2006) argues that the "masculinization of the West's hegemony" is predicted in the hegemonic principles of heterosexuality, breadwinning, and aggression.

## 2.2 Masculine Capital and becoming a man

Drawing on Bourdieu's (1998) framework on forms of capital, I offer the concept of masculine capital as a form of cultural capital that provides men with the necessary "masculine" skills and cultural competence to achieve legitimacy and social recognition as respected men. This masculine

capital goes beyond life skills that boys and girls should acquire as part of their development, but rather includes the acquisition of certain masculine manners, body postures, sexual expertise, ability in sports (such as soccer), control and display of emotions. These “masculine” performances prepare men to display manhood and fulfil the social expectations of men in society. In this way, masculine capital is learned and acquired through repeated mechanisms and techniques to police masculine behaviors, and it also varies with factors such as social class and age. Consequently, men have to learn how to reproduce this capital in culturally appropriate ways (Vasquez del Aguila, 2014).

Masculine capital is strongly linked to an individual’s habitus. For Bourdieu, habitus constitutes dispositions that are acquired through our acculturation into particular social groups, and represents the manifestation of class through daily interactions. Habitus refers to an internalized set of culturally determined dispositions to act, think, and feel in certain ways in everyday life. All human experiences take place within contested social fields. Individuals struggle to legitimize their social position and achieve capital by playing by the “rules of the game” for that particular social space (Bourdieu, 1998). While cultivated dispositions of “masculine” behavior can be a source of prestige and success in one context, the same behavior can represent limitations or even the possibility of failure in another (Bourgois, 1995).

Gender is a performance; it is what subjects *do* at particular times and situations rather than what they *are*. In this sense, masculine ideologies and discourses are reiterated by repeatedly performing as “masculine” or “feminine”. This process implies a repeated “invocation” of gender norms, thus making the norm seem like a timeless truth; and the “repudiation” of abject identities (Butler, 1990). Even though societies produce norms and institutionalize imperatives, subversion and transgression of the norms always occur. From this perspective, men constitute their masculine identities through performances of gestures of manhood and virility that are lived as “tests of achievements”. These tests of manhood are the context in which boys acquire and accumulate masculine capital.

*I argue that the acquisition of masculine capital implies five main processes that every man is expected to undergo: (a) rejection of the female world and feminine behavior (acting straight), (b) rejection of (receptive) homosexuality and managing homophobia and homoeroticism, (c) (hetero) sexual debut and boasting about sexual performances, (d) risk-taking and gestures of violence and (e) incorporating male moral values. This is a male journey where men reconcile contradictions, build their masculine capital, and struggle to become “winner” men (Vasquez del Aguila, 2014).*

### **a. Rejection of the female world and feminine behavior: Acting straight**

In order to become men, boys have to learn how to behave in both private and public spheres. They need to learn that each space has its own rules and boundaries and these lessons constitute fundamental skills for accumulating masculine capital. The first rule is to avoid spaces and activities that are considered “feminine”. Several studies have reported an active gender segregation from childhood through to adulthood. Diverse institutions and social actors encourage the separation of boys and girls to encourage the formation of “proper” masculinities and femininities (Dolgin, 2000; Poynting & Donaldson, 2005).

There are many actors who act as “pedagogues”, from parents, siblings, uncles, schoolteachers, to older friends, among others, who teach boys the importance of men-only spaces. Not only do male relatives encourage boys to stay outside the female world and embrace masculine gestures; mothers and sisters also help boys to avoid “feminine” attitudes. A common expression is to call boys *mujercitas* (little women), which acts as a warning should they cross the forbidden boundaries. These lessons constitute “gender and sexual pedagogies” (Quintana & Vasquez del Aguila, 1999). Each actor has a role in teaching and correcting the boy’s posture, voice, and other attitudes that youths could be performing “wrongly”. The man’s body needs to be adjusted to specific techniques of manhood.

As a part of the acquisition of masculine capital, older boys teach their younger peers gender and sexual pedagogies, and the younger boys have to learn the lessons. In my experience researching topics of men and masculinities, I found several representations of male representations of female images that boys should avoid, such as *tramposa* (crooked and tricky) women who will try to “trap” men with the “tale of pregnancy”. Men need to always be wary regarding women’s intentions to capture “naïve” men and shatter men’s freedom and future plans in life.

