

“WOMEN OF POWER”:
THE POLICEWOMEN IN A STATE OF MEN

DUYGU GÜL

BOĞAZIÇI UNIVERSITY

2009

“WOMEN OF POWER”:
THE POLICEWOMEN IN A STATE OF MEN

Thesis submitted to the
Institute for Graduate Studies in the Social Sciences
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts
in
Political Science and International Relations

by
Duygu Gül

Bogaziçi University

2009

Thesis Abstract

Duygu Gül, “ ‘Women of Power’: The Policewomen in a State of Men”

This thesis scrutinizes how state power and femininity are articulated in the police force where state power is mostly deployed by men. The police organization is taken as a micro setting where state power is gendered through daily and mundane practices of specific actors. Accordingly, this inquiry focuses on the policewomen and examines how their gendered subjectivities are constructed and negotiated in this particular context. It is argued that the policewomen “do gender” via their daily performances of masculinity and femininity. That is, these women enact and shift between different performances of masculinity and femininity in order to survive within this masculinist geography. Furthermore, it is claimed that the policewomen are assimilated into the police force as they embrace and normalize its masculinist norms and practices. Nevertheless, this study also emphasizes that the experiences of the policewomen cannot be adequately grasped merely as an instance of assimilation and subordination. Despite their secondary position in policing, they are able to come up with certain possibilities of empowerment. Thus, this thesis identifies them as “women of power” where power connotes masculinist state power. At this point, it is suggested that their experience of empowerment can be captured along two central axes. Firstly, they are empowered as individual women against men. They deploy institutionalized masculinist power of policing in order to defy individual men’s power. Secondly, the policewomen are empowered vis-à-vis the society as privileged state agents. In this regard, it is asserted that they identify themselves as the personification of the state and they open up a space of action and intervention via this self-representation.

Tez Özeti

Duygu Gül, “ ‘İktidarın Kadınları’: Erkek Devletinde Kadın Polisler”

Bu tez, devlet iktidarının çoğunlukla erkekler tarafından kullanıldığı polis örgütünde bu iktidarın kadınlıkla nasıl eklemlendiğini incelemektedir. Polis örgütü, devlet iktidarının belli aktörlerin günlük ve sıradan pratikleri aracılığıyla toplumsal olarak cinsiyetlendirildiği mikro bir alan olarak ele alınmıştır. Bu bakımdan, bu çalışma kadın polisler üzerine odaklanmakta ve onların toplumsal olarak cinsiyetlendirilmiş öznelliklerinin bu sınırlı bağlamda nasıl kurulduğunu ve müzakere edildiğini araştırmaktadır. Kadın polislerin günlük erkeklik ve kadınlık performansları aracılığıyla “cinsiyetlerini yaptıkları” iddia edilmektedir. Bu kadınlar, bu erkek egemen coğrafyada varlıklarını sürdürebilmek için farklı erkeklik ve kadınlık performansları gerçekleştirmekte ve bu farklı performanslar arasında gidip gelmektedirler. Dahası, kadın polislerin polis örgütü içinde asimile oldukları ileri sürülmektedir. Bunun nedeni, kadın polislerin polisliğin erkek egemen normlarını ve pratiklerini benimseyip normalleştirmeleridir. Fakat, bu çalışma kadın polislerin deneyimlerinin sadece bir asimilasyon ve ezilme vakası olarak kavranamayacağını ayrıca vurgulamaktadır. Polislikteki ikincil konumlarına rağmen kadın polisler belirli güçlenme imkanları yaratabilmektedirler. Dolayısıyla, bu tez onları “iktidarın kadınları” olarak nitelendirmektedir ve burada bahsi geçen iktidar erkek egemen devlet iktidarındır. Bu noktada, söz konusu güçlenme deneyimlerini iki ana eksende anlamının mümkün olduğu iddia edilmektedir. İlk olarak, kadın polisler erkekler karşısında birey kadınlar olarak güçlenmektedirler. Polisliğin kurumsallaşmış erkek iktidarını birey olarak karşılarına çıkan erkeklerin iktidarına karşı çıkmak için kullanılmaktadırlar. İkinci olarak, kadın polisler toplum karşısında üstün bir pozisyona sahip olan ayrıcalıklı devlet ajanları olarak güçlenmektedirler. Bu bakımdan, kendilerini devletin ete kemiğe bürünmüş hali olarak nitelendirdikleri ve bu öz-temsil aracılığıyla kendilerine bir hareket ve müdahale alanı açtıkları öne sürülmektedir.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This thesis would not be complete without the academic support and encouragement of my thesis advisor, Assoc. Prof. Koray Çalışkan, who has read the thesis with great attention and motivated me with his patience and kindness. I am grateful to him for his guidance, assistance, and permanent encouragement during the thesis writing process, as well as for his illuminating theoretical insights throughout my undergraduate study. I am also thankful to the members of my jury, Prof. Yeşim Arat and Prof. Mine Eder for their valuable critiques and contributions. Yeşim Arat gave an account of her own observations regarding the issue, and her suggestions and warnings helped me to arrange my study. I am sincerely grateful for her permanent and friendly encouragement since my undergraduate years. Her instructive courses were especially important for this study. Mine Eder took time to listen to my perplexed questions and inspired me with her suggestions. I would also like to express my gratitude to TÜBİTAK (Türkiye Bilimsel ve Teknolojik Araştırma Kurumu) for its financial support in graduate study.

I would also like to thank my interviewees who had the grace to share their stories with me. This thesis would have never been finished without the contribution of my interviewees, whose names I do not write here for respecting their anonymity. The interviews I conducted with them were perhaps the most exhilarating and teaching aspect of the study.

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to my friends Derya Nizam, Aslı Erdem, Çetin Güner and Yasin Kaya for their constant support and patience. I thank Derya for her support and nice friendship, as well as for her help in correcting the final form of the thesis. Aslı made long study sessions at Café Nero enjoyable for me. She encouraged me and made valuable comments about the thesis. I also thank Çetin, he was always a great friend who motivated me throughout the process of writing. I owe special thanks to Yasin for his warm companionship since our undergraduate years. Without his constant support, the experience of writing would be unbearable and boring for me. Moreover, I am grateful to Bilge Altay, she was always there for me with her invaluable friendship. I am also thankful to Pelin Nişancı, she helped me in translating the quotations from the interviews. Additionally, from the department, I acknowledge the candid help of Gül Çatır, Aslı Orhon, Taylan Acar, Levent Önen and Mine Yıldırım.

Finally, I would like to thank to my dearest family. I am deeply indebted to my mother, Aynur and my father, Mehmet as they never gave up supporting me. I cannot thank them enough for the peaceful life they granted to me with their love and care. My warmest thanks belong to my sisters, İkbâl and Birden. They shared the most special moments of my life and have never withheld their generous support and love. I owe eternal gratitude to my parents and sisters as they tolerated all my caprices all through my education. They never stopped motivating and cheering me up even during the most desperate times. I would also thank to my brother-in-laws, Ercan and Zafer for their patience and help throughout my graduate education. All in all, any word of appreciation would be insufficient to express my gratitude for my family as they turn the life we share into a miracle. I owe everything to them.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION	1
Fieldwork and Methodology	6
Structure.....	13
CHAPTER 2: REVISITING THE LITERATURE ON POLICEWOMEN.....	16
An Overview of the Literature on Policewomen.....	17
Newcomers in the Realm of Policing: The Introduction and Progress of Women in Policing.....	18
Policewomen: Strangers in the World of Policing.....	24
Survival of Women in Policing.....	31
The Politics of Policewomen.....	34
The Policewomen in Turkey.....	38
CHAPTER 3: THE POLICEWOMEN: GENDERED SUBJECTS OF THE MASCULINIST STATE	46
Revisiting Gendered State Power.....	48
Doing Gender in the Realm of Policing.....	54
Aspiring to Hegemonic Masculinity.....	56
Femininity as a Difference in the World of Policing.....	66
CHAPTER 4: THE POLICEWOMEN AT THE STAGE: A CASE OF ASSIMILATION.....	81
A Narrative of Transformation: Masculinized Women in Policing.....	82
The Discourse of Professionalism.....	87
Policing as a Gender-Neutral Realm.....	90
No More Women in Policing.....	95
CHAPTER 5: “WOMEN OF POWER”: A STORY OF EMPOWERMENT.....	102
“Women of Power” against Men	104
“Women of Power” vis-à-vis the Society.....	108
A Life Devoted to Policing.....	113
The Embodied State Power: Women in Uniform.....	116
A Space of Intervention in the Social: The Policewomen as Empowered State Agents.....	118
CHAPTER 6: CONCLUSION.....	125
REFERENCES.....	133

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

This study scrutinizes how state power and femininity are articulated in the context of policing through the subjectivities of the policewomen. Its main goal is to provide an in-depth analysis of how gender identities of the policewomen are constructed within a political geography where state power is mostly deployed by men. It is suggested that state power and gender are inextricably interrelated as these women negotiate their gender identities by doing gender. That is to say, they do gender via their everyday performances of particular versions of masculinity and femininity, namely hegemonic masculinity and emphasized femininity.

To elaborate, the concept of doing gender implies that their gendered subjectivities are managed and renegotiated on a daily basis via a myriad of enactments of masculinity and femininity. It is argued that the policewomen endorse and reiterate the way hegemonic masculinity is epitomized in policing. They embrace the gist of hegemonic masculinity by adhering to its central tenets such as use of force and emotional non-engagement. Furthermore, they adopt the way femininity is depicted within the male-dominated terms of policing. That is, femininity is represented as a difference that should be either disguised or conditionally approved, and this definition reinforces masculinist constitution of policing. Therefore, the way the policewomen experience their femininity can be understood as an instance of emphasized femininity that promotes and reconstitutes hegemonic masculinity. All in all, it is asserted that by doing gender, the policewomen become able to secure their fragile position within the police force. They embrace the prevailing experiences of masculinity and femininity in

policing and they carve a safe space for themselves by shifting between these gendered performances.

Closely related with this central question, two complementary questions are analyzed throughout the thesis. Firstly, it is examined whether the policewomen question and transform, or uphold and reconfirm the masculinist constitution of policing. It is suggested that they embrace and reproduce masculinism of the police force. That is to say, they internalize its masculinist norms and practices. Furthermore, it is claimed that the policewomen identify their own position via masculinist terms of policing. They adhere to the definition of policing as a masculine job and they self-identify themselves through the ensuing masculinist discourse which marginalizes and subjugates women. Therefore, it is suggested that they are transformed by policing, rather than vice versa.

To clarify, it is proposed that the policewomen normalize the restricted role that is attributed to them. Moreover, they represent their assimilation as an inevitable and spontaneous process of transformation through which they almost naturally become masculinized. Strikingly, they articulate their gendered experiences via the discourse of professionalism. In this discourse, the police force is portrayed as a gender neutral environment where there is neither gender discrimination nor favoritism. Nevertheless, it is revealed that the discourse of professionalism is based on a masculinist conception of female nature. As a result, there is almost no place in their agenda for common concerns and problems of women in the police force. They devote all their attention and effort to the maintenance of the prevalent masculinist norms and hierarchical relations of policing. Therefore, it is asserted that the potential of the policewomen to dispute and change masculinist parameters of policing is seriously limited.

Following this inquiry, as the second complementary point, it is maintained that the policewomen are active agents who come up with certain possibilities of empowerment despite their subjugated position in policing. As is stated above, the policewomen are assimilated into an ineffective position and they adopt the masculinist terms of policing. However, it is claimed that the experiences of women in policing cannot be adequately grasped merely as a story of subordination. Despite their experience of subjugation, they create a space of empowerment for themselves within the masculinist universe of policing. In this regard, the policewomen can be plausibly characterized as “women of power”. This characterization refers to their empowerment as agents of masculinist state power. They are empowered as agents who hold institutionalized masculine power as well as state power, and these two are inextricably interwoven within the context of policing. Thus, how the policewomen are empowered as women of power can be grasped along two main axes. On the first axis, it is proposed that they are empowered as individual women in their encounters with men. This is because that they deploy masculinist power as it is institutionalized in policing against individual men. On the second axis, it is suggested that the policewomen are empowered as state officials in their confrontation with the rest of the society. In that way, they distinguish themselves as special state agents who perform a duty of utmost importance. And, they open up a space of empowerment and intervention over against the society through such a subject position.

The policewomen in Turkey form a significant and interesting subject to study for a number of reasons. Firstly, there are only a few critical studies on the police in Turkey and none of them pay due attention to the policewomen as a specific group to examine. I believe an analysis of the police as a domain that is based on unequal

relations of gender can provide us with a thorough understanding compared to gender-blind perspective of the preceding studies. From such a point of view, masculinist constitution of the police force in particular, and gendered nature of state power in general can be adequately grasped.

To put it differently, such an inquiry about gendered performances of the policewomen can reveal gendered character of state power as it is defined and practiced within the locality of policing. In this regard, the police organization can be seen as a particular site where state power is interwoven with male-dominance. Moreover, from this point of view, it can be uncovered that masculinist state power does not refer to a monolithic entity with an essential and fixed trait. To the contrary, it is shown to be maintained and reproduced in specific micro settings with agents' routine and reiterative performances and practices.

Secondly, what makes the policewomen a distinct and important group to study is the fact that they are a limited number of women placed within the state's arm of violence. That is, they are a minority group of women who hold and exercise power as state agents. As is widely accepted, the police organization has a substantial role in the constitution and reproduction of modern state power. This is because that it realizes one of the most significant features of the state, that is its monopoly of violence, and it also plays a central role in the very formation of the social order and the social body. This means that the state and its monopoly of force become most visible and pervasive in the body of the police. As Berksoy (2007) indicates, the police can be differentiated from other state institutions due to the fact that "the entitlement and the possibility of the "use of violence" constitutes the *core* of the "police mandate" and it is reserved to the police mainly for monitoring, classifying, intervening and constructing the social relations of

the formation on an *everyday* and *visualized* basis” (p.49). Thus, the police officer appears to be the most visible and tangible personification of the state who daily represents as well as exercises state power. In consequence, the policewomen can be conceived as privileged agents who have a vital role in the maintenance of state power and this makes them unique and interesting actors to study.

Additionally, their position is of exceptional importance as they are not victims or objects of state power, but its subjects in this case. Unlike the prevailing concern with women as targets of masculinist state power, to put the policewomen under the spotlight entails conceiving them as actors who actively participate in its construction and perpetuation. That is to say, these women also take part in the reproduction of state power as it is associated with masculine power in the world of policing. Thus, it can be said that their role in the perpetuation of masculinist state power makes the policewomen a peculiar and appealing subject of analysis.

What is more, my study aims to make a unique contribution to the relevant literature. First of all, it looks at everyday acts of the policewomen in order to understand how state power is gendered in the setting of policing. To illuminate, it is suggested that state power is defined and practiced through masculine power within policing, and the policewomen reconstitute this masculinist state power via their daily performances. With its gendered perspective, this study is distinguished from the previous analyses in the literature.

Secondly, by looking at how the policewomen are assimilated into policing, my study goes beyond the descriptive perspective that is dominant the literature. In the preceding studies, it has been widely accepted that women suffer from certain problems like discrimination, harassment and workplace stress. Although my study also affirms

this statement, it goes beyond this argument by showing that the policewomen are homogenized into the masculinist world of policing. What is at stake is their internalization and reproduction of masculinist tenets of policing, rather than the insufficient and simplistic insight that they are faced with certain obstacles.

Lastly, my analysis promises to provide an enriched understanding of their experiences of empowerment. It is claimed that they are empowered as special state agents within the realm of policing which is formed upon unequal and hierarchical relations of gender that subordinate women. What is implied here is that their experiences cannot be adequately grasped merely as a story of subjugation since they create for themselves certain possibilities of empowerment.

Fieldwork and Methodology

As a feminist who tried to understand multiple dimensions of women's subordination and exploitation, I was concerned with the central role the state plays in the perpetuation of male dominance. Therefore, my interest was concentrated on women who are victimized by state power that is constructed and reproduced through masculinism. Nevertheless, I realized that there are also women who actively take a part in the maintenance of gendered state power. The presence of women in policing has attracted me as an interesting case. At that time, I had never met with a police woman and I did not know anything about their position within policing. My impression was mainly drawn from my encounters with them in public demonstrations, where I stood as an activist, and they were supposed to control the protestors like me. As a result, at first glance they did not seem a familiar and sympathetic group to study.

However, as I made a preliminary research to learn about women's status in policing as well as to see how they have been depicted in the media, I recognized that

their position is unique. They represent and enact state power as it is constituted in the male-dominated context of policing. In this sense, they can be perceived as “women of power”, where power connotes both state power and masculine power. In consequence, despite my initial hesitance to study an unfamiliar group with which it is difficult to empathize, I have decided that their position as “women of power” is unique and worthy of attention.

My study is built upon qualitative data obtained through semi-structured interviews with 16 policewomen. I conducted these interviews during the periods of spring 2007, and spring and summer 2008, in three cities, İstanbul, Ankara, and Kocaeli. For this purpose, I visited the police directorate of İstanbul (*IEM*) and two local police centers in İstanbul, the police directorate of Ankara (*AEM*), and the police directorate of Kocaeli (*KEM*). While eight interviews were conducted in their offices, I visited two women at their home, and met and talked with six women in other places they liked, mostly cafes. Moreover, it was difficult to gain access into the field of policing and to reach the policewomen. As a result, I could not focus my research to a specific location or to a particular group. My interviewees are from different branches and positions and they do not constitute a consistent sample that represents the whole population of policewomen in Turkey.¹ I used the method of snow balling as it is very relevant in the context of my research that provides limited cooperation and access to researchers. This means that with the aid of my acquaintances I first contacted a policewoman and then

¹ The composition of the group of my interviewees in terms of age, education level, work experience, rank, and marital status is as the following: 4 women are between the ages 20-25, with work experience of 1-4 years; 8 women between the ages 28-35, with the work experience of 8-13 years, and 4 women between the ages 45-58, with the work experience over 20 years. Only 2 women out of 16 have college education, the rest are high school graduates. While one is a retired police officer, two of them have high ranked positions, namely one is *şube müdürü* and the other is *emniyet amiri*, and the rest are rank and file police officers. Furthermore, while 6 women are single, the rest are married and except one, all of their husbands are also police officers.

she helped me to find new interviewees and this went on throughout my research.

Although this hampers the generalizability of the findings, I think that my data provide a valid and valuable insight into the questions and issues that lie at the core of this inquiry.

Furthermore, the interviews were semi-structured in that they were based on certain questions on specific issues. The interviewees were asked questions about their position within policing, how they daily manage their gender position within this masculine realm, and their perceptions and images of the state. However, these questions were not formulated and asked in a strict questionnaire form, and they did not propose a fixed and predetermined flow. I had prepared the questions beforehand and used them in a way that they helped me to probe, not to dominate, the interviewees' talk. Also, I sometimes revised or reformulated the questions in accordance with the reactions of the interviewees or came up with new questions during our talk. In this regard, the interviews opened up a space both for me and the interviewees through which we interacted and constantly repositioned ourselves. Therefore, conducting these interviews was a learning experience for me as a young researcher since I learned to ask my questions in different ways as well as coming up with new questions each time I talked to a new police woman.

After spending some time in the field and talking with the first police women I met, I realized that they were hesitant to talk with a stranger like me. Yet I observed that they began to feel relieved as we talked and as they watched my attitudes and reactions during the course of our interview. Some of them even expressed their contentment that there was someone who was interested in their stories and who came for listening to them. However, these factors do not override the fact that none of my interviewees felt completely free to talk about their identities and positions as policewomen. They all

underlined their positions as state officials and that they should be careful about with whom and about what to talk. They felt insecure as state officials who talked with a stranger without official permission.

I could not establish continuous and substantive relations with my informants due to this feeling of cautiousness and insecurity. Therefore, our dialogue was confined to one meeting that lasted fifty minutes at minimum and two hours at maximum. At this point, it should be noted that I did not use tape recorder in most of the interviews. I asked the permission to use it and most of them did not want their talk to be recorded. Sometimes I did not even ask as I understood that its presence would make my informants feel uncomfortable. Hence, I took field notes both during our conversation and as I spent time in different police settings, and I transcribed them afterwards as soon as possible. In addition, similar to Marks (2004), I particularly believe in the value of data that is created by doing participant observation in the realm of policing. Nevertheless, it seems impossible to realize such a project with the Turkish police force because of its inhospitable attitude towards researchers. Accordingly, I was treated as a stranger and I was not given an official permission even to conduct interviews with the policewomen. Therefore, for me, making participant observation in such a research context was nothing but impossible.

All these limitations derive from the fact that police researchers are generally perceived as “spies” who try to infiltrate into the world of policing.² The realm of policing is defined on the basis of secrecy and security of the state, and the researchers are conceived to be undependable and potentially dangerous intruders. It is thought that

² There is a consensus among the researchers who study the police force that the police officers are suspicious of outsiders and they are not willing to share what they see as “in-house knowledge” of policing (Marks, 2001; Herbert 2001a, Horn, 1997; Brown, 1995; Silvestri, 2007).

they have a hidden agenda which is to use their findings against the police force.

Unsurprisingly, I was also treated as an outsider who is trying to penetrate into the world of policing that is already closed to outsiders. My attempts to take official permission for the interviews were turned down and I was not given a cogent explanation about its reasons. In the absence of such an explanation, I felt that my identity led to such a rejection and it shaped how I was perceived and treated throughout my fieldwork as well. To illustrate, I was a young female researcher in such a male-dominated research setting and my gender identity put me in a marginalized status from the very beginning.³ What is more, my institutional engagement also influenced how I was positioned in this research context. To specify, I was seen to come from a totally different world, which is the critical and democratic academic environment of *Boğaziçi* University. Although I was respected as a member of such a distinguished institution, its reputation as a liberal, Western-looking and critical university made the police officers assume that I had already a negative image of the police force. Therefore, they tried to change what they thought might be my perception of the police force by proving the rightfulness of their actions and emphasizing the difficulty and significance of their job.

In addition, during my fieldwork I felt that my research interest was seen to be of little importance. In particular, all the male police officers I encountered on the road to reach my informants reminded me of the “futility”, as they saw it, of my interest on policewomen. They either claimed that this was not a subject worth studying or that they

³ As Horn (1997) says, “in a male-dominated environment and culture, such as policing, gender assumes greater importance and significance than it would in other environments. A female researcher must deal with these issues in some way, and the way she deals with them, and the effects of her response, is significant” (p.302).

could speak in the name of policewomen. For them, there was nothing that made the case of policewomen special and worth studying.

Therefore, it appears that my access to the field was difficult and complicated, and my presence there was uneasy. As a result, I cannot avoid the feeling of estrangement throughout my fieldwork. The organization of both the space and human relations made me feel as a stranger. This is because that the realm of policing was an unfamiliar research setting and also, it was difficult for me to empathize with the police officers. I had some critical views of the police force and hence, I sometimes felt uncomfortable when we were talking about certain issues like use of force. Although I always endeavor to be honest during my fieldwork, in such instances I faced with a dilemma. Despite the fact that I felt uneasy, I also felt that I should remain silent in order not to dominate our conversation with my own ideas and not to harm their trust in me. In addition, like many other researchers who study the police force I felt as if I had to continuously prove that I was not a “spy”, but a harmless and trustable researcher with a valid research subject. It was many times implied and sometimes directly told that I should not use my data to harm the image and interests of the police force. And, in the face of all these prejudices and skepticism, what I did was to honestly explain my research agenda and my position as a researcher and to assure my informants that their confidentiality and anonymity will be well preserved. To ensure this, I have used pseudonyms for each interviewee and I have not included any information that might help to identify them.

Despite such difficulties and limitations of my fieldwork, I contend that it provides me with valuable and solid data concerning the questions that intrigue me as a researcher. Following Herbert (2001a), I conceive the unwillingness of the police force

to let me in as well as the reluctance of my interviewees not as “obstacles to data, but data themselves” (p.305). All these can give us an idea about how state power is defined through secrecy in the context of policing. Also, it can be seen how these policewomen identify their position as state officials who are the legitimate holders of the state secrets and who can decide with whom and to what extent to share them.

In addition, despite certain limitations that are mentioned above, the interviews are rich and satisfactory in terms of content. Nonetheless, it should be noted my data is not confined merely to the interviews since they cannot be isolated from my observations and experiences in the field. For instance, the spatial organization of policing gives me an idea about the materialization of state power in this particular context. And, my interactions and experiences during the attempts to get a permission made me meet with and move through the state bureaucracy. Also, although I specifically focus on the policewomen in my study, my encounters and conversations with the male police officers enabled me to see how the former are perceived and positioned within the police force.

Along with these, I diversify my data and hence enrich my analysis by looking at the prevailing representations of the policewomen. Thus, I make an attempt to identify certain recurrent themes and discursive patterns that constitute a “*representational sphere*”⁴ within which the policewomen are positioned. In other words, my aim is to grasp how the policewomen have been represented and how their subjectivities are constructed through such a discursive space. For this purpose, I analyze newspaper

⁴ Sharma & Gupta (2006) use this term with reference to their analysis of public cultural representations and performance of statehood (p.18).

coverage as well as the interviews conducted with important figures like the earliest top ranked police woman, Feriha Sanerk, and a high ranked police woman, İnci Aksoy.⁵

Structure

The organization of the thesis can be briefly presented in the following way. In the second chapter, the literature on policewomen is revisited. This chapter is composed of two parts. In the first part, the main threads of discussion in the general literature are classified in three groups. Firstly, the introduction of women and their transformed role in policing is discussed. Secondly, the obstacles they encounter within the police organization are examined. And, lastly, an insight is offered about the ways the policewomen cope with the masculinist parameters of policing. After discussing each theme respectively, I pay attention to the relationship between the knowledge generated here and its political implications. For this purpose, I dwell on the politics of policewomen and look at how certain practical demands are formulated with regard to their status in policing. In the second part of this chapter, an analysis is presented on the policewomen in Turkey. In particular, prominent studies on Turkish policewomen are reviewed. Lastly, following this inquiry, the unique contributions of this study to the relevant literature are discussed.

In the third chapter of the thesis, how state power and femininity are interwoven in policing via the subjectivities of the female police officers is explored. It is argued that the policewomen constantly manage and negotiate their gender identities by “doing gender”. They do gender via their daily performances of particular experiences of

⁵ Media materials on the policewomen in Turkey are limited. Therefore, my inquiry rests newspaper coverage. Moreover, I limit my analysis to the archives of the newspapers that are available on the web which cover the period of last two decades. Such a focus in terms of the time period seems plausible since the policewomen have become more visible and prominent in recent years, and they are reported more frequently compared to earlier periods.

masculinity and femininity, namely hegemonic masculinity and emphasized femininity. To demonstrate, they adopt the masculine ethos of policing as well as the way femininity is positioned within it. Hegemonic masculinity is taken as the norm of policing and thus, the policewomen aspire to realize it in order to be accepted as competent police officers. Moreover, femininity is perceived as a difference that is either conditionally promoted or concealed. Taken together, their complicated experiences of masculinity and femininity reinforce the masculinist constitution of policing within which women are subordinated to a secondary position. Therefore, it is suggested that by doing gender as such, the policewomen play an undeniably significant role in the reconstitution of state power within policing in a way to reinforce the subordination of women.

The fourth chapter scrutinizes whether the policewomen question and transform, or uphold and reconfirm the male-dominated structure of policing. The main argument of this chapter is that they internalize and reproduce masculinism of the police force. To illuminate, it is claimed that the policewomen are assimilated into the male-dominated universe of policing. This is because that they normalize and internalize its masculinist norms and practices. They define police work as a male/masculine occupation that requires certain masculine attributes, like physical power and prowess. Moreover, they identify their own position as a role that complements and supports the work of the policemen. They adopt and legitimize the secondary position that is ascribed to women in policing. At this point, it deserves attention that the policewomen narrate their gendered experiences through the seemingly gender-neutral discourse of professionalism. They believe that there is no gender discrimination or favoritism toward women in the police force. However, it is uncovered that this discourse relies on a masculinist depiction of female nature. Thus, it is claimed that the policewomen

articulate their subject position through the ensuing masculinist discourse of policing that marginalizes and subjugates women. And, it is concluded that they are transformed by policing, rather than vice versa.

The fifth chapter discusses how the policewomen are empowered within the realm of policing. It is suggested that the experiences of the policewomen cannot be adequately understood as a story of subjugation. Although they are reduced to a subordinated position in the police force, they are able to create certain possibilities of empowerment. That is, they create a space of action and intervention for themselves within the masculinist universe of policing. In this regard, it seems plausible to characterize the policewomen as “women of power” since they are empowered as agents of the masculinist state power. To specify, they are empowered as individual women against men. This means that they deploy the masculinist power as it is institutionalized in policing against individual men. In addition, they are empowered as privileged state agents vis-à-vis the society who represent and embody state power.

In the conclusion chapter, a review of the main arguments and findings of the thesis is presented.

CHAPTER 2

REVISITING THE LITERATURE ON POLICEWOMEN

This chapter revisits the literature on policewomen. Its goal is to offer a basic and well-established insight into the body of knowledge produced on policewomen. For this purpose, it discusses not only the broad picture on policewomen in general, but also the more specific case of the policewomen in Turkey.

This chapter is composed of two main parts. In the first part, the recurrent themes in the literature are scrutinized. I categorize them into three main layers in order to come up with a well-organized and coherent analysis. The first and the most general group covers the studies on the historical background of the recruitment of women as well as the transformation of their role in policing. The second layer includes the set of studies that concentrate on the gender-related problems policewomen suffer as well as the probable causes and consequences of these problems. And, the last and most specific set consists of the group of works that are interested in how female police officers deal with these problems and how they succeed to maintain their position within the masculine atmosphere of policing.

What follows is an inquiry about the connection between this body of knowledge and a particular agenda and activism about policewomen which might be called “the politics of policewomen”. In this section, it is shown that there are certain women organizations and policewomen networks that lobby for the increase in the number of women and enhancement of their status. They rely on the knowledge that is generated in the literature and claim that women officers are as capable as men for policing. Yet, at the same time, they also argue that women have brought significant changes to the

police force by creating a female style of policing. Thus, the main argument of this section is that the politics of policewomen is based upon an emphasis that is simultaneously placed on the themes of policewomen's sameness with men as well as their difference from men.

In the second part of this chapter, this general picture is complemented with a specific focus on the policewomen in Turkey. I take a look at the history as well as the current position of women in the Turkish police force. It is maintained that the introduction of women in policing can be understood with reference to the gender agenda of the *Kemalist* regime. Moreover, the contemporary situation is revisited and it appears that there are a limited number of women in the police organization who are predominantly concentrated in the lower ranks.

An Overview of the Literature on Policewomen

The primary objective of this part is to underscore the main axes of discussion in the literature on policewomen.⁶ It seems that the themes that recurrently surge in the related body of knowledge can be organized into three major categories. Firstly, the introduction of women and their transformed role in policing is discussed. Secondly, the obstacles they encounter within the male-dominated police organization are examined. And, lastly, an insight is offered about the ways how policewomen survive in this masculinist environment. After discussing each set of works respectively, the political implications of the knowledge that is generated here are examined. For this purpose, I

⁶ At this point, the extent of this review should be clarified. Although there are some studies that are conducted in the non-Western contexts, such as the Philippines, Pakistan, India and Afghanistan, the analyses concerning Western countries are prevalent in the literature. This is because that women were recruited in policing first in the USA and Britain, and then in Europe, and they have an improved status in these countries compared to the rest of the world. Hence, the analysis presented in this chapter is primarily concentrated on and limited to the studies in these countries.

focus on the politics of policewomen and look at the underlying themes that lie at its heart.

Newcomers in the Realm of Policing: The Introduction and Progress of Women in Policing

The first thread of discussion in the literature concerns the historical background of how women were accepted to policing as well as how their status has been improved throughout the twentieth century. The recruitment of women and their transformed role in policing has been classified like the period of matrons, the period of latency, and the period of integration.

From Prison Matrons to Policewomen

The introduction of women into policing in the context of the USA and Europe, particularly Britain, has been widely examined in the literature. Women were recruited into policing in these countries under similar historical conditions in the 1910s.⁷ However, although there is a consensus in the literature that the period of policewomen began in the 1910s, this does not mean that there had been no women in the realm of law enforcement in the preceding years (Schulz, 1993; Heidensohn, 2002; Levine, 1994; Martin, 1980; Martin & Jurik, 2007; Woodeson, 1993; Darien, 2002). This is because that since 1840s a limited number of women had worked as prison matrons. Their duty was to make sure that women and children were provided with care and supervision

⁷In 1910, Alice S. Wells became a member of Los Angeles Police Department (LAPD) as the first policewoman in the USA. In late 1915 Edith Smith was assigned as the first policewoman in England. In Germany, a female officer was assigned to policing duty in 1903. By 1915, women were introduced into policing in various European countries like Denmark, Great Britain, Holland, Hungary, Latvia, Norway, Poland, Siam, Sweden, Switzerland (Martin & Jurik, 2007).

when they were held in custody and tried in the court⁸. According to Woodeson (1993), the primary objective was to maintain “middle-class notions of propriety” by ensuring that women and children were not left alone and unprotected in the masculine environment of the police office and the court (p.219).

When it came to the early years of 1900s, the position of women in law enforcement was altered from prison matrons to policewomen.⁹ What might be called “the policewomen’s movement” played a vital role in perpetuating such a change (Martin, 1980).¹⁰ What it refers to is the existence of certain women organizations that worked for the introduction of women in policing as a remedy for the evils of prostitution, alcohol, and social deterioration caused by the World War I as well as a case for increased female representation and influence in the public sphere (Darien, 2002; Woodeson, 1993). Consequently, as these demands coincided with the shortage of male population created by the war, a limited number of female officers were assigned

⁸There were certain women organizations who lobbied for the employment of women as prison matrons. For instance, in the USA, there were Women’s Prison Association, the National League of Women Voters, the American Female Guardian Society, and the Women’s Christian Temperance Union. And, in Britain, the British Women’s Temperance Association was the most prominent organization established to promote prison matrons (Darien, 2002).

⁹ In the early years of 1910s, the duty of prison matrons was expanded to deal with prostitution and social purity problems. Therefore, they were first positioned as police matrons and then as policewomen. Nonetheless, as they were mostly the wives of the local police officers and they were not enumerated and recognized as police officers, the time period before 1910s is classified as the period of prison matrons. In other words, although most of these matrons then became police officers, the history of women in policing has been categorized in a way that distinguishes the period of matrons from that of policewomen. Hence, there is an agreement in the literature that the period between the 1840s and 1910s is the period of matrons, whereas from the 1910s on the period of policewomen begins (Heidensohn, 2002; Levine, 1994; Martin, 1980; Martin & Jurik, 2007).

¹⁰ However, the term “policewomen’s movement” does not refer to a unanimous, monolithic movement. It tries to convey the idea that there were different women organizations with dissimilar agendas and programs, such as anti-vice, temperance and women’s rights, yet they shared the common goal of promoting the recruitment of women into policing. For instance, in the USA, the International Association of Policewomen was established in 1915 with the purpose of advocating the acceptance of women in policing and raising their working standards (Martin, 1980; Schulz, 1993). In Britain, diverse women groups such as Women’s Social and Political Union (WSPU) and the Women’s Freedom League organized activities for the same purpose (Woodeson, 1993).

to policing duty.¹¹ To put it differently, it seems that the acceptance of women in policing took place in a particular historical context. The socio-economic needs caused by the war, such as the employment of more women in certain jobs and the moral protection of female population overlapped with the feminist effort for women's enhanced public role (Woodeson, 1993; Levine 1994).

This first generation of policewomen has been described as "specialists" due to the fact that their duty was confined to caring for and dealing with children and female offenders. For this purpose, special female police units were formed (Heidensohn, 2002; Woodeson, 1993; Garcia, 2003). Following Schulz (1993), it can be argued that the primary objective in this period was to create a "separate sphere" of activity for women within policing (p.90). Accordingly, their role within policing was seen as an extension of their position within the family as a mother. As Martin (1980) states, this was a "specialized role which was-complementary to-rather than in competition with- the traditional enforcement tasks of the male officers" (p. 23-24). Hence, it was based on compassionate nurturance, rather than physical force or bravery as it was the case for policemen. Unlike the policemen, they were not given the prerogative for carrying guns, arresting, or wearing uniforms.

This demonstrates that the work of the early policewomen was defined in terms of a social service/crime prevention model. What they were expected to do was to provide social/moral service to a specific section of society rather than the usual police task of law enforcement. Law enforcement entails maintaining law and order and

¹¹ As Schulz (1993) illustrates, by 1918, there were 300 policewomen in 220 cities in the USA (p. 93). In Britain, two policewomen groups were formed in 1914, namely The Women Police Volunteers and the Voluntary Patrols of the National Union of Women Workers (Woodeson, 1993). Furthermore, to learn more about the socio-economical and educational background of the early generation of policewomen in the USA, see Schulz, 1993; Jackson, 2003; Darien 2002).

exercising authority, and hence it is assumed to be the work of policemen. However, the objective of the acceptance of women into policing was to prevent moral corruption of the society by providing social protection to women and the juvenile. Such a protection involved controlling not only female criminals, but also female immorality as it was experienced in the form of prostitution and venereal disease. Therefore, the first female police officers were seen as the agents of moral reform of the society who were expected to protect moral values and traditional family structure.¹²

The Period of “Latency and Depression”

After their introduction in the 1910s, the position of women in policing has been noticeably transformed throughout the twentieth century. The policewomen became almost invisible after the World War I throughout 1930s and 1940s as their numbers were decreased and their role as the “society’s housekeeper” became less significant. In the normalized post-war context, there was no more an urgent need for a group of women to control female morality.

Therefore, following Heidensohn (2002), this period can be characterized as a period of “latency and depression” (p.41). Moreover, although their numbers were increased with another war, namely the World War II, their mission remained the same. However, after the war there happened an expansion in terms of both their numbers and duties (Schulz, 1993). At this point, it should be noted that this expansion did not bring

¹² For Heidensohn (2002), the involvement of women in policing can be considered as their engagement in social control of female population and hence, as a compromise with patriarchal institutions to ensure their domination over women (p. 41). This view is shared by Woodeson. She (1993) shows that the members of Women Police Service, which is a female police unit established in Britain in the years of the WWI, appeared to rely on and reproduce prevailing male, middle-class values in their treatment of working class women (p.227). This can be understood by looking at the class positions of these policewomen. As Schulz (1993) reveals with regard to the USA, early policewomen were “overwhelmingly religious, college-educated, United States-born, upper-middle-class women” (p. 91). Hence, they thought that they had a mission for the correction of society and thus, they tried to impose their own moral values in their relationship with women from lower classes.

about a meaningful alteration in terms of the position of women in policing. The work of policewomen had been defined in terms of crime prevention until the 1970s, when they were finally accepted as police officers in equal terms with their male co-workers (Garcia, 2003).

Nonetheless, as Schulz (1993) observes, starting from the 1950s policewomen had different aspirations than the earlier generations (p. 95-96). This second generation of policewomen no longer shared the emphasis on the kind of womanly, motherly policing as they came to demand street duties. They did not embrace the social work mission and hence, they no longer saw themselves as social workers with a limited responsibility. To the contrary, they demanded to have an equal position with policemen which means to have all the rights and prerogatives of policing, such as having arresting power, wearing uniform and carrying gun.

Integration of Women into Policing

In this context, women were integrated into policing in the 1970s in the USA and a decade later in Britain and Australia. As Martin & Jurik (2007) show, a similar development was experienced later and more slowly in the former Soviet nations and in African and Asian countries (p.54). What was of utmost importance in this period was the fact that women are given crime fighting duties and they are recognized as competent police officers with full responsibility. To put it differently, as Kakar (2002) underlines, since the 1970s female officers have been welcomed to policing and they have been provided with more equal treatment and opportunities (p.239). As women were integrated into policing, separate women's departments were closed down. Additionally, the number of women in policing has been increasing in general since 1970s (Schulz, 1993; Heidensohn, 2002; NCWP, 2001). As they are now given all

policing duties including patrolling, their status seems to change from, as Martin & Jurik (2007) put it, from “specialist “policewomen” to generalist patrol officer” (p.54).

At this point, the dynamics behind the changes in the role of women in policing since the 1970s should be analyzed. The legal changes both in the USA and Britain play an unquestionably significant role in the abolishment of gender discrimination and thus, in the enforcement of equality in terms of employment.¹³ However, these legal changes should not be taken as the sole factor that shaped this process. There were certain socio-economic factors like the shortage of male population, the increasing brutality of police forces and the corresponding public contempt, and therefore an agenda for police reform by including minority groups in the police organization and changing its relationship with the community (Martin, 1980). In other words, there were certain problems like increased crime rates, the shortage of male personnel, and public discomfort due to police violence, and it was believed that they could be solved by giving female officers equal opportunities and expanded responsibilities. What is more, domestic violence has emerged as a serious social problem and it is assumed that the increasing prominence of policewomen might have a positive role in its resolution. As a result, the social service provided by female officers has been reemphasized after many years since the 1920s (Heidensohn, 1996). Related to these factors, the impact of women’s movement in the 1960s and 1970s should not be denied. Within the atmosphere of women’s liberation movement existing gender categories and inequalities were challenged and there

¹³ For instance, in the USA, major legal changes were 1963 Equal Pay Act, 1969 the Executive Order 11478 that abolished the use of sex as a criterion for hiring, 1973 Crime Control Act. Most importantly, in 1972 with Title VII of 1964 Civil Rights Act sex discrimination was abrogated and policewomen’s responsibilities were broadened (Schulz, 2003). See Heidensohn (2002) for a detailed discussion on Britain.

appeared a need to restore gender equality in many realms including law enforcement in general and policing in particular (Martin & Jurik, 2007). All in all, since the 1970s women have been accepted and recognized as police officers who have the same prerogatives and responsibilities with policemen.

Policewomen: Strangers in the World of Policing

The second axis of discussion in the literature is focused on the problems and impediments women face in the masculinist world of policing. It is argued that policewomen experience certain difficulties in policing mainly because of their gender. And, these problems are explained in reference to the masculinist structure as well as culture of policing. Within the masculinist perspective of policing, women are depicted as being incapable of and thereby, unsuitable for policing. As a result, despite the account of complete integration that is mentioned above, they are still treated as strangers and resisted by their male colleagues within the male-dominated universe of policing.

Gender-Related Problems of Policewomen

It is widely accepted that since the 1970s women are well integrated into policing and they are recognized as police officers with full responsibility and authority in equal terms with their male colleagues. In this period of integration, the number of police female officers has been on rise in general and they are assigned to all kinds of policing work including crime fighting and patrolling (Heidensohn, 1998; Martin, 1980). Nevertheless, despite such a progress there is a consensus in the literature that they still suffer from various obstacles on their road to and in policing as their number and role is still very limited and marginal (Rabe-Hemp, 2008; Brown, 1998; Silvestri, 2007). This means that they still encounter difficulties in “breaking and entering” to policing which

is a man's realm. They are faced with barriers at every stage and from every direction and level (Martin, 1980).

Following Morash and Haarr (1995), these problems can be conceptualized as "gender-related problems". The definition is the following: "discriminatory treatment in hiring, promotion, duty assignments and position designations, sexual harassment, verbal insults or abuses and sometimes even physical abuses from their male colleagues" (p.122). At this point, it should be highlighted that the purpose of this definition is to isolate the hardships policewomen experience in policing primarily due to their gender. Although it seems difficult to differentiate between the effects of factors such as gender, age, ethnicity, race, and social class in this context, there is an agreement in the literature on the validity, intelligibility as well as significance of the issue of the problems related to gender in policing¹⁴.

All these problems are scrutinized and verified in a variety of studies in different contexts ranging from the USA to Pakistan.¹⁵ What emerges as a general picture is the fact that policewomen in various contexts live through similar problems because of their gender in the male-dominated environment of policing. To begin with, although their numbers have been increasing since the 1970s in Western countries, and since the 1990s in non-Western countries, female officers are still underrepresented in policing. This is closely related to the fact that recruitment and selection processes are problematic in terms of gender equality. Recruitment of policewomen has been slow and the entry tests

¹⁴ The concept "gender-related problems" is just one of the many concepts used in the literature for referring to the obstacles women suffer from in policing. Diverse concepts such as "barriers" and "ceilings" are used interchangeably in different inquiries on policewomen.

¹⁵ See the references for a detailed list of these studies.

are biased in terms of gender since they favor and prioritize masculine physical features such as body strength and size (Martin & Jurik 2007; Garcia, 2003).

Along with such difficult entry tests for the selection and hiring of women, academy as well as field training is built on a sexist logic that stereotypes and marginalizes women (Rabe-Hemp, 2008). The content of police training is designed for male officers and hence, the emphasis is put again on specific masculine traits such as physical and technical skills, muscular power, aggressiveness, emotional detachment, and bravery. As Martin & Jurik (2007) underline, the goal of both academy and field training is to create and reproduce “the male macho image” that is based on a stereotyped and denigrated image of woman (p.78). This means that the ideal police officer has long been defined as a man and the education system of policing aims at forming this ideal policeman. And, this leads to the fact that from the very beginning women in policing are defined and positioned as outsiders.

In addition, there appears to be gender bias in terms of assignment of duties as female officers are predominantly employed in the lower ranks and they are generally appointed to secretarial and office works rather than crime fighting duties (Rabe-Hemp, 2008; Garcia, 2003; Horne, 1999; Schulz, 2003; Brown 1997, Heidensohn 1996). Accordingly, it emerges that they are disadvantaged in terms of upward mobility within the area of policing. What is promoted is decisive action and risk taking and women are considered to lack these features that are associated with masculine leadership. Also, their work is mostly evaluated by their male superiors through a sexist conception of policing. Hence, there is a “glass ceiling” for women as they are deprived of equal opportunities for ascending to the highest ranks. And, taken together with other impediments mentioned above, it seems that all these factors function as “barriers” to

women's equal representation in policing and their chance for promotion (Horne, 1999; Rabe-Hemp, 2008; Silvestri, 2007).

The Masculine Culture of Policing

All these barriers can plausibly be interpreted and explained with reference to the male-dominated structure and culture of policing. Policing is defined basically as crime fighting and law enforcement. Accordingly, a sense of mission and internal solidarity are the key notions that define the nature of policing (Reiner, 2000). The mission of crime fighting leads to a sense of being isolated from the rest of society via an understanding of "us" versus "others". This means that police officers see themselves as being distinct from the rest of the society since their perception of the public rests on a feeling of mistrust and suspicion (Herbert, 1998; Brewer, 1991). Therefore, a feeling of solidarity keeps them together and makes them feel strong in the face of such an untrustworthy, dangerous population that is associated with danger and crime. Such a sense of identity inevitably results in the fact that police officers cover up the wrongdoings of each other and this hinders accountability of the police force to the public (Herbert, 1998; Silvestri, 2002).

In addition, policing defined as crime fighting is thought to require certain masculine traits and values such as physical prowess, aggression, ruggedness, and bravery. As Martin & Jurik (2007) notice, "policing has traditionally been regarded as "men's work" because it is associated with crime, danger, and coercion" since it is taken for granted that "coercion requires force which implies physique and hence policing by men" (p.73). To put it differently, real police work is conceived as crime fighting that is assumed to take place in the street and thus, to necessitate toughness and physical power. In addition to the mission of policing defined as such, the structure and symbolic

universe of policing are constituted through masculinity. The strict hierarchical organization of the police force, firmly established rules and norms as well as the symbols such as uniform and gun can be seen as the embodiments of masculine structure of policing.

Furthermore, masculine/male-dominated occupational culture constitutes the symbolic universe of policing. To put it in other words, gender differences and inequalities lie at the center of police culture. As Heidensohn (1996) shows, cop culture is based on the exaltation of masculinity and thus, an exclusion and degradation of women. Accordingly, men are represented as being rational, physically and mentally strong, and capable of coercion and hence, well-suited for policing which is defined as an action-oriented, violent, and uncertain work (Martin & Jurik, 2007). However, as Garcia (2003) states, women are depicted as “emotional, irrational, compassionate, physically fragile, gentle, and morally superior” beings who are therefore incompetent for policing (p. 337). What is more, women can be easily stereotyped and marginalized as sex objects via a sexist language as well as a sexist understanding of humor. Therefore, sexist and most of the time even misogynistic jokes, idioms, and attitudes prevail in the police culture.

This can be understood with reference the logic of sexism that lies at the heart of police culture. It works primarily through the binary opposition of man/male versus woman/female, in which the latter is defined in its difference and lack from the former. This dualistic logic defines the nature of work and structures the practice of policing. As Hunt shows, in policing

“The logic of sexism” rests on their dualistic world view that associates gender stereotyped oppositions (i.e., masculinity/femininity) with various organizational symbols (e.g., street/station house), occupational themes

and work activities (e.g., crime fighting/service and order maintenance), and situational meanings (public/domestic; dirty/clean). In each of the gender-stereotyped opposites, the item associated with the feminine is undervalued (as cited in Martin, 1996, p.4).

Here, it is obvious that policing is essentially constructed through the duality between masculinity and femininity. Masculinity is associated with real policing, that is crime fighting on the street and hence with coercion and the authority to resort to violence. In opposition, femininity is linked to service-oriented work that is based on nurturance, care and emotional engagement. This reveals that masculinity is taken to be the norm of policing, while femininity is constantly defined through its difference from this norm.

As a result, the structure and culture of policing has been variously delineated as pertaining to a “male territory”, “man’s realm”, “machismo culture”, “male/masculine occupational culture”. All these qualifications indicate that a particular conception and experience of masculinity is central to and embedded in policing (Martin, 1980; Herbert, 2001a; Rabe-Hemp, 2008; Silvestri, 2002). As Silvestri (2007) states, this particular masculinity can be characterized as “hegemonic masculinity” that is based on “aggressive physical action, competitiveness, preoccupation with the imagery of conflict, exaggerated heterosexual orientation and the operation of patriarchal, misogynistic attitudes” (p.52). Connell (1987) introduces the concept of “hegemonic masculinity” for referring to the prevalent experiences and practices of masculinity that legitimizes the ascendancy of men not only over women, but also over other men as well (p.183-188). And, it was embraced in the studies on the police to explicate its male-dominated structure and culture that are centered upon certain norms like authority, heterosexism, subordination of women, and the ability to display force.

Resistance to Policewomen

The fact that policing is constructed as an embodiment of hegemonic masculinity leads to policemen's consistent reaction and resistance to policewomen in policing. They have been insistently resisted by their male colleagues despite the progress in their numbers and status since the 1970s (Herbert, 2001b). Drawing on the definition of policing and the prevailing understanding of women's nature, policemen claim that women are not qualified for policing owing to their physical and/or psychological nature.

As it is noted above, policing is idealized as crime fighting. It is assumed to require aggressiveness and boldness, despite the fact that real cases of policing rarely require these idealized traits (NCWP, 2003; Brewer, 1991). In view of that, some characteristics that are attributed to women such as being compassionate, emotional, irrational, and physically weak are thought to be inappropriate for policing, whereas some masculine features like physical power and fortitude are highly appraised. To specify, as women are seen to be physically inferior to men it is believed that they cannot back-up their male partners in a situation of danger. Moreover, since they are depicted as emotionally unstable, it is assumed that they cannot establish authority in their encounters with the public. Therefore, women are conceived to be inept for policing and their entry as well as upward mobility is strongly resisted by their male co-workers (Vega & Silverman, 2005; Heidensohn, 1992; Silvestri, 2002).

What is more, this opposition is based on the assumption that the presence of women in policing will undermine group solidarity and male police identity. What is at stake is the image of an ideal police officer, who is a police man, since the sheer visibility of policewomen reveals that policing can be performed by women as well. In other words, policewomen pose a symbolic threat since they challenge the very

definition of policing as a men's /male task. In consequence, it is a widespread fear that the existence of policewomen will undermine the essential tenets of policing such as the priority given to aggression, physical power, resort to force, and use of firearms, all of which makes policing a male-dominated/masculine work. Furthermore, the idea that policing is incompatible with motherhood plays a significant role in men's resistance to women in the realm of policing (Martin & Jurik, 2007; Silvestri, 2002). Policing is perceived to be performed in the street and thus, women who as mothers belong to the private sphere are seen to be less suited for policing. Accordingly, it is argued that the existence of policewomen causes financial loss to the police force due to their pregnancy and maternity leaves.

Men's opposition to women in policing also reflects a deeper concern about who has a right to manage law and order. According to Heidensohn (1992), there is a serious concern behind the policemen's argument that women are unsuitable for policing and their presence will destroy men's solidarity (p.215). This is their belief that they are the sole actors who define and enact social control in society. Thus, women are seen as outsiders who try to intrude into their realm of influence. In other words, the case of policewomen can be seen as the crystallization of women's demand to join and share in a prominent mechanism of social control, and policemen's resistance can be interpreted as an attempt to preserve their power and control in the maintenance of social order.

Survival of Women in Policing

The last central axis of discussion in the literature concerns how policewomen deal with the obstacles they encounter in policing. It has been recognized that policewomen are subject to a double bind that they are supposed to perform a task that is identified as a man's/masculine job and at the same time they are expected to behave as decent ladies.

Therefore, as Martin (1980) depicts, there seems to be a conflict between “sex role norms appropriate of “female” behavior and occupational role definitions of behavior appropriate for a police officer” (p.17). This can be understood as a no-win situation on the grounds that those who internalize the masculine norms of the job and act accordingly are not seen as proper women, and those who behave in line with the socially expected role of being a woman are despised as not being suitable for policing (Garcia, 2003). This means that they experience a dilemma since they constantly need to manage their gender identity in the face of these conflicting roles and expectations.

Moreover, the resolution of this dilemma comes through the adoption of certain coping mechanisms which help policewomen maintain their presence in the masculine atmosphere of policing (Rabe-Hemp, 2008). These are either internalizing the masculine ethos of policing, which pertains to defeminization, or embracing the limited role assigned to them by putting the emphasis not on their occupational position, but rather on their femininity. Consequently, there emerges a typology of policewomen that is based on two ideal types. While Martin (1980) proposes the typology of *policewomen* versus *policewomen*, Brewer (1991) presents the model of Amazon type and Hippolyte type female officers.

To specify, *policewomen* or Amazon type female officers embrace the masculine traits of policing which means adopting and behaving in line with its masculine occupational culture (Martin, 1980; Brewer, 1991). In this regard, they accept the prevalent definition of policing as law enforcement and aspire to be “one of the boys”. As Rabe-Hemp (2008) states, they adhere to the masculine norms and values of policing, such as “violence, aggression, danger, solidarity, and courageousness” (p.263). Related

to this, they seek to achieve occupational acceptance and success in accordance with the significance they attribute to the notion of professionalism.

When it comes to *policewomen* or Hippolyte type female officers, it seems that they underline their femininity and try to preserve it as much as possible in this male territory. What is more, they are content with the image of “ladies” attributed to them within policing. As Brewer (1991) points out, they accept their marginalization as “secretaries with uniforms” (p.243). In contrast to *policewomen* or Amazon type female officers, they embrace social-service or office work aspects of policing which enable them to preserve and perform their gender identity. As a consequence, they do not strive for getting promotion or performing street duties and thus, they are thought to be deprofessionalized.

At this point, it should be noted that these typologies or ideal types present a basic and well-rooted idea about how *policewomen* negotiate their gender identity in the realm of policing. However, the dualistic logic that lies at the heart of these models seems to be limited and thus, insufficient to understand the more complicated daily experiences of *policewomen*. As Heidensohn (2002) asserts, the experiences *policewomen* appear to lie in between the poles of *policewomen* or Amazon type, and *policewomen* or Hippolyte type (p.154-155). This pertains to the fact that they simultaneously use different coping mechanisms that are associated with these opposite ideal types. To clarify, their position is constantly redefined in their daily encounters with their male colleagues and the citizens. And, this requires them, as Martin & Jurik (2007) put it, “to monitor themselves and decide whether feminine or masculine behavior should be displayed, constantly negotiating and performing expressions of gender-appropriate behavior” (p.101).

Unlike men who are seen as the legitimate holder of police power and whose occupational position is seen as a derivation and extension of their masculinity, policewomen have to negotiate and redefine both their status and their gender identity every day according to the conditions they face with. This is because that they continuously endeavor to prove that they are competent police officers, while retaining their femininity. And, this necessitates having a high degree of monitoring and self-awareness that enable them to shift and balance the emphasis between femininity and masculinity as these are defined in the realm of policing (Marks, 2004; Rabe-Hemp, 2008). In this respect, it appears that gender identity of policewomen is formed and negotiated as a way to survive as outsiders in this male domain.

The Politics of Policewomen

In the preceding sections, I have made an attempt to reveal the general threads of discussion in the literature on policewomen. I have argued that to classify these recurrent themes in three main layers would offer a well-organized and hence, reader friendly review. And, such an analysis would aid us have a deep-rooted idea about the knowledge produced on policewomen. Having this concern, I have first discussed the introduction of women in policing and how their position has transformed since then. Then, I have focused on the obstacles and resistance they encounter in policing primarily owing to their gender. And, lastly, I have tried to generate a clarified understanding on how policewomen negotiate and maintain their presence within the undoubtedly male-dominated atmosphere of policing.

Nevertheless, it should be remarked that such an overview cannot be sufficient on its own. It seems crucial to underscore the practical implications of the body of knowledge that is discussed above. As Heidensohn (2002) puts it, this pertains to the

“policy-related nature of much police research” (p.100). In other words, the research on policewomen has inevitable policy implications concerning the number as well as the status of women in policing. Particular questions like whether women can bring certain advantages to policing, they can transform its masculine nature and create a female policing style are on the agenda and there are numerous studies in the literature that address these questions. Moreover, there are certain organizations, such as National Center for Women and Policing (NCWP), International Association of Women Police (IAWP), European Network of Policewomen (ENP), and regional and local policewomen networks like Nordic-Baltic Network of Policewomen (NBNP) and British Association for Women in Policing (BAWP) that rely on the knowledge produced in such studies and advocate the recruitment of more women to policing as well as the betterment of their status.¹⁶ To put it differently, these organizations can be effective in forcing police departments to implement such policies to ensure an increased representation of women in policing, elimination of obstacles for their upward mobility, and putting an end to discrimination and hostility they face with in policing. Here, it is obvious that there is an ineluctable connection between the knowledge generated and circulated in the literature on the one hand, and the policies and practices that draw certain conclusions from the former and implement them, on the other. As such, this connection can be identified as the politics of policewomen and in the rest of this section, I aim to capture the main themes and arguments that lie at its heart.

¹⁶ For detailed information, see the websites of these organizations. National Center for Women and Policing (NCWP) <http://www.womenandpolicing.org>, International Association of Women Police (IAWP) www.iawp.org, European Network of Policewomen (ENP) <http://enp.nl>, Nordic-Baltic Network of Policewomen <http://www.nbnp.org>, British Association for Women in Policing (BAWP).

As the body of knowledge on as well as the politics of policewomen is analyzed via critical lenses, it appears that there are two central themes, namely the notions of sameness and difference¹⁷. The emphasis on sameness pertains to the argument that women are as sufficient and successful in policing as their male counterparts. There are various studies that aim to demonstrate that the performance and capability of policewomen are the same as policemen's¹⁸. Moreover, some of these works especially try to show that policewomen are thriving in certain tasks that are associated with masculinity, such as crime fighting (Garcia, 2003; Rabe-Hemp 2008).

What is more, it can be clearly observed that the notion of difference is also highly praised. This refers to the assumption that policewomen have a style of policing that is different from policemen's due to their distinctive feminine traits. To specify, they have better communication and problem solving skills, they are more prone to empathize with others, they are less likely to use excessive force, and thanks to them, they can establish healthier relations with the community in which they work (Brown, 1997). Related to this, as Silvestri (2007) demonstrates, they have a "transformational" style of leadership that is based on such values as "mutuality, interdependence, inclusion, cooperation, nurturance, support" (p.42).

Therefore, it is assumed that policewomen can/do bring certain advantages to policing and their presence can/does have a positive impact on the way policing is practiced. For instance, it is asserted that policewomen can/do have a significant role in

¹⁷ As Martin & Jurik (2007) draw attention, a similar tension between sameness and difference exists within the more general discussions on gender inequality at workplace and the way equality is defined in this context. On the one hand, women's nature is defined as the same with men's and equality is conceptualized as their equal treatment in the form of equal employment opportunity laws and affirmative action policies. On the other hand, the difference of women's nature is highlighted and equality is conceived to be giving utmost importance to the "special abilities" of women (p. 25-28).

¹⁸ See Heidensohn (2002), Brown (1996) and NCWP (2001) for a detailed list of such studies.

the implementation of community policing that is based on well-established relationships with the community on the basis of improved communication and cooperation (NCWP, 2001; NCWP, 2003; Martin, 1991). Accordingly, policewomen are represented as “change agents” who can solve some serious problems like excessive use of force, corruption, and ineffective treatment of domestic violence cases. What is more, there is an economic concern, especially in the context of the USA, that the presence of policewomen will help reducing the costs of lawsuits on police violence and corruption (NCWP, 2003; Silvestri, 2007). Hence, it is thought that the image and reputation of the police force does/will be improved thanks to the increased recruitment of policewomen and their improved position.