Many scholars have analyzed the importance of male sports, such as soccer and rugby, in the constitution of male identities and the process of becoming a man (Connell, 2000; Fuller, 2002; Archetti, 2001; Borneman, 2010). These tough and competitive games are fundamental part of male identity. By playing them and identifying with a particular team or club, a boy is not only participating in a male sport, but he is also entering into the public sphere of male homosociality. Boys are compelled to play these games as part of their socialization and entry into the male world. Games like soccer are the archetypal masculine sport; it embodies masculine culture through performances that are expected for boys and men. In my years

of research I found the presence of these “masculine” games as the space where men develop and use their masculine capital in order to be respected as “real” men. Heterosexual and gay men recount stories of social pressure to demonstrate expertise—or at least interest in—this “masculine game” which becomes a space for “masculine” performance.

**b. Rejection of (receptive) homosexuality: Homophobia and homoeroticism**

Men, regardless of their sexual orientation, are socialized to be heterosexuals, and as part of this process, they learn that the only “natural” and “inevitable” way to become a man is through heterosexuality. Compulsory heterosexuality constitutes a fundamental pillar in the acquisition of masculine capital. In a pioneering article, Rich (1980) shows how different institutions such as religion, the state, medicine, and law produce forceful discourses about gender and sexuality through the production of a compulsory heterosexuality. Queer theorists argue that heterosexuality produces a hegemonic notion of masculinity by which “deviant” sexualities are prohibited and masculinity becomes an accomplishment that can be achieved only within a heterosexual context (Garlick, 2003).

Compulsory heterosexuality and stigma toward non-normative sexualities are an integral part of Latin American and Latino men’s masculinities (Lancaster, 2003; Cantu, 2009; Vasquez del Aguila, 2014). All boys and young teens are compelled to learn how to practice heterosexuality, not only to *act* but also to *think* straight (Ingraham, 2005). Institutions such as schools also provide an “informal sexuality curriculum” that teaches sexuality through disciplinary practices, student-teacher relationships, and school rituals and events that configure discourses and practices about sexuality which boys and girls are expected to perform.

More than words of advice, heterosexual and gay men learn to reject homosexual sex through gestures and performances. Kehily’s (2001) ethnographic research in secondary schools in the United Kingdom, suggests that boys conceive heterosexual relations as “natural” and as a way of demonstrating a “particular masculinity” that could be performed to command respect and confer status on some males while deriding others within the male peer group. Men learned, at a very early age, the notions of manhood and heterosexuality through the configuration of maps and zones of the male body. By mapping the body, some organs become “masculine” and others “feminine”; some are allowed to be touched, while others are forbidden. Men have to “protect” the “sacred” part of the male body: the bottom, which encapsulates male gender and sexual identities. In order to

keep manhood intact and not be associated with homosexuality, a man has to defend his “ass” from potential male “perpetrators”.

The institutionalized rejection of homosexuality is not coherent or consistent. This forbidden behavior has hierarchical levels of rejection and tolerance. In some cases, being the *top* (insertive partner) during anal intercourse can be tolerated or ignored as part of the process of becoming (heterosexual) men. However, being *bottom* (receptive) is the ultimate frontier that no boy should ever cross. While insertive homosexual experiences can be understood as a “transitional” phase in a boy’s course through life, passive homosexuality is considered a more “definitive” experience, a dangerous journey with no return (Lancaster, 2003; Padilla, 2007; Vasquez del Aguila, 2014).

### **c. Boasting about (hetero) sexual performances**

Young men consolidate and constitute heterosexual masculine identity through performances. Sex with women is viewed as a way of demonstrating masculinity that can be used to command respect and confer status on some males while deriding others. The links between heterosexuality and masculinity are not natural, they have to be “naturalized” through practices of “sex talk” (Kehily, 2001; Gilmartin, 2007). Sex talk among men is a fundamental part of the constitution of male identity and social cohesion. Inside the male group, these young men have topics of conversation that are avoided and others that are encouraged as part of the group dynamic. Heterosexual activity is valued and frequently spoken about in terms of conquest and prestige. In this sense, boasting about sexual performances constitutes an integral part of these boys and youth’s social interactions, and increases their masculine capital inside and outside the male group.