In other words, certain feminine traits are highlighted and it is argued that they provide a strong ground for community policing which is a service-oriented model of policing. As a result, it appears that the duty of policewomen is defined as providing specific kinds of services that are not associated with the prevailing law enforcement conception. Akin to the agenda as women were first introduced in policing in the early twentieth century, with the trend of community policing the role of policewomen is again defined on the basis of such traits as understanding, nurturance, support and communication. As the emphasis on their role in the treatment of domestic violence cases is taken into account, it emerges that their role is once more defined as dealing with women’s problems (Garcia, 2003).

Nonetheless, it is striking that these two contrasting notions of sameness and difference cross cut each other and work simultaneously in the politics of policewomen. As Darien (2008) reveals, while it is proposed that women are as good as men in policing and their performance and competence is not inferior to policemen’s, at the

same time it is advocated that women bring some special qualities to policing and thus, their presence can perpetuate a positive change in policing.

The Policewomen in Turkey

After identifying the central themes in the literature on policewomen in general, it seems necessary to scrutinize the status of women in the Turkish police force. It is striking that there is no detailed and updated data concerning the numbers and position of policewomen in Turkey. The only available data is derived from a declaration of the Minister of Internal Affairs in February 2007, who was asked about the status of women in policing and replied that there are 9833 policewomen within the police force that is composed of 200,000 officers in total¹⁹. Their distribution according to rank is as the following: 87 police commissioners (*emniyet müdürü*), 32 police chiefs (*emniyet amiri*), 10 chief superintendent officers (*başkomiser*), 216 police commissaries (*komiser*), 88 sergeants (*komiser yardımcısı*), and 9030 rank and file police officers. Moreover, this explanation included information about such aspects like the education levels of female police officers, their allocation to age groups, and their marital status. To demonstrate, the majority of policewomen are married, they are at the age group between twenty and forty and they had college education.²⁰

Moreover, there is limited information about the introduction of women into the Turkish police force. Concerning the period before the establishment of the Turkish

¹⁹ In a newspaper report in July 2009, it is stated that 11,031 of 201,000 police officers are female. However, there is no detailed information about their distribution according to age groups, rank, or educational background (Gürel, 2009).

²⁰ To specify, it is stated that 6087 are college graduates, while 3744 have high school education. 7772 of them are married. And, their distribution according to age groups is as the following: 5112 of them are at the age between 20 and 30, 4306 are at the age between 31 and 40, 365 are at the age between 41 and 50, 59 are at the age between 51 and 60 (Emniyetin Gururu Kadın Polisler, 2007).

Republic in 1923, it is stated that a few women were assigned public duties as midwives and prison matrons and they were paid by *Zabtiye Nezareti*. In 1880, the first prison matron and in 1888, the first public midwife started to perform their duties. In 1909, *Zabtiye Nezareti* was abolished and the General Directorate of Security (*Emniyeti Umumiyeti Müdüriyeti*) took its place. As a result, Fitnat Hanım, who worked as a prison matron, was transferred to and recognized as a police officer within the General Directorate of Security. Hence, it is argued that *Fitnat Hanım* could be recognized as the first female officer in Turkey (Şahin, 2005).

After the foundation of the Republic, there emerged an agenda to assign more women to policing duties. In 1928, as Latin alphabet was put in use, there appeared a need in state offices for people who could type in the new alphabet. Accordingly, female civil servants started to work in the General Directorate of Security as typists. And, in 1932, with the change in the Law 2049 of the Police Force (*2049 sayılı Polis Teşkilat Kanunu*) women were recognized as police officers (Demircan, 1973). This development was represented as a success of the new regime to create a modern, Western looking, modernized Turkish woman. In the police magazine of this period (*Polis Mecmuası*, 1933), it was stated that:

One of the most important changes that the revolution generates in the public life is the rights and freedoms given to the woman. The veiled woman of yesterday now became just a dream in foreign novels. The weak and helpless woman of the old period now, with the republic becomes a passionate and assertive creature who fights for her rights. Today, the Turkish woman holds many rights and privileges that women in most of the European countries do not have. It is natural that the police force, which should be open to reforms and new developments, adopts and implements such products of the revolution. Therefore, as a result of

the change in the law on the police force it was made possible for women to become police officers.²¹

Hence, the acceptance of women into policing could be understood with reference to the gender agenda of the *Kemalist* regime. It aims to detach itself from the Ottoman past and an image of the ideal republican woman serves well in proving its success for creating a modern and secular society (Kadıoğlu, 1998). Moreover, this new woman is supposed partake and be visible in the public sphere. In this regard, as Arat (1997) writes, professionalization was suggested for such a legitimate visibility and new republican women were encouraged to become teachers, nurses, doctors, and even police officers, as it is obvious in this case (p.105). However, it is crucial note here that such a promoted public visibility is highly conditional as the professional women were supposed not to underline and even repress their sexuality. In other words, they were given a role and a visible position in the public space only to serve the nation and the republic, and this required them in a way to conceal their sexuality behind their uniforms or professional clothes.

Women in the Turkish police force have remained a minority and they are mostly assigned to secretarial and office works. According to İçişleri Bakanlığı (1973), the areas in which policewomen are thought to be successful are “all kind of detective services, passport services, education services, technical services, traffic services, services concerned with woman and juvenile delinquents, and all kinds of bureau

²¹ “İnkılabın içtimai hayatta doğurduğu sayısız yeniliklerin en mühimlerinden biri de kadına bahşettiği hak ve hürriyetlerdir. Dünkü peçeli kadın bugün yabancı dil romanlarında bir hayal olarak kalmıştır. Eski devrin ürkek, cılız ve aciz mahluku, cumhuriyetin elinde dürüst ateşli, girgin ve hakkını bilir bir varlık olmuştur. Bugün Türk kadını Avrupa memleketlerinin bir çoğundaki kadınların nail olamadığı hak ve imtiyazlara sahiptir. Her türlü yeniliği tatbik sahasında bulundurmak vazifesi olan zabitanın inkılap eserlerini kendi bünyesinde bulundurması pek tabii idi. Bunun neticesi olarak son teşkilat kanuniyle kadınlarında zabıta mesleğine kabulleri imkanı temin edilmiştir”.

services” (p.62-63). In addition, it is stated that the purpose of women’s acceptance into policing is to solve “the unique problems of delinquent women and young girls” (İçişleri Bakanlığı, 1973, p.62). However, the model of community policing has become popular in Turkey since the late 1990s and it is advocated that more women should be recruited and they should be employed in more active units. It is believed that they are naturally more inclined to communication and persuasion, and this makes them successful in building substantive public relations.

The account presented above could be seen as an overview concerning the status of women in Turkish police force. What is more, it is crucial to have a look at the studies on the policewomen in Turkey. Starting from a more general level in the literature, it is surprising that there are a limited number of studies on the police force in Turkey. Nevertheless, Ergut’s (2006) work, which examines the role of the police in the modernization and centralization of the state in Turkey until the Single Party Period with a special focus on the CUP period, should be mentioned here as a leading study on this subject. Furthermore, Bora’s (1994, 2001) articles and the studies of Aydın (1997) and Cerrah (1998, 2006) among others²² are worthy of mentioning. Also, Berksoy’s study (2007) should be appreciated for its contribution in clarifying the changes the police force has been experiencing since the 1980s. Berksoy (2007) notices that the Turkish police force has been going through a process of restructuring. Its capacity to use power has been expanded, its budget has been enlarged, and it has been highly militarized due to the rise of the punitive state, which she relates to the establishment of the hegemony of neo-liberalism in Turkey. Taken into consideration all together, it should be noted that

²² Apart from the works published by some state institutions there are a small number of serious studies on the police in Turkey. For instance, see Sokullu-Akıncı (1990), Metin & Erarslan (1998) for a detailed analysis of the police force.

these studies make undeniably important and unique contributions to the literature on the police in Turkey. They draw a general framework about the socio-historical structure and background of the Turkish police force. However, despite these contributions, they fail to provide us with a satisfactory insight with regard to policewomen. In other words, none of them examines policewomen with a particular focus, or even give them due attention as a part of the police force.

In particular, there are two studies on the policewomen in Turkey that are worthy of mentioning²³. Firstly, Murat Cem Demir (2003) focuses on the problems of discrimination and sexual harassment and he tries to grasp whether these problems lead to stress in their work life. His is a survey research as he applies a strict questionnaire to 125 respondents who work at the general directorate of police (*Emniyet Genel Müdürlüğü, EGM*) and at the police directorate of Ankara (*Ankara Emniyet Müdürlüğü, AEM*). Relying on the analysis of his data via SPSS LISREL, he concludes that these problems lead to stress burden in the workplace for both groups. He also argues that compared to those who work in *EGM*, the policewomen in *AEM* suffer from more stress burden and sexual harassment, and there is no difference between these groups in terms of their experience of discrimination.

The second work with a focus on the policewomen is undertaken by Gülsen Demir (2006). She makes structured interviews with the female police officers who work at the police directorate of Aydın, with the aim of capturing the reasons why these women prefer policing. She reveals that most of these women choose policing as it gives them a respectable status and economic freedom, as it empowers them by making easy

²³ The surnames of these two researchers are the same by coincidence. For this reason, their names are also used in the text.

to deal with the men, and also because it is an easy way of having a job. At this point, she underlines the fact that the police uniform plays a role in their attraction to policing. Moreover, these women state that although they perform their job under the same conditions with men, they are faced with resistance and they have difficulty in managing their roles as mothers and police officers. Therefore, she argues that there is a conflict between the traditional role behaviors as women and occupational role norms of policing.

It seems that these studies draw a basic picture concerning the policewomen in Turkey. They should be appreciated for their subject matter as well as for their conclusions that are in line with the literature. To illustrate, their conclusions confirm certain major findings like the workplace problems of the policewomen. Furthermore, it is affirmed that they face with the resistance of their male co-workers. Hence, it seems that these analyses repeat some of the general findings of the literature in the specific context of Turkey.

Nonetheless, these two works fail to offer a comprehensive understanding about the more complicated issues concerning the formation of the policewomen's subjectivities within this masculine geography. In other words, they do not touch upon the ways the policewomen constantly negotiate and renegotiate their gender identity in a realm where state power is defined through masculinity. They cannot delve into daily practices and experiences of the policewomen which would demonstrate how they participate in the maintenance of the masculinist state power as such.

In this regard, it seems that these studies are inflicted by certain underlying weaknesses in the general literature. However, before going into its flaws, the strengths of this general literature should be mentioned. As is discussed in detail above, there are

certain noticeable thematic patterns that can be classified in three main groups. To begin with the most general layer, satisfying information about the history and change of women's role in policing is offered. The second group of analyses complements the former with their valuable insight into the obstacles policewomen suffer in the police organization. And, the last and most specific set goes beyond the restricted perspective of the preceding studies by emphasizing how policewomen struggle to manage their delicate position within policing. This last layer of studies also differs from the previous works with their methodology. They employ qualitative methods to see how policewomen survive in the masculine environment of policing. What emerges here is that policewomen either underline their policing identity by adopting the prevalent masculine norms and attitudes, and/or they highlight their position as women by adjusting to the socially accepted norms of femininity. Therefore, it is evident that these studies offer an essential understanding about the problems of policewomen along with how they deal with such difficulties.

Nevertheless, although all these studies provide fruitful insights, it should be noted that they are limited in certain regards. To illustrate, it can be said that the literature on policewomen is mostly descriptive and repetitive. Most of the analyses that are reviewed above do not go beyond repeating certain findings in different contexts. That is, a majority of these studies merely reconstruct and reaffirm the widely-accepted findings in the literature such as that policewomen experience gender discrimination or they can perform policing as good as men.

What is missing here is a due interest in the peculiar position of policewomen. To illuminate, they are a group of women in a context where state power is inseparably linked with masculine power. They are the agents who embody and practice this power.

Therefore, they have a role in the construction as well as reproduction of state's masculinist power as it is actualized in policing. This implies that there is no sufficient discussion in the literature on the relation between policewomen and the masculinist state power as such. At this point, my study aims to offer a well-grounded analysis as it establishes this link by focusing on mundane experiences and performances of the policewomen. To demonstrate, it discusses how the policewomen do gender through their reiterative performance of a particular version of masculinity as well as femininity.

Consequently, in the general literature almost no attention is paid to the question of how the policewomen are empowered as agents who have access to this masculinist power of the state. This work aims to fill this vacuum by scrutinizing the multiple ways in which policewomen perpetuate this masculinist state power and how they are empowered through it. Moreover, this promises to be a refined analysis thanks to its methodology. In contrast to the most of the analyses in the literature, the voices and stories of the policewomen are revealed thanks to the method of semi-structured interviews. This enables to grasp how their subjectivities are discursively constructed via certain representations and identifications. By looking at the way they self-represent themselves within the terms of particular discourses, it is possible to see how they are empowered through certain subject positions. To clarify, it is asserted that the policewomen articulate themselves a subject position as special state agents who are empowered over the individual men as well as vis-à-vis the society.

CHAPTER 3

THE POLICEWOMEN: GENDERED SUBJECTS OF THE MASCULINIST STATE

This chapter analyzes how state power and femininity are articulated in the context of policing through the subjectivities of the female police officers. It is argued that state power and gender are interrelated as these women negotiate and construct their gender identities by doing gender. They do gender with their reiterative performances of particular experiences of masculinity and femininity. To demonstrate, the policewomen embrace and enact the way hegemonic masculinity is epitomized in policing. They adopt the gist of hegemonic masculinity by adhering to its essential aspects like use of force and emotional non-engagement. In addition, they internalize the way femininity is defined within the male-dominated terms of policing. To demonstrate, femininity is envisaged as a difference that should be either concealed or conditionally promoted and this definition reinforces the masculine constitution of policing. Hence, it is proposed that the way the policewomen experience their femininity can be understood as an instance of emphasized femininity that supports and reconstitutes hegemonic masculinity.

To restate, the main argument of this chapter is that state power is gendered within the specific setting of policing as the policewomen do gender. The notion of doing gender implies that their gendered subjectivities are constructed and renegotiated on a daily basis via a myriad of enactments of masculinity and femininity. To specify, the policewomen do gender as they constantly shift between performances of masculinity and femininity. They adopt the masculine ethos of policing as well as the way femininity is positioned within it. While hegemonic masculinity lies at the center of

policing as its primary norm, femininity is ascribed to a marginalized position as a difference that should always be governed. And, the policewomen do gender in that they constantly construct and perform their gender identities in tune with these particular conceptions of masculinity and femininity.

Furthermore, the policewomen take part in the constitution and perpetuation of the masculinist state power as they do gender. They play a significant role in the way state power is gendered within the geography of policing. That is, state power is inextricably linked to masculine power in the realm of policing and the policewomen have a role in this association. They accept and legitimize the preeminence of hegemonic masculinity and the subjugated position of women in policing. They define policing as a masculine work and normalize the secondary position that is attributed to female officers. In so doing, they enact state power as it is linked to male-dominance within the specific site of policing.

What lies at the heart of this argument is a perspective that de-essentializes state power. Accordingly, the gendered nature of state power is not treated as a given and self-evident fact. It is suggested that the masculinist character of the state should be analyzed by looking at the practices and performances of particular subjects in micro settings. This implies that neither state power nor male dominance should be taken as homogenous, singular, and unitary systems or entities. To the contrary, they should be seen as a set of power relations, practices, and discourses that overlap with each other in micro contexts. In this respect, it seems plausible to conceptualize state power not as essentially masculinist, but as contextually formed through masculine power in a multiplicity of sites. Therefore, the domain of policing is taken as such a site within which state power and masculine power are articulated in a particular way.

This chapter is composed of two parts. In the first part, a theoretical discussion on the gendered character of state power is presented. Rather than taking the state as a monolithic entity that lie above the social relations of gender, it is seen as being embroiled in gender inequalities within which it is itself formed. In particular, what is espoused is a line of thinking that de-essentializes both state power and male-dominance as unsystematic, ubiquitous, and historically and contextually constituted.

The second part of the chapter is built upon this theoretical background. In this part, the scope of analysis is narrowed down from this theoretical discussion to the micro world of the policewomen. This analysis draws on the data that is derived from two sources. These are the interviews conducted with sixteen policewomen and the public representations of policewomen in the media. Relying upon this data, it is revealed that state power and male-dominance are interrelated in policing via their mundane and routine practices and experiences. This implies that these women are not passive recipients or victims of unequal relations of gender. To the contrary, they actively participate in the constitution of gender hierarchies with their daily acts and experiences. Moreover, it is maintained that they join in the reinforcement of the masculinist state power via these daily enactments that are in tune with the male-dominated parameters of policing.

Revisiting Gendered State Power

In order to come up with a micro analysis of the gendered state power, first it seems necessary to make clear the sense in which the notions gender and state power are deployed. To begin with the concept of gender, it should not be taken as a generic term that denotes a category, role, or individual characteristics of sex difference. Rather,

following Scott and Connell, it should be taken as an analytic category that is integral to all social processes and structures.

To specify, Scott (1988) conceptualizes gender as an analytic category by historicizing and deconstructing the seemingly natural and unchangeable binary opposition between the female and the male. Rather than taking it as given, this opposition should be seen as historically and contextually constructed, and thus as open to change. Scott (1988) defines gender in the following terms: “gender is a constitutive element of social relationships based on perceived differences between the sexes, and gender is a primary way of signifying relationships of power” (p.42). The first part of the definition includes elements like cultural symbols and representations, norms that define the meanings of these symbols, social institutions and organizations, and finally, subjective identity. And, in the second part, it is suggested that gender is a pervasive symbol of power. As Scott (1988) points out:

Established as an objective set of references, concepts of gender structure perception and the concrete and symbolic organization of all social life. To the extent that these references establish distributions of power (differential control over or access to material and symbolic resources), gender becomes implicated in the conception and construction of power itself (p.45).

To express it in different words, she argues that power works in and through the relations of gender. In this regard, gender meanings and significations are used to legitimize and reproduce relations of inequality in various spheres of society like the family, education, economy, and the polity. Scott (1988) interprets this “the legitimizing function of gender” in that unequal relations of power are justified in reference to the fixed understanding of the differences between the sexes (p.45). Consequently, since gender is pervasive to all these relations and structures, it should not be reduced to

individual attributes. It should be conceptualized as a process and what is meant by process is clearly explicated by Acker (1992):

...gender is a process, not a characteristic of persons, although, of course, the assignment of persons to gender categories is a central aspect of the process. Gender does not exist in a set of relations that are distinct from other relations, such as class or race, but as part of the processes that also constitute class and race, as well as other lines of demarcation and domination (p.567).

From such a point of view, gender is not taken as a categorical identity of individuals or a role that is adopted through socialization. Rather, as Acker (1992) suggests that “gender stands for the pervasive ordering of human activities, practices, and social structures in terms of differentiations between women and men” (p.567). In other words, relations of inequality and domination in various realms are based on and legitimized with reference to the assumed differences between men and women, and therefore, gender is taken to be ingrained to social processes and phenomena.

Relying on this conceptualization, it can be argued that the relations of power within the state can be characterized with reference to gender. This entails to see how hierarchical and unequal relations between men and women, through which the latter are subordinated, are formed and justified within the realm of the state. At this point, Connell (1990) offers an in-depth account of the relationship between the state and gender. He points out that neither state power nor gender relations should be conceived as static and ahistorical. To the contrary, both these elements and the relationship between them are constantly changing and historically constituted. Therefore, the patriarchal character of the state, which refers to the institutionalization of male dominance, should not be essentialized, but it should be analyzed historically. In this regard, Connell (1990) properly asserts that the state should be seen “as a process, rather

than a thing” (p.509). What is meant here is that the state should not be thought as a unified entity which lies above the social relations of gender and imposes the interests of men that are formed out there. Rather than such a linear and deterministic relationship, it should be seen that the state shapes and controls the social relations of gender through which it is simultaneously constituted. Male dominance is maintained in and through the state which in turn perpetuates it. In other words, the social relations of gender build the ground within which the state is formed and placed, and that the state in turn systematically reproduces and intervenes in these relations.

To put it in different words, the state does not stand aside and upon the relations of gender, to the contrary, it is historically and socially embroiled in them. In parallel to its regulation of the social relations of gender in a diversity of areas, the state is itself gendered by means of its gender regime. This refers to the concentration of women at lower and ineffective positions within the state bureaucracy, and their persistent exclusion from power positions. Here, Connell (1990) recognizes that the state is patriarchal, yet he immediately notes that “It is not essentially patriarchal or male, this would exaggerate the internal coherence of the state. Rather, it is historically patriarchal, patriarchal as a matter of concrete social practices” (p.535). Thus, he successfully shows that the male-dominated character of the state should not be taken for granted. To the contrary, this particular form of the relationship between the state and gender should be studied contextually and historically.

Akin to what Connell reveals, Brown (2006) places the emphasis on the need for a de-essentialized analysis of the relationship between the state and gender. She asserts that a feminist theory of the state requires deconstructing and reformulating both state power and male dominance. Accordingly, she reveals that they can be both identified

with reference to their unsystematic, multi-dimensional, and non-unitary character.

Parallel to Connell, who draws attention to “the internal complexity” of the state, Brown reminds that the state should not be conceived as a unitary, bounded, monolithic entity that occupies a privileged position above/apart from the society, and this implies to undermine the coherence attributed to the state.

Nonetheless, despite its unsystematic and elusive character, the state is a primary actor in the formation and continuation of male dominance. Thus, there appears to be a paradox in terms of how to conceive the state. As Brown (2006) puts it,

The paradox is that what we call the state is at once an incoherent, multifaceted ensemble of power relations and a vehicle of massive domination. Despite the almost unavoidable tendency to speak of the state as an “it”, the domain we speak of the state is not a thing, system or subject, but an unbounded terrain of powers and techniques, an ensemble of discourses, rules, and practices, cohabiting in limited, tension-ridden, often contradictory relation with one another (p.192).

The state is not simply a male entity that imposes men’s power over women. Rather, it should be highlighted that state power is constituted within the web of gender relations through which male dominance prevails in society. As Brown (2006) appropriately suggests, “the multiple dimensions of socially constructed masculinity have historically shaped the multiple modes of power circulating through the domain called the state” (p.192). What is at issue here is masculinist power rather than the power of men. That is, masculinity of the state should not be essentialized as a determined, frozen, and homogenous feature. It refers to multiple and sometimes contradictory aspects of the state that perform and reproduce masculine power. For this reason, masculinism of the state should be analyzed in plural terms, like the masculinist powers of the state. There is no single logic behind the gendered state power, but there are masculinist powers of the state enacted and perpetuated in different modalities within multiple sites. This is

because that neither state power nor male dominance is singular and one-dimensional, but they are of multi-faceted and ubiquitous character. Consequently, as Brown (2006) perfectly reveals, “a feminist theory of the state will be less a linear argument than mapping of an intricate grid of overlapping and conflicting strategies, technologies, and discourses of power” concerning both state power and male dominance (p.193).

At this point, the police organization can be placed within such a mapping of the articulation of state power and male dominance. As both Connell and Brown stress, it is crucial to focus on particular sites where these two dynamics overlap with each other. And, the police organization can be taken as such a micro geography where male dominance is maintained via everyday practices, acts, struggles, strategies, and discourses. For instance, Herbert (2001b) analyzes the police organization as such a particular setting and he looks at “how the police, like other state actors, do gender” (p.56). This refers to the set of practices, knowledges, arrangements, and techniques by means of which state power is interwoven with masculinism in the domain of policing. He effectively clarifies that masculinism is daily and persistently enacted and reproduced in policing through various aspects. To demonstrate, police work is defined as crime fighting which is closely associated with masculine traits like aggression, physical power, and toughness. Related to this, police territoriality is envisaged and organized in masculine terms. The street is considered to be the central location of police work and it is depicted as a male reserve (Herbert, 1997).

In addition, Herbert (2001b) indicates that the self-image of the policemen is formed via masculinism that lies at the heart of police culture. Those who are thought to perform masculinity in a satisfactory manner are perceived to be proper and successful police officers, while those who fail to achieve such a performance are feminized and

degraded. The former are labeled and praised as “hard changer”, whereas the latter are marginalized as “station queens” (Herbert, 2001b). Parallel to this, policewomen are stereotyped and resisted due to their supposed unsuitability for policing. And, masculinist ideology is deployed to justify these gendered categories as well as the unequal relations of gender within the world of policing.

It is obvious that Herbert offers an enriched understanding with respect to daily reproduction of gender within the police organization. Nevertheless, it should be noted that his analysis is primarily based on his encounters with male officers. Although he indicates that women are stereotyped and discriminated against in policing, his analysis fails to produce a detailed picture of policewomen. At this point, my study aims to complement Herbert’s inquiry by taking a closer look at how state power is gendered in the domain of policing through the subjectivities of the policewomen. For this purpose, how the policewomen do gender is put under the spotlight in the next part.

Doing Gender in the Realm of Policing

As is stated above, the aim of this part is to understand how state power and masculinism are incontrovertibly interrelated via the subjectivities of the policewomen. For this purpose, I focus on the way the female police officers do gender within the masculinist world of policing. However, before going into this inquiry it seems plausible to elaborate on the notion of doing gender.

To specify, the concept of doing gender seems relevant to elucidate how the gendered subjectivities of the policewomen are constructed in masculine environment of policing. As West and Zimmerman (1987) put it, it implies that gender is not a reflection of a biological essence, but a perpetual social accomplishment. Despite their appearance as natural, fixed, and hence unchangeable attributes of individuals, gender differences

are continuously produced and maintained in social interactions. Thus, gender identity should be conceived as a process through which one enacts and practices her/his gender difference. For this reason, one “do (es)” gender, and this is a “situated doing”. To clarify, gender is accomplished within a context of social relations, meanings, and arrangements. As West and Zimmerman (1987) propose, it can reasonably be thought “both as an outcome of and a rationale for various social arrangements and as a means of legitimating one of the most fundamental divisions of society” (p.126). Moreover, gender differences that are defined as such lie at the heart of gender inequalities and they justify hierarchical relations of power between men and women. In this regard, the subordination of women is maintained and legitimized as men and women do gender in their routine practices.

It is obvious that doing gender is a useful concept to understand how gender identity of the policewomen is perpetually managed via their everyday practices. It uncovers that gender identity is not a property that is completed or fixed; rather it is, as Bora (2005) properly asserts, under constant making and remaking, and hence refers to a process. Furthermore, the emphasis on “doing” draws attention to the fact that the subjects actively participate in this process of construction and negotiation of their gender identities. In this sense, following Bora (2005), it can be stated that gender refers not to a binary identity or category, but to a dimension of subjectivity. As is perfectly put by Sirman (2005), “Gender identity has to do with subjectivity, and subjectivity has to be constituted at the level of everyday and with the appropriate technologies that can sustain it over time” (p.152). Therefore, by looking at how the policewomen do gender, it is possible to capture how their subjectivities are gendered through their daily

enactments, practices, and performances, and this is what I endeavor to achieve in the rest of this part.

Aspiring to Hegemonic Masculinity

This section aims to uncover how the policewomen do gender through their routine practices of policing. However, at this point, it should be noted that the notion of doing gender does not apply exclusively to the case of the policewomen. It is not claimed that the female police officers are the sole actors who do gender within the context of policing. To the contrary, the policemen also do gender because they manage and negotiate their gender identity as men. Yet, this study focuses on the policewomen and therefore, it is specifically interested in the way they do gender. As the concept of doing gender implies, it is argued that their gender identities are constantly managed, negotiated, and renegotiated via their daily acts and experiences. That is to say, the policewomen are supposed to perform particular versions of masculinity and femininity, and they perpetually shift between and balance these different performances by doing gender.

To explicate, it is proposed that the policewomen embrace the masculinist constitution of policing. This is because that they internalize the conception of policing as a masculine/male task. They believe that men are more suitable for policing thanks to their muscular power, prowess, and fortitude. Furthermore, they seek to show their capability as police officers by adhering to its masculine norms and values, and thus, in a sense, by performing masculinity. At this point, it is suggested that their performance of policing in terms of masculinity is based on two pillars, namely their use of force and emotional non-engagement. They want to underline their sameness with policemen and for this purpose, they do gender by resorting to violence and achieving emotional

distance, which are the gist of hegemonic masculinity. In other words, the version of masculinity they strive to achieve can be understood as hegemonic masculinity through which masculinity is associated with authority in the context of policing.

Nevertheless, along with such a performance of masculinity, the policewomen are also expected to perform femininity that is rigidly defined and controlled within the masculinist terms of policing. In other words, they accept the limited and subservient role attributed to them. They believe that they complement the work of the policemen thanks to their feminine traits like tenderness, softness, understanding, and their inclination for improved communication with the community. In this regard, their femininity is defined as a difference that is sometimes conditionally promoted, and sometimes concealed. Accordingly, they do gender by highlighting their feminine difference in certain incidents, and concealing it in others. Hence, it can be argued that their performance of femininity is compliant to the construction and reproduction of hegemonic masculinity in the context of policing. Their performance of femininity complements and reinforces male-dominance as it is epitomized in hegemonic masculinity, and for this reason, following Connell (1987), it can be characterized as “emphasized femininity” (p.183-188). He uses this concept for referring to the version of femininity that supports and reconstitutes the power of hegemonic masculinity. And, the way the policewomen experience femininity can be plausibly understood as an instance of emphasized femininity.

Masculinity as the Norm in Policing

As the accounts of the policewomen are analyzed, it appears that their subject position is discursively articulated in terms of sameness with the policemen. To put it differently, a discursive theme of sameness recurrently comes out in the interviews. They believe that

they should be like/ behave as men, that means perform masculinity, in order to be recognized and respected as competent police officers. Hence, it seems that they do gender through their performance of masculinity. To specify, they do gender by internalizing and actualizing the depiction of policing as a male/masculine job that necessitates certain masculine attitudes, like the use of force and suspension of emotions. They seek to perform a form of masculinity that is best suited for policing, and it seems that this particular version of masculinity can be characterized as hegemonic masculinity.

At this juncture, it worths elaborating on this version of masculinity that is promoted in the domain of policing. In the light of Connell's outstanding analysis, it can be stated that there is no singular masculinity but a variety of understandings and practices of masculinity in different settings. In other words, the way masculinity is defined and negotiated differs in every particular context. Furthermore, Connell (1987) proposes the notion of hegemonic masculinity as the most prominent and widely accepted experience of masculinity through which the subordination of women by men is legitimized (p.183-186). It refers to the particular experiences and practices of masculinity of a small group of men who hold the most primary positions of power. In the contemporary society, it is built upon heterosexism, authority, display of violence, and subordination of women. Moreover, hegemonic masculinity signifies not only the ascendancy of men over women, but also the repression and marginalization of other men as well. What is of utmost importance here is that hegemonic masculinity as the specific form of male domination is constituted and reproduced not only through cultural practices, but also, and perhaps more importantly, by certain institutions like the state. It is materialized and implemented through the gender regime of the state, namely

via its gendered division of labor, power structure, and cathexis. As a result, following Connell (1987), it can be plausibly argued that the state itself could be regarded as the institutionalization of hegemonic masculinity (p.128).

In addition, the masculinist character of the police organization can be understood as a crystallization of hegemonic masculinity (Brown, 1996; Silvestri, 2007; Rabe-Hemp, 2008; Herbert 2001b). As is diversely put in the literature on policewomen, policing can be legitimately described as pertaining to a “male territory”, “man’s realm”, “machismo culture”, and “male/masculine occupational culture”. And, all these qualifications indicate that a particular conception and experience of masculinity is central to and embedded in policing. What is more, this particular masculinity typify “hegemonic masculinity” that is based on, as Silvestri (2007) puts it, “aggressive physical action, competitiveness, preoccupation with the imagery of conflict, exaggerated heterosexual orientation and the operation of patriarchal, misogynistic attitudes” (p.52). Therefore, it can be asserted that policewomen construct and negotiate their gender identities within the unequal relations of power that are framed by hegemonic masculinity (Cornwall & Lindisfarne, 1994).

At this point, I claim that the policewomen endeavor to comply with the norms and practices of hegemonic masculinity in order to manage their delicate position within the masculinist environment of policing. More specifically, the ways the policewomen internalize and reproduce hegemonic masculinity by doing gender, that means via their performance of masculinity, could be understood by looking at two specific instances. These are, namely, the fact that they aspire to the use of force as a major requirement of policing, and that they organize and expend their emotions within the masculinist terms of policing.

Use of Force: the Litmus Test of Policing

To start with, the policewomen espouse the definition and practice of policing in masculineterms. For them, policing is essentially a task that is best suited for men, and thus, it requires masculine traits and manners. This is best revealed in Didem's statements:

Our job is maculine, of course. It is more suitable for men than women. Our shifts, our extra work demand high-tempo, yet we have to perform all kinds of duties. If your superior orders you to stand guard there, you have to do it. We are expected to be of a man's power. But my nature is not suited for such a job. He can stand for hours in the falling snow and rain, and still intervene the mass there. However, our muscular system is different and therefore, I cannot stand that long. Yet, we have to do the same as we have to comply with the orders.²⁴ (İstanbul, August 2008)

In comparison to women, men are more advantageous in policing thanks to their stronger physical nature. In the face of their lack of such a natural physical superiority, the policewomen have to prove their competence by highlighting their sameness with men. Therefore, it is frequently underlined in the interviews that they can accomplish the requirements of policing in the same terms as men. For instance, Arzu emphasizes that women are as capable as men for policing:

I am against the idea held by some of our colleagues that women can not be competent police officers. Why can not I be a good police officer? I have many female friends as such, we all do anything a male officer does. Especially, I make sports as I think that it is crucial for us to keep our strenght.²⁵ (İstanbul, May 2007)

²⁴“Bizim işimiz tabii erkeksi biraz. Yani, bir bayandan ziyade erkeğe daha uygun. Nöbetlerimiz olsun, ek görevlerimiz olsun, daha yüksek tempolu sonuçta. Ama biz de her göreve gitmek zorundayız. Sana amirin çık şurada nöbet tut derse, yapmak zorundasın. Ama sonuçta bizden bir erkek gücünde olmamız bekleniyor, ama benim yapım buna müsait değil ki. Adam karda yağmurda saatlerce ayakta durabiliyor, gelen kitleye müdahale edebiliyor. Ama bizim kas yapımız farklı, ben o kadar ayakta duramam yani. Ama yapıyoruz mecburen, emir demiri kesiyor yani.”

²⁵“Bayandan iyi polis olmaz gibi bir düşünce olabiliyor kimi arkadaşlarda. Ben buna karşıyım mesela. Neden ben de yapamayım ki? Sonuçta benim bir sürü bayan arkadaşım var, bir erkek ne yaparsa aynısını yapıyoruz. Ben özellikle spor yaparım, bizim gücümüzü korumamız çok önemli yani”.

Accordingly, the presence of women in policing is represented in a way to demonstrate that they are employed in the same terms with policemen. For instance, the idea that women are now introduced into almost all kinds of policing duties is conveyed in many cases like “The first female member of bomb disposal squad” (*İlk kadın bomba uzmanı*), “The first female police patrolling on horseback in İzmir” (*İzmir’in ilk atlı kadın polisi*), and “Women police at the high ranks of the state” (*Devletin zirvesine kadın polisler*). For instance, this discernable focus on the sameness is evident in the newspaper report titled as “The first female panzer driver” (Panzere Kadın Şoför, 1999):

The first female panzer driver of Turkey works in İzmir. Sevda Gülcihan, a 27 year-old, employee in the Rapid Action Department who is in charge for 5 years, assists her workmates in social events with the panzer. Sevda Gülcihan who was on duty in Kadifekale and achieved becoming almost a shield between mobile police forces and the crowd throwing stone, reported that she is proud of being “the first”. High school graduate, Gülcihan remarked: “I have been in charge Mobile Force Branche Office for three years in İzmir. At present, it is easier to drive panzer than a car. We, the womankind, can do every single job easily like the men do.”²⁶

What is conveyed here is the competence of the policewomen as successful police officers. To be “the first” and to show that women are as capable as men of policing are what makes this female officer feel gratified and self-confident. What is more, it is crucial to note that to perform policing in the same terms with men primarily entails the use of force. As is put in the following newspaper report (Bu Kadın Polislerden Korkulur, 2007), the policewomen are portrayed as potent police officers to the extent that they demonstrate their capability in using force:

²⁶“Türkiye'nin ilk kadın panzer şoförü İzmir'de görev yapıyor. Çevik Kuvvet Şubesi'nde görevli, 5 yıllık polis memuru, 27 yaşındaki Sevda Gülcihan, toplumsal olaylarda arkadaşlarına panzerle destek oluyor. Son olarak 21 Mart Nevruz Günü, Kadifekale'de görev yapıp taş atan grupla çevik kuvvet görevlilerinin arasında kalkan görevini başarıyla yapan Sevda Gülcihan, “ilk” olmaktan gurur duyduğunu söyledi. Lise mezunu Gülcihan şunları söyledi: “Üç yıldır İzmir'de Çevik Kuvvet Şube Müdürlüğü'nde görevliyim. Panzer, şimdi bana otomobil kullanmaktan daha kolay geliyor. Biz kadınlar da erkekler gibi her mesleği rahatlıkla yapabiliriz.”

You have got to be afraid of the female police officers ...The policewomen, who make strong impression during operations, even overpower psychopathic criminals in a few seconds. They have discouraged their male colleagues while training...16 policewomen, who have been instructed, are being exposed to a strict training. The female police officers have undergone training together with their male counterparts about some subjects such as tactics for carrying criminals, using baton, hitting with baton, sore pressure points, methods of interfering in attackers carrying knife and they have impressed everyone. The policewomen, getting through even the most difficult tasks, have inspired confidence for the friend but fear for the enemy. The officers apply successfully all the tactics which is taught them by the coach, Kadir Ayaz who has years' experience and they sometimes fly like a bird, sometimes use their baton in such a way that a conductor uses his stick.²⁷

It is striking that the interviewees embrace this representation as their self-representation. In their discourse, it is remarked that they have a legitimate right to use violence when they think it is necessary. Thus, it can be asserted that use of force is the litmus test of their competence as police officers, which means an indication of their sameness with the policemen. The account of Melike presents a good example:

If the man is hard, you will do it hard, too. You use force if you have to, as anybody else would do it. The man who comes here might think that women would feel pity for them or treat them more gently. But, no, like any of my colleagues here, I would certainly do what is required.²⁸(Kocaeli, April 2007)

²⁷“Bu kadın polislerden korkulur...Çalışmalarda göz dolduran kadın polis memurları, psikopat suçluları bile birkaç saniyede etkisiz hale getiriyorlar. Kadın polis memurları, antrenmanlarda erkek meslektaşlarının bile gözünü korkuttu...Kurs gören 16 kadın polis memuru, sıkı bir eğitimden geçiriliyor. Suçlu taşıma taktiği, cop kullanma, copla vuruş, hassas baskı noktaları, bıçaklı saldırganlara karşı müdahale tekniği gibi bir çok eğitimi erkek meslektaşları ile birlikte gören kadın polis memurları yaptıkları hareketlerle göz doldurdular. En zor hareketleri bile büyük bir ustalıklarla yapan kadın polisler, dosta güven düşmana ise korku verdi. Yılların usta antrenörü Kadir Ayaz'ın verdiği her taktiği en iyi şekilde uygulayan polis memurları bazen bir kuş gibi havada uçuyor, bazen de elindeki copu bir orkestra şefi gibi kullanıyor.”

²⁸ “Yani, adam itse, affedersin ama, itleşeceksin, ancak itlikten anlıyorsa öyle davranacaksın. Neymiş, zor mu kullanman gerekiyor, kullanacaksın, herkes nasıl yapıyorsa sen de öyle yapmak zorundasın. Bayanlar acır, daha yumuşak davranır diye düşünebiliyor buraya gelen adam da, hayır yani, ben de buradaki herhangi bir arkadaşım gibi gerekeni yaparım.”

Nevertheless, it is worthy of attention that Dilek feels uncomfortable while talking about the issue of use of force. She tries to normalize her resort to violence by arguing that the written rules might sometimes conflict with daily practices of policing. That is to say, although it is formally restricted, the peculiar conditions of an incident might necessitate excessive use of force. Therefore, she underlines that despite her unwillingness for it, she sometimes finds herself in a situation where she has to resort to coercion. She adds that her refusal in such a case would create suspicion about her policing efficiency:

As professionals, we have to communicate first. Yet, as is the case with any other job, probably in yours too, it might be difficult to apply the written rules that are learned in the school. Although you know that you should talk, you might not be able to stick to such rules. For instance, they bring you a suspect, I have to conduct a body search and put her in the detention room... Yet, she resists you, she does not allow you to make a body search. We have to resort to force in such cases. In any case, imagine how my fellows in such a situation would think about me. Would not they be in doubt about my behavior?²⁹ (İstanbul, June 2008).

To sum up, the policewomen perceive use of coercion that is indeed one of the underlying elements of hegemonic masculinity as the corner stone of policing. They take it as the central requirement of policing which determines their competence and success as police officers. As a result, any failure or hesitance in use of force would jeopardize the recognition of their capability by the policemen.

²⁹ “Sonuçta profesyonel olmalıyız, her şeyi önce konuşmalıyız. Ama tabii, ııı, sizin meslekte de, her meslekte de böyledir mutlaka, okulda öğrendiklerinizle, işte yazılı kurallarla pratikte uygulamak çok farklı oluyor bazen. Şimdi, biliyoruz işte konuşmak anlatmak lazım ama bunları her zaman uygulayamayabiliyorsunuz çalışırken. Mesela işte birini getiriyorlar, kadının üstünü arayıp nezarethaneye koymam lazım... Ama aratmam diyor kadın, başka bir şey demiyor. Ee, ne yapayım ben de, böyle durumlarda mecburen güç kullanmak zorundayız. Zaten düşünsenize, o durumda güç kullanmasam oradaki arkadaşlarımda gözünde ne duruma düşerim. Bu niye böyle davranıyor diye, şaibe altında kalmaz mıyım?”

An Economy of Affect in the Realm of Policing

In addition, the configuration of policing in terms of hegemonic masculinity brings about a particular organization and expression of emotions. In the interviews, it emerges that most of the policewomen learn to hide or suspend their emotions while they are on duty. Hence, it seems that emotional non-engagement has a central place in their self-representation. They believe that policing requires emotional non-involvement and therefore, they need to disguise their emotions and personal sensibilities in order to succeed as police officers. This emphasis on emotional non-projection can be detected in the account of Ahu:

I have to use the authority that my job entails. What I mean is that our duty comes first, it is more important than any other thing. Of course, as women we are more emotional and sensitive, but we have to block these emotions. It is sort of believing that duty comes first, humanity then comes.³⁰ (İstanbul, June 2008)

As is seen above, in their discourse emotionality is identified with femininity. Policing is depicted as a realm where there is no place or need for emotions. The requirements of policing are superioritized over any kind of emotional expression or engagement that is believed to hinder their professional performance. In other words, they think that an effective performance of policing does not involve any kind of emotional expression.

Begüm clarifies this as such:

To resort to force is our legal right, of course we would use it. You can not be emotional at that moment, otherwise you can not manage such a situation where we confront with the juvenile or women. Doctors get used to death, they do not feel depressed as each patient passes away. Like them, in order to keep performing our duty we should take a

³⁰“Görevimin getirdiği otoriteyi korumak zorundayım. Yani, bizim için önce görev gelir, herşeyden önemli olan o anki görevinizdir. Tamam, biz bayanlar daha duygusal oluruz, hemen etkileniriz ama göreviniz gereği ket vuruyorsunuz. Bir nevi şey gibi aslında, önce görev, sonra insanlık geliyor.”

distance, we should not feel sorry for everyone with whom we dealt here.
³¹ (İstanbul, March 2008)

As McElhinny (1994) appropriately states, these accounts can be interpreted in terms of “an economy of affect” that is created within the context of policing. This refers to the ways in which emotions are organized within the field of policing. To illustrate, McElhinny (1994) notices that non-projection of emotions and emotional distance is perceived to be “the norms for appropriate expressions of affect” (p.165). As a result, although it is indeed closely associated with hegemonic masculinity, policewomen embrace emotional distance as a gender-neutral norm and requirement of policing.

Accordingly, the policewomen in my study are considerably careful not to transgress this emotional distance. This is because that if they fail to achieve such an emotional non-involvement they will be suspected by their male co-workers. Their capability as police officers would be questioned and they would face the risk of exclusion. For instance, Selma tells that she sometimes has difficulty to maintain such an emotional distance, yet she feels this risk of doubt and exclusion. Hers is a good example of such a dilemma:

Our job requires that your emotions should be removed, although, to be honest, it is sometimes difficult to achieve this. For instance, I saw my cousin in a mass demonstration last year. I had to keep a distance to her, therefore I could not go to talk to her. Anyway, it is not possible for me to do that. Can you imagine such a scene where a uniformed police officer goes near to a protester and hugs her? I will not do such a thing that will harm my friends’ trust in me.³² (Ankara, July 2008)

³¹“Zor mu kullanacaksın, kanunun sana verdiği bir haktır bu, kullanacaksın tabii ki de. Orada duygusal olamazsın. Yoksa mesela başa çıkamazsın, çocuk yaştakiler geliyor buraya, ya da kadınlar. Ama, nasıl doktorlar alışıyorsa yani insanlar ölüyor sonuçta, yani her hastayla sen de ölemezsin ki. Aynen burada da öyle işte, her gelene acıyıp üzülürsek bu işi yapamayız, hep belli bir mesafeden bakmamız lazım.”

³² “Bizim işimiz biraz da şeyi getiriyor, duygularınızı aldırmanız lazım yani. Ama açık konuşayım, tabii ki zor oluyor bazen. Mesela geçen yıl bir mitingde amcamın kızını gördüm, uzak durmak zorundayım sonuçta. Yanına gidemedim yani, iki laf edemedik. Zaten gitmem mümkün değil. Gözünüzün önüne

Similar to their adoption of use of force, emotional distance is accepted by the policewomen as the gist of policing. That is, these two aspects of hegemonic masculinity are embraced by them as the neutral norms of policing. As a consequence, any indication of their noncompliance to these norms risks their acceptance and integration in policing as competent officers.

Femininity as a Difference in the World of Policing

What is more, the ways in which the policewomen do gender can not be reduced solely to their performance of masculinity. They are supposed to enact a specific version of femininity that is submissive to the masculinist construction of state power in policing. In other words, they do gender through their daily enactments and practices of such a version of femininity. And, in so doing, they conform to the restricted role ascribed to them within the masculinist universe of policing.

To illustrate, femininity of the policewomen is envisaged as a difference that is either conditionally expressed, or hidden and erased. This difference is promoted and made visible when their position is defined on the basis of certain feminine traits like being more compassionate and understanding. These women are depicted as the sympathetic face of the police force and their presence is represented as a showcase for its successful transformation. Nonetheless, along with such a promotion, they are also expected to control and even sometimes conceal their femininity.

Furthermore, the policewomen perform these diverse and sometimes conflictory performances of femininity by doing gender in their daily practices. In other words, they express their femininity within certain limits that are drawn in policing, or they try to

getirebiliyor musunuz böyle bir şey? Üniformalı bir polis gidip bir eylemciyi öpüyor falan. Bir de zaten böyle birşey yapsam arkadaşlarımın bana bakışı değişir, ne oluyoruz diye. Güvenlerini sarsmam yani.”

conceal it. Their particular performance of femininity depends on the particular incident and its ensuing conditions and actors. What is striking is that all these enactments of femininity affirm and perpetuate the masculinist structure of policing. That is, the ways they negotiate their femininity support and reproduce the constitution of policing as a crystallization of hegemonic masculinity.

A Difference to Be Promoted

It can be detected that there is a discursive pattern of difference within the space created through the representations of the policewomen. Their difference is consistently overemphasized and it is inextricably associated with their femininity. This means that their femininity is thought to define their difference within the police force, and it is taken to be the most important factor that characterizes their style of policing. Their gender identity as women is emphasized over many other factors like their experience, years of service, education level, rank and position, age, and socioeconomic background. In this regard, their position as police officers are defined and represented always with reference to their traditional gender roles. Accordingly, various characterizations like “security angels” (*asayiş melekleri*), “robocop Ayşe” (*çevik Ayşe*), “police sisters” (*polis ablalar*) are widely used in newspaper reports. For instance, a team of the policewomen is depicted as the following:

Sweetheart of Elazığ: “Public Security Angels”

The police chief of Elazığ Bahçelievler police station, Nagehan Topal and ‘Public Security Angels’ ensure the safety of 6 quarters of the city. “People in Elazığ are more careful and respectful towards the women. Most of the citizens do not go against the female officers while they do against the male ones, which makes our work easier.”...Nagehan Topal uses her own affection method while dealing with criminals and she works against the crime following EU criteria with “The Angels Team”

that is made up of 5 women.³³ (Elazığ'ın Sevgilisi Asayış Melekleri, 2004)

Similarly, in another commentary it is said that:

We have seen “the elder sisters” in the streets, on the roads. They are “the police sisters” of people living in Batman. “Where are you from?” we have asked. One is from Mersin, the other comes from Adana. The others are from Kilis, Samsun, Ağrı... we have taken photos. There are 70 female police officers in Batman. Their “public relations” is 10 points out of 10. They are “the elder sisters” of every single person.³⁴ (Donat , 2006)

Here, it is explicit that policing career of these women is seen as being complementary to and an extension of their traditional gender roles as the “angels” of society and “sisters” to everyone. Their style of policing is based on a particular set of feminine traits that these gender roles entail. To clarify, it is defined with reference to certain feminine values like compassion, nurturance, empathy, and support, as well as their improved communication and persuasion skills.

In line with this representation, the policewomen discursively construct themselves a position with reference to these supposedly feminine attributes. However, it should be underscored that there are specific instances when it is appropriate for them to perform these traits. That is to say, the conditions under which they can highlight their femininity are clearly defined within the masculinist terms of policing. For instance, as

³³ “Elazığ'ın sevgilisi “Asayış Melekleri””: Elazığ Bahçelievler Polis Merkezi'nin kadın komiseri Nagehan Topal ve “Asayış Melekleri”, kentin 6 mahallesinin güvenliğini sağlıyor. “Elazığ halkı kadınlara karşı daha ölçülü ve saygılı. Çoğu vatandaş erkek memurlara itiraz ederken, kadınlara pek itiraz edemiyorlar. Ve bu da bizim işimizi kolaylaştırıyor.”...Suçlularla mücadelede, kendi geliştirdiği şefkat yöntemini uygulayan Nagehan Topal, kadınlardan kurduğu 5 kişilik 'Melekler Timi' ile suça karşı AB kriterlerinde çalışıyor”.

³⁴“Caddelerde, sokaklarda "ablaları" gördük.Batmanlılar'ın “polis ablalarını”. “Nerelisiniz” diye sorduk. Biri Mersinli, diğeri Adanalı. Ötekiler Kilisli, Samsunlu, Ağrılı... Resimlerini çektik.Batman'da 70 kadın polis var. "Halkla ilişkileri" 10 üzerinden 10 puan. Onlar herkesin “ablası””.

Zeynep indicates, dealing with children is such a proper case when they can express their femininity:

Although we have to strip of our emotions, this might not be possible because of our motherly nature. For instance, there is a difference in the way my colleagues and I treat a child that is brought to here. While they slap on his/her nape and call him, “come here you, colt!”, I caress his/her hair and ask, “What are you doing here?” I am a mother and therefore, I can not be like them. Anyhow, we should not be like them, we should be different from them. And, this is what our superiors also appreciate by saying good for you.³⁵ (İstanbul, May 2007)

Akin to Zeynep, Ahu points out that the female officers are especially encouraged to care for children:

In our society every woman either experiences or wants to experience motherhood. If there is a child involved in a case, we all take care of him/her no matter whose child s/he is. We worked in the department that deals with the children as our director especially wanted female officers to work there. Usually, women are positioned in this branch since the way we approach the children, although they might be criminals, is more gentle.³⁶ (İstanbul, June 2008)

Similarly, Sevgi underlines that women are naturally more disposed to understanding and communication. Hence, the policewomen are attributed to such tasks as dealing with the families of martyrs:

³⁵ “Ama ne kadar da duygusallık katmamamız gerekse de, yine de tabii bizim doğamız daha anaç oluyor. Mesela buraya bir çocuk getirdiklerinde işte bizim arkadaşlar bir tane ensesine şaplatıp “gel lan sığa” diyorlarsa, ben kafasını okşayıp “ne işin var senin burada” diyorum. Ee, ben de bir anneyim sonuçta, onlar gibi olamıyorum. Zaten olmamanız da lazım, yani böyle bir fark olması lazım her zaman. Bunu mesela amirlerimiz de takdir eder, onlar da yeri geldiğinde aferin der.”

³⁶ “Ama tabii bizim toplumumuzda nedir, her bayan anneliği tadar ya da ne bileyim tatmak ister. Yani mesela bir çocuk varsa ortada, hiç önemli değil onun kimin çocuğu olduğu, ilgileniriz hepimiz. İşte, bizi bir dönem çocuk şubeye vermişlerdi, özellikle bayan memur istemişti genel müdür o zaman, gerçekten de suçlu da olsa bizim çocuklara yaklaşımımız daha yumuşak oluyor. Bu yüzden genelde bayanları verirler zaten çocuk şubeye.”

It was an important experience for me that I dealt with the families of the martyrs. We built good relations with them since we, as women, are more caring and understanding toward them.³⁷ (Ankara, July 2008)

As is evident in the quotations above, in the discourse of the policewomen femininity is confined to the motherly nature of women and their natural proneness for tenderness and care. It is seen that they are allowed and encouraged to perform this particular form of femininity that is in tune with the prevalence of hegemonic masculinity. That is to say, the definition of femininity in terms of traditional gender positions and the ensuing assumedly feminine traits complement and reinforce hegemonic masculinity as it is actualized in policing. For this reason, it seems reasonable to interpret their experience of femininity as a case of emphasized femininity which ensures the maintenance of hegemonic masculinity.

What is more, the policewomen are expected to perform their difference, which is femininity, in line with the depiction that they form the sympathetic face of the police force. They insistently underline their inclination to better communicate and empathize with the public. Therefore, they formulate their role in policing as helping to promote a positive image of the police. They believe that it has been misrepresented in the media as an organization that is unfriendly to the public and that they can revise this distorted image thanks to their innate feminine traits like persuasion and empathy. For instance, Didem explicitly states that:

Women are sympathetic for the public and this is good for the public image of the police. This means women soften the prevailing image of the police.³⁸ (İstanbul, August 2008)

³⁷“Bir de ben yine bir ara şehit aileleriyle ilgilenmişim, o da mesela çok önemliydi benim için. Biz daha duygusal, daha anlayışlı olabiliyoruz tabii kadın olarak, çok iyi iletişim kurmuştuk onlarla da.”

³⁸ “Bayanları halkımız daha sempatik buluyor, yani onların olması o açıdan daha iyi tabii. Diyoruz ya, polisin imajı diye. Yani bayanlar biraz olsun yumuşatıyorlar bu imajı işte.”

Like Didem, Ayşe also draws attention to the fact that the policewomen are discernibly more amical and sympathetic in their relations with the public:

There were the Dolphins and Rapid Action Units in the celebrations on April 10. There were women in those units and they were very charming and sympathetic. And, the people there saw how sympathetic and friendly the police are. I think that women are better in public communication than men.³⁹ (Ankara, April 2007)

It should be remarked here that such a style of policing that is assumed to be performed by women is promoted within the terms of community policing. The model of community policing is a central pillar of the current reform agenda of the police force. As Berksoy (2007) draws attention, community policing can be seen as a neo-liberal technique of governance that has been put in use since the 1980s. It lies at the center of neo-liberal policing projects that aim to govern and control the modern populations. Parallel to its popularity in the Western context, it has been adopted in Turkey, especially via the efforts to harmonize the police force with European Union policing standards. Crime prevention, rather than crime fighting, is given utmost importance along with the maintenance of such criteria as transparency, accountability and civilian control and oversight (Cerrah, 2005). To add, the primary goal is to maintain well-established relations with the public that are based on cooperation and communication. In this regard, the presence of women in the police force seems to be instrumentalized as such:

The policewomen are on the roads: Kayseri Police Department has started to charge predominantly female traffic wardens for controlling the local traffic circulation in order to change the point of view of the traffic offenders, to make drivers accept their offenses with the help of women's

³⁹ “Yunuslar vardı, Çevik Kuvvet vardı 10 Nisan geçitinde, oradaki bayanlar harikuleydi. Çok güzel, çok sempatik oluyorlar. Oradaki halk da tabii görüyor o zaman polisin ne kadar sempatik olduğunu. Yani, halkla ilişkileri de daha yumuşak oluyor bayanların erkeklere kıyasla.”

power of persuasion and to build up police-citizen cooperation.⁴⁰
(Özçekiç, 2004)

A police authority has stated that female police officers who will be charged as a traffic warden or take place in motorized teams are chosen specifically and has added, 'First contact is so significant that's why female police officers who have a shapely figure, a proper diction and who speaks a foreign language.'⁴¹ (Tosunoğlu, 2006)

Here, it is assumed that women police officers are more sympathetic and friendlier to the public and therefore, they can help forming a positive image of the police and improved police-community relations. Closely related to this, their presence in policing is represented in way to show that the police force has been successfully transformed under the light of modern trends of policing. In contrast to the earlier periods, there are more women in policing and they are now assigned to every kind of duties and they fulfill the requirements of policing even in the most demanding and difficult branches:

The love for the police uniform and the fact that policing is a high-tempo job makes it popular for women. The fathers of most of the policewomen are also police officers. Like their male co-workers, the policewomen work in almost all departments of the police organization. One third of 1641 policewomen in the police directorate of İstanbul work in operational bureaus. While they were mostly assigned to office work in the past years, now, the young policewomen work in almost every units, ranging from narcotics to crime investigation.⁴² (Tosunoğlu, 2006)

⁴⁰“Kadın trafik polisleri yollarda: Kayseri Emniyet Müdürlüğü, trafik suçu işleyen sürücülerin polise bakış açısını değiştirmek, kadınların ikna kabiliyetlerini kullanarak sürücülere hatalarını kabul etmelerini sağlamak ve polis-vatandaş işbirliğini geliştirmek amacıyla şehiriçi trafiğinde ağırlıklı olarak kadın trafik polislerini görevlendirmeye başladı.”

⁴¹“Bir Emniyet yetkilisi polisin vatandaş ile sık sık karşılaştığı alan olan Trafik ve Motorize ekiplerde görev yapacak kadın polislerin özel seçildiklerini belirterek, “Vatandaşla ilk temas çok önemli bunun için fiziği, diksiyonu düzgün ve yabancı dil bilen kadın polisler seçiliyor” diye konuştu.”

⁴²“Üniforma sevgisi, heyecanlı bir meslek oluşu polislik mesleğini kadınların da gözdesi haline getirdi. Önemli bir bölümünün babaları da polis olan kadınlar erkek meslektaşları gibi Emniyet'in hemen her biriminde görev yapıyor. İstanbul Emniyet Müdürlüğü'nde görev yapan 1641 kadın polisin üçte biri sivil ve operasyonel bürolarda çalışıyor. Geçmişte daha çok büro hizmetlerinde çalışan genç kadın polisler şimdi terörden narkotiğe, organize şubeden asayişe Emniyet'in hemen her alanında aktif olarak görev alıyor.”

At this point, it is worthy of attention that this change in the status of women in policing is articulated through the discourse of the police reform. In recent years, the police force has been represented in a way that it has adopted modern norms of policing. For instance, as is mentioned above, it has implemented the model of community policing. Furthermore, within this context, the rise in the recruitment of college educated personnel is taken as an indication of such a transformation. In particular, it is underlined that every year an increasing number of police officers go abroad for their MA and PhD education and thus, now there is a Western-educated generation of police leaders who commit themselves to reforming and modernizing the police force. Furthermore, the implementation of new policing technologies such as the deployment of the electronic surveillance system like MOBESE (Mobile Electronic System Integration) is highly advertised. What is more, policewomen are conceived to be at the forefront of this reformed and modernized police force. The increased representation and enhanced status of women in policing is taken as one of the most important criteria of police reform. As Cerrah (2005), the head of Police Academy, puts it,

“The ratio of uniformed female to male staff in the security services, their distribution according to rank, their chances for promotion, (...) and whether they hold influential positions are important criteria for democratic policing” (p.87).

The enhanced position of women in policing is considered to be a proof or sign of the genuine transformation of the police force. They are portrayed as the showcase of the reformed police force as it is seen in the expression “The police organization is proud of its female officers” (Emniyetin Gururu Kadın Polisler, 2007). Moreover, the policewomen internalize this representation and construct themselves a position through discourse of police reform. This is obvious in the account of Zübeyde:

I think that it is different now than the past in that there were not this many female officers in the preceding generations. Of course, it is better now as there is no more corporal punishment and cursing. Now the police officers are better educated, almost everyone is university graduates, for instance.⁴³ (İstanbul, April 2008)

Similarly, Gülseven, who is a retired officer, stresses that the police force has gone through a process of change and she explains that the improved status of the policewomen is a consequence of this transformation:

It was the end of the 1980s, it was worse when I started working. At that time, even the superior at the highest rank was a high school graduate at best. There were a handful of women and the working conditions were challenging. Yet, this has changed in the recent years with the process of Turkey's membership to European Union. Whereas women were generally assigned to office works in the past, now, you can see them in all departments like terror and narcotics. To add, this generation is better educated, young officers are mostly college graduates. All these are important to me as I know how the things were back then in the past.⁴⁴(İstanbul, May 2008)

Nonetheless, although the policewomen embrace this depiction, they are also aware that their presence is instrumentalized in this discourse. When asked to elaborate more on the content of this transformation, most of them tell that this is not a fundamental change. In other words, this is not a genuine transformation. This is because that what has been modified is not the structure, but merely the image of the police organization. For instance, when asked to talk further about the police reforms, Sevgi, who has been working for sixteen years and now holds a high ranked position, tells that nothing has

⁴³ “Bence eskiye kıyasla şimdi daha farklı. bizden önceki kuşakta bu kadar bayan memur yokmuş. Şimdi daha iyi tabii, mesela eskiden daha böyle anlatırlar ya, dayak, küfür falan olurmuş. Ama şimdiki kadrolar daha iyi eğitilmiş, nerdeyse herkes üniversite mezunu mesela.”