While for some male groups “knowing” about sexuality and boasting about it was proof enough of masculinity, in other male groups knowing was not enough; boys had to speak out about concrete sexual experiences. Men have to demonstrate not only their desire for women, but also to show off their skills and knowledge of sexuality. This “expertise” does not come from theory, but rather it is expected that it is based on experience.

Flood (2008) recounts how heterosexual men not only measure their achievements in terms of sexual performances, but also institute hierarchical orders of the female body and sexual practices. For many boys and teenagers, kissing a girl is the first level, and having sex is the final grade. Following on from this, a celebrated victory or successful performance will soon be forgotten and surpassed by new ones. Boys and young teens have to constantly “update” their sexual performances. Whether these male sexual performances are true or not is not important, but rather that boys and

young teens are actively participating in and performing the ritualized boasting, so that they are assured of their membership of the male group, that they are part of the male game.

More than narratives about pleasure or intimacy, these men refer to their male groups as the main audience for their sexual debut. Heterosexual men's sexuality is driven by the pressure to demonstrate a successful display of virility to the male peer group. Young heterosexual men boast about their conquests of women with two audiences in mind: first, other men, to whom they must constantly prove their masculinity and virility; and second, to themselves (Allen, 2007; Flood, 2008). In my research experience, few of the heterosexual men I interviewed for more than fifteen years refer to having a satisfactory first sexual experience, where pleasure and intimacy were more important than the social pressure to demonstrate manhood or heterosexuality to their peer group.

There is more of a "social moratorium" for middle- and upper-class male adolescents in terms of sexual initiation. As Borneman (2010) shows, social commands about the male provider role and pressure to enter the labor market are less acute for European middle-class young men.

Heterosexual romance provides boys and adolescent men with a means of locating themselves within a successful heterosexual masculine identity. This process has a disciplinary aspect; boys are policed for not achieving hegemonic gender and sexual identities. Romance constitutes a transition to a new, more adult form of masculinity, in which the display of adult attributes, such as commitment, mutuality, and emotional intimacy, can be understood as part of their attempt to belong to a new age-related cultural and masculine identity (Redman, 2001; Renold, 2007). There is also room for resistance to hegemonic discourses of masculinity and sexuality outside the boasting scenario (Allen, 2003). Some of the men interviewed recount their first girlfriend as a time of change in their status as men among their peers. They were not boasting anymore, they shared their emotions and need for intimacy, not just "compulsive sex". They were with a "real woman"; they were in love. For those men who had sexual experiences with women *and* men during their teen years, or those who became aware of their homoerotic desires later in their lives, sexual debut with women was a very similar experience to their heterosexual friends of the same age. It had to be done, and they fulfilled the social expectations of their peer group (Vasquez del Aguila, 2014).

#### **d. Risk-taking and gestures of violence**

Masculinity is a homosocial enactment in which the male peer group is defined by danger and risk of failure, with intense relentless competition

(Kimmel, 2005; 2008). Young men experience social pressure to endorse gendered prescriptions of risk and gestures of violence.

Men are not “naturally” oriented toward taking risks, violence, and putting themselves in vulnerable situations. Risk-taking as a part of masculine attributes is also produced by culture and social context. There are some positive aspects to taking risks; it prepares individuals for self-development, and helps them to become self-assured. However, when risk implies social pressure, vulnerability, and potential damage, it becomes something negative for these young men, who are expected to demonstrate a disposition for dangerous adventure, a lack of hesitation, courage, and fearlessness in order to succeed as “tough” boys.

I gathered numerous stories across Latin America where men participated in risky activities that vary from relatively harmless tests to situations in which their lives were in real danger. Most of the men I interviewed were unaware of the consequences of the risks they took in their younger years. Participating in situations of danger and risk was part of their process of acquisition and deployment of masculine capital. Alcohol consumption and having the first drunken experience is a very popular ritual for these young men as part of their process of becoming men. Although the first drunken experience can be celebrated and become a something to be proud of and boast about in the male group, these young boys learn very fast that the expected male behavior is to learn how to drink like real men. They should know how to drink “like a man”, and avoid getting drunk and losing control before anyone else, particularly women.