⁴⁴ “Ben ilk göreve başladığımda daha kötüydü tabii, 1980’lerin sonu, düşün yani. O zaman en kıdemli amir bile ortaokul, en fazla lise mezunuydu. bir avuç bayansız bir de, çalışma şartları daha ağır. Son yıllarda bu değişti ama, Avrupa Birliği falan derken... işte eskiden mesela bayanlar ekseriyetle masa başı işlere verilir. Şimdi, görürsün zaten, her yerde, işte terörle şubede, narkotikte, tüm birimlerde kadınlar göz önünde. Bir de, yeni nesil daha eğitilmiş şimdi, akademi mezunu, yüksek tahsilli. Bütün bunlar çok önemli benim gözümde, özellikle eskiden nasıl olduğunu yaşadığım için daha iyi biliyorum.”

radically changed in terms of the subordinated and marginalized position of women. As she plainly utters:

For God's sake!, do you really believe in all these EU and good public relations stories? I really do not take it as it is impossible to believe in these after you see how things work here. Look, they titivate a bunch of women and put them under the spotlight, yet nothing has really changed. I do not believe that any transformation would occur unless a change in mentality would take place.⁴⁵ (Ankara, July 2008)

Similarly, some other interviewees contend that only a few women are attributed to more active and visible units like the motorcycled teams, the Dolphins, and the Rapid Action Units, whereas the majority is assigned to office works. They use the metaphor of “showcase” (*vitrin*) to explain that their position is instrumentalized within the discourse of police reform and community policing. This awareness can be easily noticed in the following excerpts from the accounts of Ahu and Begüm:

Of course, women are put in a subordinated position, which means they can not be as active as men are. What does happen, then? They take a bunch of beautiful and attractive women and put them in the most visible positions, and the rest remains the same. In my opinion, their purpose is to show off by saying that look, I have female officers now, things have changed.⁴⁶ (İstanbul, June 2008)

It is all a kind of display that only the female officers who work in the Rapid Action Units or in traffic units are depicted on TV. For example, I have a friend who is a very attractive woman with long hair and she was positioned in the Dolphin Units and worked to direct the traffic on the Bosphorous Bridge. However, this is indeed only the showcase because

⁴⁵“Siz yiyor musunuz bunları Allah aşkına? Yok Avrupa Birliğiymiş, vatandaşla iyi ilişkilermiş. Valla, ben yutmuyorum, zaten burada görünce mümkün değil bunlara inanmanız. Bakın, üç beş kadını allayıp pullayıp koyuyorlar göz önüne, ama herşey eski tas eski hamam.Zihniyet değimedığı sürece ben hiçbirşeyin değışceğine inanmam.”

⁴⁶“Tabii, aslında bir de şu var, bizde bayanlar hep geri planda bırakılıyor. Yani erkekler kadar aktif olamıyorlar. Ne oluyor peki? Numune olarak üç beş güzel, alımlı bayanı koyuyorlar en dikkat çeken yerlere, gerisi yine artık ne olursa. Burada bence amaç gösteriş yapmak, bakın benim bayan elamanım var, eskisi gibi değil işler demek.”

only a few women are put on the scene and the rest still does office work.⁴⁷ (İstanbul, March 2008)

It is obvious that the policewomen's presence is reduced to a sign that shows that the police force has been transformed. What they are expected to do is just to prove with their sheer existence that the police force has been reformed. They are expected not to do anything that would go beyond this mission. That is to say, what is needed is their mere appearance, but not their professional engagement or contribution to policing.

A Difference to Be Concealed

As is discussed above, femininity of the policewomen is discursively constructed as a difference that is conditionally promoted and instrumentalized. However, along with such a promotion, their femininity is also treated as a difference that should be controlled and even sometimes concealed. In their discourse, while masculinity is taken as the norm of policing, femininity is positioned as difference that should be governed. Thus, it emerges that the policewomen express and perform femininity in a way that would not undermine the male-dominated organization of police work. At this point, Ayşe expressly states how this goes even further to the fact that she hides her femininity while working:

We are expected to be masculine and to see ourselves as if we are men. One of our superiors once said that “outside your home, you are no longer women, you are police officers”, which means “you are men”. This is how I see myself. While on duty you put your femininity beside even without noticing it.⁴⁸ (Ankara, April 2007)

⁴⁷ “Tamamen görüntü bunlar. Hani televizyonda görürüz ya, çevikte ya da motorize trafik ekiplerine kadınlar verilir. Benim bir arkadaşım da yunuslardaydı mesela. Uzun boylu, upuzun saçlı, çok gösterişli bir bayan ve onu hemen köprüye verdiler. Vitrin halbuki bu, bayanlar masa başı iş yapar ama imaj olsun diye böyle bir iki tipi göz önüne koyarlar.”

⁴⁸ “Bizim daha fazla erkeksi olmamız bekleniyor, tıpkı kendimizi erkek gibi görmemiz isteniyor. Amirlerimizden biri “evinizden çıktuktan sonra bayan değilsiniz, polissiniz” demişti, yani erkeksiniz anlamında. İşte zamanla ben de artık böyle görüyorum kendimi, hiç farketmeden kadınlığımı arka plana

The policewomen believe that they have to make their femininity less visible in order to be recognized as capable police officers. Here, their femininity is conceived as something that would highlight and remind their natural difference from men and thus, their unsuitability for police work. In this sense, they try to erase their difference from the scene and appear to be as ordinary officers like the policemen. And, this seems to be a discursive maneuver against the widely accepted idea that women are unqualified for policing as they lack the masculine traits that are necessary for policing. The statement of Birsen constitutes a good example:

Here it all depends on you. I do not make any excuses because of some feminine reasons like I have a headache or I have something to do at home. Or, I do never say that “I can not do this or that”. I do not do anything that will arouse pity for myself.⁴⁹(İstanbul, May 2007)

Moreover, to make a claim for a special treatment would not only make visible their feminine difference, but it would also jeopardize the equal status of women in policing.

As Feriha Sanerk, the first top-ranked police woman, tells:

Sanerk remarked that she has never made the others feel that she is a woman and added, “We stand guard at nights at the head office. Branch managers, department heads do it as well. I have never passed on my turn to somebody else even for a single day; however, I have taken on my colleagues turn when they had something to do. In case someone gossips “Isn’t she a woman, you see, she has not stood guard but has made someone do it for her”, I have never set it back. ...Sanerk warns her female colleagues, “To be a police is a serious thing, it is not something like a joke. I have worked together with women. They used to ask for day off when it was some festival day. Then I used to say, ‘ You could work

itebiliyorum. o zaman artık siz de öyle görüyorsunuz kendinizi, iş başındayken kadınlığınızı arka planda bırakıyorsunuz.”

⁴⁹“Burada herşey size bağlı, şimdi ben gidip vay kadınsal nedenlerle, işte başım ağrıyor, evde işim var diye izin istemem. Ya da ben bu işi yapamam demem asla, kendimi acındırmam. Yani, ben bunu yapamam, bu kadar bekleyemem, koşamam falan olmaz. O zaman mesai arkadaşlarınız da hoş karşılamaz zaten, arkanızdan bayandır, yapamaz zaten diye konuşurlar.”

somewhere else'. I have never asked for something like that.⁵⁰
(Alanlarında İlk Olan Türk Kadınları, 2007)

Consequently, the extent to which they control and conceal their femininity is the most important criterion in their self-representation as successful police officers. For them, this pertains to be always careful about their appearance and manners, and not to do anything that would draw attention to their femininity. And, this results in constant self-monitoring of their behaviors within such an environment that is predominantly populated by men. As Selma clearly puts it:

I am careful about the way I am dressed. This is because that we work with men here and therefore, sometimes I can not act freely. For instance, it is difficult to work when I wear a skirt and thus, women officers generally prefer to wear the trousers. To me, the trousers are more neutral compared to skirt as the latter is more striking.⁵¹(Ankara, July 2008)

Similarly, the account of Arzu presents a relevant example for their constant effort to maintain self-control over their femininity:

You should watch your manners among all these men. You should be careful about the way you sit and talk in such an environment. I am watchful about such issues as I want my colleagues to see me not as a woman but as an officer like themselves.⁵²(İstanbul, May 2007)

⁵⁰ “Mesleğinde hiçbir zaman kadın olduğunu hissettirmediğini de ifade eden Sanerk, “Gece nöbet bekliyoruz genel müdürlükte. Şube müdürlükte, daire başkanları nöbetçi kalıyordu. Ben nöbetimi, bir gün dahi birisine bırakmadım. Halbuki başka arkadaşlarımın işleri olduğunda ben gittim onların yerine nöbet bekledim. Ama benimkini bir olay olur da ‘kadın değil mi beklememiş, arkadaşına bekletmiş’ derler diye katiyen bekletmedim” diye konuştu. Kadın meslektaşlarına uyarılarda bulunan Sanerk, “Polislik ciddi bir meslek, şakadan yapılacak bir iş değil. Benim yanımda da kadınlar çalıştı. Bayram olduğu zaman izin isterlerdi. O zaman ben de ‘başka yerde çalışsaydınız’ dedim. Ben bir gün böyle bir şey için izin istemedim” şeklinde konuştu.”

⁵¹“Kıyafetime dikkat ederim tabii. Sonuçta erkeklerle çalışıyoruz, çok rahat hareket edemiyorum bazen. Etek giyince zor oluyor mesela, bu yüzden bayanlar pantolon giymeyi tercih ederler zaten. Pantolon bana daha nötr geliyor eteğe göre, etek her zaman daha frapandır mesela.”

⁵²“Yani, kendinize dikkat etmek zorundasınız bu kadar erkeğin arasında. İşte, oturmanıza kalkmanıza konuşmanıza falan dikkat etmek zorundasınız. Ben çok kontrollüyümdür bu konularda. Arkadaşlarım beni kendileri gibi görsünler isterim, bir bayan gibi değil de, daha ziyade kendileri gibi bir memur olarak.”

Those who fail to control and make invisible their femininity are categorized as “improper” policewomen. Most of the informants differentiate themselves from some “other” women via a moralistic argument. These “improper” women are said to “use” their femininity for getting favors or to be easily promoted. However, the interviewees stress that they always work hard and try to fulfill the qualifications of policing in the best way possible. As Bora (2005) relevantly reminds, gendered subjectivities of women are discursively constructed through difference not only from men, but also, and perhaps more importantly, from other women. Accordingly, in this case, gendered subjectivities of the policewomen are discursively constructed through the binary opposition between proper and improper women. This is evident in the remarks of Zübeyde:

Not everyone is the same, of course. There might be some female colleagues who, unlike us, do not know how to behave properly. I do not want to put it that way but these women might seem flighty.

-Well, can you open up what you mean by this?

Well, I do not know, sometimes there might be some improper things here. Some cries loud laughs and wears exaggerated make-up. This is a matter of preference. For instance, I am really careful about all these matters and try to behave properly. As I said, some women officers behave inappropriately and I do not approve such manners although these women might be advantaged in the end.⁵³ (İstanbul, April 2008)

What is implied here is that these improper women express or highlight something that should be repressed, namely female sexuality. As Acker (1990) observes, female sexuality is marginalized and suppressed within the masculinist dynamics of gendered organizations. Accordingly, women in the police force are supposed to disguise their sexual potential. The account of Ayşe constitutes a good example in this regard:

⁵³ “Herkes bir değil tabii. Bizim gibi olmayan, nerde nasıl davranacağını bilmeyen arkadaşlarımız da olabiliyor. Tabii böyle söylemek istemem ama daha hafifmeşrep kaçabiliyor bu arkadaşlar.”
Nasıl yani? Biraz açabilir misiniz? “İşte ne bileyim, hoş olmayan şeyler olabiliyor zaman zaman. Kimisi böyle bir ortamda bağırarak kahkaha atar, makyajını abartır falan. Bu tercih meselesi sonuçta, ben mesela çok dikkat ederim, en doğru şekilde davranmaya çalışırım. Ama dediğim gibi hoş olmayan hareketleri olabiliyor bazı bayan arkadaşların, sonuçta onlar karlı çıksa da ben tasvip etmiyorum tabii.”

Not every woman here is the same. There are some flirtatious women whose hormones are uncontrollable. One would thrive and be advantaged if she is good at giving a lap dance. And, such women officers would be promoted and supported in any case.⁵⁴(Ankara, April 2007)

Thus, the sexual connotations of their femininity are disregarded. It is tamed and become controllable as the femininity of a group of decent women. This is because that their presence as a bunch of women in the male-dominated world of policing creates a discernable contradiction. Their difference cannot be ignored as it is embodied and embroiled in their very physical existence, namely in their feminine body. This means that they carry their body as a mark of their difference and this difference cannot be denied as it is what defines their position within the police force.

What is done here is that this difference is defined in terms of certain feminine traits like compassion, care, empathy, and better skills for communication. The policewomen are supposed not to express their femininity in a way that would undermine this definition as well as the way of acting that it necessitates. Thus, the approval of their difference is noticeably conditional. It is acceptable as long as it is performed and expressed, and thus made visible within certain boundaries and under clearly defined conditions. As is delineated in the preceding section, the policewomen are expected to perform their gender difference under certain circumstances like helping the people, dealing with children, and acting as the friendlier face of the police force.

⁵⁴ “Buradaki her kadın da bir değil. Başı götü oynayanlar da var, hormonları çok çalışan da var. Zaten başın götün oynuyorsa, kucak dansını iyi yapıyorsan sırtın yere gelmez. Öyle ya da böyle getirirler böyle kadınları bir yere.”

CHAPTER 4

THE POLICEWOMEN AT THE STAGE: A CASE OF ASSIMILATION

The primary aim of this chapter is to discuss whether the presence of women initiates a change in the masculinist organization of policing. In the background of this analysis lies a prominent question that is asked by Brown (2006), namely “Do female staff and clients of state bureaucracies transform the masculinism of bureaucracy or reiterate it, becoming servants disciplined and produced by it?” (p.191). Drawing upon this question, this chapter endeavors to see whether the policewomen question and transform, or uphold and reconfirm the masculinist parameters of policing.

The main argument of this chapter is that the policewomen embrace and reproduce the masculinist constitution of policing. That is to say, they are assimilated into the male-dominated universe of policing. They normalize and internalize its masculinist norms and practices. Moreover, they identify their own position via its masculinist terms. In other words, in this chapter, it is asserted that the policewomen adhere to the masculinist conception of policing and they self-identify themselves through the ensuing masculinist discourse which marginalizes and subjugates women. Thus, it is proposed that they are transformed by policing, rather than vice versa.

To clarify, this chapter first looks at the policewomen’s self-perception about their potential to create a transformation within the police force. They target the individual policemen, but not the general functioning of the police force as an object of change. This is because that they are content with the present organization of the police force. They take its masculinist and hierarchical structure as the norm that can not be challenged. To add, they are also satisfied with the ineffective position that is ascribed to

them. They believe that they do not have a space to express their femininity in the way they like. To the contrary, they feel that they have become similar to their male colleagues in their daily practices of policing. Thus, what is at issue is a process of transformation through which they become masculinized.

This inquiry is succeeded by a discussion on the discourse of professionalism. It is shown that the policewomen normalize and justify their own assimilation and subordination within policing through the seemingly gender-neutral discourse of professionalism. They believe that there is neither gender discrimination nor special treatment for the female police officers. However, as this discourse is further analyzed, its gendered, and indeed masculinist nature is uncovered. This is because that they define female nature as inherently sinister, and they discursively represent themselves as well as other women via this sexist perspective. Relying on this analysis, it is stated that they do not have a concern or sensibility about women's subjugated position in the police force. There surges no agenda in their discourse concerning the commonality of policewomen's problems or experiences. In consequence, it seems a legible fact that the policewomen reconstitute the masculinism of policing and thus, their presence cannot be translated into an agency to undermine it.

A Narrative of Transformation: Masculinized Women in Policing

As is explicated in the previous chapter, the policewomen adopt the masculine norms of policing in order to prove their competence as police officers. They also internalize the way their feminine identity is depicted as a difference that should be either conditionally approved or disguised. Their gender identity as women is constructed on the basis of certain feminine traits like tenderness, care, compassion, and understanding. Accordingly, the importance they attribute to their own position in policing is in line

with this gender identity. In other words, the meaning they ascribe to their role is formulated via masculinist lenses. It is primarily defined as helping to create a more proper working environment which is also welcoming for the citizens. Their self-representation as such can be clearly observed in their responses to the question “For you, what are the contributions you/women make to policing?” They propose that their primary contribution is the creation of a more clean and tidy working environment.

To specify, in their accounts, the emphasis is put on their almost natural disposition to care for and improve the conditions within which they work or live. This is best exemplified in the statement of Arzu:

The settings where women work are cleaner. This is because that men are more watchful about their manners and the environment is kept more tidy by women. Therefore, at first glance when you enter a police station you can understand whether a female officer works there.⁵⁵(İstanbul, May 2007)

The informants generally believe that their most significant contribution is that they embellish the environment of policing. However, it deserves attention that they do not say anything about their role in more important aspects like the decision making process. What is implied here is that the policewomen do not see themselves as the actors who have a say in the functioning of the police force. In contrast, they perceive themselves as doing a job that complements the work of policemen. That is to say, those who take and implement the decisions are the men, whereas the policewomen are given less important duties like the maintenance of a more proper working atmosphere.

⁵⁵“Yani, kadınların olduğu yer daha temiz oluyor. Çalışma açısından, erkekler daha bir çeki düzen veriyorlar kendilerine, çünkü bir kere bir kadın eli değişiyor etrafa, daha bir derli toplu oluyor etraf. Girdiğinizde hemen anlayabilirsiniz zaten bir karakolda bayan memur çalışıp çalışmadığını.”

Consequently, they express a feeling of satisfaction when their male colleagues recognize their presence. However, this does not mean that they are appreciated as competent police officers. Even a trivial indication that their presence is respected by the policemen makes these women feel pleasant. For instance, it is a recurrent theme in the interviews that the policemen are more attentive and polite in their presence. They acknowledge that their male co-workers attempt to curse less when there are women around. As Gülseven states:

Of course, there are certain advantages, aren't there? I think women create many advantages. For instance, it is easier to maintain the order in a police station when there are two female officers there. In such a case, policemen care more about their appearance and they make an effort to speak properly. Although they slang and curse with other men, they try to avoid from such a style of talking when women officers are around.⁵⁶(İstanbul, May 2008)

As is crystallized in this excerpt, the policewomen maintain that they have a positive impact on individual male officers. Nevertheless, there is a noticeable tension in their discourse about their potential to generate a meaningful transformation in the police organization. Their influence is limited to their male colleagues and therefore, they cannot initiate a change in the essential dynamics of the police force. At this point, a theme of transformation comes to the forefront in their accounts. They extensively talk about how they are changed by policing, rather than vice versa. Almost all of my interviewees explicitly tell that they have become “masculinized”. This means that their manners, gestures, and even in some cases, posture have been turned out to be similar to their male co-workers'. The account of Melike can be taken as a relevant example:

⁵⁶ “Tabii, faydası olmaz olur mu? Bayanların çok faydası var bence. Mesela bir karakolda iki tane bayan polis oldu mu, o karakolda disiplin daha kolay oluyor. Erkekler kendilerine, traşına, bakımına daha bir özen gösteriyor. Konuşmasında daha dikkatli, kendi aralarında olsa icabında konuşmaları argo oluyor, küfürlü oluyor. Ama bayan oldu mu daha dikkatli oluyorlar.”

Let me put it that way, I have turned out to be like them. I mean that I have become like a man. I can see this change in the way I walk, I sit, and I talk. Now, I am walking like a man. But, I think this change is natural and unavoidable because I spend all my day with men.⁵⁷ (Kocaeli, April 2007)

In addition, they normalize this assimilation by referring to their marginalized status within policing. For them, assimilation is inevitable since they are the minority and therefore, they have to adapt themselves to the rules and norms of the majority, namely the policemen. This is obvious in the way Zübeyde puts it:

You first come here as a woman but become like a man in the end. For instance, the older sisters here speak rudely like men. Also, there are girls who beat men while they are on patrol. We have to conform to men in such an environment where they are the majority and we are in minority.⁵⁸ (İstanbul, April 2008)

Accordingly, the theme of an almost natural process of transformation is in the foreground of the policewomen's self-representation. They have internalized and successfully performed the masculine traits and attitudes of policing, even to the extent that they might even forget their own femininity in the end. Here, this process of transformation is depicted in a way as if it happens by itself without the conscious efforts and intentions of the policewomen. In other words, this transformation is portrayed as a spontaneous and unintended process, at the end of which they have found

⁵⁷“Şöyle söylüyüm, ben de onlara benzedim sanki. Bir nevi erkek gibi oldum galiba. Farkedebiliyorum bunu kendimde, yürüyüşüm, oturuşum, konuşmam bile değişti. Artık daha böyle erkek gibi yürüyorum. Ama doğal bu bence, bütün gün onlarla oturup kalkınca oluyor böyle.”

⁵⁸“İlk başta bak kız olarak giriyorsun buraya, ama erkek gibi oluyorsun sonunda. burdaki ablalar mesela erkek gibi lanlı lunlu konuşuyor böyle nara atar gibi. Ekiplerdeki kızlar var mesela, arabada gezip adam dövüyorlar. Öyle kızlar da oluyor. Çok erkeğin olduğu bir ortamda onlar bize uyamayacak ki biz onlara uymak zorundasın, biz azınlıktayız çünkü.”

themselves masculinized. This emphasis on the spontaneity of this transformation is explicit in Arzu's remarks:

Actually, we can not femininize the policemen but they make us look like themselves. I have realized that my style of talking and my manners have become like theirs. And, this is something spontaneous, I do not even realize how this change has happened. Even I sometimes forget this. For example, today I am wearing a skirt and my colleagues are laughing at me by saying that "Arzu, you look like a woman now".⁵⁹(İstanbul, May 2007)

However, Birsen defies this masculinization as process of transformation or adaptation. She draws attention to the male-dominated structure of the police organization. Women can survive there as long as they accept its masculinist norms. This implies that incorporation and compliance, rather than resistance, is a plausible strategy of survival for these women. As she bluntly points out:

Let me tell you what happens when one works with men. Nobody is surprised and they might even like if I say "faggot" while talking about a guy here. However, they do not approve if I try to describe him by referring to his character. So, this is a masculine organization and a male-dominated environment, and after you spend some time, you become masculinized. One has to be like a man in order to survive here. Have you ever seen a female officer who wears a skirt? No, you can not. This is because that if she wears it she would take attention and feel that everybody is looking at her. Therefore, the best expression that would describe a woman here is that "she is like a man".⁶⁰(İstanbul, May 2007)

⁵⁹ "Aslında biz onları bayanlaştıramıyoruz, onlar bizi kendilerine benzetiyorlar sonuçta. İşte ne bileyim, bir bakmışım, mesela konuşma tarzım, davranışlarım onlar gibi olmuş. Biz de farketmiyoruz bunu, kendiliğinden oluyor. Yani ben bile unutuyorum bazen, mesela ben bugün etek giydim ya, bana sabahtan beri "aa, arzu, kadına benzemişsin" diyor bizim birimdekiler."

⁶⁰ "Erkeklerle çalışınca ne mi oluyor, işte ben şimdi birinden bahsederken "ibne" dersem, kimse şaşırmaz, hatta hoşlarına gider. Ama "ya işte o şöyle de böyle" biri diye anlatmaya uğraşırsam yadırgarlar. Yani erkek bir kurum burası, erkek egemen bir yer, sen de öyle oluyorsun bir süre sonra. Olmak zorundasın zaten burada var olabilmek için. Hiç etek giyen gördünüz mü, göremezsiniz ki. Çünkü giydiğinizde hemen farklı bakışları üstünüzde hissedersiniz. Zaten nedir, burada bir bayan için sarfedilecek en iyi anlamda söz erkek gibi kızdır."

Birsen's account provides a different perspective to how women are homogenized in policing. While the preceding statements represent and naturalize the assimilation of women as a spontaneous process of transformation, Birsen links it to the male-dominated structure of policing. Furthermore, her narrative reveals that the assimilation of the policewomen can not be grasped merely as an instance of false consciousness. They are well aware of the male-dominated organization of policing. Yet, they have to comply with the ensuing masculinist rules and practices in order to guarantee themselves a secure place. As she says, women "have to" become masculinized within the universe of policing. Taken together with the previous accounts, it emerges that the policewomen manage their delicate position by complying with the sexist norms and practices of policing. However, they differently envisage this experience of masculinization either as an inevitable and normalized process of adaptation or as the only way to maintain their presence within the masculinist context of policing.

The Discourse of Professionalism

It is striking that the policewomen articulate their experience through the seemingly gender-neutral discourse of professionalism. As is the case with Birsen's statement discussed above, the masculinist character of the police force sometimes becomes obvious in the narratives. Yet, they discursively construct their position within the terms of professionalism which creates an appearance of gender neutrality. Similar to what Martin and Jurik (2007) indicate, the policewomen in my study also take elements like performance, success, and motivation as gender-neutral criteria of professionalism. They strive to achieve these criteria in order to self-represent themselves as successful police officers.

The role of gender is portrayed to be minimal in their accounts, whereas effective professional performance is praised as the most important factor that determines their status in policing. To illustrate, they affirm that what matters is not the gender of the officer, but his/her personality and motivation. Didem clearly expresses this idea by saying that:

Let me say this, I think everything depends on the character, rather than the sexuality of the person. We can not say whether women are better or worse in policing. What matters here is that you should be eager and zealous as a police officer. And, this means that you should be a professional.⁶¹(İstanbul, August 2008)

Alike Didem, Zeynep underscores that what is crucial is the character of the person as well as her/his hard work. Here, it is interesting that what these women call “character” is devoid of any content. It is taken to be self-evident as a term that refers to hard-work and motivation. It is isolated from other issues like gender, social class, and ethnicity of the officers. In parallel, it is also disassociated from the unequal relations of power and gender hierarchies in the domain of policing. This entails that the gendered experiences of the policewomen and how they are subjugated within the male-dominated environment are made invisible with this discursive theme of character. This is obvious in the following extract from Begüm:

Honestly, whether the person is a female or male, what counts is the personality. So, I prefer to work with the officers who are diligent unlike those who are inclined to avoid work. What makes an officer, either

⁶¹“Şöyle söylüyüm ben size, bence bayan ya da erkekten ziyade herşey karakter meselesi. Bayanlar illa ki daha iyi ya da kötü yapacak diye birşey yok. Burda esas olan polis olarak istekli olmanız, yeterli gayreti göstermeniz , profesyonel olmanız yani. ”

female or male, successful is the zeal and ambition to work.⁶² (İstanbul, March 2008)

Furthermore, the informants interpret this professional performance simply as “doing what is required”. Following Martin and Jurik (2007), it can be asserted that the policewomen define their own position in terms of “playing by the rules” (p.102). To elucidate, “doing what is required” and “playing by the rules” pertain to their compliance with the orders given by the superiors. In this sense, the basic requirement of policing is the obedience to the orders and rules generated within its hierarchical structure. When asked to elaborate on this notion of professionalism, Arzu points out that:

For us, our job is of utmost priority. There is no difference between men and women on duty. I have to do exactly what is asked me to do, what is required at that moment. If my superior says now to go out and stand over there, I have to obey this order. I can not ask why or I can not object by saying that “oh, it is too hot outside”. This is my job.⁶³ (İstanbul, May 2007)

There is no place for indecision, doubt, or question in policing. There are certain strictly defined rules and the policewomen play by these rules. At this point, it is crucial to underline that their submission is legitimized with the depiction of policing as a duty of pivotal importance⁶⁴. What is at issue here is the security and well-being of the society,

⁶²“Valla aslında kadın olsun, erkek olsun önemli olan o kişinin yapısı, kişiliği aslında. Yani, şimdi ben mesela çalışkan memur severim, öyle kaytaran, sırf iş yapış görünmek için iş yapanlarla çalışmayı sevmem. Kadını da erkeği de başarılı yapan çalışma azmidir, isteyen başarılı olur.”

⁶³“Aslında görev her şeyden önce geliyor bizim için. Görev sırasında da o erkekmiş, bu bayanmış gibi bir şey yok. Görev nasıl gerektiriyorsa, bana ne deniyorsa harfiyen yapmakla yükümlüyüm. Şimdi amirim bana çık, şurada dur dese, durmak zorundayım. Hava sıcak, niye çıkayım, falan diyemem. Benim işim bu.”

⁶⁴ Their portrayal of policing as a duty of considerable significance will be further scrutinized in the succeeding chapter.

thus any hesitance to abide by the orders would lead to a serious drawback. This is noticeable in the following statements of Zübeyde:

One has to forget her femininity on duty. What counts is the order and you have to obey it and you can not say no. This is what we have learned here that the duty has priority over everything else. We work to maintain the security of the nation and we protect the lives and properties of the people. I can not say “I can not do this or that”. Our job requires that you act immediately as you are given an order, you can not hesitate or wait for a second. If you hesitate and do not obey the orders, you will be deflocked.⁶⁵(İstanbul, April 2008)

As is clear above, what professionalism requires is that these women give utmost priority to policing over any other concern. They conceive that they serve such a vital duty that does not tolerate any question or pause. All in all, it seems that the policewomen normalize the hierarchical functioning of the police force as well as their own place within this hierarchy through the discourse of professionalism. In their opinion, it is implausible to question or resist the orders that are dictated by their superiors. To put it in other words, for them, compliance with the commands and adherence to hierarchy is the core of policing. Therefore, not only non-conformance, but even a minute hesitance or doubt would risk their policing career.

Policing as a Gender-Neutral Realm

What is more, this ensuing discourse of professionalism also shapes the interviewees’ response to the question “Do you think there is gender discrimination against women in the police force?”. They express that they are treated in equal terms with their male

⁶⁵“Yani, orda unutmak zorundasın görev başında olduğunda bayanmışsın diye. Orda önemli olan sana verilen emir, sana bunu mu yap diyorlar, yapmak zorundasın, düşünüp de hayır efendim deme hakkın yok. Bir de, zaten öyle öğreniyorsun, görev her şeyden önce gelir. orda vatanın, milletin güvenliğini sağlıyoruz, canını, malını koruyoruz. Benim bunu yapamam deme lüksüm yok yani, beni aşar tam o noktada. Bir saniyelik bir duraklama bile kaldırmaz bizim yaptığımız iş, biraz daha düşüneyim derken sicilinizi yakarsınız.”

colleagues. They once again emphasize the notions of professional performance and personal motivation as the sole factors that determine the treatment of an officer as well as her/his chance for promotion. Hence, as Heidensohn (2002) pinpoints, it seems that these gender neutral notions “act both as a ladder and shield for them in their careers” (p.146). In other words, the policewomen explain their current status as well as project their future in policing via the gender neutral terms of professionalism.

A female police officer is accepted as a successful officer and she can climb up to the higher ranks as long as she works hard. Also, she should avoid from anything that might lead to the impression that she is not eager to work. For instance, when asked about the assignment of women to the office duties, İnci Aksoy, a prominent top-ranked female officer, says that:

That’s not the case. We have many female officers actively working. For the first time in Turkey I was assigned as the chief police officer of a town. In 1992, I worked as a chief police office of Sarıyer for one and half a year. I was in charge for all kinds of security matters there both judicially and administratively at the first rank. The point is that if you really want to and if you have no objection to the task given to you, if you do not think like “I am a woman, how can I do it”, being a woman does not hinder your rank, promotion and employment.⁶⁶ (Bilgiç, 2005)

Similarly, Melike underlines that there is no gender discrimination within the police force in terms of assignment of duties. Here, she talks against the widely held idea that the policewomen are mostly given secretarial duties. As opposed to this conviction, she argues that women are ascribed to all kinds of policing duties on the condition that they are genuinely willing to work:

⁶⁶“Böyle değil. Bizde de çok aktif görevlerde kadın polisler var. Türkiye’de ilk defa bir ilçe emniyet amirliği bana verildi mesela. 1992 yılında, bir buçuk yıl Sarıyer İlçe Emniyet Amiri olarak görev yaptım. Yani hem adli hem idari, oradaki asayişle ilgili tüm konulardan birinci derecede sorumluydum. İşin özü şu; siz istiyorsanız, itirazınız yoksa, size verilen görevlere “Ben bayanım, nasıl yapacağım” demiyorsanız, bayan olmanız rütbenizi, terfinizi, görevinizi engellemiyor”.

People might think that women in the police force are always assigned to secretarial work. However, there is really no such kind of discrimination in our organization. I can stand guard if there is a need for this. What matters is that one should not avoid to work by coming up with excuses all the time. So, I can not say that women officers always do office work.⁶⁷ (Kocaeli, April 2007)

Parallel to the insight provided in the previous chapter, their femininity is again envisaged as a difference that should be hidden or that at least should not be marked within the domain of policing. In their discourse, it is implied that there are some women who fail to conceal their femininity as they always come up with excuses. The assignment of women to office duties does not indicate a systematic policy or a structural pattern in the police organization. Rather than linking this issue to the male-dominated constitution of the police force, the policewomen explain it in terms of the failure of some women to manage their femininity as a difference.

In line with the absence of gender discrimination, the policewomen also insistently highlight that there is no favoritism in the police force with regard to gender. That is to say, there is neither favoritism nor special treatment for women. To the contrary, they are expected to achieve all the requirements of police work just like their male colleagues. The way Dilek expresses this idea is telling:

What is important for us is the duty. So, it does not matter whether you are a woman or man when you are on duty. There is no special treatment for women. One of our friends was seven months pregnant and she was given a duty to direct the traffic in one of the central places in Ankara. When she said to her superior that there was a risk for miscarriage, he

⁶⁷“Şey gibi bir imaj olabiliyor insanların kafasında, işte teşkilattaki kadınlar hep sekreteryaya işlerinde çalışıyor. Halbuki, bizim teşkilatta gerçekten öyle bir ayrımcılık yoktur. Kapıda nöbet tutulacaksa ben de tutarım yani. Önemli olan sürekli bahane bulup işten kaytarmamak. Yoksa kadınlar hep masabaşı işlere veriliyor diye birşey söyleyemem.”

replied that “Did you ask my permission when you got pregnant?”, so she had to do this duty.⁶⁸(İstanbul, June 2008)

As is delineated in the preceding chapter, the theme of sameness plays a central role in the discursive construction of their subjectivity. The interviewees underscore that they can achieve their duties in the same terms with the men, and they prove such a sameness by performing the kind of masculinity that is promoted in policing. Here, it is obvious that the emphasis on the absence of favoritism reinforces this theme of sameness. While they talk about their own professional performance in the previous accounts, now what is at issue is the way they are treated within the police organization. They believe that they are treated in the same terms with the men, as is put by Zeynep:

There is no favoritism for women here. I am treated in the same way with a policeman. I am given exactly the same duties with him, not more, not less. It is generally believed that women police are favored and they not given demanding duties. Yet, I definitely do not agree with this. There are many women officers who stand guard in front of police stations. So, what are we gonna say about this, then?⁶⁹(İstanbul, May 2007)

At this point, it is crucial to note how the policewomen are perceived and treated by their male colleagues. The attitudes of the policemen can be described as contradictory. This is because that they approach the policewomen as their “sisters” (“bacı”), yet at the same time they behave inimically. In her account, Begüm underlines this protectionist approach of the policemen:

⁶⁸“Önemli olan hep görev. Yani erkekmiş bayanmış görev sırasında hiç farketmiyor. Bayanmış diye özel muamele yok yani. Bizim bir arkadaş mesela genelkurmay kavşağında trafiğe vermişlerdi, kız 7 aylık hamile, gidiyor amirine, “amirim benim düşük tehlikem var” diyor. Amiri de “bana mı sordun hamile kalırken” diyor yani, düşün artık.”

⁶⁹ “Bizde kayırmacılık yok hiçbir anlamda bayanlara karşı. Bir erkek arkadaşına nasıl davranılıyorsa bana da öyle davranılıyor. Ona ne iş veriliyorsa bana da aynısı veriliyor. Ne eksik, ne fazla. Mesela derler işte kadınlar kayırılıyor, onlara ağır iş verilmiyor diye. Ben kesinlikle katılmıyorum, karakollarda kapıda nöbet tutan bir sürü bayan arkadaşlarımız var, buna ne diyeceğiz o zaman?”

Men are generally protective towards their female colleagues. They always keep an eye on policewomen, call them sisters.⁷⁰(İstanbul, March 2008)

As the metaphor “sister” connotes, the policewomen are positioned in a category of women who are stripped of their sexuality and who should be protected, especially in such a realm that is populated by men. Furthermore, in this depiction too, the nature of men and women are defined via dualistic and essentializing terms. For instance, while it is assumed that men are inherently inclined to protect and support women, it is normalized that women are dependent upon such a protection. This assumption is put into words by Seçil as such:

Our male friends here always protect us. They are usually inclined to protect, it is their instinct to safeguard women, take women under their wings. And, of course, to know that you are protected by somebody makes you feel safe.⁷¹(Ankara, July 2008)

However, such a paternalistic treatment goes hand in hand with their sometimes inhospitable attitude towards the policewomen. While the men undertake the most demanding duties, women are given the easiest tasks and yet, they are all equally paid.

Zeynep narrates this perception in the following terms:

Usually, they might feel jealous. Some colleagues say that “you do not work as much as we do, yet you take the same paycheck”. They talk as if women officers always avoid to work but this is not true. We just do what we are asked to do, what our duty requires.⁷² (İstanbul, May 2007)

⁷⁰“Tabii, erkekler hep korumacı olur bayanlara karşı, bayan meslektaşına karşı. Hep korurlar, bacı derler.. o kardeşidir artık.”

⁷¹“Buradaki erkek arkadaşlar bizi hep korurlar. Genelde hep öyle bir koruma şeyleri vardır, içgüdü bu tabii, kadına sahip çıkma, kol kanat germe. Tabii, korunduğunu bilmek insana ayrı bir güven veriyor.”

⁷² “Genelde çekememezlik oluyor. Siz de bizimle aynı maaşı alıyorsunuz, ama aynı işi yapmıyorsunuz der kimi arkadaşlar. Sanki bayanlar her fırsatta işten kaçıyormuş gibi lanse ediyorlar ama hiç değil aslında. Ne iş verilirse, görev neyi talep ederse aynen yapıyoruz biz de.”

Thus, it can be argued that the policewomen discursively represent themselves with reference to these ambivalent perceptions and expectations of the male police officers. They are satisfied with their portrayal as “sisters” and pleased with the ensuing paternalistic treatment. However, at the same time, they counteract the reactions of the policemen with their recourse to the discourse of professionalism. That is to say, they challenge the negative perception of the policemen by underlining that they accomplish all the requirements of police work and prove their capability as ordinary police officers.

No More Women in Policing

As is elaborated above, the policewomen identify their position via the terms of the discourse of professionalism. They believe that whether an officer is a woman or a man does not influence her/his status and upward mobility in policing. For them, women officers do not suffer from discrimination because they are treated in equal terms with their male colleagues.

However, despite its supposedly gender-neutral character, the discourse of professionalism is deeply gendered. To clarify, its gendered nature in general and masculinist character in particular, becomes apparent as the interviewees are asked “Do you think there is a need for more women in policing? Do you want to see more women around as your colleagues?” When their negative responses are scrutinized, it is seen that they embrace the masculinist discourse, at the heart of which lies a malign depiction of female nature. In their discourse, women are represented to be inherently sinister and hostile to each other. As a result, there emerges no concern or sensitivity about policewomen’s commonalities or shared experiences.

Interestingly, most of the policewomen are initially hesitant to respond to these questions. They think that they do not have the authority to reply. Therefore, they point

out the higher authorities as the addressee of these questions. As is clear in the following statements of Zeynep and Ahu:

I do not know, actually, this is not something we can know. We need to ask our superiors because they would decide what is the need and they would make the right decision.⁷³ (İstanbul, May 2007)

What matters here is to decide how many women are needed, rather than whether or not I want to see more women. Yet, of course, this is not something that I can know, those at the top make the decision. What I want is nothing to do with this issue.⁷⁴ (İstanbul, June 2008)

Here, it is striking that these women do not perceive themselves as the author of an issue, of which they are the subjects. This means that they do not see themselves authorized to speak and decide about the issue of their position within policing. With the expressions “büyüklerimiz” (“*our superiors*”) “yukarıdakiler” (“*those at the top*”), they address to those who hold the power out there to decide how many women should be recruited into policing and under what conditions. Moreover, by taking a closer look at these excerpts, it can be captured that the informants see themselves as being positioned at the bottom of an entity that is vertically organized. The decisions are taken at the top and they are obliged to implement these decisions at the bottom. As is delineated above, they think that obedience to the commands of their superiors lies at the heart of policing and here, they normalize this hierarchical organization by de-authorizing themselves.

It is worthy of attention that those women who hold relatively more power compared to the rank-and-file female officers also de-authorize themselves by referring

⁷³“Bilmiyorum, yani aslında bu bileceğimiz birşey değil. Büyüklerimize sormak lazım, onlar ne kadar ihtiyaç varsa, artık durum neyse en doğru kararı verirler.”

⁷⁴“Burada bence esas olan benim istememden ziyade ne kadar bayana ihtiyaç olduğu. Ama tabii bunu ben bilemem, yukarıdakiler bilir, onlar zaten karar verir. Benim ne istediğimin bir ilgisi yok yani.”

to the “needs” of the police force. As two prominent women within the world of policing put it:

Of course the number of the women is less compared to that of men. That means they do not employ female officers that are required. Thereby the chance of promotion is less since our number is little. Otherwise, the process of rising rank is not different with men and women. If you work hard, if you do not have any obstacle or if there is nothing in your criminal past man or woman, everyone has the opportunity to gain the same positions.⁷⁵ (Bilgiç, 2005)

The woman are represented in small numbers in all kinds o professions. The police also employ officers according to the need of the police organization.⁷⁶ (Ercan, 2001)

Interestingly, even these women, who hold a greater share of police power, do not utter an assertive word about the employment of female officers. They isolate themselves from such a decision process by highlighting the general “needs” of the police organization. These needs are associated with the general dynamics of the police force and thus, they are conceived to be independent of the individual concerns and problems of the officers. Although it is unclear by whom and according to what criteria they are defined, these women espouse such needs without any question or doubt.

Nonetheless, when I further ask the interviewees to elaborate on this issue, almost all of them reply that there is no need for more women in the police force. The primary reason is that women are intrinsically more prone to gossip and jealousy. As Selma puts it:

⁷⁵ “Tabii erkek sayısına göre bayanların sayısı az. Yani gerektiği kadar kadın polis alınmıyor. Dolayısıyla sayımız erkek meslektaşlarımıza göre daha az olduğu için yükselme sayısı da az oluyor. Yoksa rütbe alabilmek bayanlarda ayrı, erkeklerde ayrı değil. Azmedip çalışırsanız, herhangi bir cezanız, engeliniz yoksa bayan, erkek fark etmiyor herkes aynı konuma gelebiliyor.”

⁷⁶ “Kadınlar, tüm meslek gruplarında az sayıda temsil ediliyorlar. Poliste de teşkilâtın ihtiyacına göre kadın polis alınmıyor.”

To be honest, I do not want more women officers here because of gossip. There is more gossip, envy, and ambition where there are more women in a place. So, here I am ok this way.⁷⁷ (Ankara, July 2008)

They believe that women are innately more disposed to envy, tittle-tattle, and intolerance, and this implies a malevolent nature of women. As is discussed above in various cases, a dualistic understanding of the nature of women and men is prevalent in the self-representation of the policewomen. This is evident in the response given by Ayşe:

I do not want because women would be a hunch on the organization, so there is no need for more women. We are more inclined to something like gossip and envy. I myself know that even I feel envy if there is a woman who is more beautiful and well-groomed than I am. But let ask a man here, we will see that they would not feel the same way. For example, they are not inclined to gossip like we do.⁷⁸ (Ankara, April 2007)

The interviewees associate female nature with such malign attributes as jealousy and gossip. In so doing, they degrade female nature, whereas they exalt male nature through benevolent terms. Accordingly, it is apparent that they idealize the current status of women in policing. They assume that there is a harmony within the police force with this limited number of women. For this reason, any increase in the number of women recruits would lead to serious problems. The following account of Begüm presents a good example of these problems:

We are two female officers here and it is ok in this way. There is more envy when there are more women. This happened to me once, women

⁷⁷“Burada daha fazla kadın istemem açıkçası çünkü hemen dedikodu oluyor. Kadınların daha çok olduğu yerde dedikodu olur, çekememezlik, hırs olur. Böyle rahatım yani.”

⁷⁸“İstemem çünkü bayanlar teşkilatın kamburu olur, gerek yok. Biz bazı şeylere daha meyilli oluyoruz. Daha fazla dedikodu, kıskançlık oluyor mesela. Bir de kendimden biliyorum, ben bile burada benden daha güzel, daha bakımlı biri olunca kıskanırım. Ama buradaki herhangi bir erkeğe soralım, onlarda böyle birşey yok. Bizim gibi dedikoduya meraklı değiller mesela.”

officers blamed each other by saying that “you did not do this, but I did”. And, this harms the peace and creates trouble there.⁷⁹ (İstanbul, March 2008)

Parallel to this depiction of ordinary women officers, high-ranked women are also casted in a negative light in the accounts of the informants. They are asked questions concerning those women who hold superior positions and whether they want to see more women as their superiors. Their responses reveal that they internalize the way power is envisaged in policing, namely as an extension and reflection of masculinity. They normalize the association of authority with masculinity. In other words, it is natural for men to hold power as they know how to exercise it, whereas women are not suited for such power positions. Such a dissociation between authority and femininity is obvious in the remarks of Melike:

I think that women do not know what to do when they hold a high-ranking position. They get confused in such a position because they are not used to it. Usually, women get spoiled when they hold authority.⁸⁰ (Kocaeli, April 2007)

Female superiors cannot effectively direct the power at their disposal. As a result, they can be even harsher towards rank and file female police officers. The following statement of Sevgi constitutes a relevant example:

Our female superiors treat us badly to make themselves feel satisfied. So, I think that women can not hold power. And, I am not taking the exam to be promoted because I do not want to be like them. They try to impose their own ideas to you when they have power. And, they also do not empathize with our feminine problems. This is because that she was not tolerated in the past and she does not know what to do when she is promoted.

⁷⁹ “Biz burada 2 bayan arkadaşız, gayet de iyi bu şekilde. Daha fazla kadın olunca daha fazla kıskançlık oluyor tabii. Yani, daha önce benim de başıma geldi, sen göreve gitmedin, ben gittim, sen şunu yaptın, ben yapmadım falan hep mesele oluyor kadınlar arasında. Bu da tabii huzur bozucak bir durum, gerginlik yaratır olmadık yerde.”

⁸⁰ “Bence bayanlar ne yapacaklarını şaşırıyorlar amir olunca, alışık olmadıkları için bocalıyorlar yani. Genelde bayanlar söz sahibi olduğunda daha böyle artist olurlar falan.”

So, it is not that she would sympathize with you just because she is a woman.⁸¹(Ankara, July 2008)

As is evident here, the mere fact that the superior is a female does not guarantee that she would be more sensitive and helpful towards her female inferiors. Such a women-friendly attitude would mean that they cannot successfully manage their femininity within the masculine domain of policing. Anything that makes their femininity visible is disapproved as it would juxtapose their hardly-won power position in policing. For this reason, they endeavor to prove their competence and maintain their status by distancing themselves from their female colleagues. And, they eliminate any possibility of solidarity with them. That is to say, they identify themselves not with other policewomen, but with the masculinist organization of policing.

This distance and even hostility between these women cannot be understood from an essentialist perspective of gender. In this respect, the mere fact that they are all women does not automatically lead to a formation of solidarity among them. As Nelson (1996) puts it, “the validity of assumed female solidarity based on gender alone in the light of the diversity of women’s life experiences, mediated by other factors such as race, class, sexuality, age, etc.” should be severely questioned (p.144). Accordingly, it can be seen that the policewomen are differentiated on the basis of their access to policing power and by their persistent effort to preserve this power.

Therefore, there is almost no place in the agenda of the interviewees for the common concerns and problems of the policewomen. As is discussed above, they devote

⁸¹“Bayan amirler egolarını tatmin etmek için çok kötü davranırlar. Yani, bayandan otorite olmaz (gülüyor). Ben sırf bu yüzden sınavlara girmiyorum, çünkü çizgimi kaybetmek istemiyorum. Öyle olunca hep kendi fikirlerini enjekte etmeye çalışıyorlar. Bir de mesela kadınsal hiçbirseyden anlamıyorlar. Kendisi bunu görmemiş zamanında, sonra amir olunca ne yapacağımı bilemiyor. Yani bayan diye size sempati duyar, işte anlar falan diye birşey asla yok.”

all their attention and effort to the maintenance of the prevalent masculinist norms and hierarchical relations within policing. Thus, it can be argued that their potential to dispute and change the masculinist parameters of policing is seriously limited.

Furthermore, this conclusion is discernibly in line with a well-founded and validated argument that policing transforms women, rather than vice versa (Silvestri, 2007; Brown, 1996; Herbert 2001b). It has been appropriately stated that simply increasing the female recruits is not adequate for defying the masculinist structure of policing. As Silvestri (2007) properly utters,

To achieve meaningful change within policing, we have to think beyond the numerical. Recruitment of more women, although welcome, will not in and of itself impact upon the deep-rooted gendered assumptions that policing is based upon (p.54).

This indicates that women are more likely to be altered by their policing practices than changing the police organization unless the masculinist structure and culture of policing is undermined. It is necessary to undertake radical changes that will question and attack the masculinist foundations of policing. Without such structural and fundamental changes, it seems an ineffective and superficial solution merely to advocate the recruitment of more women to policing.

CHAPTER 5

“WOMEN OF POWER”: A STORY OF EMPOWERMENT

This chapter intends to show how the policewomen are empowered in a realm where state power is articulated with male-dominance through unequal relations of gender. As is discussed in the previous chapters, the policewomen are assimilated into an ineffective position and they adopt the masculinist terms of policing. Nevertheless, the goal of this chapter is to propose that the experiences of women in policing cannot be adequately grasped merely as a story of subordination. Despite their experience of subjugation, they carve out a space of empowerment for themselves within the masculinist universe of policing. Hence, what lies at the core of this chapter is the agency of the policewomen and how it is realized via certain possibilities of empowerment.

As is explicated in the third chapter, the policewomen construct their subjectivity via masculinist representations of masculinity and femininity that are prevalent in the world of policing, namely hegemonic masculinity and emphasized femininity. They conform to the norms of hegemonic masculinity in order to prove their sameness with the men. At the same time, they experience their femininity as a difference that should be either disguised or conditionally expressed. Therefore, it is claimed that their self-identification is constituted within the masculinist discursive realm of policing.

Additionally, in the fourth chapter, it is delineated that the policewomen do not dispute and change masculinist parameters of the police force. Rather, they adapt to its male-dominated organization and embrace the restricted role attributed to them. Thus, it is asserted that they uphold and reconstitute masculinism of the police force within which they are reduced to a secondary position.

What emerges from the analyses up until this point is a picture of subordination. However, the subjectivities and experiences of the policewomen can not be understood solely as a case of subjugation. Inspired by Bora's insightful analysis, it seems also crucial to look at the space of action the policewomen engrave for themselves. In her study on female houseworkers, Bora (2005) focuses on how their subjectivities are constructed through unequal relations of power and gender. She argues that this can not be grasped without taking into account the agency of these women. That is to say, although they are subordinated and exploited in many regards, they are subjects with agency who can create certain possibilities of empowerment for themselves. Following her analysis, I suggest that the policewomen can be seen as active subjects who carve out a space of empowerment for their own advantage.

Accordingly, the objective of this chapter is to capture the multi-faceted dynamics of the empowerment of the policewomen. It is claimed that they can be plausibly characterized as "women of power". This characterization refers to their empowerment as agents of masculinist state power. They are empowered as agents who hold institutionalized masculine power as well as state power, and these two are inextricably interwoven within the context of policing. Therefore, how the policewomen are empowered as "women of power" can be understood along two main axes. On the first axis, it is suggested that they are empowered as individual women in their encounters with men. This is because that they deploy the masculinist power as it is institutionalized in policing against individual men. Furthermore, on the second axis, it is argued that the policewomen are empowered as state officials in their confrontation with the rest of the society. In that way, they distinguish themselves as special state

agents who perform a duty of utmost importance. And, they open up a space of empowerment and intervention over against the society through such a subject position.

Such a point of view refrains from reducing the complicated and sometimes contradictory experiences of the policewomen to victimization. In this inquiry, they are not treated as victims who are imposed to, and thereby, have no say in the macro processes. Rather, their agency is given due recognition with the special emphasis on empowerment. Hence, it is proper to portray the policewomen as “women of power” throughout the rest of this chapter. In the first section, their empowerment against men is discussed. Following this analysis, in the second section, how they are empowered as state agents is examined. However, at this point, it should be noted that this specific experience of empowerment is not exclusive to the policewomen. That is to say, this study does not claim that only the female police officers are empowered as state subjects in their confrontation with the society. What is at issue is the position of power that is derived from holding and performing state power. Although the policemen as well are empowered as state agents, this study limits its concern to the policewomen and it prefers to concentrate on their empowerment experience as state subjects.

“Women of Power” against Men

A recurrent theme of individual empowerment is one of the most important corner stones of the policewomen’s self-representation. They are empowered as strong and self-confident women who can challenge individual men’s power. When they are asked about the advantages policing brings to them, the informants underline that thanks to their access to policing power, they can successfully stand up to the men who harass them. At this point, it deserves attention that the configuration of this narrative of empowerment is almost the same in their accounts. To demonstrate, all these incidents

take place outside the work and when they wear plain clothes. As a result, the men who disturb them do not know that these women are police officers, yet they learn this as the women reveal their identity in order to defend themselves. And, what happens in the end is that the women resort to their policing power as a way to defy and intimidate the harassers. In this regard, Zeynep's account is a good example:

Once, something like that has happened. I was driving in Etiler. Again a man was driving me into a corner, making faces, he was staring at me. Anyway I saw that he would keep on doing this, I smiled and winked at him and made him stop and pull of the road. As we both stopped he came along the car at once. I open up the window and asked what the matter was. He replied that he could not always see the women like me on the way and he was fascinated and then offered me a drink. I answered back saying that I was going to work and if he followed me we could have a drink at the café. He, poor fool, imagining that I would accept his offer, became delighted and followed me eagerly. I drove directly to the nearest police station and stopped there. Of course he was surprised and when me showing my id, said that I worked there, he turned pale. I dressed him down saying that he should be ashamed of himself disturbing female drivers, what would happen if the same thing was done to his mother or sister... and added that I did not take him in for that time for which he should be grateful; however if this thing repeated again I would be a policewoman then. He threw himself at my feet and after scolding him I let him go.⁸²(İstanbul, May 2007)

As is clear in her statement, Zeynep still thinks that she makes a favor to the man by not completely using her policing power. Here, policing power refers to her legitimate

⁸²“Şöyle bir şey geçmişti başımdan. Etilerdeyim, arabayla gidiyorum. Gene bir adam, sıkıştırıyor, garip garip yüz hareketleri falan yapıyor, beni kesiyor aklınca. Neyse ben baktım bu böyle devam edecek gülümseyip kenara çek işareti yaptım. Bir durduk, hemen geldi arabanın yanına. Açtım camımı, ne vardı dedim. O da, trafikte her zaman sizin gibi kadınları görmüyoruz, çok etkilendim, tanışıp birşeyler içebilir miyiz dedi. Ben de tamam, beni takip edin, işyerime gidiyorum, kafeteryada oturup birşeyler içelim dedim. Bu da akıllım, benim onu kabul edeceğimi zannediyor ya, sevindi, beni bi heves takip ediyor (gülüyor). Ben de doğruca en yakın polis merkezinin önüne çektim. Tabii bizimki şaşırıldı, ben de kimliğimi çıkartıp burada çalışıyorum ben deyince tabii renk menk gitti adamda. Utanmıyor musunuz trafikte kadınları rahatsız etmeye, sizin de ananız, kardeşiniz, var, aynı şeyi onlara yapsalar ne olur falan diye bir güzel fırçaladım onu orada, dua edin sizi içeri almıyorum, insanlık yapıyorum, bir daha olursa polisliğimi kullanırım dedim. Bizimki de işte aman bacım, bi eşşeklik ettim, yalvardı yakardı, ben de bir güzel korkuttuktan sonra bıraktım gitti.”

authority to treat the man more severely or to arrest him, and even a reference to this power as such suffices to make the man regret and submit.

Similarly, in her account, Ayşe underlines that she capitalizes on her policing authority to make sure that the man understands his mistake and apologizes. As she puts it,

Anyway, I kept on going and man was following me. At last, I could not stand it and waved my hand meaning come here. He pulled of the road, and as I opened the door, I took him out holding from his throat. Of course he was rocked, and I immediately brought out my id and rested him against the car. I lost my temper and beat him up. He was bewildered, he begged off and kneed before me. I think he learnt his lesson. If I wished I could take him our department and make him worse, but I did not.⁸³(Ankara, April 2007)

Zeynep and Ayşe put the emphasis on the extent to which they use their policing power. For them, it is sufficient to menace the men and they do not want to go further than their individual use of force. However, Arzu goes further and punishes the man with the help of her male colleagues:

For instance, I was going to work at night wearing low-necked dress. I noticed that a guy was staring at me. I looked at him askance and still he was gazing at me. I made him get off and told him that I was a cab. He ignored me although I showed my id. At the moment I was pulling out my gun, I saw that an officer was approaching. I stopped and told the officer that I am also a cab and that man was harassing me with his gaze. The guy objected of course. We brought him to the station and kicked him around. He begged, “sister, I beg you, I will lick your boots, let me go please”. He saw his fault and learnt his lesson, he possibly won’t do again.⁸⁴(İstanbul, May 2007)

⁸³ “Neyse, ben devam ediyorum, adam da takip ediyor. Sonunda dayanamadım, elimle gelsene şöyle diye bir işaret yaptım. Kenara çekti, kapıyı açtığım gibi boğazından şöyle tutup dışarı çektim. Tabii neye uğradığını şaşırды, hemen kimliğimi gösterdim, tutup arabaya dayadım. Hem kızdım, hem de hırpaladım biraz, tabii afalladı adam, özür diledi, yalvardı. Hayatının dersini almıştır herhalde (gülüyor). İstesem daha da beter ederdim bizim birime götürüp ama yapmadım.”

⁸⁴ “Mesela şey oluyor, ben gece geliyordum işyerine, adamın biri, ben böyle hafif açık giymişim (yakasını gösteriyor). Adamın biri, bana baktığını hissettim. Yana bakıyorum ben, o da bana bakıyor. Adamı

It is interesting that this sense of empowerment is limited to these women's experiences outside the domain of policing. The men against whom they feel stronger are not their male colleagues, but the other men they interact in their daily lives. This is because that, as is elucidated in the preceding chapters, the policewomen espouse the ineffective and secondary role given to them and accept the superior position of the policemen. They see the dominance of the policemen justified and therefore, do not perceive the latter as a group against whom they can fight. To the contrary, they even cooperate with the policemen in their struggle against the other men.

In other words, they feel well-equipped and self-confident as individual women who can confront men on their own. With this sense of empowerment, they discursively construct a position of authority over men except their male co-workers. Unlike the submissive tone of their accounts that are discussed in the previous chapters, they now sound assured, assertive, and empowered through this position of authority.

Moreover, it should be reminded that this authority is derived from policing that is a male-dominated realm. These women use such a kind of masculine power that is materialized in the police force against individual men. They tackle such situations in a way that is promoted in the masculinist terms of policing. That is, they refer to or employ physical power by threatening, intimidating, or treating the men roughly, or by collaborating with the policemen. In this respect, following Cornwall & Lindisfarne (1994) they can be conceived as "agents of state "masculinity"" who deploy the

indirdim, ben polisim dedim. Adam beni sallamıyor, kimliği falan göstermeme rağmen. Tam elimi soktum silahı çıkarıcam artık, ordan baktım bir polis geliyor. Durdurdum, bu adam bana gözle tacizde bulundu, ben de polisim dedim. Adam reddetti tabii. Biz adamı aldık, geldik, sonra da bir temiz dövdük. Adam yalvardı bana, "abla, yalvarıyorum, elini ayağını öpeyim bırak beni" dedi. Anladı yani terbiyesizliğini, iyi ders olmuştur, bir daha yapmaz herhalde."

masculinist power of policing to empower themselves as individual women (p.24). They are the agents who exercise state power that is inseparably interrelated with masculine power in the domain of policing. And, they capitalize on this institutionalized masculine power to undermine individual men's power, which means for their own good.