The literature on violence and masculinity shows how men are more likely to be victims of violence by other men. This violence runs from jokes and fights to more serious expressions such as bullying, harassment, and rape. Violence is also age-related; gender and age are the most powerful predictors of violence (Sabo, 2005; Kahn, 2009). To become a man, a boy has to demonstrate that he is respected and also capable of building a reputation as a strong man among his peers. Gestures and performances of violence such as the disposition to fighting help these young men to gain respect in a hypermasculinized environment. Hence, it is very common in these men’s narratives to find stories of peer fighting, many times without any apparent reason, just to fulfil the social pressure.

For young men who knew they were not good fighters, there was only one solution: to develop strategies to cope with the fact that they were failing in their manhood. As reported in many cultural contexts, peer fighting is part of young men’s socialization (Nilan et al., 2011). For some of the men I interviewed, these fights constituted real “training” that helped them

to develop “street skills” that they were able to use in adulthood when confronting the power of other men, while for others, these were moments that reminded them of their inadequacy as “real” men in hypermasculinized male-segregated spaces.

The literature on masculinity and gender-based violence shows the links between gender ideologies, hegemonic masculinity, and violence. Men are socialized as if they are entitled to violence—they learn that violence is an accepted form of communication with women and other less powerful men (Kauffman, 1999; Kimmel, 2005). Bullying constitutes a privileged situation to understand violence among men. This repeated, unprovoked, and aggressive behavior caused by more powerful men (Khan, 2009) is a constant threat for boys and male teenagers. These young men are reluctant to discuss or reveal to others the presence of this violence. Boys don’t denounce violence because they see this is part of expected manhood, part of being a man. Most of the men I interviewed, gay and heterosexual, reported experiences of shame, embarrassment, and the fear of being stigmatized as a “sissy” or “fag” for not performing as fearless “warrior” men. In addition, they report the impossibility of denouncing this violence; the social command is that a real man should fight back.

Several scholars have described homoerotic pedagogies across many cultures all over the world. Young boys are introduced to the adult world through rites of passage with social expectations and sanctions for the participants in the rituals. These rituals are cultural manifestations that do not carry the stigma of homosexuality, but rather they ensure an introduction to the men’s world for the young men. Homophobia and homoeroticism among male adolescents interplay in a complex dynamic of gestures and performances. Fachel Leal & De Mello (1996) and DaMatta (1997) in Brazil describe “verbal duels” among male adolescent peer groups as contradictory rituals where homophobic and homoerotic interactions are performed together as part of the “practice” of heterosexuality and hegemonic masculinity. Boys have to learn and perform ritualized gestures of masculinity in order to be considered “masculine” men; they have to integrate homophobia and homoeroticism as part of their everyday experiences as men. They have to learn how to perform these highly homoerotic behaviors in such a way that these gestures follow the group’s rules, and the ritual is culturally accepted. Even the “sacred” bottom can be the object of male games.

The story below illustrates complex performances in which heterosexual boys and men produce intense homoeroticism that is sublimated in what passes for normative male homosociality. It shows masculine pedagogies for a male adolescent in the process of acquisition of masculine capital.

Roberto, a gay friend, asked me to go with him to a Sunday picnic with his family in a public park. It was summer time, and Roberto's family was congregated in Flushing Meadows Park, Queens, New York. Roberto invited everybody to play Frisbee. Only Roberto's parents and I were enthusiastic about Frisbee. The other guys preferred to play *partidito* (a small-scale soccer game)—days later Roberto explained to me that his male cousins did not invite or insist on us playing soccer because they knew we were gay—Roberto's sister and the other girls stayed lying on the blankets, watching the two groups playing. Later on, the six soccer players were still playing and the rest of us were watching their game. At some point there was a confrontation over the ball between Manuel and his Bolivian friend, and they started measuring each other's strength, boxing and simulating a real fight. Manuel was losing the fight, so he ran after his friend, touching and grabbing the man's bottom. The Bolivian man reacted as though Manuel had touched something as innocuous as his arm. He did not seem angry or offended, as would be expected of a man who is being "feminized" by another man. Roberto's parents and the rest of the family laughed and cheered on. The men continued playing soccer. The Bolivian man did not try to return Manuel's grope, but instead acted with a gesture of indifference. He wasn't happy with being touched, but he wasn't offended, either. It did not seem as though he was looking for revenge. The soccer game continued and a few minutes later, the Bolivian man touched Manuel's younger brother's bottom. This time, the adolescent was very angry and called the Bolivian man a shitty *cabro* (faggot). The Bolivian man seemed surprised by the younger man's reaction, and apologized to Manuel. To my surprise, Manuel ignored his apologies and turned on his younger brother in anger. Days later, while having an informal conversation with Manuel, I asked him about this incident and why he had insulted his brother. Manuel told me that his younger brother needs to understand "men's games"; otherwise "people will think he is a faggot" (Vasquez del Aguila, 2014).