Moreover, this line of thinking reveals that women, too, can be the agents of the masculinist state power. Therefore, it is once again shown that state power should not be essentialized as men's power. Rather, it should be taken as male/masculine power which women, together with men, share and reproduce.

“Women of Power” vis-à-vis the Society

With regard to the second axis of their empowerment, the policewomen posit themselves as the legitimate holders and embodiments of state power. It seems that they empower themselves as state agents against the society. They construct a subject position as state subjects who unselfishly dedicate themselves to the well-being of the society. In this regard, they attribute a mission of utmost significance to their duty as state officials who work hard to guarantee the prosperity of the society.

To elucidate, the interviewees identify themselves with the state through its discursive distinction from the society. That is, theirs is a position of authority over the society. Moreover, their position is articulated via a sense of distinctiveness and superiority, and that enables them to justify their interventions in the society as state agents. What lies at the heart of this subject position is their representation of the state as a monolithic, unified, and over-powerful entity that stands apart from and above the society, and without which the latter cannot sustain itself. Through such an imagination of the state, they articulate their subject position as distinguished state agents who are entitled to exercise authority over the society.

Hence, what is at issue here is their discursive self-construction as “women of power” in opposition to the society. And, its multi-faceted dynamics can be scrutinized by looking at their perception of the state as well as their self-perception as the privileged state subjects who represent and practice state power.

With this purpose, first it seems necessary to grasp how the policewomen define policing and what meaning they attribute to their own work. As the interviews are analyzed, expressions of discontent and dissatisfaction come to the forefront. When they are asked about their ideas about policing in general, and their particular policing experiences, they extensively talk about the difficulties and challenges of police work. To illuminate, police work is identified as a demanding and arduous occupation owing to long working hours, uncertain and unexpected shifts, and insufficient payment. The informants underline that despite performing a duty that is of considerable significance for the society, the police officers are not given due respect and they are not economically satisfied. Unlike other state officials who have a fixed working schedule and who are paid for their extra work, they achieve very dangerous and crucial tasks under unsatisfying and discouraging working conditions. Didem’s discontent is telling in this respect:

Our working hours are irregular and our salaries are unsatisfactory. What is most challenging is that although we start working on a specified time, the time for the end of the work day is uncertain. An order may be given that we can not leave and we do not know at what time we can go home. And, there are also extra duties like soccer games or public demonstrations. Although we stand there all day, we do not earn extra money. While teachers, for instance, are paid for their extra work, we are not. We protect the lives and properties of the people and stand hours in the winter under the falling snow, or we put our lives in jeopardy when a

dangerous incident takes place. Yet, despite all these we are not paid for it.⁸⁵ (İstanbul, August 2008)

In particular, they highlight the uniqueness of their position by differentiating it from the work of other female state officials. As is clearly seen in Selma's statements:

We are the ones who are most subordinated among the women who work in the state sector. The others have more regular working hours, and they have their rights for weekend holiday and extra pay. But, for instance, I am pregnant and there is a risk of premature delivery, yet I can not receive an early doctor report for this. Can you believe this? I am pregrant yet I am still working and chasing after criminals.⁸⁶ (Ankara, July 2008)

Here, the stress is placed on the remarkably demanding conditions of police work. Via this representation of policing, the policewomen articulate their position as performing such a difficult task that is distinguished from the work of other state officials. In this regard, they prioritize their own work upon the ordinary, yet more comfortable works of the latter.

In close relation to this, the interviewees depict policing as a vital mission for the welfare of the society. As they are further asked how come they endure such difficult conditions, their responses reveal that a sense of mission has a pivotal place in their self-identification. It deserves attention that the expressions of discontent mentioned above are succeeded by their representation of policing as an indispensable and significant

⁸⁵“Çalışma saatlerimiz düzensiz, paramız az. Asıl zorluk da şey oluyor, buraya sabah giriş saatimiz belli ama çıkış saatimiz belli olmuyor. Bir emir geliyor, çıkışlar kalktı diye, ondan sonra artık kaçta gidersen evine belli değil. Bir de mesela ek görevler var, ya maç olur, ne bileyim, miting falan. Bütün gün orada dururuz ama ek ücret almayız. Öğretmenler sınav görevleri için alır mesela, ama biz gidip saatlerce karda, kışta bekleriz halkın canını, malını, ya da işte bir vukuat olur, gidip koştururuz, gerekirse canımızı tehlikeye atarız yani, ama para alamayız.”

⁸⁶ “Kamudaki bayanlar arasında en çok ezilen, göz ardı edilen biziz aslında. Nedir, diğerlerinin işte çıkış saati belli, hafta sonu, ek ücreti, her hakkı var yani. Ama, ben hamileyim, erken doğum yapıcım, erken rapor alamıyorum mesela. Düşünebiliyor musunuz? Hala adam peşinde koşturuyorum, hamileyim, ama hırslının hırsızın derdindeyim. ”

mission. Seçil's account demonstrates how policing is depicted as a necessity for the prosperity of society:

What we are doing is a very important job for everyone. It is like water, like air that is essential, and I am aware of this. For instance, even when a simple incident takes place everybody asks "where is the state, where are the police?" You go to the police when you are hurt, when your possessions are stolen. If everybody thinks this way, they can understand the importance of the police.⁸⁷(Ankara, July 2008)

These women believe that they have a central role in the maintenance of public order and security. Without the state in general and the police in particular as its embodiment, the society cannot even sustain its existence. There would be no mechanism to ensure its most basic necessity, such as the protection of lives and properties of the people. What is striking here is that the police force is identified with the state and it is represented as an entity that meets an almost natural necessity, namely the need for security. This need for security is defined as an essential need for everyone at every level. Police work is naturalized as a requirement for the society to continue its very existence. The statement of Zübeyde presents a relevant example in this respect:

For me, this job is very sacred. It is a great responsibility that the lives, properties, and honor of the people are entrusted to us. It is said on the media that the police beat the citizens and they use gas bombs. However, nobody is aware that there would be bloodshed and insecurity if something happens to the police.⁸⁸(İstanbul, April 2008)

⁸⁷ "Sonuçta çok önemli bir şey yapıyoruz biz herkes için. Bir bakıma su gibi, hava gibi aslında. Olmazsa olmaz, bunun farkındayım ben. En ufak birşey oluyor, herkes nerde bu devlet, nerde bu polis diyor, en basitinden. Canın yanıyor, malın çalınıyor, işte ne olursa polise koşuyorsun hemen. Böyle düşünürse herkes işte o zaman polisin önemini anlarlar."

⁸⁸ "Bu iş çok kutsal bana göre. Halkın canı, malı, namusu bana emanet, ne büyük sorumluluk. Polis şöyle, böyle diyorlar medyada, işte polis adam dövüyormuş, gaz sıkıyormuş. Ama kimse farkında değil, bu polisin başına birşey gelse, ortalık kan gölüne döner, toplumda güvenlik kalmaz."

As is revealed in these accounts, the policewomen portray their policing duty as an almost heroic work without which chaos will prevail in the society. Furthermore, they discursively construct their position in moral terms as the agents who perform such a crucial role for the society. For instance, this moral tone can be noticed in the following extracts from the accounts of Begüm and Dilek:

I really do believe that a helpful person is helped when he needs it. For instance, it comes back to you when you help somebody who comes here or solve a citizen's problem. I like helping people and I put my heart and soul into my work.⁸⁹ (İstanbul, March 2008)

For instance, one day my brother told me that "We sleep at peace thanks to you" and that satisfied me. We work to comfort people. Think why the police stations are open for 24 hours, it is to ensure that nobody's life and property would not be ruined. So, we feel happy even we hear such expressions, believe me that this is true. Look, when I was six months pregnant with my son and I chased after a burglar and he threatens me with a blade. Also, I was on guard duty on patrol when I was eight months pregnant. So, you work to maintain this peace under any circumstances.⁹⁰ (İstanbul, June 2008)

This self-representation as working for such a vital mission gives the policewomen a sense of moral satisfaction. In other words, such a moralistic emphasis lies at the heart of their self-perception as state subjects who occupy a very important role. These women believe that they personally contribute to the higher and almost sacred missions of preserving the order and security of the society, making sure that the people feel safe,

⁸⁹"İyilik yap, geri döner sana derler ya, ben gerçekten inanıyorum buna. Mesela buraya gelene yardımcı olduğunuzda, ya da bir vatandaşın sorununu çözdüğünüzde bu size geri dönüyor. Ben insanlara yardım etmeyi, onlar için canla başla çalışmayı seviyorum."

⁹⁰"Mesela bir gün abim bana "sizin sayenizde rahat uyuyoruz" demişti. Bunu söylemesi bana yetmişti, çünkü biz insanların huzuru için çalışıyoruz. Şimdi, karakollar neden 24 saat açık, düşünsenize. Kimsenin canına, malına zarar gelmesin diye. Yani bunu duyunca bile mutlu oluyoruz, inanın ki böyle. Bakın, mesela ben altı aylık hamileydim oğluma ve o halimle hırsız peşinde koşturdum, adam bir de bana jilet çekti. 8 aylıkken ekipte gece nöbet tutuyordum. Yani, ne durumda olursanız olun bu huzuru sağlamak için çalışıyorsunuz."

and helping them resolve their problems. At this juncture, it seems that this sense of satisfaction by doing something good, significant, and beneficial for the other people makes it possible for them to position themselves as holding a special and incredibly important position against the society.

A Life Devoted to Policing

Such a crucial mission for the well-being of the society requires devotion and commitment on the part of the policewomen. That is to say, a theme of sacrifice recurrently surges in their narratives. They emphasize that they put their personal concerns and demands aside, and content with the difficult life that policing brings about. In other words, the interviewees devote their personal lives, time, and energy to policing that is believed to have a pivotal role in the welfare of the society. Gülseven, who retired after twenty years of service, narrates her policing career as a story of devotion:

My work life was full of hardships. These twenty years passed by with struggles and self-denial. When I look back, I ask myself how I could stand all these difficulties. Yet, ask me how did they pass by? Believe it or not, I always sacrificed myself and my family for my work. The aim was to perform our duty. This is, for instance, was to make a contribution to the society and to make sure that they are safe. Yet, because of this I made many sacrifices, and when I look back, I see that I devoted my life.⁹¹(İstanbul, May 2008)

In Gülseven's account, the mission of policing is given priority over everything. As is obvious in her narrative, it can be asserted that the policewomen constitute their position via a sense of selflessness. This self-denial means that their individuality is overridden

⁹¹“Meslek hayatım hep zorluklarla geçti. Hep mücadele, hep kendimden feragat ederek geçti yani o yirmi yıl. Şimdi bakınca nasıl katlanmışım bunca zorluğa diyorum kendi kendime. Ama tabii nasıl geçtiğini bir de bana sor... İnanır mısınız, hep kendimden verdim, hep feragat ettim, ne bileyim işte kendimden, ailemden. Maksat görevimizi layıkıyla yerine getirmektir, nedir mesela, bir katkıda bulunmak topluma, insanların huzurunu sağlamak, güvende olsunlar. Ama işte bu yüzden çok verdim kendimden, dönüp bakınca hayatımı adanmışım diyorum.”

by, or indeed, sacrificed for the sake of their policing duty. Moreover, they discursively associate this devotion to their femininity, as something unique to women. They believe that women as mothers are intrinsically more inclined to making sacrifices. In contrast, nature of men is tougher and thus, the policemen are less prone to commitment. Ahu constructs her account on the basis of this distinction between women and men:

This job is like marriage. It always demands you to give something, but it does not give anything to you. It does not continue like this. However, we keep it going after a fashion. Very much like in marriage, here it is again women who sacrifice and devote herself. This is in a way about our nature. Because of childcare and our role as housewives, we are more inclined to make sacrifices. This is what motherhood is, you make sure that your child is fed although you yourself are hungry. But, for men, it is the opposite. It is much easier for the men here, too. This is because that it is their nature, there is no need for them to make any sacrifices as women take care of everything under all circumstances.⁹² (İstanbul, June 2008)

In Ahu's discourse, her professional position as a police officer and her domestic role as a mother and wife are defined in the same terms. She likens her professional engagement to her marriage. This is because that her role is defined on the basis of commitment and sacrifice in both of these relationships. To express it differently, she articulates her policing career in terms of her domestic responsibilities as a spouse as well as a mother. As a result, it can be said that the different positions of the policewomen in their professional and private lives are merged together with this emphasis on devotion.

Akin to Ahu's account, the important women figures in policing are represented in the newspapers via the theme of devotion. What is implied here is that they are

⁹²“Yani bu meslek de evlilik ilişkisi gibi. Siz verdikçe istiyor, hiç kendinden vermiyor. İşte böyle yürümez hep. Ama bir şekilde yürüyor işte. Nasıl evlilikte de hep ödün veren, kendini adayan kadın oluyorsa, burada da öyle. Bu biraz bizimle de ilgili yani, yapımız daha müsait, hep işte çocuk bakımı, ev kadınlığı derken müsaitiz yani kendimizden feragat etmeye. Annelik böyledir ya, kendin yemezsin, çocuğuna yedirirsin. Ama erkeklerde tersidir. Buradaki erkekler için herşey daha rahat yani, adamların doğası öyle çünkü, her halükarda kadınlar hallediyor herşeyi, onların birşeylerden vermesine gerek yok ki.”

expected to perform all the responsibilities pertaining both to their professional and personal lives. And, this is only possible with their utmost commitment. As is clear in the following portrayals:

İnci Aksoy, who is a policewoman, a mother and a housewife, is the first woman who is appointed as a chief police officer of a town. Aksoy talked about her experiences in the department and her private life.⁹³ (Bilgiç,2005)

Sanerk whose husband is also a chief police officer explained how she raised two children, cooked for her family, and even sewed dresses for her children despite life's hardship.⁹⁴ (Alanlarında İlk Olan Türk Kadınları, 2007)

Here, it is obvious that their work is self-denying. They work hard to satisfy the requirements of these roles and thereby, their life can be conceived as a constant struggle, as Sanerk puts it, "My life was full of struggles" (*Hayatım hep mücadeleyle geçti*):

-What did attract you in the department? You are married with children and you are struggling...

I gave birth while I was working in the department. Some women have break when they bear a child; however I did not think something like that when I had a child. I mean, I did not say, well I have a child, I will leave work, no. As you said, I started and carried out my struggle.⁹⁵ (Kul & Göçer, 2003)

In other words, success means the miraculous fulfillment of a myriad of responsibilities not only as police officers, but also as mothers and wives. They are expected to dedicate

⁹³ "Polisliği, anneliği ve ev kadınlığını bir arada yürüten İnci Aksoy Türkiye'de ilçe emniyet müdürü olan ilk kadın. Aksoy emniyette yaşadıklarını ve özel hayatını anlattı".

⁹⁴ "Eşi de emniyet müdürü olan Sanerk, meslek hayatının zorluklarına karşın 2 çocuk büyüttiğini, evinin yemeğini yaptığı, hatta kendisi ve çocuklarının elbiselerini bile kendisinin diktiğini anlattı."

⁹⁵ "Sizi bu teşkilatın neyi cazip gelmişti? Evlisiniz, çocuklarınız var ve bir mücadele içerisindeyiz..." "Ben emniyette çalıştığım sırada çocuklarım olmuştu. Bazı hanımlar çocukları olunca çalışmaya ara veriyorlar benim çocuklarım olduğu zaman, böyle bir şey düşünmedim. Yani çocuk olmuş, işten ayrılıyım, yok öyle şey. Dediğiniz gibi başladık sonuna kadar mücadelemi devam ettirdim."

all their time and energy to the simultaneous performance of all these roles. And, this self-forgetful dedication to the well-being of both the family and the society gives them a sense of satisfaction. In this regard, it seems that the theme of devotion is a central tenet of the discursive formation of their subjectivities. The policewomen speak through a subject position that they are state agents who work hard for the mission of ensuring public safety, and yet, who do not neglect their duties pertaining to the family life.

The Embodied State Power: Women in Uniform

The policewomen posit themselves as “women of power” who miraculously achieve all those vital missions that are discussed above. Furthermore, they emotionally invest in this subject position through the feelings of pride and satisfaction. They feel honored and proud to be state subjects who have a privileged access to and share of state power. What deserves attention is that this emotional engagement is an embodied experience. That is to say, these emotions are materialized through their bodily experiences and performances as they wear the police uniform. The uniform makes them visible as the carriers of state power and thereby, it differentiates them from the ordinary citizens.

Therefore, the bodily excitations of the policewomen while they are in uniform have an essential role in their self-representation as state subjects. When the interviewees are asked about what they feel and how they behave while they are in their uniform, they maintain that the uniform should not be taken merely as a piece of cloth. It symbolizes the presence and reconfiguration of the state on a daily basis. In other words, the police uniform reminds both the policewomen and the society that the state is and will be always there. For them, the uniform is the major evidence of their own identification with the state. For instance, Gülseven’s account reveals how the

policewomen identify their position with the state through their embodied experiences of the uniform:

Policing is sacred, my girl. So, the uniform you see is sacred. I was retired on 1988, but I am still touched when I see this uniform. Why? Because this is not just a piece of fabric. The people entrust their honor, their life, property, and security to it. When I stand guard there this means that the state puts me and so, it means that I am not doing something ordinary.⁹⁶ (İstanbul, May 2008)

With the uniform, the link between the individual female officers and the state for which they stand becomes self-evident. Their appearance connotes the existence of the state as the ultimate and unified entity over the society. In this sense, it can be argued that the uniformed body of the policewomen is no longer their individual body. For instance, the informants perceive their own bodies as the crystallization of state power and this leads to constant self-control. They monitor their behavior to make sure that they represent the state in the best way possible. The following statement by Selma presents a good example in this regard:

Our uniform is of course very beautiful, but it is more important how to carry it. To carry it means how to talk, to behave, and to walk in it. It means to behave in a way that suits it. In the eyes of the people, the police means the state and therefore, you as police officers should deserve it. So, for me, to wear that uniform can not be put into words. It is beyond the words, it is something that makes you proud.⁹⁷ (Ankara, July 2008)

⁹⁶“Polislik kutsaldır kızım. Yani bu gördüğün üniforma kutsaldır. Ben bak emekli oldum 1988’te hala bu üniformayı görünce duygulanırım. Niye? Çünkü bu sadece bir bez parçası değil. İnsanlar buna namusunu emanet ediyor, canını, malını, güvenliğini. Ben orda dikilince bu ne demek, beni buraya devlet dikti, ben öyle herhangi bir şey yapmıyorum demek.”

⁹⁷“Tabii üniformamız çok güzel ama onu taşımak daha da önemli. Yani, taşımak demek ona göre konuşmak, davranmak, yürümek gibi. Belli bir şekilde, yani ona layık olacak şekilde olmak demek aslında. Çünkü, şimdi, polis demek halkın gözündeki devlettir, siz de polis olarak ona layık olmalısınız. Yani, işte o üniformayı taşımak aslında, kelimelerle anlatılamaz bence. Kelimeler ötesi, çok gurur verici bir şey.”

Likewise, Arzu underlines that when she wears the police uniform she feels as if she carries the state authority with/in her body. This entails that the policewomen enact and reconstitute state power via their bodily experiences. They discursively self-represent themselves as the personification of the state. As she puts it,

My style of walking, and even my posture change as I put on my uniform. Look, what I am saying, I do not even carry a plastic bag. Or, I do not haggle over the price if I do shopping. I purposefully do not do this to make sure that this uniform would not be blemished. For instance, I am mad at those female officers who carry a bag. Don't do it, this has a significance, so you have to behave accordingly.⁹⁸(İstanbul, May 2007)

To sum up, it is obvious that the uniform brings about a particular way of conduct. It determines the way these women experience their bodies and organize their behavior. They constantly make an effort to self-regulate their conduct in a way that it will be in tune with what they stand for, namely the state. In this regard, it seems that these women perceive the state as a singular and over-powerful entity that exists out there above the society, and they believe to represent it with/in their own bodies.

A Space of Intervention in the Social: The Policewomen as Empowered State Agents

As Sharma & Gupta (2006) appropriately suggest, state officials identify themselves as the agents of the state who are “bearers of a special status by virtue of their association with the state” (p.20). Unsurprisingly, the policewomen in this study also posit themselves as the holders of an exclusive position, and a variety of empowerment possibilities are generated through this self-identification. In other words, their exclusive

⁹⁸“Üniformamı giydiğimde benim yürüyüşüm, halim tavrım bile değişir. Ne diyorum sana, elimde poşet bile taşımam. Ya da mesela mağazada alışveriş yapıyorsam kesinlikle pazarlık yapmam. Özellikle yapmam, hanel gelmesin bu üniformaya diye yapmam yani. Mesela ben kolunda çanta taşıyan meslektaşlarıma da çok kızarım. Taşıma ya, çünkü bunun bir ağırlığı var sonuçta. Ona göre davranmam lazım.”

access to and share of state power enables them draw a space of action for themselves.

Didem's account is telling in this respect:

I am sure that nobody on the street could pass an improper word to me.
Secondly, I am sure that nobody can go against me, unless they are crazy.
I am sure that they would respect me more. There are even those who are
afraid of the police identity card.⁹⁹(İstanbul, August 2008)

It is obvious that she feels empowered thanks to advantages of holding such a momentous and superior position. She capitalizes on the effects the state creates in the ordinary people, namely a feeling of respect and fear, in order to create a distinct position for herself. Relying on her discourse, it can be claimed that the policewomen create a space of action by not only embracing, but also reproducing the way the state is imagined. To illustrate, the state is imagined as an object that should be admired as well as beared of. This empowerment is manifested in the following remarks of Ayşe:

Of course, there are many advantages of this uniform. It causes you to gain self-confidence and prestige. I am respected and my advice is followed in all the places where I go. I feel privileged that I started the game one score over an ordinary citizen.¹⁰⁰(Ankara, April 2007)

Here, it is discernable that an aura of prestige and self-esteem is maintained in the self-representation of the policewomen. As is clear with the expression "I started the game one score over an ordinary citizen" (*maça 1-0 önde başlıyorum normal vatandaşa göre*), a sense of distinctiveness has an indubitably key role in the way they discursively

⁹⁹"Bunu giyip de sokağa çıkınca bana kimsenin laf atamayacağından eminim. İkincisi, kimsenin bana karşı gelemeyeceğinden eminim, psikopat olmadığı sürece. Daha çok saygı duyacaklarından eminim. Polis kimliğinden bile korkan var yani."

¹⁰⁰"Tabii, bu üniformayı taşımamanın bir sürü getirisi oluyor. Özgüven ve saygınlık kazandırıyor mesela. Şimdi ben hangi ortama girersem gireyim orada sözüm dinleniyor, itibar görüyorum. Ayrıcalıklı hissediyorum, maça 1-0 önde başlıyorum normal vatandaşa göre."

constitute their own position. That is to say, they position themselves in an exclusive position of authority over against the society.

Furthermore, this sense of distinctiveness implies that the policewomen adopt and reconfirm the discursive demarcation between the state and the society. They reproduce this discursive separation by placing themselves on the side of the state as its distinguished agents. In their discourse, the state is envisaged as a body that is clearly separated from the society and that is put in a hierarchical position with regard to the latter. As is illuminated above, it is believed that the society needs the state for the perpetuation of its very existence. Hence, the state is elevated to a dominant position as a singular and preeminent entity, whereas the society is depicted as a dependent, needy, and sometimes unruly body.

As a consequence, the fact that they articulate their subject position via such a discursive separation enables the policewomen to fabricate a possibility of intervention. To delineate, they identify themselves with the state and in so doing, they normalize and legitimize its interventions in the society. This means that they are empowered as state agents who can interfere in the organization of the society in order to make sure its well-being. They are empowered as special state subjects who have state power at their disposal and exercise it in the way they deem proper.¹⁰¹ The account of Ahu presents an impressive example in this respect:

There is a meeting on Sunday in Kadiköy, we are discussing whether there is anything that threatens public order. If there is nothing wrong, we say “ok” and take measures. Yet, if there is a danger, we say “no, you can not” and we take measures. We investigate who is coming from where, where they will gather. We decide where the police should stand.

¹⁰¹ At this point, it should be noted that as the majority of the interviews are conducted in the Spring and Summer of 2008, many interviewees refer to the suppression of May Day celebrations by the police force in Istanbul. On the 1st of May, 2008, police use excessive force in disrupting the celebrations.

Is it possible that anybody can gather for a rally any time they want? We have to protect the security of the people, the freedom of the labor union ends where the freedom of the citizens begins. Take the events that happened on May Day. You might have watched it on TV. Did you see any masked protestors who are throwing stones to the police? They say “oh, the police use gas bombs”. Of course, they use can use it, it is their legal right...But we have to take measures, this is our job. We, as the police, are responsible to ensure public order in the name of the state. If you disturb it, I will take action against you, as well.¹⁰² (İstanbul, June 2008)

As is seen in Ahu’s narrative, the policewomen identify themselves as privileged subjects who are authorized to make certain decisions and draw certain boundaries to maintain the public order. Therefore, they have the legitimate power to intervene when they think these boundaries are trespassed. This self-authorization is explicit in Didem’s account:

Why would I slap someone I see on the street without any reason, am I crazy? But if s/he comes and trespass the lines you draw and provoke me, then of course, I would intervene.¹⁰³ (İstanbul, August 2008)

The self-construction of the policewomen as “women of power” refers to their supposedly legitimate resort to violence. They portray themselves as empowered agents in opposition to a disobedient group or an individual who threatens public security and therefore, who should be kept under control. This implies that a binary conception of the police versus its adversaries lies at the heart of their self-identification. And, as is

¹⁰² “İşte şimdi mesela Pazar günü kadıköyde miting var, onu görüşüyoruz, kamu düzenini tehdit eden herhangi birşey var mı diye. Uygunsa, yani kamu düzenine karşı birşey yoksa tamam diyoruz ve gerekli önlemleri alıyoruz. Ama, işte bir tehlike varsa, hayır, yapamazsın diyoruz ve yine önlem alıyoruz. İşte kim nerden gelecek, nerde toplanacak, polis nerede durmalı bunları belirliyoruz. yani, öyle her isteyen her yerde eylem yapabilir diye birşey olabilir mi? Biz vatandaşın güvenliğini korumak zorundayız, sonuçta sendikamızın özgürlüğü normal vatandaşın özgürlüğünün başladığı yerde biter. İşte alın, 1 mayıs olayları. İzlemişsindir sen de televizyondan, orada hiç polise taş atan maskeli gösterici gördün mü? Ne olmuş, vay, polis gaz sıkmış. Tabii ki kullanacak, yasal hakkı o polisin...Ama biz de önlem almak zorundaydık, görevimiz bu bizim. Sonuçta polis olarak devlet adına kamu düzenini sağlamakla yükümlüüz biz de. Sen kamu düzenini bozarsan ben de sana müdahale ederim.”

¹⁰³ “Şimdi ben yolda gördüğüm birine niye tokat atayım, psikopat mıyım? Ama orada gelip senin çizdiğin her türlü sınırı aşip da seni kışkırtırsa tabii ki müdahale ederim

evident above, any actor who oversteps the line drawn by the police would be taken and treated as their enemy. Furthermore, the ensuing treatment is justified with the claim that these unruly actors purposefully provoke the police who are already stressed by the challenging working conditions. As is narrated by Dilek:

On May Day, what can the police do, but not beating the people?
Because of them, we wake up at two o'clock in the middle of the night,
we put our life in danger, our motivation is broke down. We remain
standing for hours. With that tension, what the police can do other than
beating. Then, they say "this is police violence", the media defames the
police.¹⁰⁴ (İstanbul, June 2008)

As is noticeable here, the policewomen adopt the discourse that the police force is misrepresented in the media. It is propogated that the police force is an undemocratic and intolerant organization that mistreats the people. In this discourse, the police's excessive use of force is explained and legitimized with reference to the biased approach of the media. Only a minor piece of the incident is shown on TV. Therefore, the audience cannot capture what happens in the background of the incident that necessitates the use of violence. The following statement of Ayşe constitutes a good example of how the media is depicted in this discourse:

People believe in what they see on TV. Yet, we do not have our TV channel to advertise ourselves. Here, let's show what really happened and what made the police throw gas bombs. How we come to that point is not shown in the media, they just accuse the police.¹⁰⁵ (Ankara, April 2007)

¹⁰⁴“Polis 1 Mayıs'ta dövmesin de ne yapsın. Onların yüzünden gece ikide kalkıyoruz, canımız tehlikeye giriyor, motivasyonumuz alt üst oluyor. Saatlerce bekliyoruz ayakta. O sinirle polis dövmesin de ne yapsın. Sonra da polis şiddeti diyorlar, basın karalayıp duruyor.”

¹⁰⁵ “İnsanlar televizyonda gördüklerine inanıyorlar, ama bizim kendi kanalımız yok ki reklamımızı yapalım. İşte, gösterelim, gerçekte ne olmuş da o polis gaz sıkmış. Medyada sadece aman polis adam dövdü diye suçluyorlar ama o ana nasıl gelindi gösterilmiyor.”

Excessive use of violence by the police is portrayed as an exception that should not be generalized to the whole police organization. In addition, the policewomen position themselves within this discursive realm as the subjects who are determined to dispute this prejudiced perception of the police. They attribute a particular meaning to their policing duty, which is to change this distorted image of the police force in the eyes of even one person. This purpose is plainly expressed by Sevgi in the following terms:

For me, it is really important to change even one person's ideas about the police. For example, let's take the events on May Day. We are really misrepresented in the media that even I can believe this story if I was not there. There are just a few exceptional instances, yet the police force as a whole is depicted in that way.¹⁰⁶(Ankara, July 2008)

As exemplified in these quotations, the policewomen embrace the prevalent representation of the police force as a prominent institution without which public security cannot be sustained. This entails that they adopt the hegemonic discourse on policing that the police force is deliberately pictured in the media in a way that harms its public image. They articulate their subject position through the terms of this discourse as state agents who endeavor to change this image with their individual efforts.

Relying on the discussions presented above, it can be concluded that the policewomen are empowered in particular ways within the micro setting of policing. They are able to fabricate certain possibilities of empowerment despite their experience of assimilation and subjugation. To specify, they construct and negotiate their subjectivities as women of power, which means as agents of masculinist policing power and as distinguished state subjects. They are empowered as individual women against

¹⁰⁶“Benim için halktan bir kişinin bile polis hakkında düşündüklerini değiştirebilmek çok önemli. Mesela, işte son 1 Mayıs olaylarını alın şimdi. Medyada o kadar kötü lanse ediliyor ki, işin içinde olmasam ben bile inanırım.Orada bir iki münferit olaydır mesele, ama sanki bütün teşkilat öyleymiş gibi gösteriliyor.”

men thanks to their access to policing power. In addition, they are empowered through their self-identification as state subjects who personify and enact state power vis-à-vis the society. Thus, it seems a legible fact that the policewomen are empowered as active subjects who hold masculinist state power at their disposal and deploy it in diverse ways in their confrontation with different actors.

CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSION

The present study intended to discuss how state power and femininity are associated via the subjectivities of the policewomen. Arguing that state power is closely interrelated with masculine power in the context of policing, it has been suggested that the policewomen play a role in the reconstitution of the masculinist state power through their daily performances of masculinity and femininity. In this regard, one of the major goals of this thesis has been to understand how the gendered identities of the policewomen are constructed within the realm of policing. Accepting the notion of “doing gender” as a conceptual tool that is relevant in this case, it has been asserted that the gendered subjectivities of the policewomen are formed and reproduced as they do gender in their daily practices. That is, they do gender by practicing and enacting certain versions of masculinity and femininity in their very daily routines within the world of policing.

To delineate, “doing gender” refers to a de-essentialized conception of gender in which gender identities are not taken for granted. To the contrary, it is implied that gender identities are constantly managed and reconstituted through everyday interactions and relations of power among the agents within a specific context. That is, the construction of gendered subjectivities is conceived as an ongoing process that involves the subject’s mundane acts and performances. Moreover, the emphasis on “doing” indicates that the agency of the gendered subject is recognized as s/he is deeply engaged in the construction of her/his gendered identity. That is to say, she is the agent of this “doing” through her daily practices of particular forms of masculinity and femininity.

Drawing upon this conception, it has been argued that these gendered performances of the policewomen take place within the masculinist world of policing. Policing is defined and practiced as a male/masculine occupation that requires certain masculine traits like physical strength, toughness, aggressiveness, emotional detachment, and bravery. These are also the defining features of hegemonic masculinity which refers to the prevailing experience of masculinity that legitimizes the ascendancy of men not only over women, but also over other men. Within the scope of this study, the interest is narrowed down to how the subordination of women is maintained and justified in the domain of policing through hegemonic masculinity. Within the terms of hegemonic masculinity, authority is identified with masculinity, use of force is exalted as a proof of masculine power, and women are confined to a subjugated position. As these elements correspond to the masculinist parameters of policing, it has been argued that hegemonic masculinity is crystallized and institutionalized in the realm of policing.

Consequently, it emerges that the policewomen negotiate their gendered subjectivities in the backdrop of hegemonic masculinity. With its focus on use of force and emotional non-engagement, hegemonic masculinity is accepted as the norm of policing. And, the policewomen aspire to comply with this norm in order to prove their sameness with the policemen and thereby, their competence as police officers. Along with their performance of this particular form of masculinity, the policewomen also adopt the definition of femininity as a difference that should be either conditionally approved or concealed altogether. Their femininity is taken to be based on feminine attributes like compassion, support, care, and mutuality, and it is promoted in cases when they deal with certain groups like the children. It is also assumed that the

policewomen have better communication and problem solving skills, they are more prone to empathize with others, and thus, they can establish healthier relations with the community in which they work. As a result, their femininity is advocated in cases when they are expected to be the sympathetic face of the police force. Nevertheless, femininity of the policewomen is also conceived to be a difference that should be strictly controlled and disguised. It is believed to threaten the masculinist constitution of policing and therefore, put under rigid control or suppressed completely. That is to say, they are assumed to be desexualized and indeed masculinized subjects who make their femininity invisible within the masculinist environment of policing.

Hence, it has been claimed that the policewomen seek to perform the requirements of hegemonic masculinity, while at the same time they adopt the conception of femininity as a difference. Their experience of femininity complements and reinforces hegemonic masculinity and therefore, it can be interpreted as an instance of emphasized femininity. Taken together, their performances of hegemonic masculinity and emphasized femininity reproduce masculinism of the police force in particular, and the masculinist state power in general, within which women are subordinated by men and confined to a secondary position.

What is more, this analysis that lies at the core of the thesis is supported and enriched with a complementary question. Namely, it has been scrutinized whether and how the policewomen challenge or reiterate the masculinist constitution of policing. It has been maintained that they are assimilated into the male-dominated world of policing. This is because that they embrace the masculinist tenets of policing and articulate their own position via these terms. To demonstrate, the policewomen depict their experience of assimilation as an almost natural and inevitable process of transformation through

which they have become masculinized. Here, to become masculinized refers to their adoption of the prevalent masculinist norms and values of policing that are mentioned above, namely use of violence, and emotional distance.

It is also worthy of attention that the policewomen represent these gendered experiences through the seemingly gender neutral terms of the discourse of professionalism, such as professional performance, individual motivation and hard work. They depict the police force as a gender neutral environment where there is neither discrimination nor favoritism with regard to women. Nevertheless, as this discourse is further analyzed, its masculinist undertone has been revealed. The policewomen believe that female nature is inherently sinister and women are hostile to each other. Therefore, there is no need for more women in the police force as they will harm its harmonious functioning. This masculinist conception of women is also reflected in the way the high-ranked women are represented in their discourse. They are envisaged to be naturally incapable or unsuitable for a position of authority. Arguing that they internalize the identification of authority with masculinity, it has been maintained that there is no agenda for female solidarity among the policewomen in different ranks. In short, relying upon such an analysis, it has been asserted that the policewomen are transformed by policing, rather than the reverse. That is to say, it has been concluded that the presence of these women is not translated into an agency to change or at least question the masculinist configuration of policing.

Nonetheless, this does not necessarily mean that the policewomen are subjects with no agency. To the contrary, it has been explicated how they are empowered as the agents of masculinist state power even through their experience of subjugation. As has been discussed throughout the text, the policewomen are homogenized into the male-

dominated world of policing. They play a role in its reinforcement by internalizing as well as practicing its masculinist parameters. However, it has been argued that the policewomen are able to come up with certain possibilities of empowerment in this specific context that is characterized by unequal relations of gender and power.

To specify, they can be characterized as “women of power” where power connotes the masculinist state power. It has been suggested that their experience of empowerment can be captured along two central axes. Firstly, they are empowered as individual women against men thanks to their access to policing power. This means that they deploy the institutionalized masculinist power of policing in order to defy individual men’s power.

Secondly, the policewomen are empowered vis-à-vis the society via the subject position of privileged state agents. In other words, their subjectivities are constructed as distinguished state agents who hold a distinct and superior position over against the society. They see themselves as the personification of state power and they are empowered against the society via this self-representation. To clarify, it has been revealed that they define police work as a necessity without which the well-being of the society cannot be ensured. They attribute utmost significance to policing and thereby, believe that their own work is indispensable for public security. They construct their self-identification via moral terms as the peculiar state subjects who devote themselves to such a vital duty. What is more, the feelings of pride and satisfaction accompany their performance of this mission and these emotions are embodied via their bodily experiences in the police uniform.

To elucidate, with the uniform marking their status as privileged state agents, the policewomen identify themselves with the state as opposed to the society. At this point,

it has been asserted that the policewomen internalize the discursive differentiation between the state and the society, and reproduce it by positing themselves on the side of the state as its special agents. And, through this position they open themselves a space of action and intervention in relation to the society. They capitalize on the effect that the imagination of the state as an object of admiration and fear create on the people. Furthermore, they resort to violence against the actors whom they deem to be dangerous and threatening for public security. It is also revealed that they legitimize their use of force via recourse to the hegemonic discourse of policing. That is, they believe that the police force is misrepresented in the media as a violent organization that is unfriendly towards the public. And, they represent themselves as peculiar state agents who can revise this distorted image with their personal efforts.

To recapitulate, the picture that is drawn throughout this study can be delineated as the following: The gendered subjectivities of the policewomen are constructed and negotiated within the masculinist world of policing as they do gender, which means through their everyday performances of masculinity and femininity. These gendered experiences take place in the backdrop of hegemonic masculinity that is accepted as the central tenet of policing. With these daily practices, the policewomen normalize and embrace the masculinist norms of policing and thereby, become assimilated into the male-dominated universe of policing. They are content with the conception of policing as a male/masculine job and thus, with their subjugated position in the police force. Therefore, it can be said that they have a role in the reproduction and perpetuation of the masculinist constitution of policing in particular, and the masculinist state power in general. However, they are also capable of carving a space of empowerment even within this experience of subordination. They are empowered against men as women who have

access to policing power, and they are empowered over against the society as state agents who hold and embody state power.

With its argument that is reviewed as such, this study contributed to the gender-blind literature on the police in Turkey thanks to its gender perspective. Moreover, it promised to fill a vacuum in the body of knowledge on policewomen with its distinguished focus on specific aspects. To clarify, this analysis can be differentiated from the previous studies with its concern on the subjectivities of the policewomen. It aimed to grasp how their gendered subjectivities are constituted within the masculinist universe of policing. In so doing, it goes beyond the simplistic typology of roles that is prevalent in the literature, namely *policewomen* versus *policewomen*. It has been shown that the construction of their subjectivities is a process that is more complicated than the adoption of certain gender traits. As has been elucidated throughout the text, it is a process in which the policewomen are deeply involved by articulating certain subject positions through particular discourses.

In addition, this analysis proposed to go beyond the existing literature by revealing the link between daily gendered performances of the policewomen and masculinist state power. Although it has been widely discussed that they face with discrimination and exclusion, these gendered experiences of policewomen have not been yet related to the masculinist character of state power. This is because that the uniqueness of their position as state agents has not been recognized. Arguing that these women have a unique position as state agents who exercise and personify state power, this study attempted to underline the fact that their gendered practices, which refers to the ways they do gender, are interrelated with the gendered nature of the state.

What is more, the agency of the policewomen within the masculinist world of policing has not been discussed in the literature. That is to say, what is told about policewomen is merely a story of discrimination and subordination. Although it also shares this focus on their subjugation, this work differs from the preceding studies with its unique concern about the empowerment of policewomen. Claiming that these women are empowered vis-à-vis men and the society, this study uncovers the space of action and intervention the policewomen are able to create even within their experience of subordination.

As the last word, this present study endeavored to carve a distinct place for itself in the relevant literature with its peculiar methodology. An in-depth insight has been gained through the interviews with sixteen policewomen. Moreover, this understanding has been enriched with an analysis on the representational space within which they are positioned. By looking at their own narratives as well as how they are represented in the media, the discursive space through which the gendered subjectivities of the policewomen are constructed and negotiated has been analyzed. And, in so doing, the singular voices and stories of the policewomen are heard and respected.

REFERENCES

- Acker, J. (1990). Hierarchies, jobs, bodies: a theory of gendered organizations. *Gender & Society*, 4, 139-158.
- Acker, J. (1992). Gender institutions: from sex roles to gendered institutions. *Contemporary Sociology*, 21, 565-568.
- Alanlarında İlk Olan Türk Kadınları. [Pioneer Turkish women] (2007, March 7). Retrieved September 16, 2007, from <http://www.ntvmsnbc.com/news/401924.asp>
- Amos-Wilson, P. (1999). The women in blue shalvar-kameez. *Women in Management Review*, 14, 128-135.
- Aradhana, S., & Gupta, A. (Eds.). (2006). *The Anthropology of the State: A Reader*. Malden, MA; Oxford: Blackwell Pub.
- Arat, Y. (1996). On gender and citizenship in Turkey. *Middle East Report*, 198, 28-31.
- Arat, Y. (1997). The project of modernity and women in Turkey. In S. Bozdoğan & R. Kasaba (Eds.), *Rethinking Modernity and National Identity in Turkey* (pp. 95-113). Seattle: The University of Washington Press.
- Aretxaga, B. (2003). Maddening states. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, Vol. 32, 393-410.
- Aydın, A. H. (1997). *Police organisation and legitimacy: case studies of England, Wales, and Turkey*. Aldershot, Hants, England; Brookfield, Vt.: Avebury.
- Berksoy, B. G. (2007). *The Policing of Social Discontent and the Construction of Social Body: Mapping the Expansion and Militarization of Police Organization in Turkey in the Post-1980*. Unpublished Phd, Boğaziçi University, Istanbul.
- Berksoy, B. G. (2009). Devlet stratejilerinin bir tezahürü olarak polis alt-kültürü: 1960 sonrası Türkiye'de polis teşkilatında hakim olan söylemlere dair bir değerlendirme. *Toplum ve Bilim*, 114, 92-130.
- Berksoy, B. G. (2007). Neo-liberalizm ve toplumsalın yeniden kurgulanması: 1980 sonrası Batı'da ve Türkiye'de polis teşkilatları ve geçirdikleri yapısal dönüşüm. [Neoliberalism and the reconstruction of the social: Police organizations and their structural transformation after the 1980s in the West and Turkey] *Toplum ve Bilim*, 109, 35-65.

- Bilgiç, E. (2005, April 23) “Polisim ama kızım kapkaç mağduru.” [I am a police officer, yet my daughter is also a victim of purse-snatching] *Sabah*. Retrieved September 25, 2007, from <http://www.arsiv.sabah.com.tr/2005/04/27/ep/gnc/101-20050423-101.html>
- Bora, A. (2005). *Kadınların Sınıfı: Ücretli Ev Emeği ve Kadın Öznelliğinin İnşası* [The Class of Women: Paid Housework and the Construction of Female Subjectivity]. Istanbul: İletişim.
- Bora, T. (1994). Devletin Polisi, Polisin Devleti. [The police of the state, the state of the police] *Birikim*, 57/58, 3-11.
- Bora, T. (2001). Polis Partisi. [The Police Party] *Birikim*, 141, 8-10.
- Brereton, D. (1999). *Do women police differently? Implications for police-community relations*. Paper presented at the Second Australasian Conference on Women and Policing, Queensland.
- Brewer, J. D. (1991). Hercules, Hippolyte and Amazons-or policewomen in the RUC. *The British Journal of Sociology*, 42, 231-247.
- Brown, J. & Sargent, S. (1995). Policewomen and firearms in British police service. *Policing*, 18, 1-16.
- Brown, J. (1996). *Women, policing and the millenium*. Paper presented at the First Australasian Women Police Conference, Sydney.
- Brown, J. (1997). European Policewomen: A Comparative Research Perspective. *International Journal of Sociology of Law*, 25, 1-19.
- Brown, J. (1998). Aspects of Discriminatory Treatment of Women Police Officers Serving in Forces in England and Wales. *The British Journal of Criminology*, Vol.38, 265-283.
- Brown, J. (1999). Abusive relationships at work - policewomen as victims. *Criminal Justice Matters*, 35, 22-23.
- Brown, W. (2006). Finding the Man in the State. In A.Sharma & A. Gupta (Eds.), *The Anthropology of The State: A Reader* (pp. 187-210). Malden, MA; Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Bu Kadın Polislerden Korkulur. [You have got to be afraid of these women police] (2007, November 21). *Hürriyet*. Retrieved September 21, 2007, from <http://arama.hurriyet.com.tr/arsivnews.aspx?id=7732761>
- Burke, R. J. & Mikkelsen, A. (2005). Gender issues in policing: do they matter? *Women in Management Review*, 20, 133-143.

- Can, Y. İ. (2006). *Volunteers or Governors? Rethinking Civil Society in Turkey beyond the Problematic of Democratization: The Case of TEGV*. Unpublished Master Thesis, Boğaziçi University, Istanbul.
- Cerrah, İ. (1998). *Crowds and public order policing: an analysis of crowds and interpretations of their behaviour based on observational studies in Turkey, England and Wales*. Aldershot; Brookfield, Vt: Ashgate.
- Cerrah, İ. (2006). Polis [The Police]. In U.Cizre (Ed.), *Almanac Turkey 2005 Security Sector and Democratic Oversight* (pp. 82-96). Istanbul: Tesev Publications.
- Chakravarty, S. (1998). Mainstreaming gender in the police: the Maharashtra experience. *Development in Practice*, 8, 430-438.
- Connell, R.W. (1987). *Gender and Power: Society, the Person and Sexual Politics*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Connell, R.W. (1990). The state, gender, and sexual politics: theory and appraisal. *Theory and Society*, 19, 507-544.
- Connell, R.W. & Messerschmidt, J. (2005). Hegemonic masculinity: Rethinking the concept. *Gender & Society*, 19, 829-859.
- Cornwall, A. & Lindisfarne N. (1994). Dislocating masculinity: gender, power and anthropology. In A. Cornwall & N. Lindisfarne (Eds.), *Dislocating Masculinity: Comparative Ethnographies* (pp.11-47). London: Routledge.
- Cumhuriyet Polisinde Kadın. [The woman in the Police Force of the Republic](1933) *Polis Mecmuası*, 286, Ankara.
- Darien, A. (2002). The Alter Ego of the Patrolman? Policewomen and the Discourse of Difference in the NYPD. *Women's Studies*, 31, 561-608.
- De Guzman, M. & Frank, J. (2004). Policewomen and their problems: the Philippine context. *Policing*, Vol. 27, 396-412.
- Demir, G. (2006). Eşitsizliğin Bilinen Örneği? Çalışan Kadınlar Bağlamında Kadın Polisler. [A well-known example of inequality? Policewomen as a case of working women] *Polis Dergisi Sayı*, 47, 145-147.
- Demir, M. C. (2003). *Discrimination against police women: a case of Turkish policewomen in Ankara*. Unpublished Master Thesis, Middle East Technical University, Ankara.
- Demircan, S. (1973). Türkiye'de bayanların polise alınışları, tekamül ve bu günkü durum. [The recruitment of women to policing in Turkey, the transformation of

their role and the current situation] *Kamu Yararına Çalışan Polis Emeklileri Derneği Polis Dergisi*, 248, 52-54.

Devletin Zirvesine Kadın Polisler. [Policewomen at the top ranks of the state] (2008, October 8). Retrieved September 25, 2007, from http://www.polis.web.tr/article_view.php?aid=78

Dick, P. & Cassell, C. (2004). The position of policewomen: a discourse analytic study. *Work, Employment and Society*, Vol. 18, 51-72.

Cumhuriyetin 50. Yılında İçişleri Bakanlığı. (1973). Ankara: Emniyet Genel Müdürlüğü Yayınları.

Elazığ'ın Sevgilisi Asayiş Melekleri. [Sweetheart of Elazığ: Public Security Angels](2004, October 17). *Sabah*. Retrieved May 11, 2008, from <http://arsiv.sabah.com.tr/2004/10/17/gny/gny125-20041017-200.html>

Emniyetin Gururu Kadın Polisler. [The police organization is proud of its female officers](2007, February 4). *Hürriyet*. Retrieved March 18, 2008, from <http://arama.hurriyet.com.tr/arsivnews.aspx?id=5889540>

Ercan, K. (2001, December 14) Polis Akademisi'nin ilk kadın dekanı. [The first female dean in the Police Academy] *Hürriyet*. Retrieved September 25, 2007, from <http://arama.hurriyet.com.tr/arsivnews.aspx?id=42643>

Ergut, F. (2006). *Modern Devlet ve Polis: Osmanlı'dan Cumhuriyet'e Toplumsal Denetimin Diyalektiği* [Modern State and the Police: Dialectics of Social Control From the Ottoman Empire to the Republic]. Istanbul: İletişim Yayınevi.

Garcia, V. (2003). Difference in the police department: women, policing, and doing gender. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*, Vol. 19, 330-44.

Gold, M. E. (2000). The progress of women in policing. *Law & Order*, Vol. 48, 159-161.

Gürel, S. (2009, July 7). Polisin %5.8'i kadın. [5.8 percent of the police are composed of female officers]*Hürriyet*. Retrieved, July 10, 2009, from <http://www.hurarsiv.hurriyet.com.tr/goster/haber.aspx?id=12018070&tarih=2009-07-07>

Foucault, M. (1991). Governmentality. In G. Burchell, C. Gordon & P. Miller (Eds.), *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality* (pp. 87-104). Hemel Hempstead, England: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

- Foucault, M. (1991). Questions of Method. In G. Burchell, C. Gordon & P. Miller (Eds.), *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality* (pp.73-86). Hemel Hempstead, England: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- Foucault, M. (1982). The Subject and Power. In H. Dreyfus & P. Rabinow (Eds.), *Michel Foucault: Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics* (pp.208-226). Brighton: Harvester.
- Haney, L. (1996). Homeboys, babies, men in suits: the state and the reproduction of male dominance. *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 61, 759-778.
- Hautzinger, S. (2002). Criminalising Male Violence in Brazil's Women's Police Stations: from flawed essentialism to imagined communities. *Journal of Gender Studies*, 11, 243-251.
- Hautzinger, S. (2007). *Violence in the city of women: police and batterers in Bahia, Brazil*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Heidensohn, F. (1996). Making it even: equal opportunities and public order. In C. Critcher & D. Waddington (Eds.), *Policing Public Order: Theoretical and Practical Issues* (pp.173-185). Aldershot, UK; Brookfield, USA; Avebury; Brookfield, Vt. USA: Ashgate.
- Heidensohn, F. (1996). *The Impact of Police Culture: Setting the Scene*. Paper presented at the First Australasian Women Police Conference, Sydney.
- Heidensohn, F. (2002). *Women in Control? The Role of Women in Law Enforcement*. Oxford University Press: New York.
- Herbert, S. K. (1996). The Normative Ordering of Police Territoriality: Making and Marking Space with the Los Angeles Police Department. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 86, 567-582.
- Herbert, S. K. (1997). Territoriality and the Police. *The Professional Geographer*, 49, 86-94.
- Herbert, S. K. (1998). Police Subculture Reconsidered. *Criminology*, 36, 343-396.
- Herbert, S. K. (2001a). From 'Spy' to 'Okay Guy': Trust and Validity in Fieldwork with the Police. *Geographical Review*, 91, 304-310.
- Herbert, S.K. (2001b). Hard charger or station queen? Policing and the masculinist state. *Gender, Place and Culture*, 8, 55-71.
- Horn, R. (1997). Not 'one of the boys': women researching the police. *Journal of Gender Studies*, 6, 297-308.

- Horne, P. (1999). Special report: equality in policing. *Law & Order*, 47, 52-62.
- Huggins M. & Gleebeek M. (2003). Women studying violent male institutions: cross-gendered dynamics in police research on secrecy and danger. *Theoretical Criminology*, 7, 363-387.
- Kadın Bombacıya Ödül. [The female member of bomb disposal squad is awarded].(1997, December 27). *Hürriyet*, Retrieved September 25, 2007, from <http://arama.hurriyet.com.tr/arsivnews.aspx?id=-280739>
- Kakar, S. (2002). Gender and police officers' perceptions of their job performance: an analysis of the relationship between gender and perceptions of job performance. *Criminal Justice Policy Review*, 13, 238-256.
- Kadioğlu, A. (1998). Cinselliğin İnkarı: Büyük Toplumal Projelerin Nesnesi Olarak Türk Kadınları [Denouncing Sexuality: Turkish Women as Objects of Grand Social Projects]. In A. B. Hacımırzaoğlu (Ed.), *Bilanço 98, 75 Yılda Kadınlar ve Erkekler* [Women and Men in 75 Years] (pp. 89-101). Istanbul: Türkiye Ekonomik ve Toplumsal Tarih Vakfı.
- Kul, M. & Göçer, İ. (2003). Türkiye'nin İlk Bayan Emniyet Müdüresi Feriha Şanerk: "Hayatım Hep Mücadeleyle Geçti". [The first female police chief in Turkey Feriha Şanerk says, "All my life was full of struggles"]*Polis Dergisi*, 37. Retrieved April 16, 2008, from http://www.egm.gov.tr/egitim/dergi/eskisayi/37/web/soylesi/ferihan_saney.htm
- Levine, P. (1994). Walking the Streets in a Way No Decent Woman Should: Women Police in World War I. *The Journal of Modern History*, 66, 34-78.
- Jackson, L. A. (2003). Care or Control? The Metropolitan Women Police and Child Welfare, 1919-1969. *The Historical Journal*, 46, 623-648.
- Jordan, J. (2002). Will any woman do? Police, gender and rape victims. *Policing*, 25, 319- 344.
- Marks, M. (2004). Researching Police Transformation: The Ethnographic Imperative. *British Journal of Criminology*, 44, 866-888.
- Martin, S. E. (1980). *Breaking and Entering: policewomen on patrol*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Martin, S. E. (1991). The Effectiveness of Affirmative Action: The Case of Women in Policing. *Justice Quarterly*, 8, 489-504.
- Martin, S.E. (1996). *Doing Gender, Doing Police Work: An Examination of the Barriers to the Integration of Women Officers*. Paper presented at the First Australasian Women Police Conference, Sdney.

- Martin, S. E. & Jurik, N.C. (2007). *Doing Justice, Doing Gender: Women in Legal and Criminal Justice Occupations*. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications.
- McElhinny, B. (1994). An economy of affect: objectivity, masculinity and the gendering of policework. In A. Cornwall & N. Lindisfarne (Eds.), *Dislocating Masculinity: Comparative Ethnographies* (pp. 159-171). London; New York: Routledge.
- Metin, İ. & Erarslan, F. (1998). *Türkiye’de Polis ve Kişi Hakları* [The Police and Individual Rights in Turkey]. Istanbul: İletişim Yayınevi.
- Morash, M. & Haar, R. N. (1995). Gender, Workplace Problems, and Stress in Policing. *Justice Quarterly*, Vol.12, 113-140.
- Natarajan, M. (1996). Women Police Units in India: A New Direction. *Police Studies*, 19, 63-75.
- National Center for Women and Policing (NCWP) (2002). *Equality Denied: The Status of Women in Policing 2001*. Retrieved January 23, 2009, from http://www.womenandpolicing.org/PDF/2002_Status_Report.pdf
- National Center for Women and Policing (NCWP) (2003). *Hiring & Retaining More Women: Advantages to Law Enforcement*. Retrieved January 23, 2009, from <http://www.womenandpolicing.org/pdf/NewAdvantagesReport.pdf>
- National Center for Women and Policing (NCWP) (2004). *Recruiting & Retaining Women: A Self-Assessment Guide for Law Enforcement*. Retrieved January 23, 2009, from <http://www.womenandpolicing.org/sag.asp>
- Nelson, S. (1996). Constructing and negotiating gender in women's police stations in Brazil. *Latin American Perspectives*, 23, 131-148.
- Neocleous, M. (2000). *Fabrication of social order: A critical theory of police power*. Sterling: Pluto Press.
- Özçekiç, İ. (2004, August 15). Kadın trafik polisleri yollarda. [Female traffic police officers are now on the streets] *Hürriyet*. Retrieved September 20, 2007, from <http://arama.hurriyet.com.tr/arsivnews.aspx?id=249474>
- Panzere Kadın Şoför. [The female panzer driver] (1999, March 31). *Hürriyet*. Retrieved September 21, 2007, from <http://arama.hurriyet.com.tr/arsivnews.aspx?id=-70723>
- Rabe-Hemp, C. (2008). Survival in an “all boys club”: policewomen and their fight for acceptance. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management*, 31, 251-270

- Reiner, R. (2000). *The Politics of the Police*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Santos, C. M. (2004). En-gendering the police: Women's police stations and feminism in Sao Paulo. *Latin American Research Review*, 39, 29-55.
- Santos, C. M. (2005). *Women's Police Stations: Gender, Violence, and Justice in Sao Paulo, Brazil*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Schulz, D. M. (1993). From policewoman to police Officer: An Unfinished Revolution. *Police Studies International Review*, 16, 90-98.
- Schulz, D. M. (2003). Women police chiefs: a statistical profile. *Police Quarterly*, 6, 330-345.
- Schulz, D. M. (2004). *Breaking the Brass Ceiling: Women Police Chiefs & Their Paths to the Top*. Westport, Connecticut: Praeger Publishers.
- Scott, J. W. (1988). *Gender and The Politics of History*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Silvestri, M. (2007). "Doing" Police Leadership: Enter the "New Smart Macho". *Policing & Society*, Vol. 17, 38-58.
- Silvestri, M. (2002). *You can't have it both ways; being an officer and a lady (woman) in a male dominated occupation*. Paper presented at the Third Australasian Women Police Conference, Canberra.
- Sirman, Nükhet. (2005). The making of familial citizenship in Turkey. In E. F. Keyman & A. İçduygu (Eds.), *Citizenship in a Global World: European Questions and Turkish Experiences* (pp. 147-173). London: Routledge.
- Sokullu-Akıncı, F. (1990). *Polis: toplumsal bir kurum olarak gelişmesi, polis alt-kültürü, ve insan hakları* [The Police: its development as an institution, police sub-culture, and human rights]. Istanbul: Gümüş Basımevi.
- Somvadee, C. and Morash, M. (2008). Dynamics of sexual harassment for policewomen working alongside men. *Policing: An International Journal of Police*, 31, 485-498.
- Şahin, E. (2004). *Türk Polis Teşkilatının Şanlı Geçmişinde ve Cumhuriyete Giden Yolda İz Bırakan Polisler* [The police officers who left a legacy in the glorious history of Turkish police force and on the road to the Republic]. Ankara: Emniyet Genel Müdürlüğü Yayınları.
- Şahin, E. (2005). 1890–1894 Yılları Arasındaki Zabtiye Nezaretinin Yapılanmasında Görev Alan Kadın Çalışanlar ile İlk Kadın Polis Memuru Fitnat Hanım [The

female officers who worked in the constitution of the general directorate of security and the first female police officer, Fitnat Hanım]. *Polis Dergisi*, 43, 2-9.

Tosunođlu, D. (2006, September 25). Cerrah'ın Melekleri. [The Angels of Cerrah]. *Akşam*. Retrieved September 20, 2007, from <http://www.tumgazeteler/?a=1710050>

Türkiye'nin İlk ve Tek Atlı Kadın Polisi İzmir'de. [Turkey's first and the only female officer on the horseback is in İzmir] (2003, March 7). *Hürriyet*. Retrieved September 25, 2007, from <http://arama.hurriyet.com.tr/arsivnews.aspx?id=132048>

Vega, M. & Silverman, I. J. (1982). Female police officers as viewed by their male counterparts. *Policing: An International Journal of Police*, 5, 31-39.

Wells, S. K. & Alt, B. L. (2005). *Police women: life with the badge*. Westport, Connecticut: Praeger Publishers.

West, C. & Zimmerman, D.H. (1987). Doing gender. *Gender & Society*, Vol. 1, 125-51.

West, C. & Fenstermaker, S. (1995). Doing difference. *Gender and Society*, Vol. 9, 8-37.

Westmarland, L. (2001). Blowing the whistle on police violence. *British Journal of Criminology*, 41, 523-535.

Woodson, A. (1993). The first women police: a force for equality or infringement? *Women's History Review*, 2, 217-232.

Yiyenođlu, Ç. (1995). *Sakıncalı Kadın Polis Nurhan Varlı'nın Anıları* [Memoirs of Nurhan Varlı, a dangerous police woman]. Istanbul: Çağdaş Yayınları.