This situation shows how homophobia and homoeroticism perform together, and there are practical "lessons" to be learned by boys about how to behave "like a man" in contexts outside the everyday routine. There are ritualized gestures of masculinity delimited by a concrete event; a soccer game. The stigma of being sodomized and feminized by other men is like a "hot potato". All of the men, except for the younger man, knew that being touched on their bottom was like receiving a hot potato: they were not supposed to scream or be angry, like a "hyper-sensitive woman". A "dramatic" reaction would be suspicious and indicate that you do not know the rules of manhood. A man should not be happy either at receiving a hot

potato. Nobody is happy holding a hot potato. On the other hand, excessive enthusiasm at being touched on the bottom would be disastrous for a man's sexual identity. Hence, the solution for these moments of gender and sexual uncertainties is to pass the hot potato (stigma of homosexuality) to someone else, before you get burned. The stigma needs to be passed on. The younger man reacted angrily to something that in another context would be considered offensive and the final frontier for heterosexual men's sexual identity. The bottom should be a "sacred" area for men, and boys are taught not to allow anyone to profane this forbidden area. However, in a hyper-masculinized context, the rules change and men should know how to adapt and perform with the rules of manhood. A man who is being touched on his bottom retains the homoerotic content of the gesture until he passes it to another person. A sign of excessive discomfort or sensitivity could be interpreted as lack of confidence in your own masculinity, and doubt could be established within the group. The script should be performed with perfect timing and attitude. Receive the hot potato with "masculine dignity", confidence, and indifference, retain the potato for a particular time, and then pass the potato to someone else.

Goffman (1986) defines stigma as a situation in which an individual is disqualified from full social acceptance, involving a discredited person who has a failing or handicap and is reduced in the mind of society as a contaminated person. Goffman sees the individual's interactions as a "performance" shaped by the context and the audience. In the two situations described above, stigma is situational and in constant circulation. There is no social identity attached to the performances. The real taboo is not touching each other's bottom, but enjoying the touching. The only pleasure allowed is to tease other men, to ridicule them and challenge their virility. After the soccer game ends, men return to their "normal" lives as heterosexual and masculine men, and the male bottom recovers its sacred untouchable place.

### 2.3 Conclusion

Being born male is only the beginning of a series of learnings, tests, failures, and achievements that a man has to undergo and experience in order to become a man. Men have to acquire and accumulate masculine capital, such as masculine manners, ways of walking and speaking, proficiency in male sports, display and control of emotions, among other masculine gestures, that they have to continuously perform in order to achieve social recognition and meet male social expectations. These masculine skills provide men

with the resources for the practices they must perform and those that they must reject: i.e. “failed” versions of manhood. This chapter analyzes five processes that every man has to follow in order to acquire and accumulate masculine capital, and become a man: (1) rejection of the female world and feminine behavior (acting straight), (2) rejection of (receptive) homosexuality, (3) boasting about (hetero) sexual performances, (4) risk-taking and gestures of violence, and (5) incorporating male moral values. Becoming a man is a complex journey, littered with tests and always the perpetual risk of losing one’s manhood.

Several studies across different cultural contexts show how boys and men narrate stories of difficult tests and achievements that they needed to undergo in order to gain respect as young men. They express their discomfort with the constant surveillance and scrutiny of their achievements. Some of them have indicated their regret concerning the “eternal dissatisfaction” of their parents and older siblings. There was always something more difficult or challenging waiting for them to do. In all these stories, the constant is that more than personal achievements, the goal was to gain respect among their male peers. By participating either in a fight, or skillful activities, or conquering women, or behaving as protector “warriors”, men have to demonstrate their worth to other men, that they have the masculine capital that ensures a respected place in the male group.

Boys monitor and evaluate their own credibility as men and the credibility of others. However, these tests are hard to achieve; both the heterosexual and gay Peruvian men in this study face these tests with frustration, as they are not totally capable of achieving all the prescribed goals and expectations. There are some tests of manhood and virility that constitute “life markers”, key events and turning points in the process of becoming a man. These circumstances cover a variety of social commands, tests, and roles that men have to learn, perform, and continue performing throughout their adult life. Sexual debut was something almost “inevitable” in their lives, taking part in fights and taking risks is considered a “natural” aspect of their manhood, but the majority of them recall the acquisition of male moral values as symbolic experiences that marked their passage from boyhood to adulthood.

Compulsory heterosexuality and homophobia are part of these young men’s everyday social experiences; from the very beginning of their lives, these men learn how to become masculine men and heterosexuals. This norm goes beyond their sexual relations to the other circumstances of their social lives. To be heterosexual implies the rejection of homosexual activity (mainly passive homosexual acts) and the feminine world. Boys and youths

have to demonstrate a resolute avoidance of any space and behavior that might be associated and constructed as “feminine”. Men “practice” heterosexuality through sex talk and desirable masculinity that creates boundaries for heterosexuality and “masculine” behaviors. The exclusion of women and the rejection of homosexual and non-masculine men from the male group assures the identity of heterosexual members and creates bonding and a sense of community. Becoming a man is only the beginning of a series of tests and achievements that these men have to continue performing as part of *being* men.

### References

- Adams R., Savran D., 2002, *The Masculinity Studies Reader*, Malden: Blackwell Publishers.
- Allen L., 2003, “Girls Want Sex, Boys Want Love: Resisting Dominant Discourses of (Hetero)sexuality”, «Sexualities», 6, 2, pp. 215-236.
- Allen L., 2007, “‘Sensitive and Real Macho All at the Same Time’. Young Heterosexual Men and Romance”, «Men and Masculinities», 10, 2, pp. 137-152.
- Archetti E., 2001, *El Potrero, la Pista y el Ring. Las Patrias del Deporte Argentino*, Buenos Aires: Fondo de Cultura Economica.
- Borneman J., 2010, “European Rituals of Initiation and the Production of Men”, «Social Anthropology», 18, 3, pp. 289-301.
- Bourdieu P., 1998, *Practical Reason: On the Theory of Action*, Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Bourgeois P., 1995, *In Search of Respect: Selling Crack in El Barrio*, New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Butler J., 1990, *Gender Trouble. Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*, New York: Routledge.
- Cantu L., 2009, *The Sexuality of Migration. Border Crossing and Mexican Immigrant Men*, in N. Naples & S. Vidal-Ortiz (Eds.), New York: New York University Press.
- Clatterbaugh K., 1997, *Contemporary Perspectives on Masculinity. Men, Women, and Politics in Modern Society*, Boulder: Westview Press.
- Connell R., 1995, *Masculinities*, Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Connell R., 2000, *The Men and the Boys*, Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Connell R., Messerschmidt, J.W., 2005, “Hegemonic Masculinity: Rethinking the Concept”, «Gender & Society», 19, 6, pp. 829-859.
- DaMatta R., 1997, “Tem Pente aí?. Reflexões Sobre a Identidade Masculina”, in D. Caldas (Ed.), *Homens. Comportamento Sexualidade Mudança, Identidade, Crise e Vaidade*, São Paulo: Senac, pp.31-49.

- Dolgin K., 2000, "Men's Friendships: Mismeasured, Demeaned, and Misunderstood?", in T. Cohen. (Ed.), *Men and Masculinity*, Stamford: Wadsworth Thompson Learning, pp.103-117.
- Fachel Leal O., De Mello Boff, A., 1996, "Insultos, Queixas, Sedução e Sexualidade: Fragmentos de Identidade Masculina em uma Perspectiva Relacional", in R. Parker, R.M. Barbosa (Eds.), *Sexualidades Brasileiras*, Rio de Janeiro: Relume Dumará, pp.119-135.
- Flood M., 2008, "Men, Sex and Homosociality. How Bonds between Men Shape Their Sexual Relations with Women", «Men and Masculinities» 20, 3, pp. 339-359.
- Fuller N., 2002, *Masculinidades. Cambios y Permanencias*, Lima: PUCP.
- Garlick S., 2003, "What is a Man? Heterosexuality and the Technology of Masculinity", «Men and Masculinities», 6, 2, pp. 156-172.
- Gilmartin S., 2007, "Crafting Heterosexual Masculinities on Campus: College Men Talk about Romantic Love", «Men and Masculinities», 9, 4, pp. 530-539.
- Goffman I., 1986, *Stigma: Notes on the Management of Spoiled Identity*, New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Gutmann M., 1997, "Trafficking in Men: The Anthropology of Masculinity", «Annual Review of Anthropology», 26, pp. 385-409.
- Howson R., 2006, *Challenging Hegemonic Masculinity*, London: Routledge.
- Ingraham C., 2005, "Introduction: Thinking Straight", in C. Ingraham (Ed.), *Thinking Straight. The Power, The Promise, and the Paradox of Heterosexuality*, New York: Routledge, pp.1-14.
- Kahn J.S., 2009, *An Introduction to Masculinities*, West Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Kauffman M., 1999, "Men, Feminism, and Men's Contradictory Experiences of Power", in J.A. Kuypers (Ed.), *Men and Power*, New York: Prometheus Books, pp.77-106.
- Kehily M., 2001, "Bodies in School. Young Men, Embodiment, and Heterosexual Masculinities", «Men and Masculinities», 4, 2, pp. 173-185.
- Kimmel M., 2005, "Masculinity as Homophobia: Fear, Shame, and Silence in the Construction of Gender Identity", in M.S. Kimmel (Ed.), *The Gender of Desire. Essays on Male Sexuality*, New York: State University of New York, pp.25-42.
- Kimmel M., 2008, *Guyland. The Perilous World Where Boys Become Men*, New York: Harper.
- Lancaster R., 2003, "That We Should All Turn Queer?: Homosexual Stigma in the Making of Manhood and the Breaking of a Revolution in Nicaragua", in R. Parker, P. Aggleton (Eds.), *Culture, Society and Sexuality: A Reader*, London: Routledge, pp.104-122.
- Manninen S., Huuki T., Sunnari V., 2011, "Earn Yo' Respect! Respect in the Status Struggle of Finnish School Boys", «Men and Masculinities», 14, 3, pp. 335-357.

- Nilan P., Demartoto A., Wibowo A., 2011, "Young Men and Peer Fighting in Solo, Indonesia", «Men and Masculinities», 14, 4, pp. 470-490.
- Padilla M., 2007, *Caribbean Pleasure Industry. Tourism Sexuality, and AIDS in the Dominican Republic*, *Anthropology*, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Pascoe C.J., 2007, *Dude You're a Fag. Masculinity and Sexuality in High School*, Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Poynting S., Donaldson M., 2005, "Snakes and Leaders. Hegemonic Masculinity in Ruling-Class Boys' Schools", «Men and Masculinities», 7, 4, pp. 325-346.
- Quintana A., Vasquez del Aguila E., 1999, *La Construccion Social de la Adolescencia. Genero y Salud Sexual en Adolescentes Jovenes de El Agustino*, Lima: Instituto de Educacion y Salud.
- Redman P., 2001, "The Discipline of Love. Negotiation and Regulation in Boys' Performance of a Romance-Based Heterosexual Masculinity", «Men and Masculinities», 4, 2, 186-200.
- Renold E., 2007, "Primary School 'Studs'. (De)constructing Young Boys' Heterosexual Masculinities", «Men and Masculinities», 9, 3, pp. 275-297.
- Rich A., 1980, "Compulsory heterosexuality and Lesbian Existence", «Signs», 5, 4, pp. 631-660.
- Sabo D., 2005, "The Study of Masculinities and Men's Health: An Overview", in M. Kimmel, J. Hearn, R. Connell (Ed.), *Handbook of Studies on Men & Masculinities*, Thousand Oaks: Sage, pp.326-351.
- Vasquez del Aguila E., 2012, "God Forgives the Sin but not the Scandal: Coming Out in a Transnational Context—between Sexual Freedom and Cultural Isolation", «Sexualities», 15, 2, pp. 207-224.
- Vasquez del Aguila E., 2014, *Being a Man in a Transnational World: the Masculinity and Sexuality of Migration*, New York: Routledge.